

"only if it could be implemented consistent with the United States obligations under the Boundary Waters Treaty" and that no contracts would be let until Canada had been afforded "an opportunity to consult with the Government of the United States on specific features, and adequate assurances had been given that Canadian waters could be protected, as recommended by the IJC".

Canadians, Manitobans in particular, have always valued such assurances and appreciated the fact that the United States is proceeding with construction of only phase I features, which will not transfer Missouri water to the Hudson Bay basin and which are subject to the modifications and safeguards introduced through the technical consultative mechanism.

What the Canadian side had in mind was a study of viable alternatives to phase II construction outside the Hudson Bay draining basin which could not affect adversely waters flowing over the border into Canada. In response, the United States agreed to support and broaden initiatives to study such alternatives. This agreement is a good example of the kind of positive results which emerged from the April 25 consultations and which motivated the Hon. Member to speak as he did about the breakthrough last week.

The McClusky Canal Fish Screen and phase II were the most significant but not the only concerns addressed at the April consultative group meeting. The consultative group reviewed and concurred with 17 recommendations and conclusions submitted in the technical committee's report for resolving a substantial number of Canada's detailed engineering and wildlife mitigation concerns which had been outlined in Canada's note No. 473. For example, the consultative group agree with the technical committee recommendation that the municipal and industrial outlet from Lonetree Dam be sealed with a bulkhead/frange/steel plate structure considered technically superior to the concrete plug agreed to in November, and so on.

Canada approached the April consultations with the twin objectives of ensuring that phase I technical modifications and safeguards are fully adequate and obtaining tangible evidence that United States assurances respecting phase II are indeed credible. The United States agreement to construct the McClusky Canal Fish Screen and to support studies of alternatives to phase II marks a significant advance toward both these objectives and reinforces, in particular, the utility of the technical/consultative process as the most effective mechanism for resolving any remaining or newly-emerging concerns.

I hope my remarks will satisfy the Hon. Member to some extent and that no further motions on this subject will be necessary.