

Senator Buckwold: I just think there is a limit to how far the Question Period can wander. I would suggest that this matter be raised in due course at the proper time, and that we get on with the next question or the next order of business.

Senator Muir: I would like to respond to the point of order.

Senator Argue: There is no point of order.

Senator Buckwold: Yes, there is a point of order.

Senator Muir: I believe it has been recognized that there is a point of order and I should like to speak to it. In any event, I realize that there has been a little nitpicking on who is going to do this and who is going to do that. I see nothing wrong with airing this thing in this chamber to the fullest extent, even supposing we were here for four or five hours. The fact that we are taking that much time is just fine. The fact that there is a point of discussion between the deputy leader on this side and the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board is all right too. But none of that is doing anything for the several hundred workers who are being displaced, dislocated and thrown out on the streets. What we want to do is to pin down this man Banded and his people, who will not give straight answers, who make mistakes and who lie about them. We want to do something about the poor workers who cannot get the decent pensions that they were told they were going to get.

Banded is the man I would like to see here. I think that is a good point and we should continue with it.

Senator Buckwold: There is a very easy way of doing it by giving notice today that the matter will be drawn to the attention of the Senate tomorrow and debated in full.

The point of order I raised has nothing to do with the subject at hand. That subject is most important. I am just saying that His Honour the Speaker has been tolerant in allowing the Question Period to wander as far as it has in the light of our agenda. I am merely suggesting that if you want to have a thorough discussion of this matter—and I support that and might even be prepared to speak on it—it should be done simply by giving notice that the matter will be brought forward tomorrow and put on the Order Paper.

Senator Argue: Honourable senators, on this reference to a point of order, I just want to say to Senator Roblin that I was not suggesting at all that he instruct Senator Smith, or that he should try to instruct Senator Smith. I was simply suggesting that he might pass on the message.

I agree with Senator Roblin that it would be a great mistake if he were to try to interfere with the committee or throw his weight around, because the result would be a disaster. I would not want him to start in that direction.

He has raised a question about a statement I am alleged to have made in western Canada. If I haven't got his question accurately, I am sure he will correct me. I understood him to say that I said, or was reported to have said, that the inquiry into CP Limited should take place before there could be or might be any action on the Crow rate.

That I did not say. I specifically and categorically said the very opposite. I said that, so far as I was concerned, the two

[Senator Argue.]

inquiries or the two questions could be proceeded with, or would be proceeded with, at the same time. I did not feel that it was necessary that one had to be concluded before the other was began. But I did say—and I repeat—that I think, in looking at the whole question of the Crow rate and the things that may take place, we should have all the facts on the table.

Senator Muir: Honourable senators, if I am spared until tomorrow and if Senator Smith, the chairman of the committee, is here, and if the Leader of the Government gives his full approval, I will ask him to make arrangements as soon as possible to have Dr. Banded and his officials appear before the committee.

● (2110)

Senator Perrault: That is satisfactory to those who support the government.

The Hon. the Speaker: Before we go to the delayed answers, I think honourable senators should consider the procedure we are following during Question Period. I do not pass any judgment, and it is not my intention to pass judgment, on this, but I feel that we should proceed in a more orderly fashion.

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

GARRISON DAM PROJECT

Hon. Joseph-Philippe Guay: Honourable senators, I should like to ask the Leader of the Government the following question. In view of the concerns of the American people with regard to the Garrison diversion project, and in view of the fact that American officials have suggested to officials of Manitoba that all those concerned should make representations to officials in the Government of the United States, could the leader give us his support in making appropriate representation to the American government to show our concern with regard to the fresh water in Manitoba, and to support those Americans who have indicated their concern? If we all get together, both the federal government and the provincial governments, we could probably stop the diversion project, which is what we want to do.

Hon. Raymond J. Perrault (Leader of the Government): I want to thank Senator Guay for his continuing representations on the subject of the Garrison Dam project, and also thank Senator Roblin for the questions asked from time to time by him. I have something to say about the Garrison diversion project this evening.

The Government of Canada welcomes today's announcement by the U.S. Department of the Interior that funds associated with those aspects of the Garrison project which would affect Canada—that is, the Lonetree Dam and New Rockford Canal—will be set aside as reserved funds to be committed only after the conclusion of consultations with Canada.

This is a positive and encouraging response to the representations which have been made by the Canadian and Manitoba governments and spokesmen at all levels, and one which should provide a good basis for consultations with the United States.