

*Inquiries of the Ministry*

groups in addition to agencies and representatives from both levels of government.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Edmonton Centre has a supplementary to the previous question.

**Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary arises out of the remarks made by the Prime Minister in Winnipeg. Will the Prime Minister please advise the House what he meant when in his speech on Friday in Winnipeg he emphasized the need to prevent feelings of alienation and suggested that non-Liberal members—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. In my way of thinking, that is not supplementary to the matter we were discussing a moment ago which I thought was related in some way to the movement of grain. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has a supplementary to the previous question.

\* \* \*

**GRAIN****PURCHASE OF HOPPER CARS BY GOVERNMENT—  
SUGGESTED FREIGHT RATE REDUCTION IF  
SUBSIDIZATION INVOLVED**

**Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board arises out of the question asked by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. Since the minister has indicated he cannot assure the House that the railways will cover the capital costs and depreciation of these cars which are being purchased by the government, can the minister assure the House that if there is any degree of subsidization the government will, as a *quid pro quo*, get some reduction in the freight rates on grain shipped to the coast?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the actual ambit of that question perhaps goes beyond the jurisdiction of my department, but I think I can assure the hon. member that in our discussions about arrangements with the railways we will try to be sure that every possible benefit in fact flows back to the grain producers for whom this help is really intended.

**Mr. Douglas:** Can the minister tell the House whether there will be any degree of subsidization or, indeed, whether the railways will pay the full capital costs and the depreciation through lease fees for these hopper cars?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, that is a double question which is not capable of having the same answer. There will be no degree of subsidization. That is certainly our intention. However, that does not necessarily mean that the conclusion drawn in the second part of the question is true.

**REQUEST FOR TABLING OF AGREEMENT WITH RAILWAYS**

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Will the minister make

[Mr. Olson.]

public the agreement to which he referred that exists between the government and the railway companies so we will have the answers rather than trying to obtain the information from him during the question period?

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, the agreement to which I referred was the understanding arrived at between the Canadian Wheat Board and the railways in connection with the movement of grain in the next immediate period. I will certainly discuss with the Wheat Board whether the transportation document which is normally used in connection with such discussions can be made available to hon. members.

**Mr. McIntosh:** In other words, I take it from the minister's remarks that there was no agreement?

**Mr. Lang:** Mr. Speaker, that is quite wrong. I indicated that there was an agreement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We will try another subject. Perhaps we might get away from the debate on which we are embarking once again.

\* \* \*

**POST OFFICE****CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNIONS—INQUIRY AS  
TO ACCEPTANCE BY GOVERNMENT OF PROPOSAL THAT  
NATIONAL RATES OF PAY SHOULD BE OFFERED**

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister or the Acting Postmaster General. Does the government plan to accept the proposal of the Public Service Alliance of Canada that national rather than regional rates of pay should be offered to its postal employees?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I can take notice of the question on behalf of the Postmaster General, but I would be surprised if he would want to negotiate publicly at this stage of the negotiations. Therefore he perhaps will not be in a position to answer the question of the hon. member.

**Mr. McCleave:** In light of the recommendation by the Toronto local of the Letter Carriers Union that a national strike vote be held to protest the current proposals of the government, is the government planning to develop new proposals?

**Mr. Trudeau:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will recognize that we have consistently refused to negotiate in public with the unions by the intermediary of questions from the opposition.

**Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Does the Prime Minister not agree that really the terms of the negotiations are evidence of a special status for several parts of this country and does not the government resist such a concept?