

way they have treated long-term arrangements. The same is true of the workers. If there is one thing that has gratified me over the years, it is the sense of loyalty that I have experienced on the part of railway workers to the railways. CPR and CNR employees are proud of their railways.

**Mr. Benjamin:** No, of the work.

**Mr. Friesen:** The Hon. Member says of the work, but they are proud of the railways. What bothers me is that in spite of this intense pride those workers have for their work and for their railways, they have been betrayed by the railways. Let me illustrate by way of their pension plans.

There are two pension plans that have been devised by the railways over the years, one covering pensions from 1935 to 1959 and one covering from 1959 to 1967. The pension plan devised for 1935 to 1959 gave the workers a pension of 40 per cent over the best ten years of employment. Let us say that that was a \$3 average over 1950 to 1960; 40 per cent of those best ten years. What relationship is there between that payment now and the cost of living for those pensioners? There is no fairness at all.

Some years ago when I wrote to Ian Sinclair of CP Investment about that inequity, he said, "That's tough, they invested that money in long-term arrangements and they have to pay back according to their return on that investment". I have a letter from Mr. Roy Lowry, administrative officer of the president's office of CNR. Listen to the language he uses: "The employees' contribution, subject to matching contributions from the company with interest accrued to date of retirement, represented the company's obligation." When it comes to the employers' or the former employees' obligations, it is all statutory. There is no consideration given to the increased cost of living. There is no consideration given to the inflationary spiral. There is no consideration given to the plight of those former employees who are now living on meagre pensions. It is always a statutory obligation.

● (1700)

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the railway can argue so eloquently about changing the statutory regulation when it comes to subsidies for the railway, but it is speechless when it comes to the statutory obligations for the pensioner? Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that it needs so much to operate because of the spiralling costs of production, but it cannot argue on behalf of its employees who are living on a meagre income?

Let me close by saying, Mr. Speaker, that it seems to me that the unions that are supposed to be defending employees have been no better because the unions forget the employees as soon as they are retired. They work for them as long as they are employed, but out of sight means out of mind. In that sense the unions have done no better than management.

**Mr. Neil Young (Beaches):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words on Bill C-155 today. The Bill has commonly been called the Crow rate Bill and is perhaps

not readily understood in large urban centres such as metropolitan Toronto. Generally speaking, it is viewed as something that concerns only those Canadians who are involved in the farming communities.

**Mr. Cosgrove:** They know that it means jobs.

**Mr. Young:** They certainly do know that it means jobs and, apparently, they understand that much better than does the Liberal Party. That is why the farming community is so concerned about the changes that the Government is trying to impose upon them.

My good friend, the Hon. Member for Don Valley East (Mr. Smith), wondered whether there were any farmers in Beaches who were particularly concerned about the amendments that the Government intends to make to the Crow rate, and I want to assure him that while there are no farmers as they are commonly understood, certainly many of my constituents lived on farms and migrated to the city. These people certainly understand the implications of the Crow rate and they have expressed their concerns to me.

The issue that we in the House are talking about deals not only with individuals who are directly involved in the farm industry. It goes far beyond that. It goes deeper than that. It goes to a basic principle—

**Mr. Cosgrove:** It creates many jobs.

**Mr. Young:** I will talk about jobs, and I will also talk about jobs in the Hon. Minister's constituency that will be lost because of what the Government intends to do.

We are actually talking about a social contract between Canadians and their Government which goes back to the 1800s because it was back then, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Pacific Railway received substantial mineral rights, land and cash from the people of Canada in exchange for certain responsibilities. One of those obligations was to haul grain at the Crow rate. Another was to use its mineral resources to keep its transcontinental rail line modern and efficient as the country grew.

Now Canadian Pacific says that it wants to keep the mineral rights and grants but shift its obligations to farmers and taxpayers who will have to pay the bills. The Government agrees with CP and has introduced legislation to end the Crow rates for grain transportation. This action will provoke a deep and possibly desperate reaction on the part of the people on the Prairies who consider the Crow their Confederation bargain.

The Crow is also important to central Canada. If the farmers have to pay higher freight charges, they will have less money to spend on tractors, trucks and supplies made in central Canada. Thousands of workers at farm implement plants in Ontario, for example, are already on lay-off. Doing away with the Crow will guarantee more lost jobs.

As another example, the extra freight charges to be paid by farmers under the Government's plan will lower the Canadian Gross National Product by some \$1.5 billion in 1991, which means that the economy will then support some 51,000 fewer jobs than it does today.