

Motions

Allowances and Tuition Fees paid under the Children of the War Dead Regulations, to eligible students registered in recognized universities or colleges

Also, the payment of allowances and tuition under the Pensioners Training Regulations to eligible pensioners who are registered in approved retraining programs. \$252,000
Prosthetic Services

Grants paid to Sunnybrook Medical Centre to reimburse the Hospital for the salary of one prosthetist through a federal-provincial agreement. \$104,000
Pension-Burial Grants

Grants paid under the Pension Act to provide for the funeral and burial entitled pensioners \$307,000

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Minister of State have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 29

POSSIBLE WATER DIVERSION FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. Speaker: I have an application from the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon), under S. O. 29. I will hear the Hon. Member.

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to seek leave to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing what I consider to be an extremely vital and pressing issue facing our country. That is the issue of water diversion from Lake Michigan, which could have devastating effects across the Great Lakes system and which would demonstrate to Canadians yet again how important water is within our relationship with the United States and how important it is that there be protection provided for us as a country to safeguard that water in the future.

Because we have such an important issue here, with many indications from the United States of pressure building in order for this diversion to take place, I hope that you will give very careful consideration to this request. Perhaps it might make sense to reserve judgment on it because of the importance of the issue to my constituency, to the many people across Ontario and to all people across Canada, and in view of the widespread implications of a diversion of this kind toward our relationship with respect to water with the United States in the future.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor for bringing this matter to the attention of the Chair. As Hon. Members know, this has been a matter of some interest to this place for some days. However, I want to assure the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor that it is an important matter and the Chair has given it very careful consideration, but at least for today the Chair is not disposed to move to an emergency debate. Of course, as I have stated before on other matters for emergency debates, that does not preclude another application at another time, depending on the circumstances and on what may or may not be said in this place. I thank the Hon. Member.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that in view of the amount of business that is before the House today and the time that was taken on the procedural argument *vis-à-vis* the motions on the Order Paper, the Government has decided not to proceed with the procedural debate on Motion No. 25. This has been communicated to the other House Leaders. Instead, we will proceed immediately to consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-77. That is the second item on the Order Paper.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, the Government has the right under the rules to determine government business under Government Orders, but I want to say for the record that we received word, not long after nine o'clock this morning, that the Government did not intend to call the abortion motion to enable procedural argument to take place. I do not know how at that point in time the Government was able to determine whether there would be a procedural debate on a motion to instruct the committee on Bill C-130, or to enable the committee on Bill C-130 to travel. I was personally ready to make the points that I had to make about the procedural acceptability of the Government's motion on abortion this morning.

I do not think that the Government should, under the circumstances, use the relatively brief debate that we all had on the motion to enable or to instruct the committee on Bill C-130 to travel as a reason not to proceed with the procedural debate on the Government's abortion motion. I admit that the Government has the full authority to call any motion or any matter it wants with respect to the use of its time under Government Orders, but I do not think it should leave on the record the impression that somehow or other, because the Government itself chose to initiate a procedural debate on the acceptability of the motion to enable the committee on Bill C-130 to travel, it cannot now proceed with the abortion issue. If I am in error as to who first made the procedural arguments, I will withdraw that. I just wanted to say that we were quite ready to debate the procedural acceptability of the Government's motion on abortion.