

this function tasks the technical committee with monitoring the plans of the United States for future development and advising the consultative group on technical considerations related to whether and how phase II might be developed outside the Hudson Bay drainage basin without damage to Canadian waters. In this respect, as with phase I concerns, the consultative group technical committee's interface provides Canada with an effective bilateral mechanism for narrowing the gap between general assurances at the policy level and actual project modifications at the technical level.

In my opening remarks I mentioned that in the May 1 statement of the Hon. Member he portrayed the April consultations as good news and a breakthrough. I would like to emphasize that the outcome of the consultations, which was very positive indeed, was no accident but was, rather, the product of a lot of hard and concentrated work by the technical committee and its task forces. In the short space of time between its establishment in January, 1984 and the April consultative group meeting, the technical committee met four times in Winnipeg, Bismarck, again in Winnipeg, and in Denver to examine those phase I technical concerns for which engineering plans were available and to monitor Bureau of Reclamation construction schedules and budget documents relative to the intentions of the United States for future development of the Garrison projects. At its first meeting in January, the technical committee established a supportive task force structure in the fisheries and biota, wildlife mitigation and engineering fields, which comprised representatives of the Canadian, Manitoban, the United States and North Dakotan Governments. Arrangements were also made to establish a fourth task force. These meetings and consultations went on endlessly and are continuing.

Hon. Members who have followed closely the Garrison debate over the past year will be familiar with the two key issues which were uppermost in the minds of the Canadian delegation as the consultations approached. The issue of whether or not the United States would construct the McClusky Canal Fish Screen had been a subject for consultation in November, with inconclusive results, and deferred to the April consultations when the report of the technical committee on the biota situation in the Missouri and Hudson Bay systems would be available. Of equal concern was the issue of the intentions of the United States regarding phase II, that is, the continued construction and the need to secure tangible evidence that assurances of the United States were credible.