

Garrison Diversion

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 "only if it could be implemented consistent with the United States obligations under the Boundary Waters Treaty", and that no contracts would be let until Canada had been afforded "an opportunity to consult with the Government of the United States on specific features, and adequate assurances had been given that Canadian waters would be protected, as recommended by the IJC".

● (1740)

Canadians, Manitobans in particular, have always valued such assurances and appreciated the fact that the United States is proceeding with construction of only phase I features, which will not transfer Missouri water to the Hudson Bay basin and which are subject to the modifications and safeguards introduced through the technical consultative mechanism.

What the Canadian side had in mind was a study of viable alternatives to phase II, construction outside the Hudson Bay drainage basin which could not affect adversely waters flowing over the border into Canada. In response, the United States agreed to support and broaden initiatives to study such alternatives. This agreement is a good example of the kind of positive results which emerged from the April 25 consultations and which motivated the Hon. Member to speak as he did about the breakthrough last week.

The McClusky Canal Fish Screen and phase II were the most significant but not the only concerns addressed at the April consultative group meeting. The consultative group reviewed and concurred with 17 recommendations and conclusions submitted in the technical committee's report for resolving a substantial number of Canada's detailed engineering and wildlife mitigation concerns which had been outlined in Canada's note No. 473. For example, the consultative group agree with the technical committee recommendation that the municipal and industrial outlet from Lonetree Dam be sealed with a bulkhead/fringe/steel plate structure considered technically superior to the concrete plug agreed to in November, and so on.

Canada approached the April consultations with the twin objectives of ensuring that phase I technical modifications and safeguards are fully adequate and obtaining tangible evidence that United States assurances respecting phase II are indeed

credible. The United States agreement to construct the McClusky Canal Fish Screen and to support studies of alternatives to phase II marks a significant advance toward both these objectives and reinforces, in particular, the utility of the technical/consultative process as the most effective mechanism for resolving any remaining or newly-emerging concerns.

I hope my remarks will satisfy the Hon. Member to some extent and that no further motions on this subject will be necessary.

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to listen to the comments of the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) with respect to his motion. He mentioned that there were two valid reasons, given other circumstances, for his being inclined to strike out paragraph No. 3 in his recommended conduct with respect to the Garrison Diversion project. It occurred to me that there was one very valid reason for striking the recommendation to bring to trial in the World Court the Government of the United States. It is simply that the provision is offensive and objectionable when dealt with in the fashion the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake would bring it.

He mentioned that he spoke about this issue 14 times in the House. He said that he had even gone to Washington to deal with this important matter. Let it be clearly understood that the matter of the Garrison Diversion project is serious. It has, if it proceeds, a most detrimental effect upon the welfare of this country, in particular the welfare of the people of Manitoba who live in the immediate vicinity of the project. So long as the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake and his colleagues in the House persist in attacking the Government of the United States, its representatives and the nation of the United States, as though they were Canada's bitter enemies, there is little likelihood that they can, under any circumstances, convince the administration of that country that it should deal with this serious matter as it affects Canadians in a manner which will be beneficial to Canadians.

I am not suggesting for a moment that in pursuing our goals, as they relate to the welfare of the environment and the economic well-being of the country, we ought not to be persistent and determined. However, it does us no good in advancing that cause if members of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba, in particular the minister responsible for the environment of Manitoba, attend meetings at which symbols of the United States are burned in effigy. In the event that people are legitimately concerned about the welfare of Canada and genuinely believe that something should be done to prevent this project from ever proceeding, we must advocate our positions in a strong and determined but friendly fashion.

The United States is not the enemy of Canada. The United States has defended freedom and liberty. It has the same kind of system of government as we do in terms of permitting the people to determine how the country is run. It has, through its defensive mechanisms, protected the entire North American continent. I know the Hon. Member who brings this motion and his colleagues would prefer at every opportunity to attack that friendly neighbour to the south, attack it for involving