

(2) to examine the possible effect of broadcasting on the rights and immunities of members of the House and the rights and protections due to the public, and

(3) to consider whether a period of trial broadcasting, or the broadcasting of special proceedings and debates of the House, would assist in the development of permanent facilities and procedures; and

That the committee be authorized to issue such reports on the above as will, in its opinion, facilitate the implementation of this resolution.

I would move this in the hope that it would accommodate the several positions and concerns that have been put forward in order that we can satisfactorily achieve what I think all members hope to achieve through the passing of this particular resolution, and that is that we make this parliament an even more responsible and accountable institution than it has been to date.

I think no member of this House would be prepared to say that all aspects of our present parliamentary system are perfect or could not in many instances be improved or made more relevant to the needs and concerns of the Canadian people generally. If, by taking the measure that is advocated in the resolution proposed by the government House leader, in addition to the words of the amendment I put forward a moment ago, we can achieve that end, then we will have served this parliament and our people extremely well.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** The House has heard the amendment to the motion proposed by the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). Is the House ready for the question on the amendment?

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. MacDonald (Egmont)) agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** The question is now on the main motion as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion as amended?

**Some hon. Members:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion (Mr. MacEachen), as amended, agreed to on division.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could the government House leader enlighten us as to what the government business of the House might be for tomorrow?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I propose to call the metric conversion bill because of the necessity of having it in effect for the convenience of the grain trade by February 1. Following that I hope to take up the Income Tax Act.

#### Adjournment Debate

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to suggest that since we have done a fairly good day's work and at least two of the late show performers are here we might now call it ten o'clock.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Hon. members have heard the suggestion. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

---

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—GARRISON DIVERSION—REASON FOR ACCEPTING DELAY OF REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION WITHOUT MORATORIUM ON CONSTRUCTION

**Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, on December 15 last I asked a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) which appears at page 2032 of *Hansard* for that date as follows:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is really supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris regarding the Garrison diversion. My question is this: why, why, why, why would the government . . . of Canada agree to the extension of the IJC report on the Garrison diversion without asking for a guarantee of a moratorium on construction?

The minister told me that this required an answer much more extensive than he could supply during the question period, and undertook to give me a comprehensive answer in written form. I received that written answer on December 21.

To understand this you have to get it into perspective. The Garrison diversion project is a multi-million dollar project which could adversely affect the entire Red River system, including all of Lake Winnipeg. This is a project which is now a decade old, a project that this year in the United States alone will cost that government some \$23.5 million. It is a project that in itself will reach three quarters of a billion dollars. It is a project which has been a source of debate, counter debate, facts and counter facts. It has been the subject of months of investigation by the IJC. This is the scope of the problem and, in essence, the scope of my question, yet I received back from the minister his comprehensive answer consisting of one and a half pages indicating why the government of Canada has not acted to protect the interests of Manitoba.

I recognize fully the absolute right of the government to govern, making decisions concerning international relations and international agreements such as the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. I believe that should be so and that the government should have the benefit of making those decisions