

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

### ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

#### GARRISON DIVERSION PROJECT—DAMAGE TO ENVIRONMENT THROUGH CONSTRUCTION

**Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 26, to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration. The specific and important matter is in respect of the damage which will be caused to the Canadian environment by the construction of the Garrison diversion project and the lack of positive action by the Canadian government to prevent such damage. There must be a debate so that the Canadian and United States governments become aware of these dangers and act promptly to prevent them. If my proposal is accepted, I will move the adjournment of the House, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale).

Perhaps I could give a brief explanation at this time. There is evidence that the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is attempting to complete the Lonetree reservoir as quickly as possible regardless of protests and studies currently being conducted. This reservoir is the last connecting link between the Missouri River basin and the Red River drainage basin and is considered the point of no return for the project. It will be completed in a matter of months, the necessary funds having been authorized in March by President Ford.

The following agencies have acknowledged that Manitoba will be hurt by the Garrison project: the Canadian government, the Manitoba government, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Congress, the Comptroller General and the Department of the Interior. The United States State Department, in a letter dated February 15, 1975, made public March 5, said that it believed continued negotiations on a diplomatic level between the United States and Canada would likely result in nothing more satisfactory than a stalemate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I feel that his explanation of the background of the circumstances up to this point is certainly adequate to enable me to make a ruling, particularly when coupled with the actual motion itself which is fairly clearly descriptive of the situation.

I have not the slightest hesitation in accepting the circumstances of the problem the hon. member has exposed in his motion and explanation as being of the utmost importance. I have some reservation about the timing, as it would appear that there will be considerable opposition within the United States to this last step described in the hon. member's remarks as the point of no return. There does seem, certainly, to be urgency about that last step taken in the United States in respect of the fate of environmental conditions in Manitoba.

The reason I am not accepting the application for an emergency debate at this time has nothing to do with the importance of the matter or its urgency, but relates, rather, to the other part of the Standing Order which

### Non-Canadian Publications

refers to the opportunity of an hon. member for bringing a matter to the attention of the House in other ways. This matter has been raised several times during this session already by the hon. member and by others. The estimates of the Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Sauvé) have now been before the standing committee for some time, as have been and still are the estimates of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen).

The effect of the estimates of both these ministries, as well as perhaps others, being before the standing committee would provide, and continue to provide, the hon. member with an opportunity to question the minister in such a way as to pin him down very specifically on this problem. In light of that opportunity, coupled with the rather high percentage of allotted days which remain in the less than two months—about five weeks—prior to the summer recess, as well as other suggested means of bringing matters to the attention of the House, this would recommend itself to the Chair at this moment as being adequate means in the hands of the hon. member for disposing of this problem, or at least of requiring the minister to give a direct answer either before the standing committee or before the House.

I find, therefore, that while the problem is important and urgent, the hon. member ought to enjoy, within a reasonable time, an adequate opportunity of bringing this matter before the House in other ways, considering the timing of the problem and the opposition to it in the United States.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT

#### REMOVAL OF PROVISION ALLOWING DEDUCTION OF EXPENSES FOR ADVERTISING IN NON-CANADIAN PERIODICALS

The House resumed, from Friday, May 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Sharp (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill C-58, to amend the Income Tax Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

**Mr. Marke Raines (Burnaby-Seymour):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to continue my speech in connection with Bill C-58, with amendments to section 19 of the Income Tax Act by deleting from its subsections (2) and (4). Foreign magazines, notably *Time* and *Reader's Digest*, can if they wish, and I am sure they will, continue to operate in this country, but Canadian advertisers will no longer be able to deduct the cost of their advertising when dealing with the Minister of National Revenue. I stress that because there seems to me to be a misconception across Canada that if this bill is given third reading, somehow *Time* and *Reader's Digest* will cease publication. That is simply not the case. This is simply the withdrawal of a special concession or special privilege, a privilege which perhaps should never have been granted as it was ten years ago.