

*Supply*

At one time when I was in Washington as Parliamentary Secretary I met with the late Frank Moss, senior Senator for the State of Utah, who was very interested in this same project. I told him, and later a congressional committee, that there is no such thing as a North American resource policy or a North American water policy. There is an American resource policy and a Canadian resource policy. That is the subject that would have to be investigated by this particular committee.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, my question is prompted by the number of times that the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) ignored parliamentary procedure and made reference to attendance in the House. I would not normally bring this matter up, but since the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition has chosen this forum to fight the Ontario election, I would like to ask him if he has chosen this forum because—

● (1610)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. Both Hon. Members know that comments of that nature are out of order. I know that the Hon. Member will say what is good for the goose is good for the gander, but the goose and the gander are both out of order. No one should raise the question about who is absent from the House. I am sure all Hon. Members realize that. Does the Hon. Member have a question?

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, is the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition choosing to fight the Ontario election in this forum because he will not be given any position on the hustings by David Peterson, Leader of the Ontario Liberal Party?

**Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, you know how frivolous that question is, but I will answer it, not because I want to give credibility to the Member but because I want to give dignity to the House by responding to questions.

The answer to the first part of the question is yes, the Member is right that we do not refer to the absence or presence of Members in the House. However, this motion concerns the Minister and therefore I believe her presence is essential in terms of courtesy and of the dignity of the House.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** She is here.

**Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** She is here this time. She was not here the last time. It is also relevant, when issues involving a crisis such as the tragedy of PCBs, is raised perpetually and repeatedly in the House and does not receive the attention of the Minister because she does not happen to be here. I think that is relevant.

With respect to the Ontario election, I do not know whether the Hon. Member would like to follow me but I will be in Hamilton on Thursday and Renfrew and Pembroke following that. I want to assure him that there is very, very close co-operation between the two Parties, not a type of closed circuit, hermetically sealed television between the two leaders.

**Mr. Wilson (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the right hon. gentleman criticizing

the Hon. Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Blais-Grenier) and in particular making remarks as to her demeanour, facial expressions and so on. Although I was disappointed at hearing it, I must say that I was incredulous at references to Lady MacBeth and remarks of that nature. He went on to accuse the Minister of not taking this matter seriously. He suggested that she did not understand the gravity of the situation with regard to PCBs. The Hon. Minister and our Party indeed take the situation seriously.

How does the Right Hon. Member reconcile his concern about the gravity of the PCB situation with the remarks of one of his colleagues, the rather shrill lady, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps)? Last week in the House, during a very serious question posed by the Member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Clark) to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Wise) with regard to grasshoppers, the Hon. Member for Hamilton East said, "Spray them with PCBs".

Why does the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) find the remarks attributed to the Hon. Minister of the Environment offensive but he somehow glosses over the remarks of his own back-benchers?

**Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** Mr. Speaker, that preamble was so labyrinthine that I really got lost.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Mr. Speaker, we in Manitoba are very concerned about environmental problems there, and this nonsense of laying the blame on one Government is simply not acceptable. All of them must make improvements and we must find huge sums of money to help out because one problem is that it will require billions of dollars.

One of our concerns in Manitoba is that the levels of mercury at South Indian Lake are four times the accepted level. If these socialist hypocrites are so concerned about the environment, I find it very strange that this issue has not entered into the debate today and into questions in the House. I certainly will be pursuing the Minister about dealing with this problem and I want her to find out if criminal charges should be laid against the NDP Government in Manitoba for its negligence in this area at South Indian Lake.

Furthermore, I am concerned about the statement made by the Canadian Nature Federation. It shows that Ontario—

**Some Hon. Members:** Order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. The time for questions and comments has expired. I will recognize the next Member to speak on debate.

**Mr. Benjamin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would you enlighten the House as to whether there is some criterion guiding the Chair which states that questions and comments must be at least remotely relevant to the speech made by the previous speaker? Should not the remarks of the Hon. Member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Wilson) and the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) be related to the previous Member's speech?