

Oral Questions

statements, let me pose this question to him. We are all aware of the conference that was held in Toronto last week which clearly outlined the emerging problems of climatic conditions that will cause droughts in large parts of North America. We also know that this proposed Lake Michigan diversion is only one of a whole series of efforts, attempts and initiatives by the United States, when it runs into water shortages, to export its problems to border states, whether it is Mexico or Canada.

Taking into account that we can be expecting more and more frequent attempts by the United States to solve its water shortage problems by having transport, export or diversion of water, would the Minister not now agree that it is time that he and his colleagues clearly recognized the problem? Because of the proposed agreement with the United States on trade which includes water as part of its terms, should we not ask specifically to have water exempted as a clause in that agreement so that there could be no ambiguity and no confusion in the minds of Americans that we control our water resources?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, let me say in the strongest terms of which I am capable that we control our resources. We will continue to control our resources. The question of our ability to control water policy in Canada transcends any agreement.

It has in fact been pointed out to the Hon. Member on a number of occasions that the agreement has no impact whatsoever with respect to the water resources of Canada. This is a matter which is so fundamental to our policy that we have given leadership that previous Governments have not given. I remind the Hon. Member that his Leader was the first one to raise the prospect of selling water to the United States. He should talk to his Leader, not lecture us.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the appropriate Minister and has to do with the statement made yesterday by the Minister of the Environment in Question Period. He said that a diversion from Lake Michigan has nothing to do with the diversion of Canadian water or inter-basin diversions. Everyone who knows about the water system of North America knows that Lake Michigan draws its water from the Great Lakes which in turn are boundary waters. Will the Minister admit that the Minister of the Environment was wrong in making such a statement yesterday in the House?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister referred to the project as—I am not sure of the word he used—insane. Does the Hon. Member understand the meaning of that word?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, he sure does, and that is why we think that the Minister was wrong in making the statement he made. This diversion has to do with the Great Lakes. The

Great Lakes are shared waters and therefore the Minister has either to retract his words or to admit that he was wrong.

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): In the meantime, Americans are claiming that water is on the table and is part of the free trade agreement. Will the Minister indicate to this House that the Government is coming to its senses and will amend the Bill before the House to include water as one of the items that is not part of the agreement?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals should not applaud that question because the basis of the question is simply false. Who are these people they are talking about, who are these Americans who imply that the free trade agreement in fact includes water resources? This is the kind of incorrect premise of a question which allows me to say that not only are Canadians opposed to this diversion but indeed a number of senior American governmental officials are opposed to it.

The Governors of Ohio, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are very much opposed to this project. On both sides of the border there is a unity with respect to this proposal which says to any diversion project that this is unacceptable and not on the books.

This is a matter for which Canada's consent must be obtained by virtue of treaties that have been signed over the years. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the free trade agreement, and the only reason the Hon. Member raises the question is because it is Friday and he cannot think of anything else.

* * *

FUR TRAPPING INDUSTRY

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT—PETITION TO INTRODUCE LABELLING OF CANADIAN FURS

Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, on June 1 this House held an emergency debate on the British proposal to label furs which may have been caught in leg-hold traps. The House held a unanimous position in recognition of the devastating effects this could have on the 105,000 employees in the Canadian fur industry, having seen what happened to the seal industry.

Prior to the Economic Summit and the visit of the British Prime Minister, the British order was withdrawn. I learned last night that Canada was had. The British really gave us the old one-two.

Speaking last night to Canada's Ambassador to the European Parliament, I learned that that Parliament has already gone through the first stages, having secured over 260