

Garrison Diversion

has expressed his concerns about new mechanisms. The Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) has said that we do not want phase II to go ahead. A resolution, which I believe was passed unanimously by the House, resolved to refer this matter to the World Court. Lawyers from Canada and the United States have suggested a uniform trans-boundary pollution reciprocal access Act, which the Americans scoffed at. However, the Hon. Member for York North tells us to trust the Americans.

Mr. Gamble: Are you kidding? What were you listening to?

Mr. Irwin: I heard Nicaragua mentioned.

Mr. Gamble: Yes.

Mr. Irwin: I heard many stories about the American flag.

Mr. Gamble: Yes.

Mr. Irwin: However, I did not hear much about the issue itself.

Mr. Gamble: I told them how to negotiate.

Mr. Irwin: I did not hear much about the issue, and the issue is that we in Manitoba are concerned that we should be addressing the matter as a federal House and not leaving it for a few MPs and MLAs to discuss and not leaving it to periodic dialogue in the House.

I think the public perception of this issue in Canada is much like it is in North Dakota, that is to say, 5 per cent know about the issue and want it, 5 per cent know about the issue and do not want it, and 90 per cent do not know about the issue and do not care. That is the perception in Canada of the Garrison Diversion.

I believe that if our responsibility is to the entire country, we should learn a little more about the situation and not talk about communism in the United States. We should talk about the very important fishing industry of Manitoba.

Mr. Gamble: Obviously you were not listening.

Mr. Irwin: There have been some compromises made. First, the United States invited Canadian scientists to study the matter. I think we should have taken them up on that invitation. However, the decision not to do so was a political decision. I believe we erred by not accepting that invitation.

The Americans then proposed a closed waterways system. To their credit, the Americans have suggested compromises for our benefit. Unfortunately, at the time of the proposal of the closed waterways system, the Americans wanted to save millions of dollars by doing it on the cheap, and therefore the closed waterways system was not very safe. As a matter of fact, it turned out to be worse for us than what had been suggested in the first place.

If those are the proposals of the Americans, they do not give us any great faith in them. The Americans proposed the formation of a technical committee, and I give them full credit

for that proposal because it seems that they are going to go ahead with the project notwithstanding what was done in Canada. This joint Canadian-American committee has been formed and it assures us that it will stand on guard, for want of a better word, because it cannot do much else. It assures us that it will stand on guard against the malfunctioning of the screen, the implementation of phase II, and the introduction of parasites into Canada. However, such treaties have existed with the United States since 1909. I believe it was in 1909 when the original trans-boundary water treaty under which the IJC functions was introduced. Since that time, not only the Americans but also the Canadians have polluted the water system.

I will begin with the pollution that originates in Ontario. Ontario puts 263,000 tonnes of liquid industrial waste into the water system per year. Every day, Ontario puts 34,000 tonnes of dissolved solids, 127 tonnes of heavy metals, 18 tonnes of phosphorus, 118 tonnes of oil and grease, 12 tonnes of phenol and 3,000 tonnes of chlorides into the water system. In Thunder Bay, millions of tonnes of asbestos fibres are being put into the water system. In the St. Mary's River, there are phenols, oils, cyanides, sulphides, zinc, ammonia and iron. The St. Clair River system contains ammonia and lead.

With all this going on, I commend the motion of the Hon. Member from the New Democratic Party because someone must stand on guard. I am certainly not going to leave it to the American Government.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

RAILWAYS—GRAIN FREIGHT RATES—INTERIM ADJUSTMENT COSTS. (B) REQUEST THAT MINISTER REVIEW FIGURES

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to further amplify a question I put to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) last Thursday concerning the recently announced transportation rates for western grain. I asked the Minister why the Government was not going to assume its share of the costs. This will involve some explanation; I will try to be explicit and speak in some terms so that the Government will understand exactly what I am saying. I am not at all certain that the Minister understood the question which I posed to him.

Let me begin by saying that the rates that western farmers are now paying for grain as a result of the demise of the Crow on January 1, are made up of three components: the first is volume, the second is an adjustment for the previous crop year, and the third is an increase in costs, if any, that the railways