

office employees, I am wearing one of their boycott buttons. I referred to these earlier this week in the House. I want to assure the minister that a boycott of the postal code by postal employees is in progress. My question is this: Is the minister now prepared to take steps to overcome the grievances of postal workers in this respect, perhaps by suggesting some alteration to the code system, or are we to assume that the minister is content with general mail delivery in Canada?

**Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, if there is any boycott of the postal code in Toronto, it is not reflected in the efficiency figures for Toronto. Second, it is difficult to straighten out these problems so long as there is not a union with which I can bargain. Third, I am glad the hon. member identified the button, because when he first stood up I thought he was advertising a new athletic support.

\* \* \*

#### ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

##### SUGGESTED TABLING OF CONTINGENCY PLAN TO DEAL WITH OIL SPILLS

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Some time ago I asked the minister to table in this House a copy of contingency plans for spills of oil on the west coast. I have in my hand a document entitled "Joint Canada-United States Marine Pollution Contingency Plan for Spills of Oil and Other Noxious Substances". Is this the document which the minister said at the time was difficult to table?

**Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult to table a contingency plan because it is difficult to know what plans are to be implemented before we know the nature of the accident.

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

**Mrs. Sauvé:** These plans are contained in our retrieval system. If the hon. gentleman is interested, I can get from that retrieval system the information he requests.

**Mr. Speaker:** Orders of the day.

**Mr. Jelinek:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to go back briefly to the answer given by the Postmaster General.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Orders of the day.

#### Wheat Payments

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

#### TWO-PRICE WHEAT ACT

##### MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR PAYMENTS FOR WHEAT PRODUCED AND SOLD IN CANADA FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

The House resumed, from Tuesday, October 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Lang that Bill C-19, to provide for payments in respect of wheat produced and sold in Canada for human consumption in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I was unable to conclude my remarks on this bill last night and am pleased to have this further opportunity to speak. I wonder how this bill, if passed, would stand up in court if the competition bill presented by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) becomes law. Misrepresentations have been made concerning this bill, and in the next few minutes I propose, for the benefit of producers and consumers, to reveal facts and figures which will show exactly what is taking place.

The minister suggested—that is significant—that this bill, once passed, will keep bread prices down by five cents a loaf. The consumer will benefit, according to the minister. He did not say that the Canadian producer of Red Spring wheat—that is, the producer in western Canada and, to some degree, in Ontario—is to subsidize the price of bread to the tune of three cents a loaf. The bill does not mention this fact, either. We must recognize that the western grain producer has just emerged from one of his most difficult periods in history because of low selling prices of wheat.

The recent strike of grain handlers on the west coast may not have affected very much the amount of grain used domestically in Canada, but it did affect the economic well-being of the grain producer. During that strike the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, who is supposed to protect and work for the interests of producers, told western Canadian farm organizations to settle the strike with the grain handlers' union on the basis of the Perry report. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had also thrown their weight behind that report. Clearly, the minister was trying to get his colleagues off the hook. The prairie producer is to be commended for not taking the bait of the minister.

● (1510)

Now the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Chrétien) is on the hook because the government forced the producers to settle for a 61 per cent increase to the grain handlers and Treasury Board is now offering 16 per cent to the grain inspectors who work for them. These men work side by side. I wish to quote a few facts from the August 28 edition of the *Montreal Star*, as follows:

Put into annual terms, the conciliation board report calls for a base pay increase from \$10,316 a year to \$12,126 next year and to \$13,478 the following year.

In addition to that, there is a cost of living index, plus a pension benefit. This runs to about \$17,000 or \$18,000. With regard to the income of producers, the article states: