

I will read from one of the documents upon which the cabinet based its decision. Under the heading, "Existing Regulatory Requirements under the Fisheries Act", it says:

These regulations, which were promulgated in February, 1977, prohibit the deposit of effluents (including tailings) with a suspended solids level greater than 25 ppm.

I would point out that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in his recommendation last year to the cabinet put in 400,000 parts per million in this special dumping permit. The document continues:

Therefore, if the marine disposal option is to be authorized pursuant to the Fisheries Act, a special, site-specific regulation for this operation would have to be developed and passed by the governor in council upon recommendation of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The Department of the Environment and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans are, in general, opposed to the unconfined disposal of tailings. However, the policy of the departments has been to acknowledge that the practice can be authorized under special extenuating circumstances.

The most recent departmental position with regard to this issue was presented in January, 1978, to the B.C. Pollution Control Board Inquiry into the development of the province's mining, milling and smelting effluent objectives. I quote from that presentation as follows:

To protect the Canadian fisheries, the federal cabinet endorsed the policy of containment of pollutants at source based on the installation of the best practicable control technology. However, it has been recognized by the Environmental Protection Service of Environment Canada that under special circumstances it is virtually impossible to install the required control technology—

And here we come to the economic factors, the deal on which the Liberals obviously made their decision:

—the Department of the Environment, on the basis of its review of January 1979 data, believes that the construction of such a tailings pond on land can be economically feasible. Regardless of whether the 1978 or the 1979 prices are considered, there is approximately a 2 per cent difference in the return on investment between on-land disposal and marine disposal of tailings.

So the government is on record as saying that a tailings pond can be designed and developed, can be maintained at only 2 per cent return difference on investment, and they opted for the latter, the cheaper \$6 million direct-ocean dumping which, as I will point out in a few moments, has a terrible impact on the commercial and food fisheries in that area.

I go on to quote from the same document with respect to submarine disposal into Alice Arm:

—The potential for heavy metal buildup in the food chain to the point where there may be an impact upon the ecosystem, including man.

A report done by a biologist in British Columbia was released last week. It was called the McCart report. I quote from page 18 of that report:

The commercial fishery would be expected to benefit by about \$4.25 million over the 26-year life of the mine, ignoring the possibility of price increases.

One of the things which has certainly not been looked at by the Minister of Fisheries and members on that side is the impact of 100 million tonnes of effluent going into the inlet. It is going to smother life on the bottom of the inlet and will spread up to the surface and cause serious problems in terms

of heavy metal building and poisoning of various other fish species.

With regard to shrimp densities, I quote from page 29 of the McCart report. This shows some of the very serious flaws in the scientific evidence upon which the government based its decision. In relation to shrimp, I quote:

The confidence limits, expressed as a percentage of the mean, were plus or minus 188.5 per cent.

How anyone in their right mind, particularly the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, could support a proposal going ahead when there was that sort of confidence limits is certainly, at the very best, questionable.

The conclusion of the McCart report says it all in my view. On page 68 it says:

The potential impacts are serious enough to preclude the marine disposal of tailings.

One of the groups which will be most seriously impacted, other than the commercial fishermen, are the Nishga people who live in that area. In the community of Kincolith, for example, its vice-president made a statement a few weeks ago. He is Mr. Rod Robinson of the Nishga Tribal Council, and he said:

The company has offered us a share in the mine. Our share is death.

That is certainly something that neither the Minister of Fisheries nor members on that side have responded to, to date. It was predicted that if the tailings were confined to depths greater than 100 metres the following would probably occur: (a) most of the area of Alice Arm to Hans Point will eventually be blanketed with tailings; (c) the productivity of deep water benthos fauna including commercially exploitable species such as shrimps, prawns, various species of king crab, as well as demersal fish such as halibut, rock fish, crab etc. will be reduced or where deposition is very heavy, entirely eliminated.

At this point I would quote from statements of Mr. Born, President of Amax, and by Mr. Lenton, the General Manager. First, Mr. Born:

The marine disposal, in the opinion of expert marine consultants and federal and provincial environmental officials, will have no detrimental effect on the marine life in the area and will not harm the salmon fishery.

● (1630)

I quote from Mr. Lenton:

The tailing will have no adverse impact on the environment in Alice Arm.

It is interesting to have a look at what other people have said, people who are perhaps not biased by having some tie, as the Liberals do, to the \$23 million which they have saved Amax or the corporation in its direct interest. I quote from Stephen Pond, a University of British Columbia physiological oceanographer, who says:

There is evidence that heavier, saltier water from outside the inlet flows in, mixing up the water. The prediction made that the material would go down to the bottom and stay there is not likely to hold true.

In August, 1980, bishops of the Anglican Church and bishops of the Catholic Church in Canada called for a with-