

Supply

torial Governments. The transportation of dangerous goods was partially regulated up to this time in more than 20 different statutes. When you have 20 different statutes, it really takes a little work to try to consolidate that effort into one embodying piece of legislation and one embodying group of regulations. That is what has been done. It requires negotiation and co-operation. It requires respect for the jurisdiction of the two levels of Government. That is what we have tried to do.

I do not think there is anyone in this House that has a monopoly on safety. As far as we are concerned, our Government and the actions of individual Members really speak loud and clear. In 1979, as I said earlier, we commissioned the Grange inquiry into the Mississauga incident, which was a major step forward. In 1979 we commissioned the Dubin inquiry into aviation safety. The legislation framework flowing from those recommendations is currently before the House and the committee. We accelerated the transportation of dangerous goods Bill. We did not water it down, as the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) said. There was no watering down. There was an acceleration. As a matter of fact, this was done against the wishes and the desires of the provinces, the industry and specifically the trucking industry. There was a clear understanding by the former Minister of Transport that these regulations would not be promulgated for a year. I can show stacks of correspondence from the respective provincial Governments, the trucking association and so on, recommending that the transportation of dangerous goods regulations not be promulgated in 1985 but rather in 1986. We said that in the interest of public safety and in the interest of transportation safety we must act, which is not to suggest that people should not follow good practices before the regulations are in effect. A good trucker and a good operator is following the rules today.

There are unwritten rules, the rules with respect to containers for the transportation of flammable goods, for instance. Theoretically there is nothing in effect, but practically most operators follow a very strict code. Some operators voluntarily do a good job and others do not. What we are trying to do is to move toward the establishment of a clearly understood, clearly enforceable set of regulations with which everyone can live and which everyone can respect. That is what has been going on.

What is unfortunate about this debate—and it was alluded to by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner)—is the fact that both Parties have seemed more interested in scoring political points by bringing the Ontario election to the floor of the House of Commons than in dealing with the hard issues. It was reflected in the way in which the Hon. Member for Birds Hill—

Mr. Blaikie: Winnipeg-Birds Hill.

Mr. Mazankowski: Excuse me, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie). He tried to explain away the disastrous record of the NDP Government in Manitoba concerning environmental issues. When he was trying to explain

to the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Holtmann) and to rationalize that study, it reminded me somewhat of his own leader claiming victory in the last election while at the same time losing two seats.

Mr. Blaikie: One seat.

Mr. Mazankowski: The fact is that the *Winnipeg Free Press* of March 15 had a headline which read, "Province fails test on environment".

Mr. Keeper: You will lose a lot more than two next time.

Mr. Mazankowski: Probably that Government in Winnipeg with its record on the environment will be turfed right out, as it should be with this kind of record. Let me quote as follows from an article in the *Winnipeg Free Press*:

Manitoba does less than any other Canadian province to protect its environment, says the Canadian Nature Federation.

Look at that double standard, Mr. Speaker. People are trying to lay the whole blame on the Province of Ontario. Here is another headline: "Manitoba score in forestry area lowest in report". Who is number one in this report, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McKenzie: Ontario.

Mr. Mazankowski: Alberta is number one in this report.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Ontario is number two.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: And you know where Manitoba is, Mr. Speaker? Manitoba is number 10 right at the bottom of the heap. That is where that fellow will be right after the next election if he keeps spouting non-substantiated information. He talks in a very sincere way. He is a good performer. I give him full credit.

An Hon. Member: A bit sanctimonious.

Mr. Mazankowski: Sanctimonious a bit, just a bit. That is right. I can tell Hon. Members that most of the Hon. Member's words are hollow. They somewhat express a double standard, particularly when he attempts to lay the total blame on the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Blaikie: He tried to lay it on you.

Mr. Mazankowski: He has been fair. I must say he has been fair with me, but we have to put this whole debate into perspective.

Mr. Keeper: We do not want to be too rough on you.

Mr. Mazankowski: I appreciate that. The Hon. Member said he did not want to be too rough on me, and I appreciate that comment. He knows I am a very kind, considerate, and compassionate person and that I like to do my job.

An Hon. Member: And modest?