

to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall)—Regional Economic Development—(a) Nova Scotia—Cape Breton coal resources. (b) Federal funding; the Hon. Member for Hamilton East (Ms. Copps)—Social Security—(a) Child tax credit—Treatment in Newfoundland. (b) Request for legislation; the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier)—Public Service—(a) Federal unions—Government position. (b) Pension negotiations.

* * *

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) on a point of order.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Government House Leader (Mr. Hnatyshyn) who has just mentioned—I wonder if he could come back in this House—that Thursday will again be an allotted day. I should like to know whether the Government has no bill nor motion to introduce . . . Quebecers and Canadians are unemployed. I think that the Government is really tired after only eight months in office.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): The Hon. Member for Montreal-Sainte-Marie (Mr. Malépart) knows that it is not a point of order.

We will resume the debate. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg-Fort Garry):

That this House condemns the Government for undermining the will of Parliament and the Legislatures by failing to use industrial, decentralization, agricultural, transportation and equalization policies as well as its Crown Corporations to further economic development in all communities across Canada.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the Hon. Member who just spoke is willing to give up one of his Opposition days we would be very happy to bring forward legislation. I think it is quite obvious that the Opposition is running out of subjects, judging by the motion that has been presented here today. This motion has to be the weakest and perhaps the most incoherent motion that I have ever seen presented in the House of Commons. One wonders what goes on in the mind of the Hon. Member who

Supply

presented this motion, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy).

Perhaps the Ottawa *Citizen* had it figured it right in its article on May 3, when it called him "Spaced Out Lloyd". The article said that as soon as he sees space he sees stars and starts attacking. Today we are dealing with an omnibus motion that does not zero in on any particular policy, issue or concern in the country. Rather, it is a grab bag, scatter gun approach to give all members opposite a chance to rant and rave and whine while presenting nothing in terms of a constructive or positive nature.

I also noticed that this motion condemns the Government for its failure to utilize Crown corporations to further economic development. Again, that is another matter of inconsistency. The Hon. Member who sponsored this motion, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry, tells us that we must sell our Crown corporations. The headline in the Montreal *Gazette* says, " 'Tories must sell Air Canada' Axworthy says". Again, that is an example of the inconsistency.

The other day he challenged the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board to assure the House that we would ship 700,000 tonnes of grain through the Port of Churchill. He failed to remind the House in his question that during his tenure as Minister of Transport his government shipped the lowest amount of grain—437,000 tonnes—through Churchill in the last five years. The fact that the member is losing credibility is a reflection upon the credibility of the Opposition Party.

It is also very interesting to note that, as I understand, the Hon. Member who presented the motion made his speech and left the House. At least we have three of those Members in the House today. The last time there was an Opposition motion, there was one of them here most of the time, and once in a while there were two.

● (1620)

Mr. Dingwall: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member should know very well that he should not try to impute motives with regard to those Members of Parliament who may or may not be in the Chamber. For the record, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member to whom he refers is at a committee meeting. I think it is quite unfair and quite inappropriate for the Hon. Minister to make slurs with regard to attendance in the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I think the point made by the Hon. Member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. Dingwall) is well taken. Without even going that far, the Minister or any Member imputing motives, they should not refer to the fact that a Member is present or otherwise in the House. It is not necessary to speak of motives.

Mr. Mazankowski: It was not my intention to impute motives, Mr. Speaker, it was just to state the facts.

Mr. Dingwall: Withdraw.