

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 30 March, 1981

Time — 8:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): The Committee will come to order, we are in Interim Supply.

The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to take up too much time, but I do have several comments to make with regard to the debate that took place this afternoon relative to the ministerial reversal of the Clean Environment Commission Order concerning Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, all of the members of the House should be aware of the fact that the ministerial power to reverse, or alter, or modify a Clean Environment Commission Order is not an interference with the Clean Environment Commission. The power to do what the Minister has done is not something that I would argue against; indeed, Mr. Chairman, I can hardly do so. I was the one who changed the Act so that there could be such a ministerial order and the debate that took place this afternoon convinces me that I did the absolutely right thing, Mr. Chairman, and was supported by the entire House at the time that it was done. Because members will recall that prior to there being an appeal to the Minister, there was an appeal to the Municipal Board, but the Clean Environment Commission and the Municipal Board were being asked to exercise a function that could only be properly exercised within the political arena.

That was the reason that function was given to the Minister and it's quite right that the Minister be the one who is responsible to stand up and defend what he has done or accept the responsibility for having made what the Member for Churchill has characterized as a bad decision. I am at this point not certain that it was a bad decision, but I think that a valid criticism has been made and I will get to that, Mr. Chairman. I asked the members of the House to cogitate, to think about, what the situation would be if the Minister did not have the power to do what he has done, because it used to be the case that the Clean Environment Commission was told that they had to adjudicate the entire problem. They had to adjudicate not only the environmental factors, which they would receive expert advice in, but they were also told, Mr. Chairman, and did make orders prior to the ministerial appeal which said how long a company had to proceed in order to implement changes, and how strict the changes should be, consistent with social and economic policy. It would not have been arguable in the House and the Minister would have said, what he now says about the Public Utilities Board, we've given this to an authority to do, they have done it, they are the judges, they have made the decision and it's beyond legislative control, beyond ministerial control. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that's the easy way out to

say that is a matter to be adjudicated — people are asking for that in many areas now — that this is a matter to be adjudicated, we will appoint some people to adjudicate it, and they will say what should happen.

It became very apparent to us, Mr. Chairman, that this was not a satisfactory situation because the Clean Environment Commission was being asked to take into consideration not only environmental questions, but social and economic and political questions, which they should not have had to accept responsibility for. It was deliberately said at the time, Mr. Chairman — and you can find it within the debates — that the Clean Environment Commission will confine themselves to environmental questions; to questions of how much a pollutant can be released or what the levels should be and that they should ignore what the effect would be of any difficulty in the implementation of their orders.

So when the Member for Churchill said that they made a decision which was reversed, Mr. Chairman, it can hardly be that a decision of the Clean Environment Commission would not be reversed where there is an industrial problem which involves some social and economic questions and time-lag for the cleanup. As a matter of fact it was deliberately intended that the Minister reverse such a decision and in that respect, Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism. That's the way it should be. We should not abdicate our responsibility and we should not be afraid to face our responsibility in those areas. That's the way it's been all along by the way. When there were problems with Inco we didn't shut the plant down until those problems were cured. There were ministerial decisions from time to time which took the onus off the Clean Environment Commission, the political onus which had to do with how long it will be and what will be the break-in time, that was not something which we were going to entrust or which we were going to foist, would be a better word, on a Clean Environment Commission which doesn't have that responsibility, it has to deal with environmental concerns.

So when the Member for Churchill says that the Minister has ignored or interfered with the position of the Clean Environment Commission, Mr. Chairman, it was specifically desired that the Minister do that and if the Member for Churchill has an argument he has not an argument not only with this Minister but every member of the House, which includes all of the members of his party who were there at the time, who said that this is the way it should be, because you are not going to have a Clean Environment Report which is going to be other than that which deals with the features of the environment.

That much, Mr. Chairman, I not only agree that the Minister should do, but I would want him to do in every case. I would not want those decisions to be delegated to people who are not responsible and who have to come into this House and have to face the kind of attack which the Minister faced today. Mr. Chairman, that is my entire thesis and it has now proved exactly right by the Member for Churchill, who says that the Minister has to be attacked for doing what he did on the basis that it was a bad

decision. Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. I agree that it should not be divorced from the political. I agree that it should not be the Clean Environment Commission who makes that decision and then we are to be silent, which is the position that the Minister takes relative to the Public Utility Board and I never ever told him to interfere with the Public Utility Board. I said that that's not what the act says and I still say that that's not what the act says and that if the act says what he says it says, does he want it to say that? If he doesn't want it to say that why doesn't he change it? None of which goes beyond his ministerial authority.

Mr. Chairman, there has been one point that has been made here, which I believe is a substantial point and which I believe that the Minister has not properly answered. If the Minister has permitted an appeal on the basis of consideration, which he has not stated and which go beyond merely subjective advice of staff, but which are dealt with in reports which the Minister has had given to him, Mr. Chairman, then I submit with the greatest of respect that those reports should not be kept from the members of this House. As a matter of fact, those reports should be given to the House and it's in the Minister's interest that they be given to the House, because if the Minister says that I have information which doesn't deal with environmental concerns but which deal with social and economic concerns, which I have to take into consideration and which are not the province of the Clean Environment Commission, and I'm going to ask the House to sustain my position by virtue of the advice that I have taken, then we should have that advice. I'm not, Mr. Chairman, talking about advice where the Minister sits down with his senior staff and says, "Now, let's talk this out". I'm not talking about that. But if there are reports and if there is information upon which his decision has been based, which deal with those very social and economic questions which make him make that consideration, then, Mr. Chairman, if he has changed the Clean Environment Commission Order based on that advice, then that advice should be made available to the House. I understood the Member for Churchill to be asking for that advice, and I understood the Minister to get up and say, "I won't give it to you".

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the questions and answers in the question period will be very, very clear, that the Minister said, "I won't give it to you". I'm not talking about, Mr. Chairman, opinions on questions which are merely subjective opinions given from staff in a discussion with staff. If that's what he's done, Mr. Chairman, when he says he has the advice of his staff, then he might have ignored that, because he is responsible for the decision, and if he's going to say that he has had the advice of the staff and they are the ones who told him to do this, then he runs the danger of people saying, "Well, what did they advise you?" I think that's quite a correct question, if that's what he's basing it on.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have no argument with the structure. I believe the structure is sound. I believe another structure is dangerous, both from the point of view of the environment, because it will put the Clean Environment Commission into the position that they were prior to the change. I can show the member Orders, where the Clean Environment

Commission said, "We'll give you one year to do this, two years to do the other". That is not the function of the Clean Environment Commission; their function is to say what level of pollutant is acceptable in a certain area with regard to a certain industry, with regard to certain conditions. Then if there's to be a delay in arriving at that — that is a social, economic and political delay — the Minister is quite right when he says he is responsible for doing it, but if he's done it on the basis of reports or other material that has been given to him, then in order to defend his position, in order to satisfy the honourable members, he should make that advice available to the members of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the record should be clear on this matter, and I'll be very brief to direct my remarks to what appears to be a possible misinterpretation of my earlier remarks. I said that if the Minister was going to make a decision which I believe, based on the scientific evidence which I have had before me in respect to this hearing, and scientific evidence which the Commission would have studied, and scientific evidence which the Minister should have had before him, that was the wrong decision. If he made that decision, I would like to, as would many others, see the documentation which led him to the conclusion that he made. That's what the Member for Inkster said. There seemed to be some suggestion that I had gone beyond that.

Well, I disagree with the decision but I disagree with the decision on grounds of the best scientific evidence which was made available to me as an interested party in reviewing this particular hearing. I had opportunity to read the entire transcript of the hearing, which I did; I had opportunity to read the government reports which were put before the hearing, which I did. (Interjection)— This man who is talking now, the Member for Minnedosa, probably has not read anything in respect to this particular hearing, yet still wants to make his voice heard. That is his right to do but I would like, Mr. Chairperson, some protection from yourself in being able to make my voice heard in this Chamber without having to contend with barbs from seated members.

The case as I see it, Mr. Chairperson, is one that upheld the decision of the Commission. The Minister saw it differently and if that is the case, then I think the Minister has the responsibility to provide documentation as to why he made the decision that he did make.

Now earlier in the afternoon, as the Minister was nearing the end of his remarks, he said that he would be willing to answer questions at the end of his remarks. I would ask the Minister if he would be prepared to answer some of those questions at this time because he was pre-empted by the Member for Inkster who rose to his feet when there was an opportunity to speak on the issue. So my question to the Minister is if he is prepared to answer those sorts of questions. I believe this body can in fact accommodate that sort of interchange.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply — pass — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take a few minutes to carry on where my Leader left off this afternoon with regard to the economic situation facing the province today. I would remind members that only a week or two ago the Minister of Economic Development was telling members on this side that we should really wait to see what the investment outlook was to be for 1981 which Stats Canada comes out with around this time of the year, public and private investment outlook in Canada and the provinces. As it turns out, Mr. Chairman, Stats Canada, as of Friday, March 27, did release the information by province showing investment expectations to take place in the provinces and broken down by industry.

Mr. Chairman, we have now looked at those figures, albeit in a preliminary sort of way, and I do not believe they should give any of us in this House any cause to think that the Manitoba economy is going to turn around in the year 1981. We've had three very bad years. Again, looking at Statistics Canada information and looking compilations by the Conference Board in Canada, there's been virtually no growth in this province in the years, '78, '79 and '80. The real output of this province has been virtually just about zero and, Mr. Chairman, the investment obviously is a key element in an economy. What happens in the field of investment, that is spending on new machinery, new plant, new equipment, is going to give us a clue as to what will happen to the future growth of this province. If the indicators and investment spending show a weak situation for 1981, I say categorically there cannot be any turnaround in the economic growth of this province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm aggrieved to hear members opposite say, as they have in the past including the Member for Minnedosa, when we criticize economic performance as though we are somehow or other against the Province of Manitoba, and, of course, we are not against the Province of Manitoba as members opposite would like the public of Manitoba to believe.

Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Industry and Commerce for nearly eight years, I along with the department, indeed along with the members of our government worked very hard to do what we thought was in the best interests of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to note that when the New Democratic Party was in office the average rate of growth was 4 percent a year, and under the Conservative Government of Manitoba the average rate of growth was something like one-tenth of 1 percent, way under 1 percent, nearly zero, virtually zero.

In saying that, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that the New Democratic Party believes in the Province of Manitoba — this is a great place. Mr. Chairman, I have given many speeches over the years in this House and around this province extolling the virtues of our economy, extolling the virtues of this province. I believe that we have a very diversified economy that gives us some stability; I believe that we have a very, it's not extra large compared to some other provinces, but we do have a rather interesting and a rather productive forestry industry; we have some mining potential; we have one of the greatest inland freshwater fisheries that

any province could have because we are indeed blessed with a great deal of fresh water. I might add, Mr. Chairman, as my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources, I was going to say Government Services but I'd be wrong — that as the Minister has I'm sure more or less indicated from his seat, one of our greatest assets will prove as the years go on is the tremendous amount of fresh water that we have in this province, something that's becoming a more precious commodity as the years roll on. It's becoming clear that as the North American economy grows there is a shortage of fresh water generally and not only can that fresh water be utilized for hydro-electric purposes but indeed industrial purposes and for many many other uses.

So, I recognize that we have had among the three prairie provinces and probably still have the strongest and most diversified manufacturing base. I recognize that one of our greatest assets has to be the people of Manitoba. We have a well trained labour force; we have well educated people; we have people who come from many lands, their forefathers come from many lands; we have a great diversity of people; and I think therefore we have a great cultural heritage that you and I and all of us have been blessed with. I'm sure the Folklorama, the Folklorama exercise, the Folklorama celebrations are symbolic of that rich cultural heritage.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want it to be very clear and on the record that we believe in Manitoba and we believe the New Democratic Party has policies that are going to make this province grow. We're going to build this province. That is our dedication and that is our cause - to build Manitoba, to be stronger than it ever has been in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, therefore, that obviously when we quote these figures we are being critical of what's happening to this province under the administration and leadership of the present government. That is what our concern is; that is what is concerning the people of the province of Manitoba, it's the stagnation that has resulted in the past three years, not totally, not entirely from the policies of this government, but, Mr. Chairman, you can not absolve yourself of all responsibility. I recall sitting on that side listening to speech after speech after speech coming from this side saying, whenever anything went wrong in terms of economic activity, that it was all our fault as the government. If it was all our fault then I say, Mr. Chairman, logically it is all your fault now.

So, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the members opposite cannot take the heat, they cannot take the heat. They either want to discredit the messenger, they want to discredit those of us that do a little bit of research, look at the figures, expose them for what they are, there they are, they are the figures published by different officials, agencies, but they don't happen to like the figures so then the discredit the messengers. They discredit those of us that may do a bit of research or they try to distort the situation in accusing us of trying to be down on the people of Manitoba, down on the Province of Manitoba. Well, neither of those approaches will work, Mr. Chairman, because as I said we are concerned about the economic well-being as well as the social and cultural well-being of this province of ours, this province in which most of us were born and raised and spent most of lives.

Looking at the data that came out of Stats Canada and published in their daily bulletin of Friday, March 27th, and obtaining other data from that particular area of Stats Canada, it appears now that 1981 will see total investment increasing by 6.5 percent and when you say it fast it may sound okay, 6.5 percent. But, Mr. Chairman, as we should all know in this day and age of inflation 6.5 percent is more or less very roughly half the rate of inflation. If our inflation is running around 12 percent, and I'm told the total investment expenditures will be up something in the order of 6.5 percent, I say we're going backwards. We are going backwards in terms of the amount of machinery, the amount of plants, the amount of buildings that we are putting in place. The real investment is lower now — in 1981 it is expected to be lower than it was in 1980. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, 1980 was lower than 1979. If we look at the current data, the current data has been revised from what we had last year, 1980 was actually 2.9 percent lower than 1979 in current dollars and if you put those into constant dollars it's even a greater deterioration. Then again, Mr. Chairman, when I compare these figures with what's going on in the rest of Canada, I would suggest that it makes us even more concerned, because if we look at what's going on in Canada as a whole we see that we are achieving roughly only a third of the Canadian average. The Canadian average was 17.0 percent growth; our growth is roughly a third of that.

Mr. Chairman, I have an unusual request to make, I wonder if you would tell the members on my side to shut up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Today is day 25, and both sides are doing everything they can to get me to go back, but I'm not going, and I would hope that the honourable members would give the courtesy of listening to the man, or the person, the member whose got the floor when they're giving their speech.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to be as brief as I possibly can, and quietness will lead to greater brevity.

Just a couple of other observations: Private investment data, which I know members opposite are very keen on, show an even worse situation than the public investment. If we look at private investment the increase is expected to be just a little over 5 percent, 5.1 percent. What's private investment increasing at in Canada as a whole? What is the rate for Canada as a whole? 17.5 percent, less than a third of what's happening in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, last year the Minister of Finance issued in his budget report, a table, a series of statistics and a chart, showing how private investment was increasing as a percentage of total investment, and they seemed to take some pride in that, but if you look at the latest figures, the reverse is happening; private investment as a percentage of total investment is actually diminishing. (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, it may not make sense, and without quoting all these numbers I'm simply saying that the data shows that private investment up-to-date — (Interjection)— Everything is up-to-date in Minnedosa — private investment as a percent of a total investment is expected to be lower in 1981, than it was the previous year.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to repeat what the Member for Minnedosa just said because I believe it's unparliamentary and rather than him talking from his seat, I would suggest to him that he uses a little bit of rationality and logic instead of emotion and look at the figures for himself.

If we look at manufacturing investment by itself, Mr. Chairman, because I know that too is an item that is of interest to a lot of members in the House because we have the figures broken down for various industry sectors, trade, finance, housing, primary industries and so forth, but just looking at manufacturing, the investment increase in 1981 is expected to be 12.5 percent; more or less at the rate of inflation, which means virtually no increase over last year. But again I get disturbed when I look at our situation in comparison with the rest of Canada. We are the second lowest in Canada in terms of percentage increases, and our rate of increase is about half of the Canadian rate of increase of manufacturing investment. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that alone should cause us to be concerned.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, last year the Minister of Economic Development was boasting that investment in manufacturing was going to increase 27.7 percent in 1980 — (Interjection)— At the end of the speech I will. The Minister of Economic Development last year told us in the House that the forecast investment for 1980 manufacturing would be 27.7 percent. The figures have been now revised downwards to 7.5 percent, so I point that out for the Minister and I'm sure he'll get his staff to look into the data and verify whether that is the case. At least these are the numbers we get at a preliminary look-see at the data.

If you want to know really where we're at in terms of manufacturing investment, Mr. Chairman, what you have to do is to squeeze the inflation out of the numbers and look at what's been happening through the years. I have done that using the inflation deflator that's available to us again from Stats Canada. Looking at the construction price index, which one can use to put the data into constant dollar terms and I note, Mr. Chairman, therefore that in real terms, in 1971 constant dollar terms, what is expected to take place now is actually, and certainly last year in 1980, is lower than what we experienced in the years 1970, 1971, 1973, 1974 and 1975. In other words, we were experiencing in Manitoba, higher levels of investment in manufacturing in those years that I quoted, those five years in the '70s that I referred to, when you're looking at this in constant dollar terms. Again, I invite the Minister, because he's got the staff to work on this, to look into this and satisfy himself about this matter if he wishes.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to overwhelm us anymore with detailed statistics. I simply want to observe that in spite, I am sure, of the good intentions of the Premier and of his colleagues, that they thought that they had the policy solutions that were going to work. I recall very well in the 1977 Election, when we were told very clearly and the people of Manitoba were told very clearly that this government would cut taxes, and would open up its arms to private investors, and that they would be more or less lining up to come into the Province of Manitoba, and to build the industrial base of this province further.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this has not happened. We've had no growth in the past three years. The investment data indicate there'll be no turnaround in 1981, and for the Minister of Economic Development, really, Mr. Chairman, to stand up and say, "All's right with the Manitoba economy", sounds a little ridiculous to me. If he would at least get up and say, "Well, we do have some problems", he would be a lot more credible to the electorate, to the members of this House, but when he says the economy of Manitoba is in good shape, I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is really a little much. I think that it destroys his credibility.

I want to recognize, as I did at the beginning of my remarks, that we have a lot of assets that we can utilize and develop. As I said earlier our people are probably our greatest asset. We have a terrific labour force, if I can use that term, that's the technical term used by Stats Canada, we have a good work force; we have probably an agricultural industry that is as competitive as any agricultural industry anywhere in the world. At least we have a comparative advantage, as we say in economic theory, at least we have a comparative advantage in our agriculture. If you look to any industry for efficiency, that is where you'll find it, Mr. Chairman, you'll find it in agriculture.

I do regret that the data do show deteriorations in mining output, there's certainly a deterioration in the total output of the province, and I repeat, when I make these statements, I'm not knocking the province, I want positive growth, I want to see the population loss stopped. We lost 39,500 approximately in three years, that's a net loss on inter-provincial migration. We regret that. We've always had some population loss. In fact, we've had population loss, I suppose, since the Dirty Thirties. (Interjection)— Perhaps except for the war. That's the net. I can give you the ins and the outs and then the nets —(Interjection)— Well your boss asked me to talk about —(Interjections)— Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm telling you the whole truth. Here we go, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

In 1978 the ins — 23,229; outs — 33,722; for a net figure of minus 10,493. The source is the Demography Division of Stats Canada, the same source that you've got, published data, there it is and these are the calendar years given to us, the date is given to us by Stats Canada, the Demography Division.

In 1979, 23,442 people came into our good province, but 38,900 left the province, for a net loss of 15,457, minus 15,457. In 1980, the last calendar year, 24,179 are estimated to have come into Manitoba and 37,712 are estimated to have left for a net loss of minus 13,533, approximately in three years, Mr. Chairman, 39,500 people. Really these types of losses haven't been experienced for about 15 plus years; back in the mid-Sixties when Mr. Roblin was the Premier of this province, we also had some big losses. In 1966, which was the record loss, I think, we had in the Sixties and it was 14,570, that's the net loss, but as I said last year or 1979, we superseded the all-time loss record.

There's no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that that's not, as I said before in this House, you can't use population changes as simple economic indicators. You have to look at the whole spectrum

of data, but there's no question in my mind that this loss of people has to reflect the marginal disadvantage that we have in this province vis-a-vis what's going on to the west of us and in some years even to the east of us, because, Mr. Chairman, even in some years we lose to Ontario, not every year, but some years we do. The relative economic activity in this province vis-a-vis the other provinces seems to be the obvious reason for the fluctuations in loss. I will admit as the Premier stated publicly that a lot of these people are retirement people. They are, a lot of them are retired people but I would suggest that this dramatic increase we've had is really a reflection of our deteriorating economic situation in the past three years.

Mr. Chairman, there is further evidence that these people who leave are generally people with above average skills, above average education. They are motivated and they tend to be younger people, 20 to 35, 20 to 40 years of age, people that we need in this province. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if and when there is a change of government in this province that we will hopefully see fewer of these good people leaving, that we will work with the private sector. We will do what we can in the public sector as well, to provide jobs for our people to the extent that a province can have some influence in this matter because I'm the first one to agree and indicate and know that Provincial Governments will not resolve all the problems of this province. But surely it is one of the key factors and as I said earlier when we were in government we were told day in and day out, week after week, that whenever something went wrong with the economy it was all our fault.

Mr. Chairman, the New Democratic Party of Manitoba wants positive growth. We want to stop the population loss. We indeed intend to stimulate the provincial economy. We indeed intend to see this province grow. Ours is a Party of building. We will eliminate this negative attitude that has come from the negative attitude. Mr. Chairman, the source of the negativism in this province has been acute protracted restraint. That's where it started; acute protracted restraint. This government turned everybody off. It turned the old people off, it turned the students off, it turned the hospitals off, it turned one group after another off for years and, Mr. Chairman, when the next election comes, they'll turn this government off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the member agreed to a question and I don't want to get him into another harangue on to the economy of Manitoba because his reputation as an economist in Western Manitoba is well known and I don't really think it bothers us too much, especially when we get into the artificial insemination program for the economy by the Member for Brandon East.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon East went on at great lengths about the dire straits of the economy and the financial position of the province. I wonder if he could answer me why it is that every major financial institution in Western Manitoba that has reported this year so far to their members has reported substantial if not great gains in their financial picture, if that's a sign of a sickness in our financial investment in our economy?

MR. EVANS: I ask the member to be more specific. I don't know what he's talking about. What are you talking about?

MR. BLAKE: He's an economist. If he doesn't know what the reports of the financial institutions in the western part of the province are, he shouldn't be reporting the statistics that he's blabbering off for all of Canada; we're talking about Manitoba. Every financial institution in Western Manitoba has shown substantial if not enormously large growth in the past year and how does that auger for a disastrous economy in Western Manitoba or for Manitoba as a whole? —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, unlike the Honourable Member from Minnedosa who talks very loudly without any data, very loosely, very carelessly, so much so that he doesn't even specify what kind of statistics that he's talking about that nobody on this side can understand him. You see . . . well, is he talking about the growth of employment in financial institutions? Is the member talking about the number of loans made by those institutions? Is he talking about the number of accounts in those institutions? Is he talking about the amount of deposits in those institutions? Mr. Chairman, he's just a big blabber mouth. He doesn't know what he's talking about.

MR. BLAKE: The Member for Brandon East has just exhibited exactly the point I was trying to make. He doesn't know what the hell he's talking about either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Brandon East once again has distinguished himself as an economist in this House and to all Manitobans and for a moment there in the start of his speech he reminded me of a fairy-tale and you know where that fairy-tale, and I forget which one it is but where the person was kissed by Prince Charming and they woke up to the real world and at the start of his speech I thought maybe Prince Charming might have kissed the Member for Brandon East because he seemed to be all of a sudden into the real world and not his usual doom and gloom self but unfortunately he reverted back into his normal, negative, downtrodden speech. He has not one iota of optimism in his body and he demonstrates it every time he makes a speech in this House. It was interesting that finally the Member for Brandon East got up to some of his statistics; his latest document is population loss in Manitoba and he talks about our population loss among other things. Now, once any one, any casual observer or listener to the Member for Brandon East and members opposite would assume, Mr. Chairman, that Manitoba has undergone a horrendous loss of people. They talk about 39,000 people. That's a city equivalent to Brandon and Stonewall combined have left this province and they are wringing their hands and it's doom and gloom and desperation in the Province of Manitoba. But, Mr. Chairman, the cold hard facts are that this year, this year the population

of the Province of Manitoba is estimated to be 8,800 people more than it was in 1976, not the 40,000 that they keep talking about the City of Brandon and this Town of Stonewall combined having left this province. No, but that's the negative impression they are wanting to leave with the people of Manitoba. The new doom party is speaking on every single issue to the negative side of every side of every single statistic that they can find. When it doesn't rain, they talk about the negative statistic on moisture in the province and as the Member for Minnedosa pointed out the other day, he thought they might be wringing their hands in fear that it was raining and that there was going to be precipitation.

But, Mr. Chairman, the figures on the interprovincial population that the Member for Brandon East developed; if you want to be a statistical analyst on them they show certain changes in interprovincial population movement. They also show, Mr. Chairman, that there is a large increase in the natural births in the province, births over deaths. Now to a casual observer might that mean that a number of our retired people are leaving the Province of Manitoba to retire on Vancouver Island as my aunt and uncle did, who were long-time residents of the Province of Manitoba, and incidentally they left in 1976. They were part of that exodus in 1976. Is it also possible that when we break even on population in a given year because we've lost a certain amount to net interprovincial migration but we've gained a greater amount from net foreign immigration plus net births in the province? Does that not indicate that maybe our younger people are indeed remaining in the province and raising their families here because we have a great increase in births minus deaths? And that in fact the people leaving the province are the retired people that have made their living in Manitoba and have decided to move to what may well be deemed a gentler climate on the West Coast. That's not a major disaster for the province — that's not doom and gloom like members opposite keep telling the people of Manitoba.

You ask the casual observer of Manitoba, and I'll repeat it once more, Mr. Chairman, the casual observer listening to the phony statistics that the Member for Brandon East gives us all the time will come to the conclusion that the province has dropped by 40,000 people, that we have fewer people in Manitoba today than we had in their regime. That's the impression that he wants to leave and that is not correct; that is not correct at all. We have more people today in Manitoba than we had in 1976, but yet the doom and gloomers over there want the people of Manitoba to believe that the City of Brandon and the Town of Stonewall have left this province. That's the kind of impression, the scenario they want to paint. But the people of Manitoba obviously aren't believing them, because we almost heard a breath of fresh air from the Member for Brandon East, where he almost wasn't negative for a change, he almost was saying, well, you know, it's not too bad in the Province of Manitoba, then he lost himself and he reverted back to his normal doom and gloom, Mr. Chairman.

You know, the last time we spoke on this, and we have been dealing with Interim Supply for quite some time now because the Finance Minister brought it in

quite early hoping to expedite it through the House. The last time we spoke on this, I believe, was about two weeks ago on a Friday. We had an opportunity on the Wednesday previous to listen to the Leader of the Opposition and also the Member for Brandon East. We had a chance to listen to their remarks and to read them. I spoke on that Friday and the Member for Elmwood spoke after me and he was quite exercised about the fact that they weren't going to develop any policies to tell the people of Manitoba what they would do as government until the Election is called, because they're not going to have us tearing their policies apart; they're not going to have us criticizing and telling the people of Manitoba well in advance that they are worthless policies, that they won't work, etc., etc., they are going to leave it to the last moment and spring a whole bunch on the people of Manitoba during the Election Campaign. That was the essence of the Member for Elmwood's speech and tonight, once again, the Member for Brandon East came out with a number of motherhood statements that, "We want the province to grow; we want our people to stay." All good motherhood, but he didn't tell us how. He didn't tell us what their Party proposes in terms of policy development, in terms of change of legislation, in terms of change of incentive; he didn't mention a thing like that and, Mr. Chairman, I will reiterate, they will not say anything in their policy formulation because they don't have any.

It was coincidental, Mr. Chairman, on that Friday night when I went home, I walked into my office in the house and there was this tattered Tribune newspaper from 1978. As a matter of fact, it was from Monday, February 6, 1978, and here's the exact condition of the front page. It was coincidental, Mr. Chairman, because the headline is: "Cassidy, 40, New Leader of Ontario NDP," and it was the Monday following their leadership convention for the Ontario NDP. That, Mr. Chairman, I think would adequately describe the political fortunes of one Mr. Cassidy in Ontario, rather tattered and worn out right now.

But this article was the eye catcher, but this, Mr. Chairman, was the real beautiful piece of journalism that I must thank the writer who was on staff for the Tribune at that time in 1978. Here's the headline, Mr. Chairman, and I think this is important, particularly for the Member for Elmwood and for his lacklustre party over there who are not going to develop any policies for the next election. Here's what it says, Mr. Chairman: "The Ontario NDP Platform Set." Now bear in mind that that is about two years and a month prior to the Election that we have just gone through. Here is one of their — and this also got into the speech that either the Leader of the Opposition made or the Member for Brandon East made on the first day that we introduced the Interim Supply Bill — they mentioned about how there should be more participation by Manitobans in the mining industry and how they almost alluded, they almost came out to the socialist doctrine of nationalizing the mining companies, but they didn't quite have the constitutional fortitude to come out and say that. They hinted about it; they talked around it, but they didn't quite come out and say it.

But here is one of the policies that the Ontario NDP set in 1978. It was acceptance — no, I'll talk about that one later, but this one was "Rejection of

the immediate nationalization of the major mining companies in the province". That was one of their policy platforms in 1978. Now, rejection — bear in mind now, the Member for Inkster has brought out the important word, rejection of the immediate nationalization of the major mining companies in the province.

But here's the third policy they developed: "Acceptance of the immediate nationalization of Inco Limited. That was their policy platform in 1978.

Now, we have just seen an election in Ontario where poor Mr. Cassidy and his NDP Party dropped 12 seats and it is important, Mr. Chairman, to point out where one of the 12 seats was. It was in Sudbury, where Inco is. After formulating that policy in 1978, two years before, so the people of Ontario could see the NDP platform and policies and critique them in a logical way, they dropped 12 seats.

I agree with the Member for Elmwood, I would not tell the people of Manitoba one thing about your policy until it is almost too late, because if it comes under the scrutiny that this is, you will be 12 seats less after the next Election in the Province of Manitoba, and that is exactly what will happen.

It was a very coincidental piece of newspaper. I don't very often save newspapers and there it was. But that is very very explanatory as to the attitude of Canadians towards the NDP party socialist tendencies to nationalize our mineral companies and nationalize our industry. Ed Broadbent put it all very nicely, when he said he could not support the entrenchment of the right to own property in the Charter of Rights that Trudeau is proposing for this country because it might, what? It might interfere with their future plans to nationalize in industries, in businesses and companies. Tell the people of Manitoba that you agree with Ed Broadbent's policy on that, that's all we want you to do. We just want you people over there, if you can do it, to tell the truth prior to the next Election. We know how last time around you didn't do that. We know very well that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a point of order.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: No, I was wondering if the member would permit a question.

MR. ORCHARD: Certainly I'll permit a question, when I'm finished.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed going to be interesting to watch our friends in the Opposition go into the next Election without a policy and without a platform and try to ride on the wave of whatever perceived doom and gloom there is in the province.

I also understand, Mr. Chairman, in a post analysis of the Election in Ontario that the Ontario NDP were lined up solidly with the organized labour as these people over here are with their Leader being on the end of the puppet-strings from the Manitoba Federation of Labour. We understand that Cassidy had those kinds of connections with the NDP in Ontario. We also understand that Cassidy ran a doom and gloom campaign in Ontario saying that the province was going to hell in a hand basket, and Ontarians didn't believe that, just as Manitobans don't believe the doom and gloom myopic — I can't describe the kind of negative attitude that those

people have over there, and you know it's unprecedented in Manitoba politics because I've watched Manitoba politics for some time.

Our Party in Opposition in 1976, 1975, 1977, criticized the operation of that Party as government and they criticized them in very legitimate areas and they made very concrete suggestions as to how they would change those areas and the people of Manitoba decided that those were wise ways to proceed. There will be no such comparison available from the NDP Party, because as we have all said in this House before, they have nothing to revert to except the tired strains of socialism that they tried for eight years in government that did not work for the Province of Manitoba. They will go back to taxing small business; they will go back to their expropriation of mineral rights by whatever means available, whether it's mineral acreage tax or whether outright prevention of exploration in Northern Manitoba unless there's participation by the government. Those are the kinds of programs, the only ones they can revert back to, because they are the only ones they believe in and the only ones they understand, and if they put those policies before the people of Manitoba for the next Election, they will not receive any support for them, because they've been tried. They've been tried by a person who is regarded as a capable leader. The people of Manitoba will not allow a Party with an incapable leader to implement those policies a second time around.

The future, Mr. Chairman, looks good for two political parties in Manitoba; one of them is government, and the other one unfortunately, or maybe it's fortunately, who know's, will be the Member for Inkster's Party, because you won't see his Party go out on the platform of the Election the next time without some clear cut policies, but you will see the Leader of the Opposition without any policies. He will allude to things and we'll have the Member for Brandon East talk motherhood again; about how he wants the province to grow, but he won't tell us how or what he envisions as a method of making it grow, and a method of making it prosper as he would like to see it.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is most interesting that we have had this opportunity to once again give the Opposition every available opportunity in this debate, and we've been at it now for what, seven or eight days; seven days. We have given them every available opportunity to once again, just as we did in the Throne Speech Debate with an eight day debate, and this is the Session that is coming very close to an Election in the Province of Manitoba. There have been two opportunities, the Throne Speech, and now the Interim Supply, and we will go into the Budget Speech Debate in a short while, and do you know what, Mr. Chairman, we still have yet to hear one single policy enunciation by the Leader of the Opposition or any of his tired caucus; not one, not one, Mr. Chairman.

We did hear one from the Member for Transcona. I think he mentioned that he would have no proprietary health care homes. I think that was as close to a policy platform —(Interjection)— That's right too, the Leader of the Opposition did indicate he didn't want any shopping centres in Manitoba. That's right, it was back to the land with the Leader of the Opposition.

This has been a seven-day debate, Mr. Chairman, seven days of debate and not one policy suggestion from any member of the Opposition. We're going to continue on tonight and I suspect that even the Member for St. Johns is probably going to talk, but he won't give us any policy, because he's not running next time, but he will give us the illusion, as he did one time on television about six or eight months ago, where he said, oh yes, the Conservatives may have removed succession duties but we were going to do that anyway. That was an incredible statement coming from the Member for St. Johns that they were going to do it anyway, because that was really one of their platforms in the Election of 1977 that they were going to remove succession duties; an incredible flip-flop by the Member for St. Johns where he says one thing after he announced that he's not going to run again next time, then he says, oh well, we would have changed that anyway, because we know anything he says now does not represent policy for the future of the Party, because he can duck out next time and they don't have to tag any importance to anything that he says from now, because he's not going to be with them. Anything he says they can reject out of hand after the next Election because he won't be with them. But that was the incredible state to which they have sunk when they can say three years after they lost the election, well, we were going to change that tax anyway and never mention it during the Election, and never make any move towards removing that very punitive taxation system from the people of Manitoba. A fine flip-flop by an old masterful politician, but a flip-flop that Manitobans recognize, Mr. Chairman; very much recognize.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the rest of the debate on Interim Supply and I look forward to hearing all sorts of the wonderful policies that our socialist friends opposite are going to give the people of Manitoba as an alternative to our government. Mr. Chairman, I am waiting with bated breath for those wonderful policy enunciations. We are tired on this side, as all Manitobans are, of hearing the doom and gloom and negativism out of that Opposition Party. There isn't any government that has been subject to the kind of doom and gloom and any people in any province that has been subject to the kind of doom and gloom that we have heard from those people in the last three years in this House; doom and gloom without one positive single alternative; just strictly doom and gloom; criticize — doom and gloom, sorry I got the "I" and the "r" mixed up, doom and gloom; so that we'll see if the new doom party is going to change their tone because there was a hint of it from the Member for Brandon East tonight, Mr. Chairman, where he almost got positive there once, but then he slipped back into the old rut of doom and gloom that he is so used to talking about. It would be amazing to see what kind of a policy they could develop after all this doom and gloom they have been talking about. I think it is permanently engraved on their minds now, that they can't think positively any more, and anybody who can't think positively can't govern, Mr. Chairman, so we look forward on this side of the House to members opposite participating in the balance of this debate and in the Budget Debate so they can tell us and the people of Manitoba what

good things they're going to do for Manitoba, how they're going to do it and what their policies are going to be, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. ADAM: The Minister of Highways agreed to answer a question at the end of his remarks. Mr. Chairman, the Minister in his comments tried to score points on NDP policy in Ontario. I'm just wondering if the Minister is aware that at the last Conservative Convention held in Alberta, that there was a proposal, a resolution to nationalize all the hydro power in Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, every party is allowed a few misguided individuals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, all I want to do this evening is to put on record a few questions which I trust will be answered when we are in say, Committee of the Whole, and a few questions that I've had in my mind and this is an opportunity to pose them again.

Firstly, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who has announced that he made a decision to postpone the enforcement of an order by the Clean Environment Commission. I would like him, in due course, and I suggest a good opportunity will be the Committee of the Whole on this bill, to tell us really what satisfactory evidence was presented to him to indicate that the statements which he repeated from HBM and S were correct, that is, he talked about \$60 million and other figures; to what extent did he have independent evidence to confirm that they are right and that the only way they could deal with it, is at that expense?

Secondly, I would like to know what terms he imposed to ensure that in three years time, all the problems will have been corrected, because I think we know that this problem has come up again and again, and I'm not aware that there has been a planned program developed to ensure that within three years the problem will have been disposed of. In other words, does he have some form of monitoring device and that's a word that comes easily to the lips of the Conservative Government member, of monitoring what they are doing, say every three months or so, just to make sure that progress is being made? He was asked questions by the Member for Churchill earlier — I thought he was about to rise to respond and he's nodding his head, so apparently he was, but I guess he wasn't recognized, mainly, Mr. Chairman, because he didn't stand. It appeared as if he was going to rise, but he didn't rise, so I would like him to deal with this so that we, who have as much of an interest as he has, in ensuring that the environment is protected, will be able to share in his knowledge of what are the reasons given; are they justified, are they going to be dealt with in the time he is allotted, why did he give an extension if not to ensure that there was sufficient time to do what he had to do?

The second question I would relate to the Minister of Agriculture and I've raised this a few times in the House in Question Period, Mr. Chairman, and that is my surprise that on May 16th, 1979, which is almost two years ago, the government and I assume it was this Minister, agreed to file an Order for Return, accepted it, a question asked by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, listed as No. 4 in 1979, dealing with MACC land sales details. Mr. Chairman, I'm not troubled to find out just what the question is. To me it is now a matter of interest as to why for two years now, the Minister of Agriculture has been seized of this Return; he accepted the Return. I don't understand what the ramifications would be that would make it impossible for him to have responded, within a period of almost two years. I suppose there is a reason. I cannot believe that it was a deliberate decision on his part to flout this House, having accepted the question and not dealing with it.

There was a time, Mr. Chairman, when questions were put on the Order Paper, agreed to by government, but then by tradition or by the rules, the question fell by the wayside if it wasn't responded to during that Session. That was changed, my impression is it was changed during the Conservative regime, but that is academic. The fact is it was changed and every second Wednesday, we are reminded of the — is it neglect, is it willful decision of the Minister of Agriculture, but whatever it is, we still don't have the answer, and I say, Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to expect that it is a difficult or complicated answer. I know I'm always amused by the Member for Roblin, who complains bitterly that he won't honour his commitment given to the House, about production of certain hydro bills that he promised to give so many years ago, because the then Minister of Agriculture did not respond to an Order for Return and yet we're over three years in Conservative Government. He never got his answer or if he did, he never gave us the information. He has not honoured his undertaking, but the Minister of Agriculture has not honoured this particular one, and I hope that by the time we get to the Committee of the Whole, when we are dealing with his salary, amongst other matters, that he will have the courtesy to this House to give not only an explanation, but an indication of when he will respond. May 16th, 1979 is what, about 22 1/2 months ago, that he gave the undertaking.

By the same token, the Honourable the House Leader undertook a few days ago to speak to the Premier about responding to a question asked by the Member for Fort Rouge and accepted on April 8th, 1980. Within a week or so we will be celebrating the anniversary of that undertaking by government, to give details, re appointments to boards, commissions, etc. I would hope that we will be given the courtesy and I suggest Committee of the Whole will be a logical opportunity to have responses from the respective Minister, in this case the Premier, explaining why there is a delay and giving us an undertaking and maybe actually filing the Return, so that he will have complied with that undertaking which he gave just about a year ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. GARY FILMON (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to the two

questions that were addressed to me by the Member for St. Johns, and in his question he hit the nail precisely on the head, and that is that officials of my department are not in a position to either confirm or deny the company's allegation at the present time of what the cost would be to meet the ground level concentration standards. That information was given without adequate backup, just as a figure stated, without any firm data behind it, at the Clean Environment Commission hearing, so as a consequence, officials of my department believe that if we were to move to force them to comply immediately, since they do not have a full design and cost estimate fully developed; that is, the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company do not have this fully developed, their only response would be a cutback in production, because that's the only thing they could achieve immediately.

The other response, like any business, when a major investment decision is being faced, they couldn't make that kind of decision overnight, it would take them time to accumulate that information and to present it in a form that a decision could be made on behalf of the company and that will take time. So what I have done in varying the Order is simply to give them time, knowing that the major factor, the total emissions levels from the smelter, which is in my view the crucial factor, that factor is not being altered, it is only ground level concentrations that are being altered.

Secondly, we are requesting of the company a specific plan as soon as possible, and presumably there will certainly be time for it to be done before, the Order now expires in January 1st of 1984, and we are asking of the company that they provide us with the detailed financial data and the plans that will show what it will cost for them to meet the intent of the former Clean Environment Commission Order. That will be known and be able to be dealt with well prior to the expiration of the current order, and therefore it will be able to be dealt with on the basis that should not require a disruption of activity in Fliin Flon, loss of jobs or put the economic viability of the operation in danger.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Minister has given the time before he has the information, which indicates the necessity of getting the time. I mean if you've given them until 1984, it seems to me that you have given them until 1984 to give you the information and then you will be in the same position. If they don't give you the information in 1984 or the day before 1984, the next Minister will be in a position of saying, well, they've had all this time, they haven't given it to me, if I don't give them another extension they'll close the operation.

It seems to me that the Minister has put himself in a very bad position for the getting of the Order. Well can the Minister change his Order? Can the Minister change his Order to require the information in the Order and require dates upon which the information can be given, because I believe that the Order that can be made by the Minister could require that kind of information as part and parcel of the Order. As a matter of fact, the Clean Environment Commission's

Orders have been made to that effect and if the Order merely gives him an extension until 1984, when this is to be done, then presumably in accordance with the Order, and I must say that I haven't seen it, they can wait until 1984 and not do anything. Then on the day that the Order expires, the next Minister is faced with closing a plant, and if that's the way in which the Minister has left this, then I think he's left it in a very bad situation. Either he shouldn't have made an Order immediately prior to getting that information or the Order should have been so predicated that the information would be coming in such a way that you know that step by step they are getting to the 1984 date.

Just from what I've heard, it seems to me that the Minister has given the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Corporation complete confidence that they will do what he has the obligation of requiring them to do, and if they don't do it, then the next Minister will be in no position to deal with it. Now I haven't seen the Order, but I have heard the Minister's answer and he says, in the meantime we're going to ask for this, but if the Order says that they have until 1984 to do this, and you ask for it and they don't refuse you, there is no violation of the Order from what the Minister has told us. If that's the case, Mr. Chairman, I think that there has certainly been a defect in the way in which it has proceeded.

Now I seem to recall, Mr. Chairman, that orders have been made which required, I can recall certainly with regard to Inco, which required test facilities to see what is happening with regard to new installations that have been made and regular monitoring of the test facility, and I'm not as close to the department as I was at one time, but I would have hoped that that's the way in which we dealt with the situation. It doesn't seem that the Minister has dealt with the existing situation in such a way as to know what is happening between now and 1984, because steps will have to be taken in order for them to get from where they are now to apparently what the Order says that they shall have by 1984.

Mr. Chairman, I presume that the Minister will want to deal with that question, but there is something that I want to get to before he gives his answer. I'm participating in a rather elevated debate, because I was anxious to get in on the exchange of compliments that was taking place between the Member for St. Boniface, the Member for Minnedosa, the Member for Brandon East and the Minister of Transportation, and suddenly we find that we are on a different plane. I don't know whether to call it higher or lower, but we are on a different plane in any event, and it will take some doing to get back to the mood of where we were, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister of Transportation was reaming out the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, for talking about gloom and doom and suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that this was a new low in terms of Opposition in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is suddenly talking about Manitobans and the Opposition having an obligation somehow to try to boost Manitoba regardless of the efforts, or the lack of efforts or the misguidance of the government to have put Manitoba into a position that it is. I can remember very clearly, Mr. Chairman, when I first came into this House and the Minister of Transportation says, it's a

new low in Opposition. Obviously he wasn't here, Mr. Chairman, during the eight years in which the Conservatives of this province did everything in their power to try to bring about industrial stagnation through their efforts on the side of the Opposition. Mr. Chairman, it is so, it is so that Conservative Members deliberately tried to create the impression before the event that the aircraft would never be certified. A Conservative Member got up in the House and said he had knowledge that the aircraft that was being built at Saunders would never be certified, and it turned out, Mr. Chairman, that what he was basing this information, which is boosting Manitoba's industry, it turned out that the actual test plane would not get a certificate, that the prototype would not get a certificate, that the plane would be certified, but not the prototype, and yet this man made the boosting statement, Mr. Chairman, that they would never be certified.

Another member phoned, another Opposition Member phoned a purchaser of buses in San Francisco to the effect of telling this purchaser that we were having trouble producing the buses, and were they certain that they needed these buses. The Winnipeg Free Press, who is the ally of the Conservative Party, actually wrote a lead editorial urging the City of Winnipeg not to buy Flyer buses.

All of a sudden the Conservatives have become Manitoba boosters, Mr. Chairman, and they say that this side of the House is supposed to be the cheering section for the government, that everytime the government says something, we are supposed to cheer, and that anything less is lack of patriotism towards the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that patriotism has been said to be the last refuge of a scoundrel and the fact is that when they have nothing better to say, when they have nothing better to say, they rely on the fact that they are boosting Manitoba and the Opposition is running it down. The fact that they are running down Manitoba while in government, and the Opposition cannot correct that procedure, is something they choose to ignore and I tell the Minister of Transportation the same thing as I told the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce, the drummerboy, who said the same thing in 1966 to 1969 that we are failing to boost Manitoba, that the Opposition has a problem, the Opposition cannot make a silk purse out of a pig's ear, and if the Conservatives have created a pig's ear, they can't blame the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, for not being able to make a silk purse out of it. They have made a pig's ear, Mr. Chairman, they've made a pig's ear by their own definition, because, Mr. Chairman, if they've got the guts to introduce a budget this year, and I'm not sure that they do have, I'm not sure that they will not try to avoid the bringing down of a budget; I'm not sure that they will not trump up some issue to do what the —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture says that's a good idea, that's more than a Freudian slip of the tongue, they have a real problem, they have a real problem.

They have to introduce a budget which will show a deficit of a minimum of \$200 million, that that deficit together with the other deficits will equal \$500 million in deficits, which is going to create \$50 million a year in interest charges every year, which is a Saunders

every year, for which you get nothing, and I know that I'm being repetitive, but nevertheless that's the pig's ear that they've created.

Mr. Chairman, they are seriously over there thinking of perhaps creating a constitutional issue, and they know that they have a good issue and despite the fact that the First Minister of this province has and the provinces — and I was fighting with the provinces for all of the years that I was in government I said that they were hindering the process, because they were trying to put amending formulas forward which calls for unanimity; they were trying to put amending formulas forward which called for opting out, and they were trying to make it conditional upon more powers being given to the provinces and they were the constitutional holdup for many years.

It is now reversed, Mr. Chairman. It is now certain the Federal Government is the culprit insofar as constitutional questions are concerned. I am fairly certain now, Mr. Chairman, that the provinces would be glad to split the proposal, just as Mr. Blakeney suggests now and which I have been suggesting all along, that we patriate and if you can get your Charter of Rights, which I say you won't be able to get and I say thank goodness we will not be able to get, in Canada go ahead, but patriate the Constitution with an amending formula that does not call for unanimity, that does not call for opting out and I go further, Mr. Chairman, with the same amending formula that exists today. That the Federal Government and the Senate will have the same powers to amend the Canadian Constitution as now exists in making requests for the Constitution, and if the First Minister is right, that calls for unanimity. I don't think it does, but what I know that it does is it means that a new Federal Government can change anything that the existing Federal Governments does, and that's what I am for, Mr. Chairman.

Nevertheless, what they are thinking is if they create a constitutional issue and knowing that the people of Manitoba are contrary to the Federal Government, knowing that the New Democrats are for it, knowing that the New Democrats in the Province of Manitoba have shown great equivocation to be nice to them on this issue that maybe they don't have to bring in a Budget. Maybe they can go to the public without bringing down a Budget and bring in their Budget afterwards and bring in that \$200 million deficit afterwards. And, Mr. Chairman, if you think I am exaggerating, which is the Conservative Party in Canada that is looked to with most admiration by members on that side of the House? The Alberta Party, Mr. Chairman. The Alberta Party, Mr. Lougheed, he's touted as, if it only wasn't that he was trying to protect his own province for the moment, he would certainly be touted as the next Prime Minister, put forward by the Conservative Party, and they always look to this Conservative Government of Alberta as being a model government.

Mr. Chairman, there is now a release that has said something about the Government of Alberta. Not by our definition, because these things can happen, but by their definition. They, Mr. Chairman, talked about a deficit, an overriding deficit of about, make it a maximum of \$100 million when they estimated it, it finally turned out to \$50 million and it only involved

of that \$50 million a maximum of \$30 million in over-expenditures from Budget.

Now there are a million people in the Province of Manitoba. There are two million I suppose in the Province of Alberta, so one would expect that if Alberta ran a deficit, overexpended deficit, overexpenditures of \$60 million, let's say \$70 million, let's say \$80 million, that that would be the equivalent to what the New Democratic Party did in 1977 and that would be the equivalent of what those people called a financial hemorrhage, a financial mismanagement, an impossible fiscal situation, if it was \$80 million, overexpended; if the Alberta Government was \$80 million overexpended. That's your definition. Well, Mr. Chairman, what was the Alberta — what is, not was — the Alberta Government overexpenditure this year as now estimated; \$80 million would be terrible, wouldn't it? \$80 million would be was done by the New Democrats in 1977; \$80 million would be scandalous. What would you say to \$160 million? What would that be? That would be terrible. What would you say to \$520 million? Would that be bad? Would the Minister of Finance say that that would be bad? Overexpenditures, not a Budget. Overexpenditures of \$520 million. That would be terrible, wouldn't it? You can't believe that that would happen. It didn't happen. I'm putting you on. It wasn't \$520 million. It was \$593 million; \$593 million overexpenditures. "Hyndman conceded government overspending \$593 million above Budget Estimates, also played a role, but insisted the extra spending was justified to cover unanticipated needs." Well, I mean it's true; \$593 million overexpended. Well, Mr. Chairman, I sometimes don't like to believe what I read in the Winnipeg Free Press or other newspapers, but you know they've got it listed so many times that it must, and by the way it's a CP story. "A serious reversal in Alberta's financial picture will mean a Budget deficit of \$747 million in the fiscal year that ends Tuesday, Provincial Treasurer, Lou Hyndman said yesterday. The Government with \$2.7 million in surpluses accumulated in previous years won't have to borrow . . ." etc., because they've got the oil revenue. "He said a significant reduction in anticipated revenues from energy resources to \$4.7 billion from \$5.8 billion caused by federal energy policies is primarily to blame for the deficit. Other factors contributing to the reversal were \$1.35 million reduction in anticipated revenue, a \$20 million reduction in anticipated revenue from crude oil," and then he says, "Hyndman conceded Government overspending \$593 million above Budget Estimates also played a role but insisted the extra spending was justified to cover unanticipated needs."

Mr. Chairman, I frankly can't make out the figures and perhaps the \$593 million is incorrect, because they say they've lost a \$1.1 billion in revenue but I don't know how many caused by federal energy policies which would more than make up \$1 billion. But the fact is they say \$593 million and I'm reading it again, "Above Budget Estimates, Government overspending". But in any event, Mr. Chairman, whatever the figures come to and if there is a mistake in this above Budget Estimates then I suppose that will have to be corrected, but the fact is that the Budget deficit was \$747 million; \$747 million. Now that's, if the people of Manitoba had a

Budget of \$125 million, make it \$180 million, an equivalent would be \$360 million for twice but this is over four times; \$747 million last year.

So, Mr. Chairman, the more I look at this, the more I conclude that the Minister of Finance does not want to bring in a Budget and the Minister of Agriculture says that's a good idea and I don't think he's just joking. (Interjection)— He absolutely did; that they have their election; that they avoid bringing in the Budget and they bring in the good news of a \$200 million-plus Budget in the hope that they succeed in the election. Mr. Chairman, they won't get away with it. I realize that they're in desperate circumstances. I realize that they are considering it. I realize that they may try it, but one thing that they will undersell as almost all governments do, Mr. Chairman, they undersell the intelligence of the electorate and I tell the Minister of Finance and I tell my friends in the Conservative Party that the one thing that they will miscalculate is that the people of the Province of Manitoba are not stupid, and if you try to fool them which the Conservatives have tried on numerous occasions and they're likely to try again, that you will get your just reward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I just first wish to congratulate you on your 25th day. I think that it is commendable that you are seeking to reduce pollution on such a personal level and an individual level and do hope that our conversations and Debates won't drive you back to that awful habit. Having been one who quit myself, I can assure you that the first five years are the worst, so you're almost through the hard part now.

I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment in respect to a number of things which he said before and he's just asked me for a copy of the Order and I assure him I'll get that over to him as soon as I have an opportunity after these remarks. He said that he has made a decision to allow Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting more time to develop a plan which will in fact allow them to deal with the problems that the Order was intended to have them deal with. I would ask the Minister then if he will answer some questions, I noticed that he's answered them for other persons in the House, so I would hope that he would answer them for me, although he has refused to in the past.

I'd ask him, what has been happening with the Committee that was mandated by the last Orders, and these Orders were signed on January 8th, 1973, and one of the provisions of those Orders, No. 7 was, "the licensees show cause, authorize and appropriate representatives to meet with authorized and appropriate representatives in the Manitoba Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management and authorize representatives of Environment Canada at least semi-annually for the purpose of finding appropriate solutions to minimize the omission of pollutants into the atmosphere. The convening of such meetings is to be the responsibility of the Provincial or Federal authorities and shall be held more frequently if any one of the representatives consider it advisable to do so. The first such meetings shall be held not later than June 30th, 1973." There was a committee in place since at

least June 30th, 1973, unless these Orders were violated that has been put in place and ordered to determine ways and means in which the environmental contaminations and emissions originating from that plant could be in fact dealt with. So I'd ask the Minister why it is now, eight years later, he suddenly finds that this committee hasn't been able to come up with anything over the past eight years or at least anything to his satisfaction that would indicate that this problem can be dealt with and if that's the case, what leaves him to expect that over the next three years they're going to be able to come up with anything more positive?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I obviously am not in a position to respond for the actions of Ministers for all but two months of that period of eight years of which more than half that period of time the position was filled by a Minister from his party's government. The purpose of my asking for the copy the member has of the Order is that I've attempted to contact my secretary without success and without my secretary I'm unable to find in the files, the Order, but I can respond and say from memory and I'll serve correction when the actual copy is given to the Member for Inkster that the Order does call for a proposal or for proposals which identify the associated costs and financial impacts to be provided by September 1st of 1982. Those associated costs and financial impacts on the operations of the plant and the costs of reducing the sulphur dioxide emissions by 50 percent and the ground level concentrations to meet the Order that was varied of the Clean Environment Commission. That's the response that I can give just from memory and it's subject perhaps to detail correction.

MR. COWAN: Well, the Minister still hasn't answered why it is in the past eight years, over three of which have been with a Conservative Government in the province that this issue has not been able to be dealt with.

I'd also like to ask the Minister the following question. He mentioned earlier in the day that in fact the problem was one of weather, of climatic conditions, that for the majority of the time, the plant could operate within the guidelines as provided for in the new Order, but however when there was an inversion that it would be impossible for the plant to do so because the heavy air would push the contaminants which would normally go out the tall stack down into a local area and the guidelines would be exceeded in the local area at that time. I'd ask the Minister first for clarification; is that the only reason that he has in fact amended the Order because of those circumstances which he says are relatively rare when inversion climatic conditions create a situation where the company cannot abide by the maximum acceptable levels of pollutants as determined by the Manitoba Government and by the Federal Government?

MR. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, that's one of the reasons why they can't meet the ground level concentrations at the present time but as I indicated previously it was a matter of looking at the consequences of requiring them to meet it now as

opposed to giving them some time to provide the economic information to do the complete analysis that will result in the same, we believe, the same guidelines, the same standards being met in the future.

MR. COWAN: There will be more time to discuss this matter, Mr. Chairperson, but I can tell you that those answers are not satisfactory, that in fact earlier today the indication from the Minister was that it was just a climatic condition, which created the difficulties. Now he says there's something else, but he doesn't say what it is. I hope he'd be able to provide us detail as to what other conditions exist that prevent the company from meeting these standards, which he says the company can meet 99 percent of the time.

So we will have time to pursue that line of questioning. I know that the Minister will need an opportunity to give some consideration to that, but I hope he can come back with more detail.

However, when he says that it is the cost of abatement and it is the cost of abatement by the company which bothers him, I want to read into the record a statement which was made by someone who is probably more expert in this area than I am, and as well who is obviously more eloquent than I am, as you will see when I read a very brief paragraph into the record. But the quote comes from Dr. Martha Katoush (phonetic), Chairperson of the Public Advisory Committee on the Environment, which is appointed under The Environmental Council Act of Alberta and is to give advice and assistance to the Environment Council and the government on environmental matters. It comes from a House of Commons proceedings on acid rain, which I recommend to the Minister and any other person who wants to discover more information about this. This by the way, and we will read more from this into the record, says that there is a problem in Northern Manitoba with acid rain, as there is in Northern Saskatchewan and Northern Alberta, but we will read that in at a different occasion. But I think it's appropriate to end on this quote, and this is the good doctor speaking, who is the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee for the Government of Alberta, a government which the Member for Inkster says, notwithstanding their excessive spending or over-expenditures is a favourite government of the Government of Manitoba. She says, and I quote, "Some people ask if we can afford the cost of abatement. I ask if we can afford the cost of no abatement. Can we afford to replace the buffering capabilities of soils? Can we afford to treat lakes void of life because of acid rain, even if we had the means to treat the lakes? Can we afford decreased forest and agricultural production? Can we afford the medical costs resulting directly or indirectly from air pollution? Can we afford to prevent the corrosive effects of SO₂. We must either pay the costs of abatement or pay the cost of no abatement. If we choose no abatement, our children and their children will pay." I hope the Minister takes that advice seriously. I hope he thinks about that statement, because that is the nub of the issue.

He has said that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting does not have to pay, and be doing so he has said that the rest of us have to pay, and that is the tragedy of the issue and I don't want to get caught

up in a speech, but I do want that concept that someone has to pay sometime clearly on the record, so that the public know that when the Minister excuses one party, he calls into effect a debt due on another party which may last for generations and may last for centuries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Earlier today I entered this debate and the Member for Churchill wasn't in the House. Once again I want to agree with the Member for Churchill, I'm not going to disagree with anything that he said this time, and underline one of the things that the Minister said earlier that caught my ear. He was seeming to take some solace in the fact that the particulate matter in the air was alkaline in nature and that HBM&S was relying on 99 percent success in spreading this over a larger area.

You know, Mr. Chairman, very many things happen in the atmosphere. I'll have to best make the case by telling a little story. There is in the air, ozone; oxygen is O₂ and ozone is O₃, and one of the things that lightning does is it energizes the ozone so that it's able to combine with nitrogen and form a soluble compound, which is washed into the ground and as an indirect consequence lightning acts as a fertilizer for soil. This fact was put as a question on an exam in high school, and I happened to be marking tests and one of the teachers across the staff room gave me a loud guffaw and when I asked him what he was laughing at, one of the students had given as an answer to the question, how does lightning increase the fertility of the soil, he had responded it scares the manure out of the cows. Nevertheless the Minister should not accept just *carte blanche* the suggestions by your technicians, because when you use the term it's neutralized, neutralization is a process by which a base combines with an acid to form water in a salt. Now I don't want to get off into that particular thing, but nevertheless what are these salts that are being formed. Before I could give a technical opinion, I would have to know what the particulate matter is and what kind of an acid is being talked about.

The Member for Churchill, of course, has made for us relative to acid rain and in many of these processes it's sulphur and sulphuric acid that we're dealing with. Well, if that be the case then you know what is the effect of pollution in long range terms of the salts of sulphuric acid, which are known as sulphates on the soil and everybody else is breathing and everything else, you know, the whole bit. So as I said earlier, I appreciate the efforts of people such as the Member for Churchill in consistent and persistent . . . in this area, and underline with the Member for Churchill the importance of resolving these problems.

The only part that I didn't say, in my earlier comments, I don't know if the Minister misunderstood me or didn't hear me correctly, I didn't say that he had made a stupid decision; time may prove that he made a stupid decision. The only thing I defended was his ministerial responsibility for making decisions. In listening to the debate that has taken place, and the questions asked by the Member for St. Johns and the comments made from the Member for Churchill, I am beginning to wonder, and

especially when they point out that the Order, as I understand it, is so nebulous that the HBM&S is not required to provide the information in a logical sequence with some time limits as to when they have to provide the information.

The technical knowledge that we have acquired, Mr. Chairman, some things that we have done historically, we have to review them. I know I'm quite a coffee drinker and I hear on the news that drinking too much coffee is knocking the heck out of my pancreas. So but as this knowledge is acquired, it is incumbent upon governments to take actions in the public interest, and I am somewhat concerned that the actions of the Minister have not been positive enough to put the kind of pressure, which I had said earlier in my comments, in my own experience it took some 30 years to cure the problem of what people in the community said was killing the grapes, so they corrected the problem, the grapes grew up to the door, so there is some basis for the argument that they were killing the grapes. I don't know all of the technical information that is available, but I had mentioned before that the arguments do not prove causal relationships. But just in that regard, you know the world has changed and these things have to be addressed, because the final line costs, Mr. Chairman, are things which the government has the capacity to develop, and they're the only people in society who have that capacity, and they're the only people who can make the case to the public, and show that we can't afford to continue in this particular path. If there are other consequences, such as economic considerations, they have to be taken into consideration, and adjustments have to be made. It's going to take involvement of government in a direction and perhaps even in the monetary way to help shift some of these changes, not only in the effects of pollution, but in technological change, and a whole broad spectrum of changes, which have to come about, and the only instrument which can protect the people and see that these changes come about are governments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply — pass; Resolved that a — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: One point, Mr. Chairperson, just by way of explanation.

I had mentioned that the Minister had asked me for a copy of the Orders. I told him I would provide him with one, I don't have a clean copy with me, but he did at that time indicate it was because his secretary was not available to him. I didn't want to leave the impression that he did not have a copy of the Orders which I may have inadvertently done. The fact was he had explained it to me in exactly the way he explained it on the record, and I didn't mean to in any way attempt to embarrass him or even inadvertently try to embarrass him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply — pass.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$673,466,010, being the 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 — pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chairman reported on the deliberations of the Committee of Interim Supply and asked leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: 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 of Ways and Means of raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means of raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order, Interim Supply.

Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1982, the sum of \$673,466,010, being 30 percent of the total amount to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1981, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund — pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations and asked leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. RANSOM, by leave, introduced Bill No. 32, An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1982, and to authorize commitments to expend additional money for subsequent years.

SECOND READING — GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL NO. 32 THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1981

MR. RANSOM, by leave, presented Bill No. 32, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1982, and to authorize commitments to expend additional sums of money for subsequent years, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow (Tuesday).