

if expropriated or purchased property will be used; (18) public annoyance: no data on how MOT acquires negative information on public annoyance, whether current complaint procedures are adequate and represent actual annoyance; (19) land purchase: no clear explanation of policies used to buy up land, whether it was equitable or not.

Mr. Chairman, these are questions put to the hearing in Vancouver right now, and we still do not have any answers. The Minister of Transport says there have been environmental impact studies done, yet his department fails to produce them at the hearings and that is why we have sought to have them halted. There seems to be a conflict here, because the Minister of the Environment said last Friday night in Vancouver, as reported in the *Province* of Saturday, February 10:

Environment minister Jack Davis said Friday night the ministry of transport will not expand Vancouver airport without a full environmental study, including public hearings.

A further quote from the Minister of the Environment reads:

I think we've got at least 18 months to do this study.

If in fact, Mr. Chairman, the study has not been done, why are we expropriating the land of people in that area? We should give them a chance. The hearings require that these people be told everything that is going to happen so that they have a proper reason to object. They have not a proper reason to object now, because they do not have these answers in their hands.

For the Minister of Transport to state a few people are seeking more money for their property is scandalous, and I think they deserve an apology. The mayor of Vancouver is concerned about it and his council has passed a resolution seeking that the government delay the hearings. The greater Vancouver regional board has asked that the hearings be delayed until the environmental studies are complete.

The people of that area would like to go along with this government. They agree there is an airport needed. A year ago, in 1972, they came to an agreement with the director of the property and commercial law section of DOT on how the property would be disposed of. The government has not seen fit to bring that agreement before this House. It would have provided an agreeable solution to the problem. My last point in talking about the airport is that it is not a local problem. Members of our party and of the NDP have been raising it here since January. It is a national issue.

In the province of Quebec a priest, the Reverend Georges Duquet, has demanded a probe into the airport at Ste. Scholastique. Yet all we hear is that everything is going all right in that area. The Reverend Duquet challenged the Quebec department of justice to investigate the expropriation of thousands of acres of land for the Mirabel international airport. I read from the press report.

• (2010)

At a press conference, the fiery parish priest charged that "many hands were greased" with expropriation funds and urged the justice department to look into the takeover of 93,000 acres in the Mirabel region.

Supply

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I am having difficulty relating the hon. member's remarks to the matter before the committee. I know he has been referring to the environmental situation relating to the setting up of an airport, but I hope he will keep to the subject matter before the committee and not discuss the process of establishing airports.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Chairman, I will try to abide by your suggestion, but I feel that when we talk about expropriations we are dealing with the environment, and the people of my area are as concerned about this question as Father Duquet is about Ste. Scholastique.

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): You cannot compare the two.

Mr. Reynolds: The hon. member for St. Boniface says you cannot compare them. The people of both areas are concerned about the environmental impact and about the treatment they are receiving at the hands of this government in the matter of expropriations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Reynolds: I have the greatest respect for the Minister of Transport and for the hon. member for St. Boniface. They have discussed this issue with us but still have not solved the problem. I wish one of them would go to my area and find out what is happening. The people of my area are concerned about the environment. I am speaking of the people of Sea Island, the people of Vancouver and the people of British Columbia. They want action. I hope that tonight's discussion will result in the Minister of Transport going to the area soon and finding out for himself the problem facing the people of British Columbia.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond asked several important questions. He is concerned about the preparation of environmental impact statements before the bulldozers move in. I think this is essential; it is basic to the federal government's position on environmental policy. It is important, however, to separate two very distinct happenings on Sea Island. One is the removal of a certain number of old homes, probably 50, by expropriation, and the other, at a later date, the expansion of the international airport there.

The expansion of the airport will be a sizeable undertaking and it will have a substantial impact on the immediate surroundings. The environmental consequences could be serious if the airport is not properly planned. But if we deal with one thing at a time, namely, the expropriation of homes and the removal of private residents from that island, the environmental impact of removing those homes will be zero, or positive. That, obviously, is good.

When we come to the expansion of the airport which will begin, say, in 18 months' time, we will need prior to that date a published environmental impact statement. I hope it can be prepared within 12 months; that is the deadline the task force is working to. It must gather all the information available to date. After the publication of that information we must hold hearings. I would hope at the same time that intervenors, be they municipalities, the