

*Oral Questions*

Canada's Premiers unanimously passed a resolution saying that commercial viability of transportation links must be balanced with regional economic development objectives in order that the potential of each region can be realized. The Minister of Transport ignored the specific request of the Canadian Premiers that this principle be included in the legislation that he tabled yesterday. They wanted something beyond a mere recognition that transportation is important to regional development, and that transportation policy should recognize the need to combat regional disparity. It is not there. Why?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member took time to read the Bill he would see that in the preamble, Clause 3, it is clearly stated that transportation is recognized as a tool for economic development. That has never been stated in previous transportation legislation. It is part and parcel of the agreement that was signed by all the provinces and the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion approximately a year ago. It forms a very integral and vital part of the Government's approach to regional economic expansion.

## REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister would not want to mislead the House inadvertently by suggesting that the Premiers endorsed this tepid statement of fact. Will the Minister insert a clause in that Bill that will ensure that the regional disparity programs of other federal Departments and provincial Governments will not be destroyed because of the deregulation approach that is being taken, which simply has a market-place philosophy rather than a philosophy that recognizes the need to combat regional disparity?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, this transportation Bill is the best news for regional economic expansion this country has ever seen.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Tobin:** That is not true and you know it.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Before the Hon. Member inadvertently misleads the House, perhaps he should have attended the technical briefing which we sponsored for the opposition Parties yesterday, which they refused to attend. Maybe they would understand the Bill a little better if they had attended that meeting.

\* \* \*

## CANADA POST CORPORATION

## MAIL DELIVERY IN NEW SUBDIVISIONS

**Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Canada

Post. The Parliamentary Secretary has said that Canadians waiting for home delivery in new subdivisions can forget it. Instead of developing policy at the Post Office by slips of the tongue, will the Minister ask Canadians whether they support his plans to treat some Canadians as second-class citizens, or whether they want him to re-examine whether rapid debt reduction at the Post Office is realistic?

**Hon. Michel Côté (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Canada Post):** Mr. Speaker, I have answered that question many times. We are looking at many alternatives in the Post Office. We will introduce a corporate plan soon and we will give all the details then.

## REQUEST FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

**Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister agree with the Prime Minister when he said in 1984:

The Progressive Conservative Party feels that Canada Post's current program of rapid debt reduction is unrealistic, and is the underlying cause of problems with regard to—declining postal service—

Will the Minister personally ask Canadians whether they want to be treated fairly or want to have rapid debt reduction at the Post Office? If he does that, does he not think that the message will get through to his cabinet colleagues?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Michel Côté (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Canada Post):** Mr. Speaker, I can say yes to both questions.

**Mr. Keeper:** Then do something.

\* \* \*

● (1140)

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

## RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEW BRUNSWICK FOREST FIRE

**Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East):** Mr. Speaker, my question this morning is directed to the Associate Minister of National Defence and involves a promise made by the Minister to residents of Upper Gagetown, in New Brunswick, who suffered material, financial, and emotional loss because of the disastrous fires that occurred earlier this spring. In view of the Hon. Minister's statement that quick and generous compensation from the Government would take place, could he tell the House if there has been any progress whatsoever, in this respect, to report to the residents prior to the summer recess?

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Associate Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, a board of inquiry has indeed established that the Department of National Defence was responsible for starting the fire on the range at Camp Gagetown. I have sought and received Treasury Board approval for some of