

be laid against the companies at that time. However, in 1973, the director filed notice before the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission that he would initiate an inquiry under section 47 of the Combines Investigation Act, which allowed him to investigate, without necessarily laying charges, the results of the interrelationship between these two companies.

In December of 1976 a summary of the material which had been gathered was submitted by the director to the RTPC pursuant to section 47. The statement of material, or the "Green Book," as it is called, is entitled: "The Effects of Vertical Integration on the Telecommunications Equipment Industry in Canada". The director concluded in the statement of material that the existing vertical integration between Bell and Northern Telecom, then called Northern Electric, would appear to be contrary to the public interest and indeed ultimately against the interest of both Bell Canada and Northern Telecom.

An initial hearing on this matter was held in Ottawa in June of 1977. Since that time the RTPC has heard submissions from a number of interested parties. As of today's date, the RTPC has held 223 days of hearings. These hearings were held in a number of major cities across Canada. The commission has also heard evidence from various manufacturers, distributors, telephone companies and expert witnesses called by the director of investigation and research. As well, many firms and individuals have appeared on their own behalf to present evidence.

In his appearances before the RTPC, the director has taken the position that Bell Canada should be required to divest its interest in Northern Telecom. The report of the RTPC on this matter is expected at the end of this year.

I hope the foregoing will serve to indicate that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has been active in supporting the consumer interest in this matter.

● (2210)

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS—ALICE ARM, B.C.—GRANT OF DUMPING PERMIT TO AMAX—REQUEST FOR INQUIRY INTO CIRCUMSTANCES

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question tonight arises from a question I raised on January 16, 1981 with the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen). I hope whoever responds for him tonight, since he is not in the chamber, will take care to listen to what I have to say and respond in relation to that rather than simply respond with what is on a piece of paper which happens to be in his or her hands.

The issue of Amax at Alice Arm is viewed seriously by Canadians from coast to coast. It is something which has been raised many times in this House. I would like to quote from answers which have been given to me by a variety of ministers in the past months, which indicate some of the serious reservations I have in terms of how the government is dealing with this serious issue.

*Adjournment Debate*

On Tuesday, July 8, 1980, I raised this issue. The following is part of the answer I received from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Le Blanc):

We will obviously review this whole issue and come back to the hon. member when we have more information.

I have received nothing in relation to that question from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Also on July 8, 1980, I put a question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). He said:

If the hon. member would like to have an answer, maybe I could take his question as notice.

I have had absolutely no answer in relation to that since July of 1980.

On October 21, 1980, I asked a question of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. I quote from his answer:

I may have a fuller answer for the hon. member early next week.

Since October 21, 1980, I have had no further answer from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Also on October 21, 1980, I asked a question of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro). I quote from his answer:

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.

To this date there has been absolutely nothing in relation to that minister's response.

I also put a question to the Prime Minister on October 21, 1980. He replied, in part:

—we asked for a review—

To this date there has been no review and no response from the Prime Minister.

On October 27, 1980, I debated this issue at some length, with no response from anyone on the government side.

On October 31, 1980, I raised a question of privilege, in response to which the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said:

In this case, my review of the situation leads me to think that this was a matter of what was on balance, the best judgment. Until I have been given further information I think that would still be my position.

Since that point in time I am unaware of any further information the minister has had. He certainly has not provided me with anything in writing.

On November 13, 1980, I rose under the provisions of Standing Order 43. My motion was turned down by the Liberals. It was a call by the five main churches of Canada requesting a full public inquiry. As I said, the motion was turned down. Many of those churches have not had a response from the Prime Minister or from the minister responsible.

On January 16, 1981, I put a question to the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. That is what causes me to stay tonight. In answer to my question he said:

Madam Speaker, I have no knowledge of that, and I will make inquiries.