

Order Paper Questions

[English]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

Mr. Smith: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. McKenzie: Madam Speaker, I should like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary about starred question No. 4,641 which I placed on the Order Paper on December 20. I thought that the Government would have provided an answer over the Christmas break. My questions were:

Will the Government be launching a comprehensive environmental study to determine the effects on the water quality of Indian Bay and Shoal Lake in the event that the proposed 350 cottage lots on the northwest corner of Shoal Lake in Manitoba are developed and, if so (a) what will be the starting date (b) on what date will it be completed (c) will it determine the degree of risk of increased algae production, oil spills or other major forms of pollution (d) will it include an examination of the effects of using the sewage lagoon located across from Winnipeg's drinking water intake on the shore of Indian Bay?

Will the Government permit the use of motorboats for recreational purposes on Indian Bay?

We are talking about the water supply to a city of 600,000 people. This is a matter of great importance and concern to the citizens of Winnipeg. I feel that over a month is a long enough time to provide an answer as to whether or not a full environmental study will be conducted.

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I do not know offhand what progress we have made in answering that question, but I will be happy to look into it on the Hon. Member's behalf.

Mr. Reid (St. Catharines): Madam Speaker, I welcome back the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary. Would he be good enough to check once more, since this matter was raised earlier, question No. 4,502 which was placed on the Order Paper on October 27, 1982. It relates to the receipts and expenditures of the federal Government from the Provinces under the lottery agreement, as well as two related questions, Nos. 4,531 and 4,544, all of which were referred back to the Parliamentary Secretary earlier on the basis of obtaining some information for us.

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I will be happy to look into that matter and find out what progress we are making on providing those answers for the Hon. Member.

Mr. Stevens: Madam Speaker, now that I see the Parliamentary Secretary back in the House, I should like to remind him that the question I asked on January 29, 1981, not 1982, is still unanswered. It is the question dealing with the Prime Minister's December/January world tour at that time. Now that we have the Prime Minister back after another jaunt of holidaying time, would the Parliamentary Secretary zero in and try to obtain some answers as to what these trips are actually costing Canadians? It is time they were told.

Mr. Smith: Madam Speaker, I would have been disappointed had the Hon. Member not asked about that question upon

my return. Needless to say, it was not a holiday that the Prime Minister undertook; it was a hard-working trip.

Mr. Stevens: With no results.

Mr. Smith: I will be happy to look into the question on behalf of the Hon. Member. I would be very pleased to do so.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

**SUPPLEMENTARY RETIREMENT BENEFITS ACT
(NO. 2)**

MEASURE TO MODIFY BENEFIT INDEX

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray that Bill C-133, an Act to amend the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act (No. 2), be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment thereto of Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton).

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my presentation proper, I should like to make some comments on the new rules, especially as they apply to the ten-minute question period after a Member has made his speech. I found this procedure most useful in the case of the Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mr. Cousineau) who finished speaking before lunch. He gave what on the face of it was a presentation that made a certain amount of sense. He was well-rehearsed and it was well-written, but he was devastated by a few simple questions put to him by Hon. Members on this side of the House. He did not know what was up or what was down. If we are to follow this procedure, it means that Hon. Members will have to think out their positions much better than at the present time. I am sure when the Hon. Member for Gatineau returns to the House that he will be much better prepared than he was earlier this morning.

Another surprising thing about the Hon. Member's presentation was the fact that it was diametrically opposed to an earlier speech in the House by a colleague of his in the same Party, a gentleman who is, to all intents and purposes, his next door neighbour, the Hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle). This goes to show that a Member's views in the House are influenced by the type of constituency he represents. In the case of the constituency of Hull, it is one with very many public servants. The next door riding of Gatineau is an industrial one suffering from very high unemployment at the present time.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to present the last views on Bill C-133. The guillotine is poised, as it has been