

in the world have 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the world's surplus in food, particularly grains. Why do those countries compete so well with the countries which must buy the grains—such as the communist countries and certain others—when we are selling our grains below the Canadian farmers' cost of production? It is no different in the United States, Argentina or Australia than it is in Canada. As well, I believe that the old international wheat agreements should not be discounted. Perhaps we as Members should pursue that with Members of Parliament from other countries or with U.S. Congressmen to find out if there are answers.

Various provinces are attempting to assist through subsidies, which has created some difficulty with pork in the U.S. market. Perhaps we might attempt to deal with better stabilization on a national basis which would not interfere with export markets.

It is very easy to get wound up when talking about agriculture. I come from a rural riding and my family has farmed for over 100 years. I know the difficulties, but it is not my intention to talk out this motion. It is my intention to move the following motion:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-215, an Act respecting parity prices for farm products, be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture."

I believe that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry (Mr. Axworthy) indicated that he was prepared to second the motion.

Mr. Axworthy: Yes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the main motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as amended?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Accordingly, the Order is discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order! Private Member's Hour has now expired.

Adjournment Debate

• (1800)

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT
MOTION**

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

MINES AND MINING—EXPANSION OF FALCONBRIDGE REFINERY IN NORWAY. (B) GRANTING OF EXPORT LICENCES

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, on April 3. I raised a question with the Minister of State for Mines (Mr. Layton) having to do with Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd. building a refinery in the Sudbury Basin. I asked the Minister if he was aware that Falconbridge had announced that it was going to spend \$41.5 million to expand its refinery in Norway because it was buying Botswana nickel matte and it had to expand the refinery to process this new nickel matte from Botswana.

Since Falconbridge began operations in the Sudbury Basin in the early 1940s, it has always refined its nickel matte in Norway. We in the Sudbury Basin have always demanded that Falconbridge should build a refinery to refine Canadian ore where it is mined. We felt that was a good principle. If one mines ore in Canada then it should be refined in Canada.

Eventually, Mr. Speaker, in 1975, after we started to experience all sorts of downturns in the mining industry in the Sudbury Basin, the Ontario Conservative Government belatedly attempted to save face in the matter and amended its mining act. That mining act said that Ontario resources should be refined in Canada. We would have liked it to specify Ontario but we agreed that the ore should at least be refined in Canada.

Section 104 of the mining act was then passed which exempted Falconbridge from that rule. Falconbridge in Ontario, therefore, is the only mining company which is allowed to ship its resources in a semi-processed state offshore to have it refined.

In the last two years Falconbridge has reduced its work force from 2700 workers to 1900 workers. We have lost 800 jobs in that company alone. The company itself has not been doing any development of new mines in the Sudbury Basin. In fact, it has been importing from abroad a lot of scrap metal and has been smelting out the nickel from that scrap metal. This does not create any employment for our people.

Falconbridge has now announced that because Amex has pulled out of its consortium in Botswana, it is moving in to buy the nickel matte from Botswana and is going to ship that nickel matte to Norway for refining. To do that it has to spend \$41.5 million to expand the refinery in Norway. It seems to me the logical and the kind of patriotic thing Falconbridge would want to do, if they have \$41.5 million, is use that money as a down payment in order to finally build a refinery in the