

Adjournment Debate

of the press. Thanks to the coolness of an American colonel, nothing really happened. However, there were many people in hospital. Soldiers from both sides flooded the demilitarized zone because of one particular incident.

I am afraid that the pressures of international communism or the pressures of the international cold war are going to turn themselves to Korea. Be that as it may, and without trying to relate blame in any way, shape or form, I simply suggest, as I did to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) the other day, that Canada try to play some role to get the two sides to sit down and talk over their differences. The only way I can see that this can be profitably and usefully done is to get them outside the Korean boot, the Korean peninsula.

There is no chance at all of resolving the differences of both North and South Korea if they are locked in some meeting in the demilitarized zone. It has to be tried in an international gathering. I know we do not recognize them and they do not recognize us. The Canadian position, as I understand it, is that Canada will not object to meeting with North Korea at some table at an international gathering. This being so we have a golden opportunity to take the initiative in trying to talk these two sides into resolving their differences.

Mr. Herb Breau (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the government shares the hon. member's concern over the recent rise in tension on the Korean peninsula. Indeed, it is the government's view that recent actions and pronouncements by North Korea, in particular a decidedly belligerent statement by North Korea's leader during a recent visit to Peking, represent a grave threat to the continued maintenance of international peace and security on the Korean peninsula. These developments are of course more alarming for having followed so closely the recent events in Viet Nam and Cambodia. In consequence, Canada has been discussing the Korean situation with like-minded friends. We appreciate, however, that there is very little Canada alone can do about the situation other than to continue to support efforts to achieve progress in the current dialogue between North and South Korea.

With respect to the hon. member's proposal that North and South Korea be brought together in an international forum, there already exists, in our view, no lack of forums in which the two sides can discuss their differences, including the North-South Co-ordinating Committee talks whose terms of reference provide for discussion of virtually all issues holding up unification between North and South Korea, the Red Cross talks aimed at re-uniting families separated by the division of the peninsula, the Military Armistice Commission talks to ensure the maintenance of the 1953 armistice agreement, and discussions of the Korean question at annual sessions of the United Nations General Assembly in New York. We recognize that there appears to have been little progress achieved to date in any of these four forums but some useful proposals have been tabled by both sides on outstanding questions separating them.

One major problem, however, is still North Korea's apparent unwillingness to accept that re-unification can take place only if each side is reassured about the peaceful intentions of the other, and only on terms which are

[Mr. McCleave.]

acceptable to the peoples of both Koreas. Until an understanding on these issues is reached, we believe the process will be a slow one, and that talks between the two sides in any forum are likely to be inconclusive.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—GARRISON IRRIGATION PROJECT IN
UNITED STATES—REQUEST FOR CANADIAN EFFORTS TO
SECURE MORATORIUM ON CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rose to propose a motion under Standing Order 26 in order that there might be a full and open discussion of the Garrison diversion project. Although Mr. Speaker did not allow my motion he was very sympathetic and suggested I pursue it at another level. I am doing so this evening in the adjournment debate.

I am suggesting that the Canadian government contact the United States government and demand an immediate halt to the Garrison diversion project and stop turning Manitoba into a sewer or a toilet for this undertaking. I should like to point out that according to recent news reports, one dated May 17 of this year, the Ohio representative, Mr. Charles A. Vanik, stated that the Garrison project was environmental and economic madness. He added:

The Bureau of Reclamation has tried to do everything in its power to push the Garrison project ahead. Nothing can hide the fact, however, that it is an environmental disaster.

● (2210)

He further stated that the United States House of Representatives should place a moratorium on the project, and I am asking the Canadian government to support this moratorium tonight. I hope the parliamentary secretary will give me an answer in this regard. We can no longer put this off and say there will have to be more studies and research, and then pass it on to the IJC. This is simply stalling. While that is being done, the bulldozers and construction equipment are at work daily in North Dakota completing the Garrison diversion project. I hope that the parliamentary secretary will give me some confirmation tonight that the government is going to take firm action to have this whole project stopped, since people in the United States are also asking that a moratorium be placed on the project.

Speldon Meyers, director of the Environmental Protection Agency federal activities, has stated in a letter that the study of a private group, the Institute of Ecology, had done a much better environmental assessment of the project than had the Bureau of Reclamation, and had "accurately pointed out many of the deficiencies". The Environmental Protection Agency agrees with this institute's concerns about the adverse effects of the project on Canada.

Richard Madson of the U.S. Audubon Society has stated that court action must be taken immediately if the project is to be stopped in time. During this interview on May 14, 1975, he further stated that the report of the International Joint Committee on the project would not be completed for a year's time, that the Lonetree reservoir would be completed and the project could not be stopped. Also, the