

*Pollution Control*

understood the scope of the hon. member's question, I believe those matters which he described would fall within its consideration.

Perhaps I could check *Hansard* to see if I misled the member. I am not trying to do so deliberately, but I am not quite sure I caught all of the aspects of the question he presented to me.

**Mr. Anguish:** Madam Speaker, I should like to put that in the way of a supplementary question. Basically I was asking if it was within the scope of the task force to look at preventative means rather than emission control.

**Mr. Roberts:** Preventative means of what? We are looking at the prevention of the levels of emission which are now taking place. That is why I am not sure I understand exactly the distinction the hon. member is making between preventative means and emission control.

**Mr. Anguish:** The question I should like to ask of the Minister of the Environment is if he is aware that there is a process now for scrubbing coal which removes the potential harm of sulphur dioxide being given off and as a byproduct produces fertilizer? If he is aware of that, will it be within the scope of the task force to study such processes?

**Mr. Roberts:** Yes, I am aware of that. I am not sure whether the hon. member is referring to thermal generation or specifically to the Inco situation.

**Mr. Anguish:** I am referring to the problem of acid rain.

**Mr. Roberts:** If the hon. member is referring to acid rain, yes, we are aware of those problems. As I understand it, there are at least two techniques which appear to be practicable in relation to the Inco situation. But I think the problem he is raising in relation to washed coal, for instance, is something which is more directly related to the oil and gas conversion plans which President Carter has presented to Congress. We are looking at all ranges of possible techniques, but there are two pre-eminently which are under consideration in relation to Inco.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Madam Speaker, several days ago, as reported in *The Globe and Mail*, the minister of the environment for Ontario, Mr. Parrott, was quoted as saying that while he welcomed the interest of the federal government on the question of acid rain, and particularly the problems in Sudbury as a result of the Inco operation, he made it quite clear that the decisions as to what would be done and when would be made by his government and not by the federal government.

I should like to ask the minister two questions. First, what authority will this joint task force have; and second, is the minister aware of the fact—and I do not have the report here—that in that report the Ontario minister of the environment set back by several years the date at which Inco would be required to really clean up the pollution it is creating? Has he

agreed to a further delay on the part of Inco to getting rid of the pollution it is creating?

**Mr. Roberts:** Madam Speaker, I will reply in a twofold way. The present legislative base for action is in the hands of the province of Ontario. It is quite true, as the hon. Mr. Parrott has described, that the control order is within his authority and that it is his decision as to the issuance of that control order. Our participation at the federal level has been in the studies and the research which we believe have been very helpful to the government of Ontario in deciding to move at this point.

Our continuing role will be in studies with the province of Ontario to try to ensure that we have a sufficiently large knowledge base to be accurate as to what kind of control is possible and at what pace it should be brought forward.

The control order Mr. Parrott issued today caps the Inco emissions at the present level, which is far below the permissible levels of emission, with a provision for further lowering those levels of emission within the next two years. The third phase is the one to which our studies will be particularly directed.

I hope the hon. member understands that the order is within the legislative base of the province of Ontario, but that the province of Ontario and the Government of Canada have been working closely in a co-operative way to try to ensure that the steps taken by Mr. Parrott are taken as promptly and as efficaciously as possible.

**Mr. Orlikow:** If I understood the minister correctly, he said that the amount of emission now from the operations of Inco is less than the limit, but I think the minister will agree that they are far too high. Unless they are pressed to get on with the job of moving closer to the time when there will be virtually no pollution, I do not know how the minister can go down to the United States and put any real pressure on the United States to get their polluters to take the kind of action which is required, because just as our pollution moves over their land, their pollution moves over our land. Unless we can show that we are really putting the pressure on corporations polluting water, air and land, I do not know how we can expect the United States to do better than it has done, and they have not done very well up to now.

**Mr. Roberts:** Perhaps I have not communicated sufficiently the point I was making. The capping at the present stage is followed by a subsequent and rather immediate stage which involves a considerable reduction in the levels. As I have said publicly, my very strong belief from the information we have is that within four or five years the emission can be reduced by 50 per cent to 60 per cent. I can assure the hon. member, as a result of the conversations I have had with United States officials, that the steps we have taken with Inco will not only be welcome but I think will lead to considerable pressure for a more responsive action on their part, not only in relation to possible future problems with the oil conversion program, but also in dealing with the present problem of what we consider to