

*Supply*

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, we would have no objection to having the bill stood and retain its present place.

•(1800)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Does the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) wish to comment on this suggestion?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** If I may, Your Honour. Naturally, I shall not object to that. I am unhappy at what seems to have happened to an agreement that we thought we had, but may I suggest that we order two things, that this bill stand at the top of the list and that the bill regarding Sir John stand as No. 2 so that we can consider them together next time.

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** It is agreed and so ordered. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired. Perhaps the House will permit our going back into committee of the whole before I call it six o'clock. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### SUPPLY

#### APPROPRIATION ACT No. 1, 1973

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-141, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1973—Mr. MacEachen (for Mr. Drury)—Mr. McCleave in the chair.

On clause 2—*Schedule*.

**The Chairman:** Order. It being six o'clock, the committee stands adjourned until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

### AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

**The Deputy Chairman:** When the committee rose it was considering the schedule, vote 20a related to the Department of the Environment. The hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta.

**Mr. Reynolds:** Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that we are talking about the environment tonight because one of the things that has concerned me since I have been in this House is airport expansion. Airports have a great effect on our environment, and one that concerns me most is the Sea Island airport in Richmond which is in my riding.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

Mr. Marchand stated yesterday that only a small number of people were concerned about the expansion of our airport. He said that he did not see why some who wanted to obtain more money for their property used those pretexts in order to get it. I think that Mr. Marchand—

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Order.

**Mr. Reynolds:** —is very wrong when he accuses people in my riding of seeking more money. The people in my riding are seeking an environmental impact study on the relationship of the new airport to the environment. The main thing that is wrong with the way the government is expropriating land is that they expropriate first and do their studies later.

I have asked the hon. Minister of Transport questions regarding the environment and he has stated they are all answered. I should like to put on the record of this House some of the questions on the environment that people of my riding are still asking: (1) noise: (a) did not provide technical data on CNR noise cones; (b) new NEF noise cone reports still unavailable; (2) air pollution: no studies, data to justify statement that airplanes are not a contributory factor; (3) engine test-beds: no studies of effect enlarged airport will have on use, expansion or inconvenience caused by test beds; (4) environment: no studies, research, data on environmental effects of airport on Vancouver, Sturgeon Bank fishing, river pollution due to expected container cargo ports, etc.

Then (5) Burkville: long-range plans for this area absent. Mr. McLoud hinted that there may be long-range plans; (6) decision-making process: no information on process of planning for airport—especially whether or not Mr. Marchand has taken a direct interest in decision-making; (7) diminution of land values: neither guarantees nor information about DOT's responsibility for land values; (8) comparative costs: no information on whether comparative cost studies done—comparison of building new airport versus letting air carriers pay penalties versus cost to community. MOT said a study existed, but was not available to be taken home; (9) no data on zoning restrictions and requirements for parallel runways—these exist but have not been made available.

Then we got to (10) Boundary Bay: no studies on whether reserved area at Boundary Bay could be developed into a freight airport thus diminishing the necessity to enlarge Vancouver; (11) cargo ports: no information on proposed cargo ports, environmental effects, effects on property values of nearby Vancouver, etc; (12) population: no data to show that expected growth of airport use is based on realistic estimate of future population growth in greater Vancouver area; (forecast for needs of airport based only on predictions by airlines. This data not supplied either); (13) air space: no studies have been made of available air space (MOT seems to have sought only verbal opinion of air controllers); (14) taxiways: no plans, data, studies of effects of taxiways especially north of new runway.

Then we have (15) landfill: no studies on environmental impact, cost, source of landfill, etc; (16) sinking runway: no explanation of contention that old runway is sinking and this is the reason for the haste in building a new runway; (17) property use: no data, schedule of when and