1909 completed work on the historic Boundary Waters Treaty. We owe it to that unique binational entity, the International Joint Commission, which has studied many bilateral environmental problems and come forward with effective and far-sighted proposals. We owe it to the growing environmental ethic in both our countries. But perhaps most of all we owe it to the sense of good neighbourliness which is manifested so well here in Minnesota.

It would be wrong to speak of these matters as simply questions of environmental protection or as disputes between so-called environmentalists and so-called developers. The history of environmental issues between Canada and the United States is instructive. In virtually every case the reaction on one side of the border to a perceived threat of pollution from the other side, was based, to an important degree, on social and economic considerations. In other words, on both sides of the border, people have demonstrated again and again that their concern for preserving environmental values is in some ways a surrogate for fear that transboundary environmental degradation will undermine their lifestyles and damage the base of their economy. That is why Montanans feel strongly that any coal mining in southeastern British Columbia must be carried out in a way which will fully and effectively protect the Flathead River; they want to preserve the excellent fishing which is an important part of the local economy as well as the local lifestyle. That is why people from my home province of Manitoba feel strongly that any Garrison Diversion Project in North Dakota must be carried out in a way which will prevent damage to Manitoba waters; those waters are the basis of their agriculture, of industry and of recreational and commercial fishing. That is why Canadians and Americans alike supported their governments in the momentous change in attitude that resulted in the massive clean-up of the Great Lakes.

Even setting aside wilderness lands often has an important socio-economic component. One of the best examples of bilateral co-operation here is that pair of environmental jewels, Quetico Park in Ontario and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area in Minnesota. The close working relationship between the managers of those lands deserves special commendation. But even here we know that setting aside and protecting as diligently as we do these two wilderness areas is much more than the expression of a preservationist philosophy. We know that the pristine quality of these beautiful lands provides unique and highly prized recreational opportunities for many of you and many in Canada who have the good fortune to live nearby. And it attracts tourism to a region where outside visitors provide a powerful boost to the local economy. That surely was the determinant of your concern about Ontario's plans for a power plant in Atikokan.

But what would happen to this land and to the local economy if the trees stopped growing and new trees failed to germinate, as is now happening in central Europe? What would happen if the rich and varied aquatic life perished and the lakes and streams became a kind of wet desert as is now happening in central Ontario? That would not only be a tragedy in environmental and ethical terms; it would also be an economic calamity.

It is that synthesis of affection for the land and understanding that we must protect it if it is to sustain us that lies at the heart of the powerful concern that Canadians and Minnesotans share about acid rain.

As the political debate swirling around the acid rain issue has grown in intensity, one major theme has