

notwithstanding questions from the opposition today, to stress the positive in the Post Office. Going back to the bargaining table and inviting CUPW back to the bargaining table, so that indeed we can have a collective agreement signed before June 30, is what we are trying to do. Judging from the very negative questions that have been directed to me by the opposition, I do not believe they are being very helpful at all.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

REASON FOR REFUSAL TO TABLE MANAGEMENT STUDIES OR  
HOLD INQUIRY INTO OPERATIONS

**Mr. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** The matter of having the mail delivered on time or at all may not be serious to the Postmaster General, but it is serious to a number of Canadians who might be looking forward to receiving pension cheques and to a number of Canadian small businesses which might be looking forward to having their businesses carry on. Would the Postmaster General, who claims he is doing the best he can do—we all know the results of that—tell us why he refuses to publish the studies that have been made into the Post Office, and will he tell us why he refuses to consider seriously the proposal to have a joint parliamentary inquiry into the operations of an agency of the government of Canada which, despite his defenses in the House of Commons, obviously to every Canadian who tries to get his or her mail is not working today?

**Hon. J.-J. Blais (Postmaster General):** Very simply because negotiations with a very combative union that I have described as exercising nineteenth century union tactics, are very difficult at the best of times, and we can only complete successful negotiations when there is no undue publicity. What the hon. gentleman is suggesting is completely counterproductive to achieving that particular end.

**Some hon. Members:** Why?

**An hon. Member:** Let us have Finkelman's legislation at least.

\* \* \*

INFORMATION

ALLEGED INTIMIDATION OF NEWS MEDIA BY GOVERNMENT—  
ATTEMPT BY TRANSPORT MINISTER TO SUPPRESS PUBLICATION  
OF "CANADIAN"

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Will the government take steps to discontinue its policy of intimidation against the news media so that the public can receive facts and information which it refuses to disclose and, in particular, will the government dissociate itself from the alleged action of the Minister of Transport in suppressing or attempting to suppress the publication in Saskatchewan of the weekend magazine *Canadian*?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Acting Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, on the first point, obviously there is no such policy of intimidation either on the part of the government or the

Oral Questions

opposition. If there were such, it is obviously very unsuccessful and should be abandoned.

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

**Mr. MacEachen:** On the second part of the question, I must say that I have only heard fragments of information that might provide the basis for an answer to the hon. member's question, and with that fragmentary information I hesitate to provide any answer at all. I hope that tomorrow I may be able to answer it in more detail, or the Minister of Transport may be present.

**Mr. Baldwin:** May I try, with some success I hope, to increase the minister's knowledge? Will the government cooperate in holding an inquiry by a committee of the House or under the Inquiries Act into this question of intimidation as illustrated by statements of the Prime Minister and others in respect of CBC and the broadcasting media and, most important, the alleged action by the Minister of Transport to prevent publication of the *Canadian* magazine in Saskatchewan, and the statement by the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont, which are plainly indicative of improper pressure by the government on the news media?

\* \* \*

TRANSPORT

REQUEST FOR INQUIRY INTO ALLEGATION SINKING OF  
"WILLIAM CARSON" CAUSED BY POOR DEPLOYMENT OF  
ICEBREAKERS

**Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. It is in connection with the sinking of the ferry *William Carson* last Thursday. Is the Acting Prime Minister aware of the statement of the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, that the sinking would have been avoided had there been a proper deployment of icebreakers off Newfoundland and Labrador, that the present deployment is scandalous and the sinking of the *William Carson* a prime example of this deficiency? Does the Acting Prime Minister agree with these comments of the parliamentary secretary, and if he does not will he have an immediate investigation carried out and a report made on icebreaker deployment and its relationship to the sinking of the *William Carson*, and will he have the results of this inquiry made public as soon as possible?

**Hon. Ron Basford (Acting Minister of Transport):** Without commenting on those reports which I have not seen, as acting Minister of Transport I will inform the hon. member that an investigation by the Department of Transport is continuing and of course the matter will be investigated.

**Mr. Crosbie:** The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue, who is part of the ministry, has said that there is only one icebreaker for Newfoundland and Labrador and that the other is on lease, that four or five icebreakers are