

*Government Orders*

The possibilities also exist of the development of land transport, particularly fast rail transport between Quebec City and the Windsor corridor. Again, the government has shown no initiative, no progress in exploring the two proposals that the private sector has come forward with to develop that fast rail service, patterned in part upon the highly successful rail services in Europe and in Japan.

This would alleviate many of the pressures on Pearson International Airport but we have had no indication from the government that that initiative, that possibility, can be given a fast-track treatment and we have no assurance to offer to the people living around Pearson International Airport that the rail facilities will be so developed as to lessen some of the pressure on Canada's major airport.

With regard to the situation at Pearson International Airport today, the noise problems are the paramount environmental question but there are other problems which I want to turn to in just a moment.

With regard to noise abatement, the report which the Liberal Party brought forward is quite clear about the need for more effective monitoring of noise pollution at Pearson airport. As I said at the beginning of my brief statement, we welcome the very modest step that was offered today in the way of fining those who systematically violate the existing noise regulations.

The fact remains that those regulations are not in themselves adequate to ensure that the people of the surrounding communities, whether in Malton or in Mississauga or in Etobicoke, have a healthy and enjoyable environment.

• (1530)

I would salute my colleagues from Mississauga East and from York West along with the member for York South—Weston for the leadership that they too have provided in attempting to convince the government of the necessity for pursuing more actively and energetically noise abatement procedures at the airport. In the bill before us only is there the provision for increased fines. Welcome though that may be, it certainly does not address the question, for example, of night flying, a problem that is becoming increasingly acute at the airport where services are now offered on a regular or scheduled basis after midnight and before 6.30 a.m. or 7

a.m., with an impact on the residents that you can well imagine.

The fact is that a number of the schools and public buildings as well as individual citizens are deeply affected by the constant noise of the airport. There are health problems. And, of course, there are certainly property value problems which are pervasive throughout the area.

I would suggest that steps should be taken, even at this late date, to look again at the installation not only of additional monitoring equipment but additional sound barriers and more stringent restrictions on night flights, on full power take-offs and on engine testing at the airport, especially during what should be the quiet hours from midnight until 7 a.m.

Despite those and a variety of other recommendations offered by the Official Opposition, the government has not brought forward any substantial response. It has not indicated the directions of its thinking other than to propose that there be three additional runways built at Pearson airport.

Quite obviously the traffic numbers which the government has brought forward to justify the expansion of Pearson airport by the construction of three additional runways ignores completely the possibilities offered by the greater utilization of the neighbouring airports which, as I have already suggested, might well be expanded and tied in together to a total network of airports for the metro Toronto region.

The impact of the airport, not only in terms of noise but in terms of the adverse effect it can have on ground water from the pollution caused by dumped fuel or by de-icing solutions, has not been adequately addressed.

The impact on wildlife remains a very real problem for all those who are concerned about the adverse impact of the airport on the natural environment. Again, we have had no indication of leadership from the government in those issues despite the reassurances of a succession of transport ministers. I believe there have been something like six in the past few years.

The growth at the airport in traffic has not been matched by any real effort to address the questions raised by the opposition and indeed by my colleague from Dartmouth who has done some notable work regarding the expansion of rail services in Canada and the direction of public funds to that expansion as one