

Garrison Diversion

Pursuant to those 1935 appeals, the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the American Bureau of Reclamation began considering the feasibility and the engineering possibilities of constructing dams along the Missouri River system. The plan put forward at that time was known as the Pick-Sloan Missouri River basin plan. In a document dealing with Manitoba and the Garrison Diversion Unit, it is stated that in 1943 Congress authorized the Army Corps of Engineers to construct the mainstem series of dams on the Missouri River and that at the time the United States Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation was awarded the Garrison diversion unit. Work began on the Garrison dam in 1947, and it was completed by 1956.

Subsequent to the completion of the Garrison dam, proposals were put forward for the entire irrigation unit. The plans put forward in 1957 and 1959 did not meet the cost-benefit requirements of the United States government, and they were rejected. A plan was put forward in 1962 which was approved by the United States Congress in August, 1965.

The paper that I referred to earlier describes the unit that was authorized in 1965 as a "multi-purpose water resource project to divert Missouri River water into central and eastern North Dakota where the water will be used to irrigate 250,000 acres of land, provide a municipal and industrial water supply to 14 cities and furnish recreational and fish and wildlife opportunities throughout the area".

What the plan does, essentially, is to take water from the Missouri River, transport it in an easterly direction across north central North Dakota into a reservoir called the Lonetree reservoir. This reservoir acts as the hub of a wheel. Flowing out from the Lonetree reservoir the water goes northward through the Velva canal, eventually into the Souris River and into Canada. Flowing eastward through the New Rockford canal, the water eventually goes into the Sheyenne River and then into the Red River which goes into Canada. It flows southward along the James River feeder canal into the James River, the Wild Rice River and again into Canada.

The Lonetree reservoir is really the crux of the whole problem in Canada and more particularly in Manitoba. It is at the Lonetree reservoir that the water from the Missouri River breaches the continental divide and becomes linked with the Hudson's Bay drainage basin. This link-up eventually causes most of the problems. It brings water, biota, chemicals and parasites into the Canadian water system which are completely foreign to Canada.

Subsequent to the authorization given in 1965, construction on the Snake Creek pumping station which is an integral part of the system, was started in 1968. In 1970 construction of the McClusky Canal, one of the largest parts of the project, was started. The most recent work on the Garrison diversion unit was a tender called in 1980 for construction of the New Rockford canal.

In April, 1969, the Canadian government became concerned about some of the possible adverse effects that the Garrison unit would have in Canada. At that time the first of many notes between Canada and the U.S. state department and our

embassy in Washington was passed. Canada sent a note verbale requesting information on the Garrison unit. In October, 1971, the first diplomatic note was sent protesting the adverse effects of the Garrison diversion unit return flows. The Canadian concern reached the point in 1975 where the whole issue was referred by the United States and Canada to the International Joint Commission which, after an extensive and very good study, filed a report in 1977.

This is where I have a problem, Mr. Speaker. Since 1977 nothing has been done to implement the recommendations of the International Joint Commission. There have been no bilateral negotiations. Nothing has been done, and it is this lack of action that my motion addresses.

Let us consider the recommendations of the International Joint Commission. The report filed in 1977 clearly stated that the Garrison diversion unit, if constructed and completed as designed, would have adverse effects on the environment of Manitoba. It concentrated on three particular areas of concern. The first was water quantity; increased flows of water would come into Manitoba at certain times of the year. The second was water quality; there would be an increased chemical content in the water coming into Manitoba. The third, and probably the most critical in the long run, was the adverse impact that would be felt by the biological resources of Manitoba. This includes an impact on fish stocks in Manitoba, and wildlife stocks among other things.

● (1710)

I should now like to speak about the effects of Garrison on the fish stocks in Manitoba. First I would like to read into the record some comments I made in October, 1980, when I was speaking on a motion concerning fisheries in Canada. I shall quote from a technical report issued in February, 1979, by the Fisheries and Marine Service. It is entitled "Potential Effects of Exotic Fishes on Manitoba: An Impact Assessment of the Garrison diversion unit". I shall refer to three fish which will have serious impact in the province of Manitoba. First is the rainbow smelt. In this connection the report reads:

—we believe that rainbow smelt will be successfully introduced and established in Manitoba waters. . . . We believe that smelt, when introduced to Manitoba, will cause the collapse of lake herring populations in Lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba and Winnipegosis and will have a major negative impact on the lake whitefish fishery in the north basins of Lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba.

Smelt will also have negative impacts on walleye fisheries in certain locales of Lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba and Winnipegosis. Declines in the abundance of higher-valued species will result in decrease in fishermen's incomes such as occurred in Lake Erie during the late 1950s.

The report goes on about the gizzard shad. It reads:

—we believe that gizzard shad will be introduced and can be established in Lakes Winnipeg, Manitoba and Winnipegosis. There are suitable environmental and habitat conditions, food supplies and spawning areas for establishment of gizzard shad populations in these waters. . . . Magnitude of impact may range from minimal impact to the worst possible impact of total collapse of walleye and sauger populations in these lakes.

With regard to a third fish, the Utah chub, the reports reads:

In summary, Utah chub have a high reproduction potential, a potential for population irruptions and likely can establish in Manitoba waters. . . . Further-