

the Minister said again that his officials had advised him to issue the licence, that it was the best move. Documents prepared by the departmental officials said that there were two options, either issue the licence or don't issue the licence, and the officials would recommend: "That it would be desirable to resolve the apportionment in the Manitoba matter before the licence is issued".

Considering that it was the advice of the officials of the Department of the Environment that the licence not be issued until the matters with Manitoba had been resolved, why did the Minister issue the licence without having those matters resolved? Is it not simply once again because he was party to a deal?

**Hon. Tom McMillan (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has just made one of the great classic fallacies in logic. Because something happens after something else, ergo, it happens as a result of it. I think nothing would be further from the truth. In any event, the officials advised me to issue the permit only after Manitoba's interests were fully taken into account. I acquiesced in that advice, first, by weaving into the fabric of the permit 13 environmental conditions among which the conditions stipulated that Saskatchewan would have to honour all relevant international obligations with respect to the effect of the Souris River on Manitoba, second, that the boundary waters agreement signed in 1909, which protects Manitoba, would apply to the Rafferty Dam.

**Mr. Axworthy:** After it is all finished.

**Mr. McMillan:** Third, that the 1959 apportionment agreement that protects Manitoba's quantity of water from the Souris River through North Dakota would apply. So every single relevant provision apropos of Manitoba, and the effect of that dam on Manitoba, applied in spades.

**Mr. Axworthy:** After it's done.

**Mr. McMillan:** And only after I was assured by my officials, the top hydrologists in the country, that those conditions attached to the permit would protect Manitoba did I agree to it, and I did.

\* \* \*

## AIR CANADA

### MAINTENANCE CONTRACT AWARDED IN BRITAIN

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport who, I assume, still has some responsibilities for Air Canada. We learned on Friday that 8,000 person-hours of maintenance work for Air Canada are being subcontracted to a company in England. Could the Minister explain to the House and to the

workers at Air Canada why maintenance work is being done not in Canada where it should be done, but in Great Britain?

[Translation]

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I was indeed informed, if I have understood my hon. colleague's question, that such a transfer was made by Air Canada. I would like him to repeat his question because I have not quite grasped its meaning.

[English]

### EFFECT ON JOBS

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, Air Canada on Friday sent Aircraft No. 512, a Lockheed 1011, to Marshalls of Cambridge in England for approximately 8,000 person-hours of work over a one-month period. According to the documents provided to the union, the IAM, the nature and volume of the work is such that undesirable fluctuations in employment would automatically result. Obviously, there would be an increase in employment for a short period of time here in Canada, yet they decided to take those jobs over to Great Britain instead of putting Canadians to work here. Could the Minister explain why Air Canada is allowed to do that, or is it all because of privatization?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to answer the question of my friend. As long as he is talking about privatization, I think it has nothing to do with that, but in terms of the operations of Air Canada I think he would agree with me that I should have more information from the company because this is the first time this question is raised in front of me.

**Mr. Angus:** The Prime Minister got a telegram on Friday.

**Mr. Bouchard:** I listened to your question. You could listen to my answer. As soon as I have a good explanation, or any explanation, I will give it to my friend.

\* \* \*

## ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

### TRANSPORTATION OF PCBs ON AIR CANADA PASSENGER FLIGHTS

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. In view of the fact that by transporting some 27 tonnes of PCBs on commercial flights, Air Canada put at risk the passengers and residents near airports where Air Canada takes off and lands—understanding, of course, this was done within existing regulations—and in view of the fact that the Port of Montreal is still being used for the export of PCBs, I would like to ask the Minister whether he would use the power he now has under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and immediately ban the export of PCBs from Canada.