

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would not want in any way to prejudge the consideration which the CTC will be giving to the applications. The exact question regarding further facilities, when it arises is, of course, one which we have to take under consideration having regard to our total priorities and available funds. I can assure the hon. member, however, of a full and sympathetic examination of specific problems in his area.

* * *

POST OFFICE

ALLEGATION BY UNION DEPARTMENT VIOLATING TECHNICAL CHANGE PROVISION OF CONTRACT— GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): My question is directed to the Postmaster General, and I have given him prior notice of it. In view of the fact that the minister has told the people of Canada in the past that the agreement between the Post Office and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers concerning a contract clause dealing with technological change would solve many of the problems in the Post Office, and in view of the fact that these problems have not been solved as in several centres the union has complained that the government has not lived up to its part of the contractual clause dealing with technological change, specifically article 29.03(b) requiring a detailed description of the technological change, and in view of the fact that the chief adjudicator of the Public Service Staff Relations Board, Mr. Ed Jolliffe, ruled in his presentation that the Post Office Department is in breach of article 29.03(b), can the minister assure the House that he will instruct his department to honour the technological change provisions of the agreement between the Post Office and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, the written report of the adjudicator has still not been made available to both parties. The hon. gentleman is basing his premise on a verbal declaration of the adjudicator last week. What he said in effect, and the hon. gentleman is quite right, is:

... it is my opinion that the onus was on the employer and not on the union,—

in refusing advance information. He also said:

... but it is also my opinion that it would have been reasonable on the part of the union to specify the kind of information needed,

In other words, it can hardly be deduced that the adjudicator is blaming the employer any more than the employee. However, the more important thing is that if they want this particular section to work, I would be quite pleased to meet with the leader of the union in order to clarify any ambiguities in the section.

Mr. Rodriguez: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the minister that a meeting between the two groups would certainly be most helpful, but the fact of the matter still remains that the minister is responsible for his department—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Oral Questions

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

REASON MOUNTED POLICE NOT PATRONIZING CERTAIN GASOLINE STATIONS—REQUEST FOR REPORT

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Supply and Services and ask him on what basis local service stations, which in the past have supplied gasoline and oil for vehicles used by the RCMP detachments, are not being patronized now by the RCMP, even though the price of these service stations might be as low or lower than the price at service stations which are supposedly on the department's priority list for purchases?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I will surely check the facts mentioned by the hon. member and answer him as soon as possible.

* * *

[English]

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—DATE PRIME MINISTER KNEW OF VERBAL AGREEMENT ON FINANCING

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister stated in the House on June 3 that he would check the cabinet minutes to determine the date when he learned that the deal with Lockheed was proceeding on the basis of a verbal commitment by that company to provide interim financing. Now that the Prime Minister has had a chance to check his records, would he tell the House when and how he learned that the verbal arrangement with Lockheed was truly a verbal one?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I did have the sequence of events put on the record for me. Unfortunately, I do not have the record with me today in the House. I will make sure that I bring it with me tomorrow. But in so far as I can recollect, it is the same as I heard the President of the Treasury Board say it a few minutes ago.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh; we are really in trouble now!

Mr. Trudeau: Late in November, I believe on the 27th, there was a meeting of the Treasury Board at which cognizance was taken of the fact that DND could not finance this particular deal, that we needed more financing. At what point the knowledge of a verbal contract came to my attention I am not certain. I will have to check the date.

LOCKHEED CONTRACT—POSSIBILITY OF COURT ACTION IN VIEW OF ALLEGATION COMPANY BREACHED AGREEMENT

Mr. Peter C. Bawden (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister this question. If Lockheed misled the government and in fact reneged on the verbal agreement, as often stated by the Minister of National Defence, will the Prime Minister say why there is any legal commitment to pay \$16 million or any other amount to Lockheed? Will the Prime Minister say why