

answer which Dr. Needler gave me earlier to a question in the pollution field. This statement that there is no pollution problem refers to outfall discharges from pulp mills and then later on, on page 2, when the paper is dealing with the problem of pulp fibre pollution and the absorption of oxygen from the water by decaying wood matter, it has this statement: In all cases there was evidence of this type of pollution." It refers to Alberni harbour and several other locations in British Columbia where there are pulp installations.

The answer Dr. Needler gave me will be found on page 89 of the Committee report. The last line of his answer says: "field laboratory studies at Alberni Inlet have disclosed substantial seasonal reductions in dissolved oxygen." I wonder if I could have it clarified for me whether this seasonal reduction in dissolved oxygen is as a result of the absorption of oxygen by decaying wood matter in the bottom of the inlet or whether it is related to the direct discharge of fluids in the effluent from the mill?

Dr. R. R. LOGIE (*Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Fisheries*): Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this is also discussed on page 170, when Mr. Lucas was discussing it with Mr. Barnett at that time so I will ask him to carry on.

Mr. LUCAS: Is it the same question, Mr. Barnett, that we were discussing on page 170?

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Chairman, I think it has been correctly pointed out that this question, in effect, is answered on page 170. I am sorry. There is just one other question I would like to ask for clarification. In these references to the question of pollution or the lack of pollution or the absence of pollution, am I correct in inferring that this is in relation only to the affect on fish populations, that it is not to be considered there is a lack of pollution in the sense that it is described here, as far as, well shall we say, recreational uses of certain waters are concerned. And, perhaps ancillary to that—

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should confine ourselves to the field of the Department of Fisheries' interests here, Mr. Barnett.

Mr. BARNETT: Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me, I think it is important that people who are concerned should understand in what context statements are made by the Department of Fisheries. I know a great many people who have quarrelled seriously with the fact that there is no pollution, for example, in the Alberni Inlet. In asking this question I feel that I am asking it for purposes of assisting people to understand what the Fisheries Department people mean when they make a statement of this kind. In other words, I do not want to have statements by the Fisheries Department misunderstood as meaning something they do not. I hope you might allow me—

The CHAIRMAN: I think I will allow it. I am not just sure whether the safety of the girls on the beach lies within the problems of this Committee but, if Mr. Lucas can answer this, or Dr. Logie, we will have the answer.

Mr. LOGIE: Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief. Basically, and as a broad generalization, the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries is for the health and welfare of the fish. When the pollution acts on the health of the fish, it is quite clearly our responsibility. There is a parallel responsibility principally the