



Fifth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

30 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXIX No. 48A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 30 MARCH, 1981

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty - First Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, A. R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANDERSON, Bob	Springfield	PC
BANMAN, Hon. Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BARROW, Tom	Flin Flon	NDP
BLAKE, David	Minnedosa	PC
BOSTROM, Harvey	Rupertsland	NDP
BOYCE, J. R. (Bud)	Winnipeg Centre	Prog.
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
CHERNIACK, Q.C., Saul	St. Johns	NDP
CORRIN, Brian	Wellington	NDP
COSENS, Hon. Keith A.	Gimli	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CRAIK, Hon. Donald W.	Riel	PC
DESJARDINS, Laurent L.	St. Boniface	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOMINO, Len	St. Matthews	PC
DOWNEY, Hon. Jim	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
EINARSON, Henry J.	Rock Lake	PC
ENNS, Hon. Harry J.	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FERGUSON, James R.	Gladstone	PC
FILMON, Hon. Gary	River Heights	PC
FOX, Peter	Kildonan	NDP
GALBRAITH, Jim	Dauphin	PC
GOURLAY, Hon. Doug	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Hon. Harry E.	Birtle-Russell	PC
GREEN, Q.C., Sidney	Inkster	Prog.
HANUSCHAK, Ben	Burrows	Prog.
HYDE, Lloyd G.	Portage la Prairie	PC
JENKINS, William	Logan	NDP
JOHNSTON, Hon. J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
JORGENSEN, Hon. Warner H.	Morris	PC
KOVNATS, Abe	Radisson	PC
LYON, Hon. Sterling R.	Charleswood	PC
MacMASTER, Hon. Ken	Thompson	PC
MALINOWSKI, Donald	Point Douglas	NDP
McBRYDE, Ronald	The Pas	NDP
McGILL, Hon. Edward	Brandon West	PC
McGREGOR, Morris	Virden	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., Hon. Gerald W. J.	Osborne	PC
MILLER, Saul A.	Seven Oaks	NDP
MINAKER, Hon. George	St. James	PC
ORCHARD, Hon. Donald	Pembina	PC
PARASIUK, Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PAWLEY, Q.C., Howard	Selkirk	NDP
PRICE, Hon. Norma	Assiniboia	PC
RANSOM, Hon. Brian	Souris-Killarney	PC
SCHROEDER, Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SHERMAN, Hon. L. R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
STEEN, Warren	Crescentwood	PC
URUSKI, Billie	St. George	NDP
USKIW, Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, D. James	St. Vital	NDP
WESTBURY, June	Fort Rouge	Lib
WILSON, Robert G.	Wolseley	Ind

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 30 March, 1981

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James) introduced Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster) introduced Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone) introduced Bill No. 44, An Act to amend An Act respecting The Beautiful Plains County Buildings.

MR. JIM GALBRAITH (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 45, An Act to amend An Act respecting The Town of Dauphin (2).

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this time I would like to introduce 20 members of the 135th Scout Troop covering Grades 6 and 7 under the direction of Mr. Dutton, Mrs. Rutulis, Mrs. Derksen and Mrs. Onyshko. This scout troop is from Fort Richmond, which I believe is in the area of the Honourable Minister of Health,

On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable First Minister.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be allowed to make a brief statement to the House which is of a non-political nature. I'm sure that many honourable members, but perhaps not all, have heard of the attempt on the life of President Reagan which took place just a few moments ago. I merely rise to indicate, and I'm sure I speak for all members, that we would wish this Legislature to go on record as saying that the man who was so recently a distinguished visitor to our country, that apparently has been spared from this attack, although associates of his have been wounded in the course of the attack and that we do wish that the President and the members of his staff who've been involved in this dreadful attempt will be spared and that our best wishes go forward in that connection.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to join with the First Minister in abhorring the violence and the attempted assassination of the President of the United States. It's certainly

unfortunate when you consider the history of the United States and the assassinations and attempted assassinations upon Presidents of the United States, as elsewhere throughout the world. We're relieved that the attempt was not successful and certainly join with the First Minister in expressing our satisfaction and pleasure that indeed the assassination attempt was unsuccessful.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development who, I'm sure, shares our disappointment over the announcement of investment intentions for 1981 showing Manitoba to be the second lowest, second worst in Canada, 6.5 percent. In view of the announcement can the Minister now indicate, in view of the persistently poor record of investment in Manitoba, can the Minister now indicate whether or not the government has any programs in order to reverse this continuing poor investment record in relationship, particularly to what is occurring in the rest of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, we don't have any programs to announce at the present time, to answer the Leader of the Opposition's question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I want to further, by way of supplementary, ask the Minister why it is that after three-and-a-half years of lagging in the economy that the investment intentions in the private sector for 1981 for Manitoba show to be 5.1 percent, worse than all but Prince Edward Island; while during the intention period for '81 public investment is shown to be 9 percent, private investment intention 5.1, the second lowest, I mentioned, of any province in Canada. Does the Minister have any programs in the works? Is the Minister preparing any proposals in order to reverse what obviously is continued lagging of private investment in the Province of Manitoba under the Minister's stewardship?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, we don't have anything to announce, Mr. Speaker, at the present time. I can only say that the investment has been showing improvement during the past three years, whether the honourable member wants to agree with that or not. Anybody can read figures any way they like, Mr. Speaker, and as I've said if they're not going to analyze them, there isn't really much sense trying to argue with them.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the Minister. It certainly concerns me that the Minister should be reading any data, any analysis to suggest that there has been improvement over the past three years when precisely the reverse is the case. Can the

Minister advise whether or not, pertaining to housing, in view of the announcement that housing investment is expected to grow by only 7.5 percent from 1980, will the Minister recommend any expansion in Manitoba home repair rehabilitation programs?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we do have home repair programs that are presently in place at the present time. The increase in our housing, the increase that he mentions, is a very welcome increase because housing certainly wasn't moving that well. It's a welcome increase over what housing has been before, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how the member can say that the economy is lagging behind when our investment and manufacturing has been continually up for three years. I don't know how he can say that we're lagging behind when our shipments and exports have been up over three years and I don't know how he can say we're lagging behind when we're the second lowest unemployment in Canada, Mr. Speaker. When you put those all together, Mr. Speaker, I would say that Manitoba is faring very well, compared to some of the others. Mr. Speaker, I'm not here to make comparisons, I just make this statement: we have been increasing, not going backwards.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, following the same line of questioning as my leader, I am very surprised at the Minister's last statement. Will the Minister acknowledge that in 1980 total capital expenditure in Manitoba was \$1,980.8 million, down by 2.9 percent from the level in 1979? Will he acknowledge that even in current dollars, total investment in Manitoba was lower in '80 than in 1979? If you take real dollars, not inflated dollars, it's even worse.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that the purpose of the question period is to seek information, not to debate.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Well, the Minister has no answer to a decline, current as well as in constant dollars. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister this supplementary question with regard to the manufacturing sector. If it is in such good shape as the Minister would have us believe, and if his Conservative economic policies are so right for Manitoba, why is it that our forecast for manufacturing investment in 1981 will only be up by 12.5 percent, barely keeping pace with inflation, the second lowest in Canada, and less than half the Canadian average of manufacturing investment?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's up. We are holding our own in the Province of Manitoba. In fact, we're doing very well.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, since investment is obviously a very key element in the economic growth of Manitoba, and since there's no evidence of growth in 1981 after three years of no growth and real output, is the Premier of this province ready to

concede that his neo-Conservative, Thatcherite economic policies are a total failure for this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment, and it refers to the pollution problems at Norway House. In view of the fact that the Playgreen Inn at Norway House has apparently been in contravention of public health statutes in dumping raw sewage into the Nelson River, can the Minister advise the House why the public health officer at Thompson did not take action upon first receiving complaints in this particular matter, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated last week, the matter was identified by a public health inspector of our department, and upon identification of it, he issued an order for the cleanup. It was subsequent to that there was knowledge within the area by residents of the area, so I'm not aware of what the concern is with respect to a public health inspector in Thompson.

MS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, since the fine imposed on the Playgreen Inn was only \$150.00 which could be considered a licence fee to continue operating, will the Minister be ordering stronger action, for instance closing the hotel until a proper method of sewage disposal is implemented?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my department did order stronger measures to be taken. As a result of that the outflow, the overflow pipe from the sewage disposal system has been permanently capped; a new pump has been installed with a warning system that will identify if it ever malfunctions so that this situation need never occur again. In the longer term we have requested that the hotel itself do a study with consultants to see whether or not there is adequate capacity in the longer term for sewage disposal from the hotel and we will be awaiting the results of the consultant's report some time later this summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

MS. WESTBURY: Yes, again to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister assure the House then that the water supply at Norway House at the present time doesn't constitute any health hazard to the residents in any form?

MR. FILMON: To the best of my department's knowledge I can assure the residents of that at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can

the Minister of Labour advise us whether it is correct that a settlement has been arrived at with respect to the service employees staff at St. Adolphe Nursing Home?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Well, Mr. Speaker, not a settlement in my terminology but both parties have, in fact, agreed to binding arbitration which in effect is a settlement permissive enough to allow work to resume.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the employees who withdrew their services will be employed by the company during the process of binding arbitration and whether both sides have agreed to accept the award which is made by the Arbitration Board?

MR. MacMASTER: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that that is precisely correct.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder in what respect this is not a settlement, first of all; and secondly, the Minister has indicated it is not a settlement in his terminology, I would like to know in what respect this is not a settlement; and secondly I would like to know whether it is going to be announced as to who is going to arbitrate the terms and conditions of employment?

MR. MacMASTER: I have been made aware of who the arbitrator is and I guess I come from the old school where I like to see the signatures on the document and both parties have accepted it before I call it a settlement, precisely so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: The question is to the Minister of the Environment. I'd ask the Minister if he can specify as to what action he has recently taken in respect to Clean Environment Commission Order No. 899, an order which limited sulphur dioxide emissions at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting complex in Flin Flon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the ground level concentrations of the emissions from the facility I have issued a ministerial order which varies that Clean Environment Commission order allowing the company until, I believe it's January of 1984, to comply with those ground level concentrations. All other aspects of the order remain intact.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, as the original Clean Environment Order in fact did determine that those ground level contaminations were unacceptable, and that was based on evidence presented to the commission, and the Minister has overruled the commission's decision in this regard, can he indicate whose advice he specifically sought when he was making the decision as to allow Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to continue to pollute in respect to

ground level sulphur dioxide emissions in the community of Flin Flon for the next three, three-and-a-half years?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it was based on advice from the scientists and technologists within the Department of the Environment.

MR. COWAN: I would ask the Minister then if he would comment on a report by his own department which indicates that in fact it would be costly for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to contain ground level emissions but goes on to state these conclusions, and I'm quoting, "Although the economic impact requires further data, are acknowledged and agreed to in principle, however, acceptable air quality for the Flin Flon area is also a basic necessity". Can he comment on that particular remark which was made in a report to him, File No. 1095.2 which would seem to indicate that he has made the wrong decision in respect to his ministerial order?

MR. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the information which the member read from he puts the finger on the essence of the problem and that is that the economic impact data requires further clarification and study. In particular, I want to emphasize that ground level concentrations, at the level that were specified in the order, are anticipated to be able to be met 99 percent of the time, or virtually all the time, with the exception when there are adverse weather conditions such as air inversions that might prevent that from happening and that will happen only very very occasionally. So, I don't suppose that we are substantially varying the order in the decision that has been made.

Secondly, the officials of my department, from the review that they've made, believe that if the order were implemented immediately, the only response that the company might conceivably have would be to cut back their production 30 to 40 percent, which would adversely affect many many jobs in the Flin Flon area, and obviously would be a kind of response that wouldn't be acceptable necessarily to the community either. So we put the company on notice that we intend to see that they meet those levels of concentration at the ground level in the future, and we're giving them some time to supply us with the kind of economic impact data that everybody will need in order to make a rational assessment of the problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be doing excessive monitoring of the ground level effects to make sure that they aren't exceeding them to any unacceptable extent in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and ask the Minister if he could advise me as to whether the proceeds from the weekend telethon held by the Variety Club, are to replace any of the insured programs in place by his department for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, Mr. Speaker, they won't replace any insured program, but I'm happy to have the opportunity to say that as a result of the efforts of the Variety Club of Manitoba and those who participated in, and all those who contributed to the telethon, that we will be able through the efforts of the club, to fund a new program for children who have lost or been born without upper limbs, the mio-electric arm, which was intended to be brought in under the insured service spectrum of the Commission as soon as possible, perhaps even this current year, but now is going to be provided through the funds raised by the Variety Club, and therefore puts us in a position to free up funds for other insured programs.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, members of the House would be interested I'm sure to know that the prosthetic and orthotic lab at the Rehabilitation Centre for Children, where the prostheses of this type and others are manufactured, is being renamed "The Variety Club Wing" of the hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether or not he is prepared to give consideration to improving the worth of the existing series of Manitoba bonds which will be maturing in the next year or the year after — I believe there are several series that will be maturing — in order to update them with respect to the interest rates that will accrue to those bonds.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, that matter is under consideration at the moment.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Province of Manitoba has just entered into an agreement with the Province of Alberta for a 14 percent interest rate on some \$110 million, would it not seem reasonable for the province to upgrade the benefits of Manitoba bondholders who have indeed some confidence in the Province of Manitoba by holding onto those bonds?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the concept of borrowing money in Manitoba is one that we would all agree to in principle. The difficulty with this type of loan is that unless the interest rates are set at an extremely high level the chances are that, after a period of six months, then the bonds simply become short-term money and the province, of course, will have some long-term requirements. The bonds, for instance, that were issued in 1979, there was over \$10 million of those issued at that time, and I think that there's only some \$2.7 million that are outstanding today. So while it is something that, in principle, would seem to be acceptable, in practice it's not quite that easy to accomplish.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is aware that the Government of Canada has updated, and they are doing so again, the value of existing bonds, in order to discourage the kind of thing the

Minister is talking about. My question to him has to do with whether or not he is going to do anything that would give incentive to Manitoba bondholders to stay in the Manitoba Bond Series if they are now in, as opposed to cashing them in and forcing the Minister into the money market for additional funds?

MR. RANSOM: My answer to that question was that it was under consideration.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would wish to continue on with my questioning of the Minister of the Environment in respect to what can only be called an ill-considered and ill-advised decision to amend an order of the Clean Environment Commission. The Minister indicated that he based that decision on a review. Is he prepared to table all the documentation that has been forwarded to him from all interested and involved parties respecting this decision since the original order was made on September 29, 1980, so that the public can have an opportunity to review the materials which he says are available to him?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that we had sufficient information at our disposal in arriving at the decision that was arrived at and I'm not prepared to table any information that the member is alluding to.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that says quite a bit. I would ask the Minister why he chose to take the course of action he did and make a ministerial decision, when it was permissible to him by The Clean Environment Act to refer this back to the Commission or refer it to a municipal board for their consideration, which would have been an open public debate on the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest to the honourable member that the question period is for the purpose of seeking information rather than debating. The honourable member may rephrase his question.

MR. COWAN: Yes, I'd like to rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. It is simply, why did the Minister choose to make the decision on his own and not to refer this matter to other public bodies which could have taken into consideration the new evidence which he suggests has been presented to him?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I was satisfied that the main part of the requirements, that is the total emissions from the facility, are being met. It is only a matter of ground level concentration, so they are not spewing forth more pollution into the atmosphere; rather it's a question of the concentrations at the ground level at certain distances from the plant. That seems to me to be a cause of lesser concern than the initial one. It seemed as though, since they were meeting those levels 99 percent of the time, or a very high percentage of the time, that the question was one of reason whether or not they ought to be allowed to put forward a plan of action that would allow them to put in the amount of money that might be involved, some \$60 million or more in a short period of time. They've been put on notice that they will have to develop those economic plans in the

future. We've given them a little time, and I think that's something that was available under ministerial order, and that's an action that I've taken. I'm prepared to stand with it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: The Minister indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the ground level emissions were complied with 99 or a suitable percentage of the time. Will the Minister indicate, since he has removed any possibility of restricting those emissions through the Clean Environment Commission order, what action he is going to take in respect to emissions which have exceeded Manitoba's maximum acceptable level in a five-year period, over 240 different occasions in a 24-hour period, and have exceeded Saskatchewan's several hundred times per year on a one-hour basis. What is he going to do in respect to those emissions that are over the limit now that he has removed any protection from the Clean Environment Commission Report and Order which was intended to deal with that sort of fugitive emission problem in the area?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the officials of my Environment Department will be working with HBM and S in an effort to bring compliance with those kinds of emission levels — ground level concentration levels I should say — on 100 percent of the time basis, it will take place over the intervening time and they will be monitoring the readings on an ongoing basis regularly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Highways. I would like to ask the Minister of Highways if he can inform the members of this House what is the situation in regard to the road restrictions on both the provincial roads and the main highways throughout the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, some two weeks we started limited restrictions on some of our provincial roads, our surfaced provincial roads, and as of Monday, today, we gave notice last week that 350-pound restrictions would be coming on the majority of our highways that we normally restrict in the spring break-up period. So, Mr. Speaker, the road restrictions are in place now and are likely to remain for some several weeks depending on the nature of the weather that we have from now until the finish of spring break-up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. I would ask him in view of the fact that it's reported that the Government of Alberta is allowing grain to be shipped from its terminals with cars that have not been authorized by the Grain Transport Authority, does the Minister have any concerns in this regard or does he support the practice?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to get the full meaning or the question that the member is asking. If he is asking the question, do I support the movement of grain out of Alberta terminals to port of export, yes, I support the movement of grain out of any part of Western Canada because it's the bettering of the agricultural people who grow that grain and it's the objective to sell it and move it out of the country.

Without the authority of the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator, Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any documented evidence that the member may have. I'm not aware of that situation and if he has further information dealing with that I would ask him to present it.

On the other hand, it's very difficult at this particular time over the last few months to really understand who is controlling the transportation industry and in fact the movement of grain within Western Canada, so the effort and the momentum that was put forward in January of 1979 right here in Winnipeg were to be carried forward at this point, it appears as if the efforts are starting to be less appreciated or visible than they were in the last year or so.

MR. ADAM: As a supplementary I would ask the Minister, in view of the fact that he has been a strong supporter of a Grain Transport Co-ordinator and Authority, whether or not he's concerned and has he contacted his Alberta counterpart, the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta to find out what the facts are in this case because I know the Minister is a strong supporter of that authority and I'm just wondering if he's not concerned. Could he advise if he has contacted the Alberta Minister of Agriculture in this regard?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for being supportive of the Grain Transportation Co-ordinating Authority that was in place and it in fact gave us some record movements of grain out of this country. Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to note that the efforts that were put forward by Dr. Horner and the Grain Transportation Co-ordinating Authority have somewhat been lost in the last few months. Those efforts I would have to say gave us a renewed hope in Western Canada that in fact we were able to meet the sales commitments that were made by the private sector and by the Canadian Wheat Board and it would be unfortunate if that kind of momentum is let slide just by the lack of the Federal Government appointing a new Grain Transportation Co-ordinator to get on with the job of moving the agriculture commodities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose with a final supplementary.

MR. ADAM: Thank you. My final supplementary then. I take it from the Minister that he does not have any concern. I ask the Minister now, it appears that he does not have any concern insofar as what has happened in Alberta at the present time, that cars of grain have been moved without any contacting of the co-ordinator. He does not concern himself with that, I presume.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, unlike my friend from Ste. Rose, who unless there's some form of government attachment or some regulatory or rule over top of what's happening in the agricultural community, if in fact it's within the terms and within the system that is available to be moved or to be worked within Canada, then I have no problem with it. In fact why doesn't he come out and say it, that it's because possibly the Canadian Wheat Board didn't give them the authority to move it. Is that really what's bothering him? I really can't find out what his hang-up is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Has he had a chance to personally review or have his staff review the material made public at a press conference by the nurses at the St. Adolphe Nursing Home on Friday, March 27th, regarding the deplorable state of care of the patients at the St. Adolphe Home, wherein they said that patients had developed bed sores; that they had been left in urine and feces until nurses were finding this out; that there were dietary errors that had been made and that medication errors had been made as well with respect to patients. Has he had a chance to investigate these charges made public on March 27th by the nurses at that home?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, we have investigated and continue to investigate all such criticisms and charges that have come up in connection with the St. Adolphe Personal Care Home. I might say that we maintained the closest contact with the professional nursing staff at the home throughout that industrial dispute; that we had every intention of evacuating that home at the moment that those professional nurses indicated to us that they thought it should be evacuated; that we were prepared in fact to evacuate Friday morning because we didn't want to put the professional nurses through another weekend; and that our standards officers who were there and who are all registered nurses were advised by the professional nursing component not to do so so, not to evacuate the home for the reasons that I had previously specified.

But certainly the concerns of the professional nurses with respect to care and with respect to the morale and energy of those nurses were uppermost in our minds throughout.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister. In view of the fact that the Minister indicates that he was prepared to take action on Friday, March 27, after the nurses made their complaints public, could he indicate why he wasn't prepared to take action on March 19 when the nurses made the same accusations and tabled the same information with the Manitoba Health Services Commission one week prior to the Minister saying he was prepared to take action on matters that they finally made public because they felt that the Minister wasn't acting. Instead of doing that, Mr. Speaker, he attacked me for bringing inaccurate information to the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult to address "so-called questions" from the Honourable Member for Transcona because of the opportunity that he uses to make a speech, deliver himself of a criticism and to distort the situation. I did not say that we were only prepared to evacuate last Friday morning; I said that we had been prepared to evacuate throughout the latter part of the industrial dispute. Our evacuation contingency plan I told the House was in place prior to the preceding weekend, any time from that preceding weekend and from last Monday, one week ago today on. But we looked at it again on the Thursday before the happening on Friday morning to which the Honourable Member for Transcona refers, the news event staged by the NDP-MFL. Prior to that we had put in place again on the Thursday firm plans to evacuate on the Friday so as to avoid weekend difficulties and our people went out that night to do that on Friday morning; again we were dissuaded by the professional nurses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on Thursday, March 19, the Minister, in this House, said that the operator of the St. Adolphe Nursing Home has responded to the findings of the Workplace Safety and Health inspectors dispatched earlier this month by the Department of Labour, has responded to meetings held between myself, the Minister of Labour and the Manitoba Health Services Commission and has responded to orders and instructions that have been directed to that operator by my office and the Health Services Commission several days ago, in view of the fact that the Minister said that and one week later the nurses publicly stated that the conditions in that home, the physical conditions with respect to broken windows, leaking roofs, have not been fixed and were not fixed on March 27, can the Minister indicate why on March 19 he told the members of this House and this Legislature and the public that all these matters had been looked after?

MR. SHERMAN: I can certainly indicate, Mr. Speaker, because they are being acted on. Most of them have been carried out; the others have been ordered, commanded through the Manitoba Health Services Commission and will be carried out. But I go back to the basic position which the Member for Transcona has, certainly if he understands it he's failed to concede that he understand it and he has continually attempted to exploit it, if we had evacuated that home, Mr. Speaker, for one thing we would have been putting the elderly patients through an unnecessary trauma; for two, we would have been acting against the advice of the professional nurses; and three, we would have removed 45 jobs from the St. Adolphe community. Those three considerations were our primary considerations in trying to get through this industrial dispute and get the problem resolved. The fact that there is some physical things that have to be done to the home is not denied, I don't deny that. The Member for Transcona knows as the Minister of Health I only have one hammer,

one lever in the end, and that is revocation of the licence. If I revoked the licence the St. Adolphe community can say goodbye to those jobs. I don't want to do that; we are putting pressure on the operator to carry out those repairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Could the Minister indicate what his government's practice or policy is with respect to the designation of a type of fishing use of various lakes in Northern Manitoba as between commercial and tourist or recreational fishing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, that decision takes place only after a great amount of checking into the economic factors that include the job opportunities for the local people involved, the pounds of fish that are being fished commercially, as opposed to the economic benefits of designating the lake for sports fishing only. I understand the honourable member is probably referring to a particular situation dealing with Lake Utik in Northern Manitoba. It's always a somewhat difficult decision to make when making that change but I can assure the honourable member that in consultation with the native community in and about that lake they have come to the conclusion that a lodge and sports fishing operation considerably enhances their economic opportunities in that area, provides considerably more jobs than they can expect, and that the record has shown over the past number of years than commercial fishing does.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The Minister had indicated that there is prior consultation with the community, can the Minister indicate whether there had been consultation with all groups who may in what directly or indirectly rely upon fishing for their livelihood, that is fishing in Utik Lake? Did such consultation take place there?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that consultation took place with all interested parties on that lake. I can also indicate to him that it's obvious that the one commercial operator, namely, a Mr. Johansson was not particularly happy with that decision inasmuch as that it directly affects his livelihood. However, it is a resource that has to be managed in the interests of as many as possible and it should be apparent to the Honourable Member for Burrows that the other persons involved at Lake Utik, namely, the people who are directly involved in the fishing at Lake Utik are not suggesting, either to the media or to anybody else, that they disagree with that designation but in fact are supportive of that designation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health. Could

he indicate why he didn't consider the option of putting the private profit-making nursing home in St. Adolphe under public trusteeship, in view of the fact that private profit-making corporation which is paid for by public funds refused to meet the regulations laid down by the government health inspectors with respect to provision of services to elderly people, why he didn't put it under public trusteeship?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I assume the Honourable Member for Transcona is talking about expropriation but let me say this that the situation with respect to St. Adolphe is not over; it is being addressed; there are considerable challenges that remain at St. Adolphe. The first thing to do, the first thing that was necessary was to try to resolve that industrial dispute without eliminating the existence of it as a place of employment and without putting the elderly residents in the home through unnecessary trauma. That was the primary challenge that has been met. We now have some other matters at St. Adolphe that we're addressing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for question period having expired proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, that will be Interim Supply, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for Interim Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats: This Committee will come to order. Interim Supply. Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$673,466,010 being 30 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, laid before the House at the present session of the Legislature be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1982.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to place on the record as we begin again Interim Supply that the Interim Supply was introduced March 11. It has been discussed on six days. Search of the records would appear to indicate this is by far the earliest date on which Interim Supply has been introduced. The same search of records would indicate that we have spent more time, certainly on this stage, than ever before according to my search of records and I would therefore simply rise to speak, Mr. Chairman,

to bring this matter to the attention of Members of the Assembly and hope that this matter could be dealt with with some dispatch.

We will not be meeting on Wednesday, I think, all members have agreed that the Legislature will be attending the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair in Brandon. My understanding is some cheques are to be issued for the end of this week and I hope we can proceed with all due dispatch and I note the Leader of the Opposition is anxiously wishing to rise and I suppose close debate on this aspect, at least at this stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, let me assure the House Leader that we have no intention to delay passage of Interim Supply. What we do however insist upon, of course, is our right to debate Interim Supply and we will be doing that throughout the course of the next two, three days. But let me assure the House Leader that there is no intent whatsoever on our part to delay passage of Interim Supply.

I recall, for the benefit of the House Leader, if you'd like to go back by way of record to 1975-1976 in which there was in fact much much more extensive debate in Interim Supply than what has taken place so far this session. But again, let me assure the Minister that we have no desire to hold up Interim Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, we do appreciate the statistics which the Attorney-General has provided to us and perhaps in answer to his implied questions, although not his stated questions, we might just suggest that they have done such a deplorable job of managing the economy, of managing the affairs of government, that they have created the environment for these types of discussions to continue during the Interim Supply opportunities of the House. So, I think he has to take some responsibility for the fact that it is taking so long. If in fact there was not so much to talk about there would not be so much talk.

But while speaking to the Environment, and that was sort of an offhanded way to approach a subject, I do feel it is necessary to use this portion of the opportunities to debate in the House, to discuss action which was taken by the Minister of the Environment just a couple of days ago which we find to be ill-considered, ill-advised and it goes beyond that. It goes beyond that, Mr. Chairperson; it is a dangerous act on the part of the Minister of the Environment. Let us look at what has happened in respect to the Minister's decision, which he takes full responsibility for, to overrule the Clean Environment Commission's order respecting sulphur dioxide emissions at the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting complex in Flin Flon.

In order to reach the type of decision that the Minister reached, in order to make the type of overruling order that he made, he must first do a number of things. He must first review the information available to him, or at least we would assume that a Minister who was, in fact, living up to

the full responsibilities of his department would take the opportunity to review that information. And if he reviewed that information, Mr. Chairperson, as others have reviewed the information, as I have reviewed the information which is available publicly, then he would have to ignore the advice of the Clean Environment Commission; he would have to discount the scientific evidence which was available to him when making that decision, evidence by the way which was also available to the Clean Environment Commission; and he would have to conduct closed door negotiations in order to arise at the type of decision which he has come to. Then have the audacity to stand in this House and say, no, I'm not going to give you any of the background documentation; I'm not going to table any of the reference materials; I'm not going to tell you what any party involved in the appeal to the Minister said; I'm going to keep that all tucked close to my chest. That is what he has told us in essence over the last couple of days in his public statements and in his statements in this House.

His decision allows Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting to exceed the maximum acceptable limits or levels for sulphur dioxide emissions in the Flin Flon area. He has told them point blank, categorically, without any qualifications whatsoever that they can continue to pollute for a number of years; that in fact the Clean Environment Commission, in making the decision based on the best scientific evidence available to them, said that something has to be done in order to deal with what is a significant problem. The Minister must have discounted that as a significant problem; the Minister in fact must have discounted any evidence that was provided to him; and the Minister in fact has made what we consider to be an extremely dangerous decision to allow a mining complex in this province to continue to pollute unfettered and unhampered by any sort of restrictions or guidelines on the part of the government. And that is allowing them, that is giving them the licence to, that is permitting them to destroy the environment. Impermentally as it may be, it's not a massive destruction of the environment which we can put into a small box and study and say this is why it happened and this is the result of it but it is impermental damage to the environment and that should be avoided.

Let us look at the maximum acceptable level definitions of his own department and, it's from a document called Guidelines for Various Air Pollutants; it's from the Manitoba Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management and it's dated January 1978. What they say about a maximum acceptable level is the following: "Maximum acceptable level deemed essential to provide adequate protection for soils, water, vegetation, materials, animals, visibility, personal comfort and well-being". That's what the province has to say about the guidelines which the Minister has taken onto himself to cancel in respect to the order for the Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting operation in Flin Flon.

One could almost understand, although perhaps not accept, the ministerial action of this nature if in fact they had been dealing with maximum desirable levels because let us look at what maximum desirable levels are.

A maximum desirable level is, "that which defines a long-term goal for air quality and provides a basis for an anti-degradation policy for the unpolluted parts of Manitoba and for the continuing development of control technology." Now the Clean Environment Commission did not impose upon Hudson's Bay Mining & Smelting any requirement to meet the maximum desirable level, although one would certainly hope that would be a goal, a long-term goal. All they said to Hudson's Bay Mining & Smelting is, you can no longer continue to violate the maximum acceptable level because when you violate the maximum acceptable level, if we are to follow the logic of the definition, this is what happens to the province.

There is not adequate protection for soils, water, vegetation, materials, animals, visibility, personal comfort and well-being. In other words, if those guidelines are violated, the environment is violated. If those guidelines are not adhered to, that sort of adequate protection which does not even forestall or prevent degradation, just as adequate protection will not in fact be accomplished. So the Minister had to, in making his decision, be aware of all that and still he said to Hudson's Bay Mining & Smelting, go ahead and pollute, go ahead and do the type of damage which we know accompanies that sort of sulphur dioxide emissions.

What we were talking about in general here is acid rain; we're talking about sulphur dioxide emissions into the environment which in fact can cause and give rise to acid rain. Now the Minister and the Minister previous to him and I'm not certain about the Minister previous to him, but I know the last two Ministers have said we don't have a problem in Northern Manitoba with acid rain because of the high buffering capacity of the soil, because of the alkaline nature of the soil, it's not really a problem. Well, the fact is when questioned on that they did have to admit that there are certain areas in which it is a problem and those areas are in the Precambrian shield — the Hudson's Bay Mining & Smelting operation, by the way, is in the Precambrian shield as well — and those are areas where acid rain and high levels of acidity and snow in the soil can have a profoundly negative impact on the environment.

So the fact is we're talking about a very serious problem; it's not a problem that has been well documented. The Minister only need read the report on the United States-Canada research consultation group on the long-range transport of air pollutants to understand the full significance of that particular problem. Perhaps the Minister has read it and if the Minister has read it, then one has to question his decision even more because what that report says, Mr. Chairperson, is that there is a significant problem in respect to sulphur dioxide and nitrous oxide emissions throughout this continent, not confined to Flin Flon, not confined to Thompson, not confined to Sudbury, not confined to the industrial centres, but throughout this province. When we have lakes dying and we have fish dying and we see the reduction in the quality of fish, we see the reduction in the catch of fish, because of pollution of sulphur dioxide and it's happening.

You know, I had the opportunity this morning to talk to one of the residents of the Flin Flon area and we were talking about in fact the quality of the

environment. Now, he was born there, lived there all his life, he's a young man and what he said to me is, I don't need the scientific evidence — although he has looked at it and studied it and agrees with it — he said I have seen the quality of the lakes deteriorate; I have seen the degradation of the environment; personally he has seen that happen. He has witnessed it with his own hands and filtered it through his own experience. The fact is that it is occurring. The fact is that when the Minister allows a company to pollute in the way in which he has done recently he is going to, apt to, encourage that further deterioration and degradation of the environment.

But you don't have to take it upon my word, Mr. Chairperson. You don't have to take it upon the word of a long-term resident who has seen it with his own eyes. All you have to do is read the reports, the scientific evidence that was available to the Clean Environment Commission and therefore is available to the Minister which was available to the public and which was used to form the basis of a decision by the Clean Environment Commission to restrict further pollution in that area. What they say is, "The results indicate that the vast majority of metal fallout occurs within 10 kilometres of the smelter but that the measurable deposition of copper zinc occurs up to 30 kilometres from the source. Smelting activities in the Flin Flon area have led to a general decline in the forest community in the immediate vicinity of the smelter". In other words, there it is in black and white. That was a report done by government officials.

It goes on to say as well, "That severe degradation is obvious in a row of jack pine and spruce studs located a few kilometres to the south of the smelter complex. These sites are depleted of species which are sensitive to atmospheric pollutants". So what it says is that we cause for concern; that there is a problem and in fact that the Clean Environment Commission was attempting to deal with that problem in the best way possible to them. So the scientists came forward and presented that evidence, that government came forward and presented that evidence. His own government, his own department came forward and said and I quote again, "That HBM&S has studied implementation of sulphur fixation at the Flin Flon smelter in a report entitled, Economic Implications of Sulphur Dioxide Fixation, May, 1978". Now, that's the report and that's the evidence that the Minister says we still have to study, May, 1978. It's three years later and the Minister still wants to study the situation. Well, while he's studying pollution is ongoing and the environment is suffering.

One has to question why that information has not been studied in the past. One has to question why the Minister couldn't stand up and say, I have definitive evidence and proof that in fact my decision is the right decision; he couldn't do that. He wouldn't give us any evidence; he wouldn't give us any background; he wouldn't give us any support; he wouldn't give us any reviews or documentation for having made his decision, so we are left with that which is of a public nature — and again, remember this comes from the Minister's own department and is dated November, 1979 — so the fact is that this report has been available to them for some time.

Let me go on to read from the report which was drafted by the Minister's own bureaucracy. The

report they're talking about for the record, Mr. Chairperson, is a report on the economic implications of sulphur dioxide fixation presented by Hudson's Bay Mining & Smelting and what they say is, "This report concludes that sulphur containment would require not only gas conditioning in the sulphuric acid production facilities and major revisions to present process facilities as well, would result in a substantial operating loss and would have a dramatic and negative short-and-long-term impact on the Flin Flon operation of HBM&S and thus on the community in which it operates." Now, that's a statement which the Minister read back to us today, the statement from the HBM&S report. In fact, that this would have economic implications that would result in long-term and short-term difficulties for the community, community residents and employees of that operation. What does his own department say about that report? In reading this I have to wonder if he is listening to his own department. I have to wonder who he was talking to when he made this decision. But for the record, what it says, "These conclusions (although the economic impact requires further data) are acknowledged and agreed to in principle, however, acceptable air quality for the Flin Flon area is also a basic necessity". That's what his department says. We agree with that. The people of this province agree with that. It seems as if there are only a few people who are out of locked step with that sort of principle, and that's the Minister and whoever advised him to overrule a decision by the Clean Environment Commission.

I would suggest that he does not have widespread public support; he does not have widespread political support and he probably does not have widespread scientific support for the decision which he made. It was truly ill-advised and ill-considered. His own department says that the economic impact requires further data. What they are saying is that report upon which the Minister is basing his decision, or appears to be basing his decision, is incomplete, and in fact that was brought out time and time again, that was a report that needed to be calibrated against known evidence in other areas; that was a report that needed further study; that was a report that could not be accepted on its own without supportive documentation and that's what was missing. The Minister won't provide us with that supportive documentation now and I don't think he will provide it to us because I don't believe that he has it.

So in fact, he has taken the word of HBM&S over the word of his own department, over the word of his own Clean Environment Commission. He has rejected the sound scientific advice which was available to him; He has rejected the data which shows a general decline in the area. Mr. Chairperson, he has rejected the public input which was provided to the Clean Environment Commission, which overwhelmingly supported a course of action that would reduce pollution in the area and he appears to have only listened to a presentation by Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting. That is the appearance of it as it stands now.

The orders that he overturned, why all the fuss and furor over the orders that he overturned, the Clean Environment Commission Order Number 899? What that order said in essence, Mr. Chairperson, was that

the company was not going to be allowed to exceed what were considered to be the maximum levels under which the environment could continue to produce and prosper. That sounds reasonable enough to me. That sounds as if it would make good common sense and I would suggest to you that it goes beyond that, that it in fact makes good environmental sense — I don't think there's any doubt about that — but even beyond that, it makes good economic sense.

I don't mean to lecture the Minister, but surely the Minister knows that somebody in the long run is going to pay for pollution. Somebody is going to pay for pollution. Either somebody is going to have to pay to stop that pollution at its source and to prevent emissions from entering the environment and thereby having an impact and effect on the environment — in this case, we know it's a negative and a destructive impact, in effect — or we're going to have to pay to clean up the environment. We're going to have to pay to cure the health of individuals in that area who are adversely affected by pollution; we're going to have to pay in lost revenues to the tourism industry; we're going to have to pay in lost revenues to the forestry industry; we're going to have to pay in lost revenues to the fishing industry in the area and the list goes on and on and on and on.

So it's an economic question certainly, but the Minister has only looked at one side of the equation. The Minister has failed to look at what it is going to cost to deal with his decision not to provide a firm, concrete mechanism to prevent pollution in the area. They have made those sorts of analyses in other jurisdictions, and I would suggest that they apply more or less, to this particular jurisdiction.

We all know that sulphur dioxide is in fact, a pollutant. We all know that sulphur dioxide does in fact, have a negative impact on the environment and human health. Some scientists have tried to determine in fact, exactly what that impact is and the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare — no less an authority than them, Mr. Chairperson, — have estimated, and they say it's a conservative estimate — that the cost of each pound of sulphur dioxide emitted in the United States, costs general society 12.5 cents. That's a few years old and inflation has probably put that price up a bit, but the fact is that there is a set figure which one can place on this type of pollution. That formula, by the way, does not include the effect of sulphur dioxide on animals, soil and the aesthetic appeal of natural areas. So that formula in itself is incomplete. That is an understatement of the cost to society, but is a significant amount when you realize that we're talking about millions of pounds of sulphur dioxide per day, being emitted from pollution sources such as Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting. They in fact, are a major polluter in the area and one has to only use their own figures to determine that in fact they are spewing out into the environment 390 pounds of cadmium every day, 820 pounds of copper every 24-hour period, 2,970 pounds of lead every 24 hours, millions of pounds of zinc and millions of pounds of sulphur. So we have to pay for that.

Now, it is well known, it is well documented that they are polluting, but what are the effects of that pollution? Well again, let's turn to the Minister's own report and let's see what it has to say about the

effects of that pollution. I quote again, "A current Federal-Provincial vegetation and soil survey ongoing in the Flin Flon areas, has indicated that:

1. An inverse gradient of zinc, copper and other heavy metal accumulations in the soil and vegetation occur distantly from the smelter site.

2. High accumulations of heavy metals were found on soil and surface vegetation targets to some 10 kilometres distance from the smelter.

3. High levels of heavy metal contaminants were found in the mineral soil at five kilometres and closer distances.

4. The native vegetation within most of the area five kilometres from the smelter has suffered severe deterioration.

5. Many of the symptoms displayed by the remaining forest vegetation within these areas were consistent with those caused by sulphur dioxide and heavy metal contaminant stress".

So in fact we have what was to be anticipated and what was to be expected on the basis of the best scientific evidence available to us; that pollution which he is going to allow to continue will result in severe degradation of the forest area around Flin Flon. That report was based on circumstances when there was a small stack in the community. Now we have an 825 or an 850-foot stack — I'm not certain which — that in fact spreads and disperses pollutants over a much larger area.

So when we're talking about five kilometres now, we're going to be talking about a much larger area later on. We're talking about the long range transportation of pollutants, remember? That is a matter which concerned the Canadian and United States governments so much that they have embarked upon a very extensive and special program to deal with the very types of conditions which the Minister is condoning and continuing to allow by his actions.

So we had a decision by the Clean Environment Commission that appeared to be environmentally sound, appeared to be common sensical, appeared to be economically sound and the Minister overruled it. It was based on a package that decision that they made, that was made in the light of the day, public hearings, public representations, public deliberations. Now we have the Minister in the back rooms overturn such a decision and he won't specify who advised him, he won't say who consulted him, he won't provide us with any of the information which he says is so conclusive that he can stand firmly behind the type of decision he made. He won't let the public review his appeal, he has bypassed the mechanisms which are allowed to him by the Clean Environment Commission in respect to the appeal. He could have referred this to a municipal board, he could have referred it to a number of areas. He could have said go back and look at this again, new evidence has come to me. That's what he needs by the way, he needs new evidence. He says he has new evidence but he won't tell anybody what the new evidence is, he won't show anybody what the new evidence is. The fact is that there is no new evidence.

The fact is that it's the same old tired story. The Minister has in fact fallen prey to the discussions from the company and the threats perhaps, I don't know what transpired, that in fact if they proceeded

with the Clean Environment Commission Hearing it would cost that community dearly. We have heard that in so many different instances and cases that it is repetitious.

The vinyl chloride industry, when they were told that they in fact were going to have to cut down their emissions to a specific level in order to protect workers in the area, in order to protect people living in the close proximity to their plants, said we can't do it, it'll throw us out of business. Well, it didn't throw them out of business. As a matter of fact they made money on the deal because the technology which they developed in order to contain those pollutants was bought up by other companies and they had a whole side industry which allowed them to produce and to design technological equipment which was intended to prevent pollution, and they flourished. There was more vinyl chloride produced than before and there were more people working in the industry than before.

It's the same old tired story that we get every time it comes down to making a decision to protect the people of this province or any other area from pollution. It will cost too much, we can't afford it. Mr. Minister, — I can see them now — Mr. Minister it's on your head that jobs will be lost in the area, production will be cut in the area, it's on your head so you make the decision. Well he made the decision; he made the wrong decision; he made a bone-headed decision; he made an ill-advised, ill-considered and stupid — can I use that parliamentarily — stupid decision when it comes to the decision that he made to condone and permit a company to continue to pollute; and in making that decision he had to overrule his own department and he had to overrule the Clean Environment Commission.

He takes responsibility for it, Mr. Chairperson. He has voluntarily taken responsibility for that action during the question period. —(Interjection)— Well he does take responsibility for it, not because he voluntarily accepts it; because he must accept it; because it is his responsibility; because the decision does lie in fact on his head. He is going to have to be the one to prove beyond a doubt that the decision was in fact the proper decision. It's going to be difficult for him to do it if he does not provide us with the information which was available to him.

We will ask again, Mr. Chairperson, through you let me inform the Minister that we will put an Order for Return in for that information and if we have to we will debate the Order for Return. If the Minister accepts the Order for Return and wishes to proceed in the way in which so many of his other Ministers have done and not provide us with the information and sit on it, we will continue to ask. We will not let him discard a decision which was made in the full public light so haphazardly and so carelessly and without providing the rationale for his own decision to overrule it. So the responsibility rests with him.

Right now the only thing we can conclude, that it was little more than a whim or a threat that caused the Minister to make the type of decision that he did. The people of the Flin Flon area — and that's a large area, there are some 600,000 acres of land which are affected by the contaminants which are polluted from that smelter — the people of that area deserve better. The people of this province deserve better,

Mr. Chairperson. The people of the country deserve better. Because we are talking about long-range pollutants in sulphur dioxide I suggest to you that the people of this continent deserve better than the Minister has provided to them.

I think it is important in the two minutes that are left to me to put on the record, the fact that what he has allowed to continue are violations of the maximum acceptable level which have approached or exceeded over 50 times per year. In other words, once a week those maximum acceptable levels have been violated by that company and he has said to them by his decision, go ahead, continue to pollute, continue to dirty the environment, we will allow you to proceed in the way in which you have proceeded in the past. We will allow this pollution to continue and we — he's taking responsibility on behalf of all the taxpayers of this province as well — will be the ones that will be faced with the ultimate bill to clean up for the ill-advised, ill-considered, wrong-headed, bone-headed, stupid decision of the Minister of the Environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Minister was rising to respond to the Member for Churchill. Mr. Chairman, apparently that is not the case. The Minister is not in a position to respond to, I think, the very well-founded positions raised by the Member for Churchill. What I wanted to deal with, Mr. Chairman, was the lack of response received earlier this afternoon from the Minister of Economic Development.

Mr. Chairman, there has been an effort by the Minister of Economic Development to leave the impression that all is well in Manitoba. In fact we heard that even this afternoon when the Minister attempted to suggest that indeed there had been improvement during the past three years in Manitoba by way of economic development and progress. Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I wasn't quite sure for a few moments whether I was hearing correctly that we still have a Minister of Economic Development in Manitoba who suggests that all has been well during the past three years, and indeed there is no need for concern or the initiation of new programs in the year 1981.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, and of course it was naive to so hope that the Minister would have recognized the significance of the information which was just released this last Friday dealing with investment trend intentions, which indicated quite clearly that insofar as total investment is concerned in Manitoba, Manitoba is the second worst in Canada — 6.5 percent compared to an average Canadian figure of some 17-some percent — and in case the Minister as I know he wishes to do from time to time pull the Alberta, Saskatchewan, B.C. figures out, the major improvement was not in Alberta or British Columbia but indeed was in such provinces as Nova Scotia, Manitoba, 6.5 percent, one-half of the rate of inflation by way of projected investment intentions in the year 1981, yet we have from a Minister of Economic Development and from the government a lackadaisical do-nothing approach.

Mr. Chairman, to add fuel to the concerns that are felt on this side is that it was this government that

suggested they were going to turn around private investment in Manitoba; that the business community was going to be placed on trial, is what this government had said back in 1977. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the same statistics released indicated that private investment intentions are 5.1 percent increase, worse than all provinces except for Prince Edward Island, and in fact much worse than public investment intentions in Manitoba which are 9 percent. So after three-and-a-half years private investment in Manitoba is continuing to lag under the Conservative Government.

Then, Mr. Chairman, as if that was not bad enough, is the information by which we find that housing investment is expected to grow by only 7.5 percent from 1980 — 7.5 percent — to \$262.6 million compared to \$366.7 million back in 1979. Again, the Minister of Economic Development when questioned earlier this afternoon in regard to this matter, simply shrugged and gave no indication that there were any plans under way on the part of this government to generate rehabilitation programs, critical home repair programs in Manitoba.

I can recall in 1977 during the Throne Speech the First Minister condemning the then-government for spending only \$5 million in Critical Home Repair Programs, 1977. In 1981, Mr. Chairman, the amount that is being expended on Critical Home Repair Programs is less than \$5 million after three-and-a-half years of inflation. Yet, Mr. Chairman, despite the efforts on this side to encourage the development of some innovation, there is still no response from across the way; there's no indication of any new policies or programs by way of investment increase in Manitoba, by way of housing.

Let it not be argued that there is need for rehabilitation of older homes; there is need for Critical Home Repair in Manitoba; there is need for more senior citizen housing; there is need for more family housing for those that are in low and middle income brackets in the province and yet we find that the housing investment situation in Manitoba is continuing to be sluggish. Any increase this year will be below the rate of inflation, it will be less by way of constant dollars. So, Mr. Chairman, Manitobans cannot help but be disappointed by way of the information that was released earlier on the part of Statistics Canada in Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, I also wanted to provide to the Minister of Finance, who I recognize is somewhat new in his portfolio, new to the ropes of his own department, the Manitoba government's position in 1977 on federal fiscal arrangements. I note a letter that the Minister of Finance wrote to the Winnipeg Free Press dealing with Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements in responding to an earlier letter that I had written to the Winnipeg Free Press. I can only assume that when the Minister of Finance wrote the letter as he did to the Winnipeg Free Press, that he was unaware of the position that had been taken by the then-Schreyer government pertaining to the change in the Federal-Provincial arrangement.

Obviously the Minister, if he had a copy of the 1977 Manitoba Budget Address, didn't have a copy of the position paper that is attached to that Budget Address, otherwise the Minister would not have written as he did write in the style that he wrote to the Winnipeg Free Press because it showed

unfortunately a lack of knowledge on the background of the negotiations which led up to the change in the Federal-Provincial arrangements.

On Page 131 of the 1977 changes in Federal-Provincial financial arrangements, there is a complete formulation of the position that had been taken. In fact it was the Minister's party in Ottawa that supported the changes in Ottawa. It was only accepted in Manitoba when there was no alternative but to accept the federal position; that the Federal Government took a take-it-or-leave-it sort of attitude when the Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements were entered into in 1976-77 despite the opposition that had been expressed earlier by Manitoba. It was only after the Federal Government were proceeding regardless, that there was acceptance because there was no other choice after Manitoba had opposed.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to send a copy of the 1977 Manitoba Budget Address to the Minister and refer him to the page that I made reference to.

I'd also asked last week if the Minister would arrange to have the Minister of Finance present during the Interim Supply Estimates and the Minister didn't commit himself to do so, but on the other hand he didn't indicate that he wouldn't attempt to accommodate the presence of the Minister of Finance. —(Interjection)— The Minister responsible for Flyer, apologies, the former Minister of Finance responsible for Flyer.

Mr. Chairman, a number of questions had been posed in connection with Flyer in the House. A letter was written to the First Minister on February 5th of this year by Flyer employees and a petition was signed. A further letter was written on February 15th of this year and, to my knowledge, neither of those letters have been responded to yet by the First Minister; nor indeed has the Minister responsible for Flyer responded, although it is my understanding that the Minister responsible for Flyer has his Executive Assistant sitting on the board of Flyer which, Mr. Chairman, in itself is somewhat of an unusual situation. To my knowledge, by way of precedent, by way of background an Executive Assistant sits on a Board of Directors of a Crown corporation, that is the case in the matter at hand. Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge neither the First Minister nor the Minister responsible have indicated to the employees whether or not they will sit down to discuss their letter with them. If they are not prepared to do so then I think it is nigh time that the First Minister and the Minister of Finance do so and indicate they are not interested in sitting down, indicate that the employees must deal with the Chairman of the board and the board members. If that is their policy intention then let them so indicate to the management at Flyer. Up until this point there has been no indication, unless it has been just in the last several days, made by either the First Minister or the Minister responsible, as to their intentions pertaining to the communications that have been submitted to them dated February 5th and February 15th.

Serious allegations have been raised in the letters involved. The one of February 5th suggested indeed that the Minister responsible for Flyer had provided the public with false information. When a news release was issued and appeared in the January 31st edition of the Winnipeg Free Press that news release

indicated a former General Motors plant manager is the new president of government-owned Flyer Industries Limited. He was with General Motors for 14 years serving as a manager of the firm's 6,000 man plant in St. Catharines.

My understanding is that the employees have indicated that is not the case; that he was not the manager of a 6,000 man plant, that he acted as superintendent of foundries, that he was the No. 2 or No. 3 man in the St. Catharines operation and the foundry had some 2,500 employees. These are allegations that are being raised by management and yet the government has seen fit to continue to allow these allegations to rest, appears to have made no effort to deal with the allegations involved.

Mr. Chairman, what is of concern is during a 10-month time space in 1980 there was significant improvement under way at Flyer. Flyer enjoyed a profit. There apparently was quite an improvement, from all reports that we have received, of morale uplift at Flyer. The staff at Flyer went out, they successfully finalized a number contracts and it appeared that Flyer again was turning around. Now, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the government unwittingly, or wittingly, have created the opposite kind of atmosphere now at Flyer. A consultant firm was appointed, Woods Gordon, to attempt to find buyers for Flyer. It is my understanding this consulting firm travelled over much of the world and attempted to obtain buyers for Flyer. I asked a question of the Minister responsible, and he hasn't responded yet, whether it is true indeed that the billings pertaining to Woods Gordon have been directed through to his department rather than to Flyer or to MDC itself. It is my understanding that they have been, Mr. Chairman. It is my understanding that those bills are very very substantial in number and if the Minister doesn't see fit to provide us with that kind of information then we will have to certainly file an Order for Return.

What happened, Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that the employees responded to what they received from the government, was an indication the government is interested in selling Flyer. And I want to leave aside now whether or not the government should have been attempting to sell Flyer, but the method by which this entire operation was handled. Employees took the government seriously; they prepared a purchase package. Then it's my understanding that once the government realized precisely what the employees were intending to do that their attempt to sell was cancelled, called off.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why did the government suddenly change it's mind. We have not been informed as to why the government at one point in time wished to sell Flyer. I wouldn't hesitate to suggest that scores of thousands of dollars has been spent by way of a consulting firm to try to attempt to locate buyers for Flyer involving extensive travel and other expenses in the process. Apparently some firms had expressed some interest, including the employees. The employees presented their offer and, according to the allegations provided to us by way of the employees, they can't even obtain a meeting with Woods Gordon or anyone else on behalf of the government pertaining to the sale of Flyer.

So, Mr. Chairman, what concerns Manitobans: (a) that a Crown corporation, which I believe was clearly

becoming successful; was clearly increasing the number of contracts for sale of buses, not only in Canada but through the United States; a Crown corporation that indeed was improving month by month, the morale within that Crown corporation was improving month by month which indeed had turned a profit according to the last financial statement but according to the information that we have there was a good relationship developed amongst the management at Flyer. My first question to the Minister is, why would the government under these circumstances (a) want to sell Flyer at all? Why would they not keep Flyer in the Province of Manitoba owned by Manitobans as a whole? But if it is their intention to bull right ahead to sell Flyer then why would they have given such a cold shoulder to the employees that expressed some interest, Mr. Chairman, in purchasing Flyer; and if indeed they have shuffled aside the employees, is the government interested still in selling Flyer to other interests outside the Province of Manitoba? And is Woods Gordon, that were appointed by the government to undertake this work, Mr. Chairman, are they still in the process of meeting with prospective buyers; is Woods Gordon's intentions to meet with the employees pertaining to their purchase of Flyer? What is the intention of this government? Because what the government has done unfortunately, Mr. Chairman — and there was an interesting article in Business Week about two or three weeks ago about the impact of a For Sale sign put up on the front of any business being sold — is that it does create personnel raids; it does create a problem pertaining to morale; it does provide opportunities advantageous to its competitors. What the government has done by its actions has indeed jeopardized the position of Flyer. They generated uncertainty; they expended large sums of moneys through a private consulting firm and now the government would not clearly indicate to the very people that are most intimately involved in Flyer as to their intentions.

So, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a great deal of the personnel issues that are at stake here, but I say to the Minister that the management and employees at Flyer deserve answers to the inquiries which they made of this government on February 5th and February 15th of this year. And if the government doesn't intend to provide the employees or management with a response then let them say so and let them give the reasons why they feel such a meeting is not desirable. If they intend to refer the employees to the Chairman of the board, let them again tell the management and staff that are complaining at Flyer that they want them to deal with the Chairman of the board. For the First Minister to receive a petition, then a follow-up petition and still no response, to shuffle the matter first to the Minister responsible, from the First Minister's office I understand received the petitions, then I can assume it went to the Executive Assistant working for the Minister responsible for Flyer, then apparently worked its way down to the Chairman of the board and to the new manager of Flyer. Does the Minister for a moment think that this is going to improve what is a deteriorating morale situation at Flyer.

If the Minister challenges my comments that the morale situation in Flyer has deteriorated, then I

simply refer to the letters February 5th and February 15th that very clearly document what is taking place with respect to that. I think that this government has a great deal of answering to do pertaining to Flyer and the longer that this doubt and uncertainty is permitted to continue the more indeed that we are jeopardizing the position of Flyer in this province for no good reason.

I want to make it very clear too, Mr. Chairman, that we in Opposition will oppose any move on the part of this government that could result in Flyer being disposed, in main or in part, to interests outside the Province of Manitoba that would result eventually in the loss of jobs and investment belonging to all the people of the people of Manitoba; we will oppose that. But if it is the government's intention to dispose of Flyer then let them tell Manitobans that that is their intention. Let us not find out through the back door as we have through petitions and letters forwarded to the First Minister by those most intimately effected at Flyer.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a complete lack of direction in this matter, on the part of the government. There is no response from the First Minister; none whatsoever from the Minister responsible for Flyer. We don't know where the Minister responsible for Flyer is receiving . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition persists in saying he hasn't had an opportunity to raise questions with the Minister of Energy and Mines who is responsible for Flyer; that is not correct. In the Minister's Salary last Thursday night the opportunity was available. The Member for St. Vital noted that the opportunity was available; he noted that his leader had not given him any questions to ask. But he did ask one question; the Minister responded to it and that was it. The Leader of the Opposition had the opportunity and he wasn't here. —(Interjection)— It is a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on the same point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: Indeed you're finding that to be a point of order, I think that it's rather an unfortunate intervention by the Minister at this stage because I wasn't quarreling with the opportunity or lack of opportunity. What I was indicating is that we had not received answers and, Mr. Chairman, we've been asking questions during question period at least on three occasions. If the Minister of Finance would open up his ears, Mr. Chairman, he might fully be aware that indeed those questions had been asked in the House and on each occasion the Minister responsible has been ducking answers in connection with this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order — the Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that in providing opportunities for members to ask questions, to me is a matter of order to the Business of the House.

The Leader of the Opposition had the opportunity to ask questions when Flyer was before the

Committee. That had been pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition. He has raised questions in question period and was told that the Minister would be dealing with his Estimates. The question was raised and he was told that it could be discussed under the Minister's Salary. When the Minister's Salary was before this Committee for discussion, the Leader of the Opposition was not here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. PAWLEY: The fact is, I was hopeful that we could expedite Interim Supply, and I was hopeful that we could all co-operate with the House Leader. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that I was unable to be here Friday evening. I had other commitments, longstanding, Thursday evening. The First Minister now is suggesting that because I was unable to be here, even though notice was served upon the Minister of my interest in respect to this matter, that I'm precluded from dealing with this matter further, I'd say the Minister is going to have another thought coming.

We have posed questions and, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has every opportunity — either the Minister of Finance or the Minister responsible for Flyer — to respond to those questions, either through question period or through some other avenue. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we still have not received responses to the questions which we've posed up to this date.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I could carry on. Mr. Chairman, the Minister again is taking that cavalier type of attitude that we find so much exemplified on the part of the government across the way. He is not being asked to respond to questions just because this side of the Chamber is asking those questions. He owes, yes, a responsibility to this Chamber but, Mr. Chairman, somebody owes a responsibility to the staff and to the management at Flyer, to provide some answers, and also to the people of Manitoba. I find that the Minister's cavalier attitude, "Well, the Leader of the Opposition couldn't be here Thursday night, therefore we're free of providing any information in this Chamber", Mr. Chairman, I find to be one of the most despicable, cavalier attitudes that could be imagined on the part of the government across the way. If that is the way, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister and the Minister of Finance are going to conduct themselves, then I believe, Mr. Chairman, the people of the Province of Manitoba are going to have some judgment upon their arrogant approach in this Chamber.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister is telling us that because I was not present late Thursday evening to ask these questions, that they therefore feel no obligation to provide any information whatsoever, let the Minister not think that this is the last that they will hear of this matter, because there's a larger issue involved.

There is the future of a basic industry in this province, a basic industry that is operated by the public in the Province of Manitoba through their government; an industry that the public and the Province of Manitoba want to see continued in this province, not sold out to interests outside the Province of Manitoba; an industry which the public in this province want to know precisely what the

intentions of this government is pertaining to that industry. Why would a decision be made one time and space to sell the industry, then that decision to be withdrawn, Mr. Chairman? Then uncertainty is really what the intention of the government is.

They may or may not be intending to sell the plant, we don't really know. I would have hoped that the management of Flyer would at least be given the benefit of some information. Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be the government of business wisdom, business competency and efficiency. They were going to be the government that would turn around the so-called operations of government, make matters much more competent, balance the Budget, improve the economy of the Province of Manitoba, improve the functioning of agencies and departments of government. (Interjection)—

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues behind me says, "What a joke". It is a joke. To the Member for Minnedosa, yes, he does look silly and has been looking silly for quite some time, in his constant and repeated efforts to justify the unjustifiable in this Chamber. That's what he's been doing.

The government has no necessity to provide any response. They can be doing as the First Minister has been doing, as the Minister responsible for Flyer has been doing to duck the questions that are being posed, to postpone response, to suggest that it should be Order for Return knowing very well that an Order for Return probably won't be answered according to the tradition on the part of this government for another year or two. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we want to know how much money has been paid out to Woods Gordon in attempting to obtain a buyer for Flyer and I believe that Manitobans want to know how much has been paid out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. To the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, time is up.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition's case is very well taken. Just while I'm on my feet now I hear the expression, "weak link" used from across the way and I would like to take this opportunity just to refer to that.

My friend the Member for St. Johns and I have differences of opinion, and the day that he made that particular comment I reacted, as people usually do when they're annoyed about something. But I'll never forget the Budget that man introduced into this House and it was supported unanimously. Now I don't distract that so in the weak links, I'm probably the weakest link because I'm in the back row again.

But I rise, Mr. Chairman, primarily to agree and disagree with the contribution of the Member for Churchill. When he was making his remarks, my mind went back to 30 years ago. I was involved in the opening of a pulp mill in Antioch in California and after the operation of this pulp mill, all of the grapes around the plant died. Cases were made that it was the pulp mill's existence which had killed the grapes and of course court cases were entered into, and the company tried to prove in a cause and effect way that it wasn't the pulp mill that was killing the grapes and the arguments went on and on and on.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that I was down in Antioch in California about six weeks ago,

and grapes today are growing up right outside of the plant. I personally, in the interests of all Manitoba, want to thank the Member for Churchill for his contribution in the area of pollution, because what he says is right on. The continued insistent and persistent arguments that the Member for Churchill makes in this area are of vital importance to everyone that's involved. So I want to agree with the Member for Churchill in the case that he makes vis-a-vis pollution in general, and to thank him for his diligence and the effort that he has made since first elected in this House in 1977.

The Member for Churchill and I disagree in a couple of fundamental areas, and we disagree strongly. Nevertheless, I respect the contribution that he has made in this House and the effort especially in pollution.

I want to disagree with him on one aspect. I don't want to disagree with the words that he used in saying that the Minister has come to a stupid decision, or a few other adjectives that he used relative to that decision, but I wanted to defend the Minister's right to make that decision, because if our system is to work, then at some point in time someone has to decide. It was the former New Democratic Party which wrote that particular Act and the amendments to it, to allow that kind of discretion.

The Member for Churchill's position is that it should be referred back. Perhaps history will prove that it should be referred back but nevertheless, the Minister not only has the right but the responsibility when he feels or she feels — whoever happens to be the Minister of the day — that enough argument has been made and a ministerial decision will be made.

Mr. Chairman, when we keep saying, "You know, I don't like the answer you got. We'll have more research done". Anybody who knows about research, knows that you can get experts with all kinds of degrees and everything else, to support almost any side of an argument. Look at the cases before the courts, whether a person is sane or insane. You get psychiatrists on one side arguing this way or that way and eventually somebody has to make the judgment. If I want orange answers to a question, I will find orange men. If I want pink answers, I will find pink men to analyze all of the data that is, tut to make the system work somebody has to accept the responsibility.

A very good example of this lack of ministerial direction is, I'm sorry to say, right in the hands of the Minister himself. Again, the Minister has that responsibility. He has to exercise it, relative to the Utility Board. He is the Minister that is responsible to this House through whom the Utility Board reports to the House, and because that particular argument will take place relative to a bill which was introduced by the leader of our party today, I'll leave that particular case to another day, but there's another more important area.

For years, Mr. Chairman, everybody talks about the necessity of psychiatric care for children in the Province of Manitoba and because the Minister of Health will not accept his responsibility and exercise that responsibility, we have not to this day a psychiatric capacity for children in the Province of Manitoba and we won't for some time to come. Why? During the Estimates of the Department of

Health we asked the Minister of Health, "What are you doing relative to the psychiatric care for children?" He's trying to develop a consensus. We can find no agreement because every group that's got any interest in anything wants to have more to say than every other group. Each individual group wants to be in charge. That's the way things are. That's the way it is. So the Minister says in response to the question, "Oh, yes, we have some capital in our Estimates to develop a psychiatric facility for children". Where is it? I think it was last year, but he to this day, has not got together a body which will on his behalf, exercise the administrative responsibility in coming up with a physical plant, with the professional help needed, the support staff needed, this has not been developed. They're trying to project the image that something is being done in the field of psychiatric care for children. Nothing has happened.

Take a parallel case, Seven Oaks Hospital. A decision was made that there should be a hospital in the northern part of the City of Winnipeg. A group got together to accept the responsibility of steering it through, of looking at plans, physical plans for the building. After they dug the hole and started putting up the building, they attracted a key group to reach out into the community and get the doctors, the anesthetists, the nurses and everything else that was necessary to operate that hospital and that thing has been abuilding since they dug the hole in the ground, about four years.

So when the Minister of Health was telling us in Estimates, "Oh yes, the psychiatric capacity to help children is just around the corner because we have this capital in the Budget", as if that was it. It isn't. There was a conference here just concluded here in the last few days, that the most important time in a child's development is the first three years. The first three years. The old adage, that we didn't need all of the modern analysis with all of the figures that they take, and the Chi squares, and all the type of analysis that they massage figures to say, "Hey, it's important. Zero to three years is important". In our day, Mr. Chairman, we had this in our gestalt, our knowledge, our way of operating; the way the twig is bent the tree will grow.

But evidence after evidence or people with evidence and more evidence have been saying, "For gosh sakes, in the interests of saving money down the road, put some effort into the psychiatric care for children." It's a nice-sounding word, you know, psychiatric. The government says we've got to do something about that so we'll put some money in here, a couple of million of dollars in our Estimates, which they're not spending. They don't have to spend it because they haven't got anything to spend it on but they keep coming back and saying, well, we got the answer, we put the money there. But when you get down to the nitty-gritty, what are you doing about it? The answer comes out, "nothing".

So have the government on one side. The Minister exercised what I believe is the ministerial prerogative, he's right or wrong, and that part of it I will defend that he should be able to have that right. The fact that he chose not to, history may well prove as the Member for Churchill said that it was a stupid decision, I don't know, I'm not privy to the information that was provided to the Minister. But

nevertheless, in this other most important field the Minister of Health is not exercising his ministerial responsibility, not exercising it.

It is up to the Minister of Health to say, enough, enough, the argument has gone on and on and on. Here is a group and there are many capable competent people in the Province of Manitoba — I don't want to focus on any particular individuals — but just when I use that sentence, it comes to mind about 10 people who could form a board of whatever you want to call it. Call it X or call it anything, call it the psychiatric facility for children until you come up with a better name but to do it; not to come up and pretend by putting some money in capital which they don't intend to spend that they're solving the problems of children with mental problems, because that's what we're talking about.

Mr. Chairman, we expect we will defend the Minister for having the right to make this decision and also when the Minister of Health finally decides that he is going to do something about psychiatric help for children, we will test him on what is done; we will criticize it constructively when it is done; but nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of all people in the Province of Manitoba we insist that the Minister of Health exercise his responsibility and put in place the instrument for putting psychiatric services for children in this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to indicate that I was prepared to speak a little earlier in the course of this debate but I received an indication that the Member for Winnipeg Centre was going to be speaking first on somewhat the same topic and yielded the floor so that I might have the benefit of his wisdom prior to making my views known on the subject.

I must indicate to him that I think as I interpret his position, he says that he agrees with the Member for Churchill that the decision may well be stupid, ill-advised and so on but I have the right to make that decision. I'm not comforted by his taking the position that I have the right to make a stupid decision, Mr. Chairman. I had hoped perhaps for a little more support but I'll take whatever I can get on the matter and proceed.

I hope to proceed by showing members that it isn't an ill-conceived and ill-advised decision, Mr. Chairman, but be that as it may I am given to understand that in parliamentary procedure I am not permitted to refer to a member's presence in the House and I don't have to refer to a member's presence in the House when speaking on the matter. I was going to suggest rather that I would be hopeful that he'd read it in Hansard but on the other hand the member has arrived so he will have the benefit of listening to my response in person, so that there may be no question as to what I said or have said since I think he misinterpreted some of the responses I made, or at least he misrepresented them when he spoke earlier in the debate today.

But it turns out that in having had to wait in order to respond to his criticisms I've had a great deal of my work performed for me by the intervention of the Leader of the Opposition because the Leader of the Opposition demonstrated exactly what the difficulties

members of the New Democratic party have when considering any issues that pertain to the Province of Manitoba.

There's always the two-sided approach to everything and on the one hand certain members are arguing about taking actions that might reduce jobs that might have severe economic impacts, while the other half are arguing that there isn't enough consideration being given to economic development, to job creation. They're concerned about unemployment levels and so on and these two factions are always at work and it seems as though members opposite cannot get together and view an argument or view a problem from all sides. They either only take one and carry it to its ridiculous extreme or they take the other and carry it to its ridiculous extreme. They never attempt to find a rational, reasonable decision that allows for, shall we say, peaceful co-existence of various ideas, of various interests and concerns when they approach a problem, Mr. Chairman.

Besides that, I don't think that the member is completely well informed on the subject although he quotes very well from studies, from reports, from interdepartmental memos and so on. He makes the statement that they are my department's positions and that's absolutely right, but just as his party has many different positions on the same issue, members of my department have many different positions on the same issue. He is reading selectively from ones that he believes provide the kind of information that he would like to present in debating the issue and he selectively ignores other viewpoints that may well be held by other members of the environmental management department and other positions which they have taken over the years with respect to issues of pollution control, of environmental pollution standards and so on and so forth.

It seems, Mr. Chairman, another thing that he ignores in taking I think what appears to be a very altruistic, idealistic approach on pollution — and I think that we all ought to consider that approach as being a laudable one - the point is whether or not those long-range, laudable objectives need to cause severe short-term hardships on some of the people involved. The only position that I am taking, Mr. Chairman, because we are indeed looking at the long-range view on this particular issue, is that we believe we can achieve that long-range objective which we believe is laudable and acceptable and one that we should strive towards without having to undergo the short-term, economic hardships that people in Flin Flon, we don't believe, have to be put through.

He speaks in, Mr. Chairman, as I say very altruistic terms about the 600,000 acres in the Flin Flon area and all of the people of Flin Flon who might be adversely affected by the decision that's been rendered by the Minister of the Environment in this particular issue. What he doesn't tell you, Mr. Chairman, is that we have not changed the gross overall total emission standards for that particular smelter in Flin Flon. What we have dealt with is ground-level concentrations at a certain distance from the smelter. So in effect, Mr. Chairman, we have not said to them that they can spew more pollutants into the atmosphere; that they can produce more emissions or more unacceptable

pollutants to the atmosphere; rather we have said to them, those standards remain. You are restricted to the amount of total emissions that you can produce but we're saying to you that in the certain distances the concentrations we're going to allow, I might indicate — not for a lengthy time in future — the company asked for five years extension to reaching this particular standard. We have instead given them something in the order of two-and-a-half years, January 1, 1984; and put them on notice that we believe that they still will have to meet those standards as of January 1, 1984, when they have been able to undergo the economic analysis and the economic moves that will allow them to spend the considerable sums of money that will be required for them to achieve those ground-level standards.

I might indicate that the obvious solution is, build a bigger stack, so that instead of having it just fall directly down on the ground close to the smelter, you would disperse it and it falls down farther but you don't change the total amount of pollution that pervades the atmosphere and that's the point that the member ignores totally. He tries to make it sound as though we're letting them put more things into the atmosphere than they were previously allowed to, but we're not.

What we are saying to them is that in order to achieve the ground-level standards we're going to give them some time, time to plan the major investment that's involved, time to plan over a period of time what effects that will have on the economics of their operation and incidentally on the economics of the entire town of Flin Flon; because obviously this is the major employer, the major economic entity in the town, and to take a precipitous action that would require them to cut down immediately on production, to lay off people, I don't believe would be a well considered rational reasonable thing to do. The member opposite may well consider that, but then he's going to have to argue with other members in his party who believe that job creation and job preservation is an important thing to the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the member referred to internal documents. I didn't talk about internal documents, that was his word in the question period. I did not respond to it. I said that the decision was made on the advice of the senior staff advisers of my department. Mr. Chairman, any internal documents that have been used, that will be used, that are being used within departments of the Legislature always have been confidential and in my view will continue to be. They always were when the member opposite's party was in government and they were kept that way and very advisedly so because as I said, there is advice, there is information, there are positions being taken throughout various departments by various members.

Those members should not be inhibited from putting forth their opinions to the Minister for fear of the fact that they are going to be used and debated and everything else. Contrary views of all sorts are always acceptable, in fact, encouraged as far as I am concerned on any issue and it's up to the Minister to solicit all the views in order to arrive at a decision such as this. I will continue to protect the rights of my staff members to provide contrary views and all differing views on any issue prior to making a decision of this nature.

Mr. Chairman, the member implied that there were private negotiations carried on between the Minister and the party involved in the application, Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting. I can confirm on the record that I have held no discussions whatsoever with Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting on this particular issue or on any other issue since having assumed the position of Minister responsible for the Environment. So that is something I will lay to rest immediately. I repeat that the decision was made based on the information made available to us from the public hearings, from material provided and advice provided only by senior staff members of my department.

Mr. Chairman, again the member has implied that, firstly, the sulphur dioxide emissions are of great concern and perhaps even he has implied that there's been no effort or no attempt to cut down on sulphur dioxide emissions perhaps either at Flin Flon or at Thompson which are major producers of sulphur dioxide emissions to the atmosphere of the Province of Manitoba.

I want to say again so that the public knows, so that the people of Flin Flon, Thompson and all over this province who are concerned about this issue, know that there have been ongoing efforts and very successful ongoing efforts, to reduce total sulphur dioxide emissions from both of those plants over a period of the last say 5, 10 years or whatever. I want to say that the situation that prevails today is not something that has come up all of a sudden, that has increased all of a sudden. In fact it has existed for 10 and 20 and maybe more years. If anything it has improved over all those years, Mr. Chairman, but it has not deteriorated, as the member opposite would probably have people believe, in the course of all of the various partial truths and innuendoes that he has given during his discussion here today. There has been a continuing effort and a very successful continuing effort to reduce total sulphur dioxide emissions in the northern smelters.

I want to repeat that the guidelines that were established by the Clean Environment Commission for ground level concentrations will be met a very high percentage of the time. We may be only speaking in terms of certainly less than 10 percent, probably even down in the level of very small percentages, maybe even 1 percent of the time as indicated. They are able to meet those standards; they aren't able to when faced with adverse weather conditions that, as I said, cause inversions that may cause a lack of dispersion in the atmosphere before it reaches the ground.

The member went into some great lengths in quoting from American studies about the effects of acid rain, of sulphuric acid, resulting from emissions of sulphur dioxide. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated in the past, that acid rain is certainly a matter for concern for people all over North America but we have the unique situation in Manitoba in which the dust particles that are normally prevalent in the atmosphere over Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta generally are alkaline in nature and a neutralization takes place of this acid in the atmosphere so that there is not acid being produced on the ground. —(Interjection)— No, the member referred to the ground. He referred to the Precambrian Shield and said that it was sensitive to

acid rain, and indeed it is sensitive because of its rock formations which would be broken down by sulphuric acid if the sulphuric acid descended to the ground, but the neutralization takes place in the atmosphere. The neutralization takes place in the atmosphere so that the acid does not manifest itself at the ground level. And, although the Precambrian Shield would be sensitive to it if the acid did reach the ground level, it is not being adversely affected because the acid is not reaching the ground level in Manitoba.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, there are many, many comments and innuendoes that are being left on the record about the point readings, the fact that some 50 per year point readings have been taken which exceed the recommended level under the Clean Environment Commission orders. I have already referred to the fact that those take place under unique weather conditions from time to time. Again, it's not a question of total emissions, it's a question of ground level concentrations being exceeded very very occasionally under the present circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I think what we're looking at in this particular debate is a question of what is reasonable under the circumstances. Is it reasonable to say to the plant in Flin Flon that we have come up with these ground level concentrations, these guidelines for ground level concentrations, that we believe are reasonable. I think that I've made the point that those are reasonable standards, reasonable guidelines to attempt to obtain in the future. The point is, should we say to them do it now, overcome this problem that has existed for 10 and 20 years and maybe longer, overcome this problem immediately because we have just found that this is a laudable guideline or objective to impose upon you and we think it ought to be met right now. Is it reasonable to do that, to potentially destroy some jobs or jeopardize the economic viability by a precipitous demand that says it has to be done, period, now? Or is it reasonable to say to them, because what the member opposite wants, he wants it done now to heck with the jobs, to heck with the economic viability, do it now, okay. Or, on the other hand, is it reasonable to buy some time, to say to them that these are the objectives and the guidelines that we now adopt and say are reasonable and ones that we want to have pertain to the operations in Manitoba; and you have a period of time during which you can study what the economic impact will be on your operation?

We will have the time to work with you to try and reduce the emissions, even in the intervening period through our testing, through our analysis to find out just exactly what is possible under the current technology, under the current operation of the plant. We'll protect those jobs, we'll preserve the economic viability but we'll put you on notice to say that you have about two-and-a-half years to get your act in order to meet the new guidelines that have been proposed by the Clean Environment Commission. Is that a more reasonable approach knowing that they are meeting those emission standards, as I said all but perhaps a small percentage of the time overall; knowing that they are not producing more total emissions than what the Clean Environment orders had asked them to, in total; and knowing that the alkaline nature of the particles in the atmosphere

normally neutralizes the potential for acid rain in Manitoba so we do not have the injurious consequences that the member quoted from in the U.S. studies that he has at his disposal.

Mr. Chairman, I think that faced with this kind of dilemma . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Churchill on a point of order.

MR. COWAN: I'm sorry to interrupt the Minister, Mr. Chairperson, but I wonder if the Minister, for the purpose of providing information, would submit to a couple of questions from myself.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to submit to questions at the conclusion of my talk. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, may I continue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. FILMON: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, while the member opposite was speaking he was suggesting that he was speaking in protection of and in consideration of the potential pollution that would occur in the 600,000 acre area surrounding Flin Flon, he was speaking on behalf of all of the people of Flin Flon. Mr. Chairman, I don't think that he is because I don't think that they'd like to see this plant close down because of a precipitous action taken by the government of Manitoba. I don't think that they would like to have all those jobs lost. I don't think they'd like to have the economic viability of their operation closed down. Yes, I think that they would like to see the matter improved; I think that they'd like to see the atmospheric pollution improved; I think that they would like to see the ground level concentrations improved and I think that they'd like to see the new guidelines imposed as soon as it's reasonable possible to do and that's precisely the area of concern and conflict.

Mr. Chairman, the member opposite, in quoting from a study made by officials of my department, said that the one caveat that they had put forward in the whole suggestion of meeting of these pollution control standards and guidelines was the need for further economic impact data. Now, Mr. Chairman, doesn't that say that there's a need not to cause a precipitous action to wipe out what is being done at the plant today, to destroy jobs, but analyse the economics and allow the company to bring forward a proposal to improve it over a period of time. That's what's required is reasonable action, Mr. Chairman, not irresponsible precipitous action that might have very lasting adverse effects on the town, on the workers, on the plant and everything else, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what we're doing by this order that has been issued, Mr. Chairman, is giving them the time to do that. I think that's only reasonable, Mr. Chairman, and that's why I suggest to you that the order was put forward; that's why, on the advice of the senior officials of my department, that order was put forward and that's why, Mr. Chairman, I believe that it's the right order to do under the present circumstances, not take the action that the member opposite would have us take.

Mr. Chairman, there was one other matter that was brought up by the Member for Winnipeg Centre in

which he referred to the lack of or the decision by the Minister with respect to the Public Utilities Board. I know that matter is currently being reviewed in a variety of different ways. Mr. Chairman, I just want to repeat for the benefit of the member the thing that I have said here before. I am not the Minister to whom the Public Utilities Board reports. I cannot, by Ministerial Authority overturn an order of the Public Utilities Board. The Public Utilities Board is responsible to the Legislature, is a creature of the Legislature but it's decisions are appealable to the courts; that's what's being done right now. But they're not appealable to me and they're not appealable to this House, Mr. Chairman. If members opposite, and two of them have indicated that concern by public action during the past few days, that's the right way to go. That's what I said during my Estimates debate. If members opposite believe that the Public Utilities Board should not be an arm's length situation with the Minister or with the Legislature, then they'll have to change the Act, but as the Act reads now I am only doing what can be done under the present legislation. I can't leave it on the record that he says that the Public Utilities Board is responsible to me as Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return into committee at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're now under Private Members' Hour.

The first order of business on Mondays are resolutions. The first resolution is Resolution 19 — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: I'll let that matter drop, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 11. Are you ready for the question on Resolution No. 11? We're dealing with the amendment as proposed.

The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments in regard to the amendment, which I think is absolutely necessary in view of the original resolution which makes some assumption that I would question rather seriously and some statements that are actually not correct.

In fact, the original resolution, Mr. Speaker, started out by inferring that post-secondary education had always been the prerogative of the rich and that assumption in itself, Mr. Speaker, I think bears some serious consideration. If that was true, there are a lot of us standing and sitting here today certainly would not have had the opportunity to go to university. There are many factors that may account for the fact that the children of the rich supposedly are the ones who go to university that have nothing to do with finances — aspiration level, motivational level are something we find that students inherit or receive from their parents. It would appear then that if your parents have been university graduates that the aspirations are quite often passed on to the child.

Certainly that situation still exists today, Mr. Speaker, and we may deplore it, but I am encouraged by the fact that it holds less and less in our society.

The original resolution, as well, mentioned that in the past four years tuition fees at our community colleges and universities had increased to about 53 percent, Mr. Speaker, which was not correct. In fact, that percentage is around the 40 percent level which is right in line with the CPI increase over those years, I might mention, and also, Mr. Speaker, in line with increases that we have seen in other provinces of this country as well and in spite of that increase, Mr. Speaker, if the resolution as it was originally proposed infers that our tuition increases have put tuition fees at such a level that they are exorbitant, then I would suggest that if it's wise to compare them with what holds in other provinces of this country because certainly Manitoba is still in a most enviable position. As far as tuition fees are concerned we still are much lower than the eastern provinces by \$100 or more, Mr. Speaker. Our community colleges are still much lower than even many of our western neighbors. I mention as a comparison the fact that our course is \$30 a month in 1981 compared with British Columbia when their institutes of technology were charging \$55 a month. Kelsey Tech. in Saskatoon was charging some \$32 a month; the southern Alberta Institute of Technology at \$31.25 a month and of course Confederation College at the Lakehead at \$40.00 a month, Mr. Speaker, in fact up to \$44 a month in 1981.

I merely mention those figures because I think they do illustrate very vividly, Mr. Speaker, that in Manitoba our fees we charge at our community colleges are certainly well below those of practically all provinces in this country. It is mentioned in the resolution that we have no policy in regards to tuition fees at our community colleges and universities. Our policy, Mr. Speaker, has been to hold our tuition fees around 6 percent of the operating costs of our community colleges and that is where they sit at this time and that is where we would hope that we can maintain them at 6 percent of operating costs and we do operate our community colleges quite efficiently I'm rather proud to say.

It is interesting in the area of our universities, Mr. Speaker, that in the years previous to 1977 the percent that tuition fees paid of the total operating costs of the universities was slightly over 15 percent of the total operating costs. Since this government has come into power, Mr. Speaker, the tuition fees paid by the students in our universities amount to some 11 percent of the total operating cost; this year something in the neighborhood of 10.2 I believe. In other words tuition fees are a smaller percentage and have been a smaller percentage of the total operating costs of our universities under this administration than they were under the previous administration. I can expand on that of course, Mr. Speaker, at a later date perhaps when I get into my Estimates, but I think it's an interesting point and I wanted to mention it at this time.

The original resolution of course also mentioned that Student Aid loans and bursaries particularly the upper limits, had not been increased in four years. Mr. Speaker, that is incorrect. It is not fact. The Student Aid bursary level was increased from \$1,400

to some \$1,800 by this government in the 1978-79 year and I bring that to the attention of this House because in fact that statement is not true. The increase did take place so that the bursary level was increased by some \$400 that year to bring it in line with the loan level of \$1,800 and, Mr. Speaker, I'll have more to say on that particular subject later as well.

The original resolution also mentioned something about student government, student employment program salaries and mentioned that there had not been significant increases there for over four years. I understand from my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, who is responsible for these programs that we will see a significant increase in those salaries this year. I only hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that the number of students employed in government student employment programs is certainly not large in relation to the number of students who find employment in the private sector and whether this is of great significance in the total picture or not I would very seriously question. But in any event we are seeing some increase this year in those particular levels.

The original resolution of course also mentioned that there was no clear policy showing any direction as far as student aid was concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I again would add that this statement is not true, not correct, and certainly can't be based on any very viable information. If we are going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Fort Rouge on a point of order.

MS. WESTBURY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of debate when this was first introduced, Mr. Speaker, you stated that you were going to take the proposed amendment under advisement. The Member for St. Johns questioned whether it was in order and you said at that time you would take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker. We have not yet received the printed amended resolution and I apologize for interrupting the Minister at this point but it did seem to me that I should perhaps draw this to your attention at the earliest possible moment. We do not seem to have received a ruling from you on whether the amendment was in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. The honourable member has raised a point of order and I have to confess to the House that I have not got the amendment in front of me; it is in my office. Nobody has the amendment at the present time. I apologize completely for that and if perhaps it might be well . . . the Honourable Government House Leader on the point of order.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps in view of that unexpected turn of events members might be agreeable to adjourn in the House at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.