

members not to concentrate on the Windsor-Quebec City corridor and not to concentrate on the words Quebec and Windsor. It may be somewhere else.

Mr. Murta: Brandon and Winnipeg?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes, or Montreal and Toronto. But we want a much better, more integrated system. It is silly, but one can go from Ottawa to Montreal by CP, CN, STOL, ordinary aircraft or by highway and none of these are co-ordinated. If one wanted to take a bus in Montreal, he would have to take a cab. I think we can have better co-ordination. That means that all those corporations will have to work together. We will ask for this power.

● (1710)

I mentioned in the speech that I should like to see CP and CN integrate certain of their structures and services and rolling-stock because I think this is important. It is silly for two trains, one CN and one CP, to run side by side to exactly the same place. Maybe there will be some resistance and members will have to vote on some of the measures that they have in mind.

Mr. Murta: The minister mentioned an effort to upgrade the passenger services of CN and CP, but the only specific thing in the statement this morning was that the reservation aspect of the system would be integrated in some respects, and also the common terminal aspect. Could the minister elaborate on this? Are these the only two initial projects that the minister is considering at the present time, or is there thought of using a common right-of-way, for example, for passenger services? For instance, would they run one or two trains to Jasper on certain days and one or two trains to Banff on other days?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, in principle, to this and the document showed that we are open on this question. I have promised to discuss such questions with the standing committee of the House, and hon. members can make proposals there. The task force did not retire this morning with the tabling of the paper; they are still working on the things outlined in it. I cannot give details because, of course, we cannot do everything in the same year. We cannot give money for city buses or stations or commuter services and at the same time have a STOL system. We will have to recognize certain priorities, and I should not like to do that before I have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. Murta: Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago there was an election promise of \$270 million for urban transportation, but this was not mentioned in the speech. Can the minister assure the House and the country that the money will be forthcoming and can he tell us when, in the context of the election campaign?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): We have not changed our opinion on that, Mr. Speaker. A paper was prepared for cabinet and is before cabinet now. Let us see how much money they give us—because there is money involved. As far as the policy is concerned, I will not backtrack.

Transportation Policy

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I see the hon. member for Lévis is seeking the floor to ask a question. The procedure we are following this afternoon is not even akin to the one we follow on statements on motions. It is separate from that, and in fact is debate. It is not only an exception to the question period but an exception to statements on motions. I have, therefore, no hesitation in recognizing the hon. parliamentary secretary to ask the minister a question. The hon. member for Lévis.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Raynald Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, contrary to the official opposition which did not use its time this afternoon for making suggestions, and I think that is why I am allowed to put questions to the minister, I would like to be very practical.

Since the minister mentioned water-borne transport, does he expect to make shortly—and when—a statement on the Canadian merchant marine in order to follow up the recommendations of the Darling report tabled in this House lately? Does the minister think there will be a special debate on the content of that report?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I think I have already said that I favour a merchant marine. I would be most embarrassed if I were asked to build it tomorrow morning because we would probably be short of steel as well as shipbuilding yards. We already have a lot of ships on the Great Lakes. In the documents tabled this afternoon, there is a project for an icebreaking bulk cargo vessel. This is something extremely interesting for the future of Canada. This is a boat of about \$35 million. I shall not be able to make a complete statement on the matter of a merchant navy in the near future, but it may be said that I will take all steps possible in that direction.

Mr. Guay (Lévis): Would it not be a good thing that the contents of the Darling report be referred to a committee for discussion, at the same time as the overall policy? What is the minister's opinion in this respect?

Mr. Marchand: Mr. Speaker, I feel that we shall have enough work with what we have. I have no objection to the report being submitted. But I rest convinced that the committee will not be able to study all the material at the same time. Things will have to be done in orderly fashion. I have no objection at all to the Darling report being referred to the committee, but I am under the impression that such a referral can wait a while, since ships travel much slower than planes.

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: In his statement the minister spoke of using transportation as an economic pool, and the question of regional disparity also came up. Could the minister assure the House that one transportation policy that we have at present will not be touched, and indeed might be extended, and that is the eastern freight rates assistance? Is that policy going to be continued under this new program?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, we are not going to touch that. If we ever do touch it, it will be done separately; but nobody has proposed it. For the time being,