

*Garrison Diversion*

of Canada certainly intends that the government of Manitoba will be fully involved in all preparations for the consultations and will be represented among the Canadian participants.

Clearly, any developments must be viewed within the context of the new United States administration and Congress. The Government of Canada is considering and re-evaluating the most effective methods of ensuring that the new Congress and administration are fully aware of the seriousness of Canadian objections to the project. Our officials in Washington have been working actively over the past few months on this. All hon. members are aware that discussions are now under way to arrange a visit by President Reagan to Canada early in his term of office, and this will provide another opportunity to review the issue at the highest level.

The federal government and the government of the province of Manitoba are working together, and it is important that Canada speak with one voice on this issue. The two governments, the Government of Canada and the government of Manitoba, have well in place the legal and technical bases on which Canadian opposition to the Garrison project rests, and this co-ordination has been one of Canada's strengths in discussion of the issue to date. The individuals and the citizens' organizations that have made their viewpoints known have also contributed.

While we are dealing here with a possible violation of an international treaty, one perhaps would not want to speculate too much on possible sanctions, although the hon. member has raised this possibility. I think it is important to remember that Canada has had long and friendly relations with the United States. Our relations have generally been based upon co-operation and respect for international obligations, and we hope that this final round of negotiations will result in a satisfactory arrangement in which Canada's environment is protected.

**Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter for the province of Manitoba. I have stated for a long time and I have felt for a long time that it is certainly not a partisan issue. It is one which I hope transcends partisan political boundaries, and I am glad that the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) raised this question this afternoon through a private members' motion.

I am not sure I agree totally with some of the things the hon. member requests in his motion, but I certainly agree with the intent of the motion. We cannot for one lapse of time take for granted that we will not have problems with our water if it comes from the United States into Canada as a result of the transfer of water from the Missouri to the Hudson Bay basin. I will not get into the engineering end of this, or why we do not want the water, because I think these were covered quite adequately by the hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake.

What does concern me is the fact that this is an international affair; there can be no doubt about that. This matter involves an international boundary and, as such, the responsibility for showing leadership with respect to Manitoba and Canada clearly rests with the federal government.

When I see a private member's motion such as the one raised here this afternoon, I am led to comment that the federal government has not been doing what it should be doing in terms of taking leadership and seeing that the area of Canada which will be affected is aware of what the federal government is doing and, not only aware, but also satisfied that what the federal government is doing is what it should be doing.

Groups have been organized in Manitoba to go down to North Dakota to protest the further construction of the dam in question.

● (1740)

The thing that concerns everybody is that each year as the project goes on more money is allocated to it, and each year that more money is allocated to the project we get impetus to have the project completed. With the completion of the project we will get the transfer of the water and therefore the problems. This is borne out in local papers in Manitoba.

I have an article here from the *Daily Graphic* of Portage la Prairie, November 17, 1980, reporting that the U.S. consul-general in Winnipeg urges Canadians to be heard. Michael Carpenter, the U.S. consul-general in Winnipeg, stated:

Manitobans must stand up and be counted in their opposition to the Garrison diversion project, the U.S. consul-general in Winnipeg said in Portage la Prairie Saturday evening.

Here is an American consul-general saying Manitobans must stand up and be heard. Here is an article from the *Brandon Sun* of November 19 last year and the headline is "Flashing Amber Signalled for Garrison Construction". Again, I am talking about the proceeding of the construction of the dam.

There is an article in the *MacGregor Herald*, which is a local paper in southern Manitoba, of November 19, and the headline is "Audubon Society's Case No Comfort to Canada". I will quote from the first paragraph:

A spokesman for Canadian groups opposing the Garrison diversion project said he was not optimistic about the National Audubon Society winning its case to halt or scale down the project after hearing the proceedings of a U.S. federal court case in Washington Friday.

The Audubon Society is an American based society. Its members are also concerned about the ongoing construction and completion of the dam.

Another headline from a local paper dated December 10 reads "North Dakotans Not Getting anti-Garrison Message". I will finish with a quote as recent as January 21, and the headline is "North Dakota Governor's Statements on Garrison Deplored by Manitobans". It goes on to say:

A joint meeting of Canadian and American citizens in Jamestown, N.D. has produced a statement that "deeply deplores" North Dakota Gov. Al Olson's recent assertion that the Garrison diversion project should proceed until it is proven it could harm Manitoba's fishing industry.

We do have a lot of concern. There is concern on both sides of the border. If the federal government were doing what it should be doing, and that is showing some leadership in this area, we would not necessarily be having all of the concern by