

that Minnesota outfitters bought significant amounts of equipment in Ontario, one illustration of mutual interest. He added that the controversy between Ontario and Minnesota was causing U.S. fishermen to avoid the entire area. "We are both losing."

The discussion then turned to the question of whether the issue might be referred to the International Joint Commission. The Canadian M.P. from northern Ontario suggested that the IJC might be the appropriate body because both sides claimed violations of the Boundary Waters Treaty. This view was endorsed by a number of other Canadian and U.S. delegates but questioned quite pointedly by others. A Canadian Senator from Ontario argued that the dispute was a regional and a local issue, not a national one, and therefore the two parties on the scene would have to solve it. A Congressman strongly doubted that the IJC would want to have anything to do with the issue. The Canadian co-chairman of Committee III closed the discussion by assuring the American delegates that, whatever approach was taken, they had strong support for their concerns from the Canada-U.S. Group.

White Pass and Yukon Railroad

A Senator from Alaska described this issue as a very difficult one. The railroad had tremendous historic interest because it ran along the beautiful 'trail of 98', but had gradually lost its economic base of carrying ore to Skagway and was finally closed. The Senator had proposed that Alaska subsidize the railroad but the closing of the Cyprus-Anvil mine caused Alaska to back away from any such proposal. It was now being proposed to use the Carcross-Skagway highway to carry the ore, if and when the mine reopens, but the tourist industry was strongly opposed. The Senator argued that with heavy traffic the road would have to be rebuilt every year, making the railroad "cost effective in the long run." He conceded that the future of the railroad hinged on the future of the mine though subsidized transport would help make the mine viable. A Canadian M.P. from British Columbia said there was little chance of discussing the transportation issue until the mine reopened. He pointed out that it was a high cost mine faced with a very competitive world market. The U.S. Senator acknowledged that "we have a hell of a lot of lead and zinc" and that the prospects for reopening the railroad were not all that bright.

The Raising from Lake Ontario of U.S. Naval Vessels

A Congressman from New York said that he had been responsible for putting this matter on the agenda. It concerned two U.S. ships sunk in Canadian waters during "the recent conflict between Britain and the U.S." (The War of 1812). He informed delegates that the vessels were in good shape and that in 1979 the custody and title of the vessels had been transferred to the Royal Ontario Museum with provision that any bodies recovered would be returned to the U.S. The Congressman explained that the U.S. side "wants in the worst way" to raise the vessels and to display one of them. He said that the U.S. was willing to raise the vessels, cover the costs and give

one of them to Canada but that Ontario had refused on the grounds that the vessels belonged to the province. He concluded his brief remarks by thanking delegates for this opportunity to bring the matter to their attention.

II. Environment Issues

The Garrison Diversion

A Canadian Senator from Manitoba opened the discussion by saying the two countries had "come a long, long way" in resolving the Garrison issue and that discussions in the Canada-U.S. Group had been very helpful. A Congressman from Minnesota agreed and said that, while he was a supporter of Garrison, he was satisfied with the recommendations of the Garrison Commission which had been established in July 1984. He remarked that Senator Andrews of North Dakota had asked for the Commission in the knowledge that, without some kind of compromise, the project would have died in Congress. The Democratic Congressman from Minnesota agreed that establishment of the Commission was a good compromise and that the Commission's recommendations had guaranteed that the entire project would be kept on the U.S. side. He said that both Canadian and American environmental groups had been satisfied with this approach. The Canadian Senator who had opened the discussion now closed it by saying that apart from an update at next year's meeting, delegates might look forward to Garrison being dropped from the Canada-U.S. agenda.

The Flathead River

A U.S. participant remarked that the Flathead issue was "the flipside of Garrison". The U.S. was concerned that a proposed British Columbia coal mine development on Cabin Creek near its confluence with the Flathead River would have harmful effects on the air and water quality of Glacier National Park and inhibit the migration of wildlife. He noted that in February, Canada and the U.S. had jointly referred the matter to the IJC and that as long as it was being studied "we don't need to do more here". He said that the IJC report might be issued before the next Canada-U.S. Group meeting.

A Canadian M.P. from British Columbia assured the U.S. delegates that Canada would maintain normal water standards but expressed the hope that the U.S. would not insist on such high water quality standards as to make economic development impossible. An American delegate interjected that the Canadian argument was a lot like the one used by the Dakotas to justify the Garrison project. A Canadian M.P. acknowledged the point, but said that if both countries insisted on pristine standards there would be no development anywhere on boundary waters. He suggested that it was necessary to come up with "tolerant" water standards. The U.S. co-chairman of Committee III warned that environmentalists would be adamantly opposed to any deterioration of water standards on the Flathead. He then drew the discussion to a close by saying he was confident the IJC would help resolve this issue.