

The McClusky Canal Fish Screen was not included in original designs for the Garrison project, but was added shortly before 1975 in response to concerns, mainly from Canada - one can see from this that the matter has been going on for at least ten years - that diverted Missouri River water would convey undesirable fish species, fish disease, and other biota via McClusky Canal directly into the Lonetree reservoir. From there it would enter into all associated water systems of the Hudson Bay basin. However, at a bilateral technical meeting in Ottawa on July 20, 1983, the United States made available to Canada the final supplemental environment statement prepared by the Department of Interior which reported that the fish screen was no longer contemplated. Canada was told that this decision would be made final only after the consultations anticipated for the fall. This kind of thing went on.

Canada's request for construction of the fish screen was raised by the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) when he met with Secretary of State Mr. Shultz for their bilateral discussions on October 16 and 17 in Halifax. The same issue dominated the agenda at the November 21, 1983, meeting. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that this has been a matter of concern to both sides at a high level for quite some time. I suppose the cost of this project was really one of the problems, because the cost for the Fish Screen Project is \$40 million.

In April, the consultative group reapproached the question of the fish screen, this time equipped with the results of the technical committee's study of the fish and biota situation in the Missouri and Hudson Bay systems. Canada built its case for the fish screen on the technical committee's finding that there had been no significant change in the distribution of problem fish species in the Missouri and Hudson Bay systems which would cause different conclusions to be reached from those in the 1977 International Joint Commission, reinforcing its case with the technical committee's conclusion that downstream movement of rainbow smelt and other Missouri species into the Lonetree reservoir was certain without the fish screen while the fish screen, though unproven, would provide a first line of defense against any such movement.

The second major issue dominating the agenda for the April 25 consultations was the question of U.S.A. intentions regarding phase II. Canada has taken every opportunity to communicate its unequivocal opposition to phase II, and did so once again at the consultations. As anticipated, the United States repeated earlier assurances provided in diplomatic notes and at bilateral discussions that phase II would be undertaken