

Suggested Lack of Urban Policy

of the nation's air pollution, 30 per cent being attributable to industry. Most people in Canada are becoming concerned about the fumes and the thick smoke and smog shrouding our cities. What we do not too often realize is that between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of air pollution consists of largely invisible and odourless yet potentially deadly gases. The car is a major culprit in air pollution. Some steps towards easing this problem have been taken in the United States, although very belatedly. Little or nothing has been done in this country.

I think it is important, for example, that the shortly-to-be proclaimed 29 motor vehicle safety standards should include realistic anti-pollution regulations with regard to motor vehicles. This ought to be an immediate step that we should take. However, we probably ought to go much farther than that if we are to cope with the causes of this disease-spreader. For example, should we stop building more highways between municipalities and try to revive our passenger train services? Should we spend our transportation funds in the cities for better public transportation, instead of for super highways right up to the cities which leave to the cities the problem of building approach and service roads, in that way forcing them to spend the money they might have spent on public transportation? I also believe that industry is a culprit in air pollution. I believe that before an industrial site is established, the industry concerned should be required to provide evidence that it will not contribute to air, water or sound pollution.

May I now say a word about sound pollution. As I said, statistics in the United States show that motor vehicles are responsible for 60 per cent of that nation's air pollution, while industry contributes another 30 per cent. Statistics in that country also show that motor vehicles are responsible for a great deal of the sound pollution which affects the residents of urban centres. This is true of this country also. I think statistics indicate that noise from motor vehicles, drills and other sources in the city contributes to a great extent to one of the most prevalent non-fatal disease factors in North America. With the tensions that have been built up from constant noise in our urban areas, I find it rather curious that we do not have an even higher incidence of crime than we have at present.

A loudness of 80 decibels is about as high a noise level as most people can stand without being uncomfortable. Noise levels higher than

that produce physiological effects. Also, exposure to more than 100 decibels may cause permanent impairment of one's hearing. One suffers physical pain at a level of 140 decibels and more. I will give some examples of noise levels. Ordinary conversation is at about 60 decibels. A cocktail party produces about 90 decibels, a riveting-gun about 130 decibels, and a jet aircraft at close range, 180 decibels.

The bill I have sponsored with regard to sound pollution aims at making a modest start toward the solution of the problem. It has been brought forward with that view in mind rather than with the thought that it will effect any cure of the major problems of sound pollution. It would provide that any business concern dealing with the federal government must not produce within its establishment sound levels of over 80 decibels. I think if this bill were adopted we would set an example to private and provincially-controlled industry across the country and the federal government would give leadership in the fight against noise pollution.

As our urban areas grow, they produce more and more pollution. Our urban regions contain millions of people who live, work, plan and act together. I feel that the federal government ought to do a great deal more than it has done in giving leadership in the setting of standards relating to the control of water, air and noise pollution to help the people in those regions. Whether we like it or not, Canada's growing problems in its growing urban areas mean that there is a need for better planning to protect the public against the forms of pollution I have outlined. We must protect the people against the effects of pollution. My party has always felt this way. I therefore urge the government to do more than it has done thus far in combating these problems.

● (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, for the most part this has been a constructive and useful debate. Most of the speeches have contained proposals to improve the condition and the status of the urban centres of Canada. Some speakers have stated the obvious—the need for Canada to act before an urban crisis of overpowering proportions develops. In their ocean of words other speakers have not indicated an island or even a lonely atoll of hope. They have condemned the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras), in charge of housing, quite irresponsibly and without basis. Even these mem-