

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Gilchrist:** Well, Madam Speaker, let me be specific. Could the minister explain how the same policies, which have plunged Canada's technological effort by one quarter of 1 per cent to the shameful level of under 1 per cent of the gross national product—equal to Iceland and Ireland and other such "high technology" countries—will suddenly magically turn around, reverse the decline and instead bring about a two-thirds increase, even if that figure is met? And if it is not met, how can it be in Canada's interest, since it will put us so much out of step with our trading partners and cost us thousands of Canadian jobs?

**Mr. Gray:** Madam Speaker, we intend to improve, upgrade and substantially add to what is already in place.

## FUNDS ALLOTTED TO SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel):** Madam Speaker, perhaps in view of the previous answers I could direct my question to the Minister of Finance, who is also acting Treasury Board head. As the chief architect of our federal fiscal framework, I wonder if the Minister of Finance, in view of the comments made by his colleague about support of science and technology being shared by the Minister of Finance, would indicate why he has permitted the public service to snowball once again in size, going up over 7,000 in numbers since last April alone, costing the treasury in the full year \$140 million, when the total amount allotted to science and technology as a department is \$7 million, or one-twentieth of that amount?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member had better address the question to the President of the Treasury Board instead of to the alternate president of the treasury board.

**Mr. Stevens:** Madam Speaker, I will give the Minister of Finance another chance because I think the lack of funding for science and technology in this country is a terribly important issue. Would the Minister of Finance, perhaps after he has crowned the three hundred thousandth new public servant in this country—that is the number of public servants we have just exceeded—indicate whether he plans to take up, especially with privately-owned foreign concerns in this country, the need that they give their local subsidiaries in Canada a greater mandate, especially in the field of research and development?

● (1420)

**Mr. MacEachen:** Madam Speaker, no one could disagree with the motherhood portion of that question.

\* \* \*

## ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

## ALICE ARM, B.C.—DUMPING OF TOXIC WASTE BY AMAX

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. In

view of the fact that an internal review of Amax's permit to dump 100 million metric tons of toxic heavy metals into Alice Arm, British Columbia, has been completed, would the minister advise the House whether or not he now agrees with the conclusions of the McCart report? It reads in part as follows:

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

If the minister has not yet reached that conclusion, would he now call for a formal impact assessment and public hearings?

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, I have in fact received the report and I want to discuss it with the authors. Hopefully I will go to British Columbia this evening to discuss it with them this week. I may have a fuller answer for the hon. member early next week.

## IMPACT OF DUMPING ON NISHGAS AND COMMERCIAL FISHERY

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I hope he and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will get together on this issue. On October 6, 1980, the minister sent out a letter in which he called for a review committee to consider a public inquiry on the Amax question. Would the minister now advise whether the impact of this dumping on the Nishga people and the commercial fishery are considerations of the government, or is the review process simply a further cover-up of the backroom election deal made between Amax and the Liberal party?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Madam Speaker, I had a chance to discuss this question with the chief of the Nishga people a couple of days ago. I indicated that if he wanted to give further consideration to the materials before him before asking me to consider seriously a public inquiry, I would be more than happy to give him that opportunity. As I perceive it, further discussions will be going on before I will be required to make any decision of that kind.

## CALL FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, my final supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister. Very clearly the corporate interest is being supported by the government in this particular situation. The conflict between the evidence produced by the corporate sector and that by independent scientists looking into this matter indicates that the ocean will be seriously polluted and that in fact there may be an impact something like genocide of the Nishga people at the head of Alice Arm.

Will the Prime Minister simply stand up and indicate that he will call a full public inquiry into this situation, since the permit given to Amax is the only one of its kind in Canada and was granted behind closed doors in the middle of the 1979 federal election?