

*Amax Limited*

the Environment, with attachment, dated December 18, 1979 (58) J. MacLachy to M. Ito, on the subject of metals in stream sediments, dated December 3, 1980 (59) J. MacLachy to M. Ito, F. Claggett and J. Scott, on the subject of by-product recovery of metals, dated December 5, 1980 (60) F. Claggett to "File", on the subject of preliminary results, EPS surveillance samples, dated May 5, 1981 (61) M. D. Nassichuk to F. C. Boyd, on the subject of the Amax-US Borax meeting with Alaskans, dated April 1, 1981.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this certainly is not the first time I have spoken on the Amax matter in the House. I have reviewed my file and noticed that there are about 50,000 pages of material on this matter. However, I am sure that all Hon. Members of the House, when we finally bring the matter to a vote, will want to vote that these papers be released.

The reason I say this is that any reasonable, thinking Member of the House or any reasonable Canadian, on looking at these documents, will realize that they were all prepared at public expense and that they are documents which in fact have been subjected to what the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) has publicly described as a public review process. All these documents were provided to what is known as the McInerney panel in British Columbia and were used as substance for the decision to which they came over the past year regarding the safety and propriety of the Amax operation, although in its most recent report it has distinguished that somewhat, in that some parts of the Amax Kitsault operation are not operating according to the special Order in Council granted during the federal election in 1979.

I urge all Hon. Members who are here today and those who are doing any research on this matter to obtain Motions Nos. 109, 110 and 111 and to look at the documents which are listed so as to assure themselves that they are not what the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Smith) referred to them as when this motion was referred for debate. He said that they were internal Cabinet memoranda of some kind or that they were some kind of special inter-ministerial documents which could not be released for some special reasons—for the security of the country or something. They are technical documents. They are primarily biological and oceanographic in nature and are very important documents to be released to those members of the scientific community, to the Nishga people and to many of the other groups which have been interested in this matter for some time.

I would like to put on the record some of the groups that called for a full public inquiry and are interested in seeing these documents released. I am sure many Members are now aware that there are several hundred recognized groups in Canada that called for a full public inquiry. Earlier today I tabled another 1,300 signatures of petitioners, bringing the number of names which I have tabled to somewhere in the region of 20,000. I understand that some 80,000 have been directed to the office of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), bringing us to probably the level of 100,000.

The number of individuals represented by these groups is very rapidly approaching half the population of Canada. Here is just a sample: Canadian Union of Public Employees; Native Brotherhood of British Columbia; Prince Rupert NDP;

Victoria Labour Council; Anglican Church of Canada, Ottawa Diocese; British Columbia New Democratic Party Caucus; Project North; B.C. & Yukon Territory Building and Construction Trades Council; National Indian Brotherhood in Ottawa; North Coast Tribal Council; United Church of Canada; Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops; Anglican Church of Canada, in particular the Most Reverend Edward W. Scott, Primate; Anglican Church of Canada, Bishop Douglas Hambidge; NDP Federal Caucus; Anglican Church of Canada; Port Simpson Band Council; Nishga Tribal Council; Telecommunications Workers' Union; West Coast Environmental Law Association; Canadian Environmental Law Association; Greenpeace Foundation; United Fishermen & Allied Workers' Union; Dr. Peter McCart, a biologist; Reverend Peter Hamel of the Anglican Church of Canada; SPEC from British Columbia or the Society for Pollution and Environmental Control; British Columbia Federation of Labour, representing all workers in British Columbia; the Council of the North; Lutheran Church in America; B. C. Conference of United Churches; Kitimat-Terrace and District Labour Council; Vancouver Island Building & Construction Trades Council; Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility; Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council; the Edmonton Diocese of the Anglican Church; the Huron Diocese; the British Columbia Medical Association; and petitions from every Province and both Territories.

This is just a sample of the groups which are not amused with the footdragging on the Government side at every attempt I have made to obtain legitimate documentation. Most recently I obtained under Motion No. 106 a highly sanitized group of documents; there were parts of documents missing, whole areas of documents missing, entire documents missing. Those were simply in relation to the draft copies of the regulations circulated between Amax and Government lawyers as they were going behind the scenes drafting the regulations ahead of time.

• (1530)

Here are a couple of samples of what has been said in some publications. In December, 1980 the *Canadian Churchman* had this to say:

Archbishop Scott has written Prime Minister Trudeau expressing "deep frustration" at the lack of response to a letter informing the government of the General Synod's resolution on Amax: "Our concern over the development of this project is even stronger today, and actions that have taken place since then have impressed upon us the need for urgent action to address this matter. Even though Amax and government officials continue to say the Kitsault mining project does not impose any major threat to the environment, a significant and growing body of individual scientists and groups are contradicting that position", he said.

Statements by doctors on behalf of the British Columbia Medical Association appeared in *The Globe and Mail* on July 18, 1981. One reads:

The entire General Assembly of the British Columbia Medical Association, representing 4,000 doctors, moved and passed a motion on the need for such an inquiry as a basic requirement and passed it almost unanimously at their annual meeting in May.