

certain amount of noise. We are now dealing with problems of a more sophisticated and complex nature which I believe can be overcome and controlled. As a result, residents within the immediate environment of the noise-emitting agency would be given some protection which they are now denied.

As I speak, and I hope this is not a reflection on my oratorical ability, the level of noise in the House of Commons appears to be rising. Perhaps it is appropriate as I deal with this problem. In any event, I want to draw to the attention of the minister that there have been undertakings in other countries very substantial efforts to control noise pollution. I draw to his attention the maximum noise level standards established by the Swiss anti-noise commission. That federal country seems to have had no serious difficulty in establishing and enforcing substantial anti-noise devices and control in recent years.

The United States Congress set standards in that federal country under the national environmental protection act. They are enforced by the environmental protection agency. They apply to virtually all forms of noise pollution except those surrounding the operation of airports and aircraft. In Great Britain, the British Standards Institution has set out a comprehensive method of rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I think this matter is of most immediate concern in our country. Those standards are elaborately described in a document published by the British Standards Institution which I commend to the Department of the Environment.

I am aware that many problems surrounding the general area of noise pollution and noise control must be solved at the provincial and/or municipal level. However, I believe that federal leadership is required and can be extremely beneficial. I believe that federal leadership, as an example to a wider community, by way of direct action in connection with those enterprises and agencies which fall within federal control, and by way of moral support to a growing number of citizens in Canada who take the environmental issue seriously and who are devoting their attention to this particular and less tangible form of pollution which none the less may have as serious an impact on our over-all environment as any other, would enable those seeking action and redress at any level to enlist the support of an authoritative set of standards in their struggle to protect their neighbourhoods and point to an example set by the federal government in this field.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be overly long tonight, but I think the matter raised by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta deserves some comment in this debate on the environment. I do not mean to go back into a great deal of detail as to what is wrong with regard to the proposed plans for the Vancouver airport. The point I want to make is that we are now reacting after the event.

The Minister of the Environment said that before this project goes ahead, we will need to have a fully fledged environmental study and these matters will all have to be considered. My position is that this shows the basic weakness in our environmental planning, our administrative system and our legislative system. The decision to go ahead with this new runway was made a long time ago,

Supply

before members on the government side or members of the bureaucracy who have to do these things in a detailed way had any idea of what the impact would be on the surrounding municipalities. What is the use of coming along after the event and promising that we will have another study? According to newspaper reports we will be spending \$3 million to \$4 million to expropriate this land. We will have destroyed a neighbourhood in the process.

• (2030)

Now there is to be an environmental study. I say, with respect, that the only reason there is to be an environmental study is that there has been so much commotion raised about the matter in the House of Commons during the last month or so. The point is that we have not yet come up with an answer to the question: How shall we make decisions in a proper sequence? It is not enough to come along after the event, at the tail end of the decision-making process, and run around trying to satisfy some irate voters by giving them a sop and saying there is to be an environmental study. Let me give an example. The *Province* of February 12, writes:

The problem of noise levels is being re-examined this weekend by Minister of Transport's Warren Christopher, a senior planning officer from Ottawa, who will try to produce an updated noise exposure forecast by today in partial answer to objector's demands for information.

Why was this not done a long time ago? When we are talking about the environment, we must remember that unless all hon. members in this House recognize that our decision-making process is all wrong we shall be unable to satisfy the public and we shall be unable to solve environmental problems. We have been talking tonight about Vancouver, but this could apply to any area across this nation.

The last point I want to make is this. All hon. members in this House have an obligation to the electorate of Canada to look as though they are trying to do things properly. The protest which is growing in my city does not come only from a few people who are objecting to the expropriation of their property. Hon. members, especially those on the government side, must realize that protests have come from the municipality of Richmond, the city of Vancouver and the executive committee of the greater Vancouver district. The city of Vancouver passed unanimously a resolution last week asking that this whole process be stopped until they can discuss it; and today a telegram has been sent to the Prime Minister from the executive committee of the greater Vancouver district saying: "Stop it until we know what is going on."

These are not protests coming from silly people who are only concerned about the value of their property. These protests are coming from an entire community. If we go on doing things the way we have been doing them—we must all take some of the blame for this—the faith of the ordinary person in the validity of our decision-making will become less and less. So it behoves us all, especially members on the government side, to remember what the consequences are likely to be, because we have an obligation to show the electorate that we can make decisions in a way that makes sense to the people who have sent us here.