

would prove the Canadian points. He said that Canadians were unwilling to study alternatives to Garrison and that we stick to only one point, that is, that we want the project stopped. That is clearly untrue. We have always stated that we have no problems with what they do on their side of the border.

● (1720)

The recent action of Senators Burdick and Andrews is very disappointing. It begs the question as to who is really dealing in good faith and who is looking for a way whereby Americans and North Dakotans could have the benefits of Garrison while Manitobans and Canadians would be protected from the bad effects of Garrison.

Let me point out quickly that the member of the House of Representatives from the State of North Dakota has been very supportive of the alternatives proposal.

In conclusion, let me just say that I am pleased to have had the opportunity to present this motion to the House yet again. It is an ongoing and very critical issue in the Province of Manitoba. At times it might seem that we belabour it too much and that the issue is always around and will not go away. I am not sure that it will ever go away in the sense that I am not sure that we will get a clear-cut victory. However, it is an issue for which I strongly believe we must continue to fight to the best of our abilities in order to prevent the serious harm that might come to the Province of Manitoba. It is far too important for our province to let it lie or for us to roll over and let the proponents of Garrison proceed to construct it as it is currently designed.

I pointed out that we have seen an important development. Let us hope that there are many more important developments. Members of the House and the Government of Canada must continue the very strong and, I would suggest, the very good fight we have been carrying on for the last few years.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to announce a change in House business for the remainder of the week. I have just talked to representatives of the two Opposition Parties to inform them that tomorrow we will proceed with Bill C-17, an Act respecting bankruptcy and insolvency. There is no change for Thursday. On Friday, we will be debating Bill C-32, which was supposed to be debated tomorrow. However, debate on Bill C-32 is postponed until Friday and will be replaced by Bill C-17 tomorrow.

The back-up Bill tomorrow, in case we conclude second reading of Bill C-32, will be Bill C-10, the Divorce Act. As I have indicated there is no change for Thursday. It is an Opposition Day.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Government House Leader if he could give the House an idea as to when he will be presenting the Bill to amend the Western Grain Stabilization

Act? Could he tell us now when he believes that Bill will be introduced?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the minute notice is given, we will be able to introduce the Bill within the normal delay. There is no link to be attached to any other legislation to be passed, depending on the introduction of the Bill referred to by the Hon. Member.

I indicated in my answer last week that we would likely do that this week. I have very good reason to believe that the notice will be given before the end of the week. I hope to be able to introduce the Bill, as the result of pressure from Members on both sides of the House, as early as possible.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I have heard suggestions that the Bill may in fact be introduced in the Senate. Could the Government House Leader comment on whether it will be introduced in this place or in the other place?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, our intention would be to introduce the Bill in the House of Commons.

* * *

GARRISON DIVERSION

ADVISABILITY OF ENSURING SAFETY OF CANADIAN ENVIRONMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Sargeant:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of taking those measures necessary to ensure that there is no damage caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion or construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit in the State of North Dakota and, that such measures to be considered include:

1. Continuation of diplomatic action to have the Garrison project amended so as not to affect the environment of Canada;
2. The offer of legal and technical assistance to those citizens groups in Canada now striving to halt the progress of the Garrison Diversion; and
3. The bringing to trial in the World Court, the government of the United States, should Canada be unsuccessful in its efforts to receive satisfactory assurances regarding the future safety of the Canadian environment.

Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) on his persistence and his concern about this very important matter. I can assure him that this matter is not only a concern to him and his constituents but it is a concern to all Canadians. It has been a great irritant between Canada and the United States for a number of years.

I welcome this opportunity to respond to the Hon. Member's statement on an appropriate strategy for managing the long-standing garrison issue. The Hon. Member is advising the Government in his motion before the House to consider the advisability of taking necessary measures to ensure that no damage is caused to the Manitoba environment by the construction of Garrison project features. His recommendation in particular is that the Government continue current diplomatic action, offer legal and technical assistance to anti-Garrison