

itself, as it should, in preserving freedom in the Americas, attack it for being unfriendly to a communist regime in Nicaragua or for not treating as a friend the communist government in Havana, Cuba. Quite frankly, the real issue which should be dealt with when we are concerned about the environment of this country should not be intermingled with contempt and open hatred for the Government of the United States and the people of that country. Accordingly, I examined the original draft of this motion and, as I indicated at the outset, was offended by the suggestion that the United States be brought to trial in the world Court like some criminal.

We have disputes with the United States. There is no doubt that we have disputes with respect to the establishment of a boundary off the Grand Banks. Quite frankly, that dispute is now being adjudicated. It is a matter which has a direct bearing upon the welfare of our fishermen off the East Coast. We have disputes with the United States with respect to matters of pollution such as acid rain. It would appear—and I say that because I do not think it has been convincingly established as yet—that Canada has decided to go it alone, at long last, with respect to this issue, as indeed it should, and abate a pollution problem for which we are in large measure responsible as well.

We need the co-operation of the United States. In the event the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake goes to Washington, he should go there as a legitimate ambassador speaking to a friend, not someone shaking a fist like an enemy. In my view these problems with the administration of the United States could best be solved if men and women of good will, recognizing a common problem and desiring not to harm a friend, negotiate for the purpose of ending this project, ending the problems of pollution which jointly confront both our nations and working out, as friends should, the difficulties which are bound to occur when two developed nations have areas of disagreement between them. If they are legitimately concerned about the issue raised in this motion, I would urge members of the NDP, both in the Government of Manitoba and in this House, to approach the matter in the fashion that I have described rather than by wielding a battle axe and chanting anti-American slogans.

● (1750)

Mr. Ron Irwin (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a very difficult problem which goes back almost to the 1930s. I will try not to wrap myself in the Canadian flag as the Hon. Member for York-North (Mr. Gamble) has done.

Nothing really happened with the Garrison Diversion until 1943, and we have been debating the problem ever since. One thing is clear, Mr. Speaker. The goal of connecting the Mississippi River with the Hudson Bay drainage system is not in Canada's best interests. It is only in the best interests of the United States. The Americans wish to achieve the goal of connecting those two waterways solely to irrigate North Dakota.

We in Canada have some legitimate concerns about this goal. If the Hon. Member for York-North wishes some Ameri-

can input, I might suggest to him that he read the 1977 IJC report. That report was prepared by equal numbers of Canadians and Americans and it indicated that as of 1977, the technology for the McClusky screen referred to by the Hon. Member from our side was not adequate. All this time we were being told by American politicians, who were not really acting as judges but more as advocates, that we in Canada should not be concerned. Well, we are concerned.

We are concerned about parasites getting into our water system. We are concerned about fish eggs, fish, chemicals and everything else that comes from that drainage system which may interfere with our commercial and sports fishermen, our drinking water and our recreational facilities.

While we in Canada were being told not to be concerned, an impartial report was prepared in the United States by the Environmental Protection Agency. Again, I would suggest that my friend, the Hon. Member for York North read that report, because he seems to be very prone to American studies. In that report, the EPA indicated that it could not conceive of a program which would adequately police human and wildlife activities to prohibit transfer of undesirable fish species. This report was in existence at the same time as we Canadians were being told not to be concerned.

My hon. friend referred to the great things that Canada and the United States are doing together. He referred to the achievements made with regard to solving the problem of acid rain. In August, 1980, Canada had a written memorandum from the United States regarding acid rain. That is much more than we have now. Daniel S. Greenberg, a respected and responsible writer for the *Washington Post*, said about the Reagan administration's feelings toward that written memorandum that the Reagan administration was of the opinion that the memorandum of intent carried only "moral rather than legal force" and so, without consultation, the Reagan administration went its own way. He went on to say:

We have double-crossed the Canadians plain and simple.

That was the fate of our 1980 written memorandum. Fool me once, foolish you, but fool me twice, foolish me.

We are now expected to believe, without even a memorandum like the one we had in 1980, that all these great things will be done regarding the Garrison Diversion. The Americans informally say that they will police fishing at the reservoir. I can see them trying to police fishing. If they cannot even police chemicals. How can they police fishing? They say that the screen for which they are paying \$40 million will work. It has not even been tested. They tell us not to be concerned about phase two, and at the same time they have allocated approximately \$5 million for 1983, I believe, \$20 million for 1984, if my memory serves me correctly, and approximately \$40 million for 1985, in order to go ahead with the project.

Who from Canada has gone to the United States to discuss our concerns? We have sent federal-provincial representatives, farmers, fishermen, municipal people and native people to the U.S. The Right Hon. Howard Powley sent wires to all Congressmen. The Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy)