

mental problems. He will also know that Inco, a non-ferrous smelter, is emitting approximately 2,000 metric tonnes of sulphur dioxide into the air each day. He will also be aware of the task force report which identified the financial and ultimate employment problems faced by Inco and other smelters when trying to come to grips with this emission problem.

I would like to ask the Minister if he has committed himself to the course of action that was recommended by the task force report and, if so, if there are solutions. What is he intending to do on behalf of the federal Liberal Government to control emissions in Canada today so that the lakes and the other areas of the environment that are affected by those emissions will not be affected in the five to 10-year intervening period before the ultimate solutions, which will depend upon research, will be determined?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that question is that, of course, I am committed, and we are all committed, to those reductions.

To deal with the Hon. Member's question in detail would take a fairly long answer. However, I would like to assure the Hon. Member, who shares this concern with all of us, that the report of the task force which dealt with non-ferrous industries recommends that the modernization of the non-ferrous industries proceed, with the idea of pollution reduction in mind. Thus, at the same time as those industries proceed with modernization, they will include in their plans an emission reduction program. The study is the first step in that direction. As well, it sets out a program for an industry by industry approach. As new technology is developed, the implementation of the reductions will take place.

I would invite the Hon. Member to look at the task force report as being the first step in the right direction. As well, there will be a working group of federal-provincial Ministers which will meet regularly in the months and years ahead to see to it that this program is put into place. I look forward to working with that group.

EFFECT ON NEW YORK STATE

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. The Minister will know that I and my Party have an absolute commitment to the research and development of the efficient commercial operations that are important to this industry in the long term. That, however, is a long-term solution. The Minister is talking about a delay of five to 10 years before there will be an actual reduction of emissions from those important sources.

I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware that 30 per cent of the acid rain falling on the State of New York actually comes from Canada, while only 10 per cent of it comes from the industries and the people of the State of New York. So what kind of an argument do we have, and what kind of agreement can we reach with the United States? What kind of important agreement can we reach with the United States,

which must be necessary in order to control our own North American environment if we, in fact, are giving to some States more acid rain than they are giving to themselves?

● (1430)

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am faced here with two questions and I will try to answer them as quickly as I can. First of all, there is no delay implied in the study which was just published. As the Hon. Member knows, we have already in place a planned reduction of 25 per cent by the year 1990. Inco has been ordered to cut. Ontario Hydro has been ordered to cut 43 per cent by the year 1990. It has been indicated to Noranda by the Quebec Government that it should cut 40 per cent by the year 1990. However, an order by the Quebec Legislature has not yet been passed. I raised this matter with my provincial counterpart this morning.

As to the situation in New York, Mr. Speaker, of course emissions are exported on Canada's part, but there is also a phenomenal amount of tonnage which comes across our border into Canada from the south. This is why we have tried to convince the Americans to come on board, and we will continue to do so, because we have made this commitment to cut emissions by 50 per cent by 1994. We know that we need the co-operation of the Americans to achieve a safe level of emission. We must get the co-operation of an administration in Washington which prefers to carry out scientific research without really taking on the responsibility it has to face, namely, cutting emissions, as we are already doing in Canada by ordering a 25 per cent cut in emissions by the year 1990.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair will attempt to recognize supplementaries later, in fairness to the parties involved. The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

* * *

FINANCE

EFFECT OF CORPORATE TAX STRUCTURE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister who, on Friday, was attempting to explain the Government's inaction regarding the tragic unemployment level still being faced by Canadians.

The Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues have indicated, time and time again, that it is the private sector they look to in terms of getting Canadians back to work. Yet many of us feel that the present tax policy, which intends to encourage the expansion of businesses, tends to favour almost exclusively the large corporate sector which, if there is expansion, tends to be capital intensive as opposed to labour intensive. Is that the Prime Minister's observation as well? If it is, why would he continue with this type of tax policy which favours the large corporate sector with its capital intensive development, at the expense of small businesses or labour intensive development?