

ment also included an increase in widows' benefits by 50 per cent of the amount of the scaled increase.

It is true that no increase was granted at that time to personnel who retired after January 1, 1973. I do not think the hon. member should read anything ominous into this particular move by the railroad.

The approach of applying a scaled flat dollar addition has been viewed as a suitable interim measure pending the completion of the Hall report to which the hon. member has referred and for which we have been waiting for some time. As he points out, the Hall hearings are continuing. I understand they will be in Thunder Bay, Winnipeg and Regina next week, and later on in Edmonton, Calgary, Victoria and Vancouver. Mr. Hall has indicated to the minister that he hopes to make his report available by the end of the summer. I share the hon. member's view that the quicker we can see this report the better, since it will provide a blueprint for the kind of action he and others of us would like to see taken with respect to pensions of railway employees.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—GARRISON DIVERSION—SUGGESTION
UNITED STATES BE ASKED FOR MORATORIUM ON PROJECT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am rising again to speak against the Garrison diversion project unit because new evidence has surfaced to support my demand that Canada request a moratorium, and because of a distinct note of urgency at this particular time. On June 20, this coming Friday, more millions will be appropriated to this project. A formal note must therefore be sent immediately seeking to halt, until the report of the International Joint Commission is completed, what promises to be one of the greatest ecological calamities of the century.

I hope the parliamentary secretary will address himself more directly to my specific points tonight than he did on May 20 or May 29 when he blissfully re-stated the U.S. government's assurances of compliance with the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty only minutes after I had quoted the chairman of the Congressional Sub-committee on Conservation, Energy and National Resources as saying that the Garrison Diversion unit was certain to result in a treaty violation.

Also on May 29, the parliamentary secretary noted that the ongoing discussions, with the United States were at a government to government level and specifically not at the level of the Bureau of Reclamation. This has been precisely my point. It is the Bureau of Reclamation which has been pushing forward with this project heedless of any and all protests from the United States and Canada. Further to this, I intend to give new evidence and examples of the way in which the bureau has misrepresented the facts to the United States government.

I have here the minutes of an April, 1975, hearing before a House of Representatives Appropriations Sub-committee. In testimony the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamations, Gilbert Stamm, stated flatly that Canada's only objections to the project were over return flows from the Souris Loop division, specifically the mineral levels. This is untrue. Canada and Manitoba have repeatedly voiced fears of large-scale pollution of the Red and Assini-

Adjournment Debate

boine Rivers and Lake Winnipeg, as well as the northward flowing Souris River. Mr. Stamm also neglected to mention Canadian concern over the introduction of exotic species into Manitoba waters and the incredible loss of 350,000 waterfowl annually in North Dakota, which we consider an international resource and an international loss.

Mr. Stamm's testimony also gave the false impression that the objections were near the point of being satisfied and that discussions were going on with Canada as to alternatives. This is untrue, according to diplomatic sources and to Stamm himself, who stated in a memo that studies on alternatives were not to be made available "to local interests or to the Canadians" because "to do otherwise would be very damaging to the United States position in the negotiations." If the United States government is not receiving an accurate overview of the facts on the Garrison unit, then all the good faith in North America is not going to halt the degradation of Manitoba water quality.

● (2210)

Further to this, Manitoba and Canada have based their official positions on a time frame that would not begin construction on the Velva canal until 1980. According to my hon. friend opposite and to the minister of mines, resources and environmental management in Manitoba, this canal is the connecting link between the Missouri River and the Souris River. But the Bureau of Reclamation, as stated in a confidential memo dated April 25, 1975, and signed by Gilbert Stamm, anticipates consideration of construction approval to be completed by June, 1976, four years earlier than the official level assurances. This memo states that the secretive studies of the alternatives will require three to four years to complete, but that a decision could be made in one year regardless of that.

There is no question that the diversion plan, as currently envisaged, will result in damage to the quality of water in Canada. The Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) is in complete agreement with this. As Ambassador Cadieux noted on January 16, 1975:

The Canadian government is firmly convinced, on the basis of studies conducted in the United States and Canada, and on the basis of information provided by the United States in response to questions raised by Canadian officials at the August 28 meeting, that the Garrison diversion unit, as presently envisaged, would have adverse effects on the Souris, Assiniboine and Red Rivers, and ultimately Lake Winnipeg, which would cause injury to health and property in Canada.

American groups, such as the general accounting office, the U.S. State Department and the congressional sub-committee chairman I named earlier, agree with this claim to the letter. Yet Mr. Stamm continues "to maintain our original position that there has not been sufficient evidence provided to indicate that return flows from the Garrison diversion unit will cause a violation of the Boundary Waters Treaty." Mr. Stamm further believes that "return flows will improve the potential for beneficial use of waters from the Souris River".

It is obvious that we are in a very dangerous position, and it appears that the United States government is not even fully aware of the Bureau of Reclamation's beliefs, and its plans for the project. This is further proof of the need for an immediate moratorium on the project. I there-