

Garrison Diversion

Following a tour of diversion sites and meetings with American officials, the Manitoba Conservative caucus concluded that key data on the Manitoba situation is missing from American studies and that Manitoba apparently is relying exclusively on these studies for its protection. As a result, the Conservatives called on the NDP provincial Government to do a complete environment impact study, itself. The NDP claimed that no such independent study was necessary because both countries were working amicably on the full range of environmental impact reviews. In addition, Manitoba has a pledge from the U.S. State Department that the Americans will abide by their treaty obligation and do nothing to pollute Canadian waters.

I have just pointed out what the Attorney General of North Dakota stated and what Senator Mark Andrews stated—they are going to complete the project.

The Leader of the Manitoba Conservative Party stated that the Government's reliance on another jurisdiction to protect Manitoba's interest is a gross dereliction of duty. He was referring to the NDP Government of the day. It sat back while North Dakota was proceeding full speed ahead with the diversion project.

The North Dakota Senate commended a former NDP premier of Manitoba for not attempting to stop the Garrison Diversion project. How naive can we be, Mr. Speaker.

A Member of the United States National Audubon Society, Richard Madson, said in an interview that the former NDP Premier of Manitoba received a letter, approved by both the United States Senate and the legislature of North Dakota, which thanked him for not backing a proposal to finance court action against the project. The former NDP Premier of Manitoba had taken this action although the State of Minnesota had come to the conclusion that litigation was the only way to stop the project in time. This former premier now lives across the street from the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker.

It was reported in the *Winnipeg Free Press* that at a time when Minnesota was wisely implementing legal action to protect the rights of its citizens to a clean and healthy environment, the former Manitoba NDP Premier not only blocked such action on the part of Manitobans but received a commendation from the very individuals promoting the development which will degrade the quality of Manitoba's environment. The resolution of commendation from the Garrison promoters is an incredibly clear indication of just how completely the former Manitoba NDP Premier and his caucus had failed in their elected responsibilities to protect the interests of Manitobans.

● (1550)

In October of 1982, the *Winnipeg Free Press* reported that the Manitoba NDP Government spent more than \$86,000 that year on its fight against the giant North Dakota Garrison irrigation project without reaping any tangible evidence of success. That includes more than \$20,000 in legal bills from a Washington law firm and expenses for a Crown attorney to lobby Congressmen on Capital Hill. The NDP Government

has hired more people, spent more money and published more pamphlets, yet has not been effective in halting the Garrison Diversion project, and by the time we go to the World Court to debate the Garrison Diversion project, it will be completed.

If Garrison proceeds, a multimillion dollar Canadian industry will be destroyed simply by changing the direction in which that river water flows. North Dakota is bisected by a height of land or divide. North of the divide, water runs north to Hudson's Bay through the Hudson's Bay drainage basin. Land south of the divide is in the Missouri River drainage basin. The two drainage basins have been separated since the last ice age. Each has developed its own kinds of fish. For the first time, because of the Garrison project, the Missouri River water flow north across the divide. With the water would come fish and fish eggs, as well as parasites and diseases which do not now exist in the Hudson's Bay drainage basin.

Use of this water to irrigate land in this basin would enable Missouri fish to move north into Canada. The International Joint Commission investigated the Garrison Diversion project. The Commission warned that the introduction of foreign species of fish into Lake Winnipeg would result in major reductions in the more highly valued species. Whitefish, walleye and sauger populations could decrease 50 per cent to 75 per cent. This would wipe out the commercial fishery. The IJC further stated that while most of the impacts can be mitigated, those from the possible Biota transfers are so threatening that the only acceptable policy at present is to delay construction of those features of the Garrison unit which might result in such transfers. Furthermore, if this project proceeds, it will violate the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, which reads:

—waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury or health or property on the other.

I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of Canada contact the President of the United States and launch an official protest. I understand a report came out of Minneapolis last week that a note was sent recently to Mr. Schultz in the United States. We have been sending notes, having little meetings and writing letters for about seven or eight years, but the project is still being continued. As I pointed out earlier, Senator Andrews and the Attorney General have made their positions perfectly clear. They are going to complete the Garrison Diversion project regardless of what is going to happen to Canadian waters.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, we have gone beyond the point of funding little groups to study the matter, and going to the World Court. The Prime Minister will have to take a position on this immediately and contact the President to ask him if he will investigate and report back to the Prime Minister on whether he will be able to stop this project and make sure that Canadian waters are protected.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in the debate today on Motion No. 28, a motion which was put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant), and seconded by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre