

northern Ontario are not accurate as far as young people are concerned because there are few Manpower centres in the north and there are great distances between these Manpower centres. The result is that not as many young people are registered with Manpower centres in northern Ontario compared with the south. Therefore, there is a bias toward large urban areas in southern Ontario where young people are registered with CMC. It is projected that the penetration rate of CMC for youth applications for jobs is about 30 per cent in the north.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I put two questions to the minister tonight. Firstly, how does the minister justify such budgetary discrimination against northern Ontario in projected OFY funding? Secondly, will the minister give a commitment here and now to restructure the OFY grant formula so that the disadvantaged north will receive its fair and just share of Opportunities for Youth grants?

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, while it is true that most regions of Canada will receive less funds for the OFY program in the summer of 1974 than they did for the OFY program in the summer of 1973, I should like to reiterate the reply which my minister gave to the hon. member when he put his question on Monday, March 11, as reported in *Hansard* at page 353:

The final sub-provincial allocations have not yet been struck.

In fact, although the share for the province of Ontario has been increased—that is, the proportion—the allocation will still be smaller than last year's. Last summer the Department of the Secretary of State funded 1,211 projects in Ontario at a cost of \$8,929,843. However, hon. members on both sides of this House will be aware that the total budget for the OFY program of 1974 has been reduced from that of last summer. As my minister indicated in his letter to members of February 28, the budget for the summer of 1973 totalled \$35,315,159, while \$25,625,000 has been set aside, after costs of administration, for allocation under the 1974 summer OFY program. Members will recall that the letter also provided a table of the allocation of funds by province.

As far as the allocation for each labour market area is concerned, the answer of March 11 stands. I do not know where the hon. member got his information, but I do know that the preliminary figures that he provided are wrong and bear no relationship to fact even as preliminary figures. In fact, his figures are made up out of whole cloth. When the final allocation is made, it will take into account the freshest data on this year's employment opportunities available to students in each labour market area. At that time my minister will be happy to give hon. members the correct allocations for each labour market area.

I might add that the preferences which the hon. member quoted obviously refer to the distribution of grants within a particular labour market area and not to allocation within a province. They are not the criteria for sub-provincial allocation.

Adjournment Debate

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—GARRISON WATER DIVERSION PROJECT—FEDERAL REPRESENTATION AT MEETING BETWEEN NORTH DAKOTA AND MANITOBA GOVERNMENTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on a matter which is of much concern both to me and to the people of Manitoba. I am referring to the infamous Garrison diversion unit, a huge United States irrigation project currently under construction in North Dakota. This project has immense environmental implications for Canada as it will seriously degrade the water quality of Lake Winnipeg and two Manitoba rivers, the Souris and the Red. According to wildlife ecologists with the Manitoba department of mines, resources and environmental management, Manitoba will be the sewer of the project. It is thus imperative that the federal government continue to convey in a forceful manner Canadian opposition to the scheme.

To date, \$60 million has been spent on the first phase of the project which is designed to channel great quantities of water from the Missouri River to irrigate some 250,000 acres of U.S. farmland. It is estimated that a further \$500 million to \$1 billion may be spent before the project becomes a reality. Incredible as it may seem, this money is being spent to irrigate 250,000 acres of semi-arid land that already supports workable dry land agriculture. Even more astounding is the fact that the dam and diversion project, with an awesome network of reservoirs, canals, roads and bridges, will consume nearly as much land, 248,000 acres, as will eventually be irrigated.

As was mentioned, the deleterious environmental effects this mammoth scheme will have on Canada are many. Run-off water from the project will be diverted into the Souris River and the Red River flowing from North Dakota into Manitoba. The salt content of the Souris will be doubled or even tripled, seriously polluting a river which currently serves as the water supply for the town of Souris and indirectly, through the Assiniboine River, Portage La Prairie. In addition, it is impossible for towns and cities to attract industry when the water supply is polluted.

Even more serious are the fish, bacteria, parasites, fungi and other junk that will flow into the Manitoba when the Garrison project joins the watersheds of the Missouri River and the Red River for the first time since the glacial age. As well, ecologists fear that the Garrison diversion will destroy 26,000 to 39,000 acres of North Dakota wetlands and threaten an additional 34,000 acres, which could seriously affect migration of Canadian waterfowl. The project could also alter the immigration patterns of the birds and interrupt their mating cycles. On top of this, the increased water flow could increase incidents of waterfowl poisoning. Scientists have also pointed out that nutrients flushed from irrigated soil in North Dakota will reach Manitoba, accelerating the growth of algae, and possibly turn Lake Winnipeg into another Lake Erie, thus destroying the fishing industry and recreational areas on the lake.

These are but a few of the potential environmental repercussions of the Garrison diversion unit. Even though the Garrison project was conceived by the United States government in 1965, it was not until April, 1969, that Canada formally acknowledged the existence of the