

**Mr. Mayer:** Mr. Speaker, we had 66 Transport Committee meetings. I think he attended a good number, if not all. That was explained at length at committee. If the Hon. Member did not understand it in 66 meetings because his head is that thick, I do not think I will have much success doing that in ten minutes.

Very simply, all that the rate freeze meant was that we were not going to increase costs to producers for at least the next three years. We said that a billion dollars a year for the railways from the Government coffers for the next three years was enough. The investment part that was going to go ahead and the jobs that would be created, supposedly by investment by the railways, would come about as a result of the Government pumping in \$1 billion a year. We thought that the producer should not have to contribute in the meantime.

It is interesting to note that at committee on Tuesday, September 13, if memory serves me, this Parliamentary Secretary berated us and bemoaned the fact that we were all over the place because we were talking about cost of capital for the railways and their constant costs. He was saying that was terrible, that we should not deprive the railways of that money. The next evening he came forward with a Government amendment which said it would look into the cost of capital. We were saying essentially the same thing, except we came down on the side of the producers. We said that when the review process was under way, the producers should not be asked to pay any more. When the Government is conducting the review process, it does not care about the producers; it just looks after the railways and in the meantime asks the producers to pay more.

The Parliamentary Secretary talked in glowing terms about all the jobs that this will create. That may be true. However, what is the point of creating a lot of jobs in the mountains by building passes when you are going to chase 30,000 or 40,000 producers on the Prairies out of business? What kind of sense does that make? Those are the kinds of figures that we heard when we travelled the Prairies this summer. When talking about jobs, let us be consistent.

If you chase farmers off their farms because you have put them out of business, they will move to the cities. The farmers will not be out of work, it will be the people in the cities. When farmers move to towns or cities, they get jobs. It is a well known fact that they displace other people. That can be backed up in any city in the country. If someone hiring has the opportunity to hire someone with a farm background, that is who they hire. The farmer will not be out of work. When the Parliamentary Secretary talks about creating jobs, he should understand what this Bill may do to prairie agriculture and the jobs it will cost.

We talk about all the money that the railways need to go ahead and invest in building the mountains, to create the extra capacity and finance the double-tracking. I refer to what was said on July 12 by Wood Gundy concerning Canadian Pacific Limited. I will read one paragraph entitled "CP Earnings":

Given its leverage to enterprises and the significant effect of the Crow revision, we expect CP to enjoy record earnings in 1985. However, like enterprise, the turn will be gradual in 1983 with anticipated earnings per share of

#### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

\$2.90 versus \$2.60 in 1982. However, for 1984 and 1985 respective earnings of \$6.50 and \$10 should slay any notions that Canada's largest corporation is less than dynamic.

The point made throughout the four-page review is that the revision of the Crow rate will have a substantial effect on CP shares. It will drive them up. It is suggested that they will have record earnings in 1984 and 1985.

**Mr. Flis:** What's wrong with that?

**Mr. Mayer:** There is nothing wrong with that. There is nothing wrong with making a buck; I would be the last to bemoan that fact. I am saying that if you want to be consistent and not talk out of both sides of your mouth, be concerned about the producers whom we heard from when we travelled. When they tell us on one hand that they are going to go out of business, and on the other hand we hear that CP is going to have record earnings, where is the equity? If Members representing western agriculture do not point that out, they are being less than honest and derelict in their duties. If the Parliamentary Secretary wants to talk about jobs, he should do that in the complete context.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. The Chair does not question the validity of the Hon. Member's remarks, but I do raise some question as their relevancy to the amendment now being debated. Perhaps the Hon. Member can indicate in what way this is strictly relevant to the amendment.

**Mr. Mayer:** Mr. Speaker, in my view it is extremely relevant because basically this Bill is written for the railways. It is a regulatory Bill. If you are going to pay railways based on regulations and on their costs, there should be something in the Bill to require the railways to keep their costs as low as possible. I am pointing out how inconsistent the Parliamentary Secretary is. As a result of this Bill and because it is so favourable to the railways, Wood Gundy points out that CP will have record earnings. Producers have told us they will have difficulty staying in business as a result of this Bill. This amendment speaks to putting some efficiency into the Bill as far as the railways are concerned, therefore holding down costs to the producers, hopefully not letting CP shares go as high as they might according to this report, and in the meantime saving tax dollars. I think I am making a very relevant point in terms of this amendment.

● (1250)

If you would like some more convincing, Mr. Speaker, allow me some more time and I would be more than pleased to go on.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order. I appreciate the Hon. Member's attempt to convince the Chair that his comments are strictly relevant to the amendment. However, the Chair must remind him that we are now debating an amendment respecting the duties and functions of the Administrator. At the report stage in the House, debate must be much more formal and relevant than it generally is in standing commit-