

ministers or their staffs released to the public so that everyone may know what has taken place. Why not release the background papers relating to the issuance of these permits? Let us clear up any doubt that exists, and let the people know.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Roger Simmons (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, I say to my good friend from Skeena (Mr. Fulton) that this is the old one-two punch from the Newfoundland end of the country.

I share the view of my hon. friend from Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) who is Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc). I cannot see what the issue is, frankly. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has given a full explanation in this House of the manner in which Amax was permitted to dispose of its tailings. There was a detailed examination of the environmental impact undertaken by the Department of the Environment and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The House knows there was a special review of all the data on which the decision was based. This was done by an independent panel of competent scientists from outside the government. The result of that inquiry showed there would be no significant negative impact on the fishery in Alice Arm.

These are the facts and even the member for Skeena has not disputed them. They are on public record. I ask, as did my hon. friend from Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe; what papers does the hon. member want? He has the results of the independent panel, and there is all kinds of documentation on this issue. The message is always the same. If there had been something in the scientific findings that hinted at skulduggery or wrongdoing, I would be inclined to think he might be on to something. But he is just on a wild goose chase. What does the hon. member for Skeena want? He has the categorical statement of the minister that the Amax decision was reached through the normal regulatory process. Even a cursory glance at the record should tell him that the approval was straightforward, proper and not different from many other decisions made in this context.

I submit that the hon. member for Skeena does not particularly want to look at the record. He does not want to be baffled by the facts. He has got himself a lot of ink out of this one, you must remember. Like any politician, he is reluctant to let a good thing go.

**An hon. Member:** A headline hunter.

**Mr. Simmons:** What is most contemptible, Mr. Speaker, is that he is prepared to waste the time of the House on this issue, which he has done for many hours in this session and in the last session. He has unnecessarily raised the fears of the people who are most directly involved, despite all the facts to the contrary. Since he is the member for that region, he should be providing some sort of leadership in getting to the bottom of this issue. But what does he do? He shunts the record aside. He asks that the realities be ignored, and presses on to get a

### *Canada Oil and Gas Act*

few more headlines. That might be very good short-term politics, but it is not terribly responsible.

● (1800)

The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has noted an editorial in the Vancouver *Province* which described the Amax situation as a storm in a teacup. After listening to the rhetoric of the hon. member for Skeena and then looking at the report of the review panel, the *Province* said, and I quote directly from the editorial: "We now learn that the Amax tailings are less poisonous than our tap water".

I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** With great hope I ask the hon. member that he not move the adjournment of the debate. We are not at that stage. We are simply at six o'clock, and if the hon. member will allow the Chair not to consider that suggestion, we will adjourn until eight o'clock.

The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At 6 p.m. the House took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### CANADA OIL AND GAS ACT

#### MEASURES RESPECTING OIL AND GAS INTERESTS

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-48, to regulate oil and gas interests in Canada lands and to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works and Motions Nos. 7, 8, 9 (Mr. Andre for Mr. Wilson) and Motions Nos. 10, 11, 12 (Mr. Skelly) and Motions Nos. 13, 15 (Mr. Andre for Mr. Wilson) and Motions Nos. 16 and 41 (Mr. Skelly).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** When the debate was interrupted at five o'clock this afternoon, the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) had the floor.

**Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, earlier I mentioned the steps which had been taken by the government of the United Kingdom when it found itself facing rather large expenditures in the field of energy. Let me read a short excerpt from Keesing's "Contemporary Archives". It reads: "Together with unspecified fiscal adjustments to be made later, certain increases in direct taxation and the sale of