

Transportation

referred in this motion to the actions of the minister in needlessly causing tension at the Cornwall training centre where, through his inappropriate choice of words, he cast reflection upon and unjustly defamed some of the instructors who are doing a very difficult job at the institute.

We could have referred to the government's failure to enunciate a fair and comprehensive regional third level air carrier policy in this country. We have had inconsistent and ad hoc measures and policies which were clearly demonstrated in the Nordair fiasco, which company is nationalized, or privatized, and we do not know what will be the eventual outcome. Surely in an area as important as regional air carriers in this country, a policy must be enunciated so that the industry may develop and grow in an orderly fashion. Surely we need a definitive policy in order to establish the necessary infrastructures such as airports, navigational aids and other related items. There has been no policy, however, and there has been no planning.

In this motion we could have singled out any one of a dozen examples of waste, incompetence and mismanagement, as cited in the recent Auditor General's report, such as cost overruns at the Calgary airport, cost overruns at the transport training centre, cost overruns on R class icebreakers, Mirabel and Pickering; and, of course, we could have selected that new little scheme which was produced in the estimates this year, the new airport revolving fund scheme which will have the effect of hiding the white elephants. The department is clearly a mess, Mr. Speaker. Anyone reading the Auditor General's report would not be mistaken in coming to that conclusion.

We could have put the legislative record of this minister before the House. Since he assumed the portfolio of transport he has only piloted two substantive legislative measures through this institution, the Air Canada reorganizational bill and the CN bill. There were some amendments to the maritime code but most of the work was done before he assumed the portfolio.

Just the other day in the House the minister complained that he could not get any legislation through. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) learned the meaning of the words co-operation and consultation, I am sure it would be a different story.

We offered to refer the subject matter of Bill C-20 concerning amendments to the National Transportation Act to the committee for study, but we have to ask ourselves why that committee has not been working. It has not considered any major business since last June. Indeed, it is probably the most underworked and underutilized committee of this House. The minister suggested the other day that the Tories will not allow any legislation through because they want to travel. That is absolutely untrue. I suggest to you, sir, when he says that, that he is treading on the borerline of perpetrating a deliberate falsehood.

Mr. Railton: Be careful there.

Mr. Mazankowski: I am always careful. We detect a certain amount of friction between the minister and the chairman of

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

that committee, the hon. member for LaSalle-Émard-Cote Saint Paul (Mr. Campbell). We know that the minister wanted the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Goodale) to be chairman.

An hon. Member: Who is he?

Mr. Mazankowski: He is the pampered pet. The minister thinks he needs a little higher profile because he is in trouble out there.

An hon. Member: They are both in trouble.

Mr. Mazankowski: The hon. member for Assiniboia came to the organizational meeting but he saw the troops were solidly lined up against him. He did not get his lollypop and had to resort to sitting on the sidelines. The committee came out solidly for the present chairman. We think he has been doing a good job. He has been performing his duties in an objective way, he has been independent and, above all, he has been fair.

I was speaking about the inaction of the committee, Mr. Speaker. This goes back to the relationship between the minister and the chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications with whom the minister seems to have some sort of axe to grind. I see the parliamentary secretary shaking his head in the negative. He knows there was a certain amount of campaigning before this election took place.

What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a clear demonstration of the failure of the minister to use the resources of the committee. He has failed to use the resources of this House and the members of this House. He has failed to co-operate and use the expertise that exists in the various sectors of transportation in this country.

I am glad that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Horner) is in the House, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure he will agree with what I have to say. When it comes to the provinces, as far as co-operation is concerned, the minister's duty to provide leadership in the area of co-ordinating national policy and in the area of defining national goals and objectives has been totally abrogated.

The minister of transport for the province of Alberta has been attempting to work with the federal government to seek redress in the area of freight groupings and better rates on processed goods, but he absolutely gave up on the federal minister. He dealt directly with the railways and he got an agreement. They signed a railway pact which would achieve those objectives. The leadership did not come from this minister or this government; they had to go it alone.

Another example is the attitude of the minister with regard to the emergency grain summit which he fought tooth and nail. He went to the first ministers' conference and was embarrassed when the premier of Manitoba called for an emergency summit. He was immediately supported by the other western premiers and was shamed into attending. It was a very good meeting. I know the minister was really surprised. When I asked a question in the House in this regard, he