

*Parity Prices*

successful, but unfortunately it also brought the Liberals back to power. That increased our debt, and this is what is generally hurting the farmers on an over-all basis.

I commend the Hon. Member for his stop-gap measure, but we need to look at the whole lake on the other side of the dam rather than just at one crack in the dam.

**Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, it seems there is general agreement that this is a terribly important matter and needs to be studied. I certainly agree with that. It should be referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and looked at in great detail. Hopefully, the committee will then report back to this House on the legislation which might be considered by Parliament. In that spirit of agreement, which I sense among the three Parties—

[*Translation*]

I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following: Bill C-232, 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respecting parity prices for farm products, be not now read a second time but that the order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** It has been moved by Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Orlikow, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following:

Bill C-232, 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respecting parity prices for farm products, be not now read a second time but that the order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

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 Guilbault):** Accordingly, the order is discharged, the Bill is withdrawn and the subject matter thereof is referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** Is there unanimous consent to proceed to the adjournment debate at this time?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

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

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—PROJECTED REDUCTION OF WORKFORCE. (B) REQUEST THAT MINISTER CONVENE MEETING OF INTERESTED PARTIES

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, two days ago I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) if he was aware of the fact that the CPR had told unions representing its employees that in the next few years the workforce of that company would be reduced by some 4,000 people and, if so, would he at least convene a meeting with the company and the unions concerned to discuss the situation and what might be done to lessen the very serious effects of such massive lay-offs. This is just one of many questions having to do with the railways and their workers, particularly in Winnipeg, which the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) and I have asked the Minister of Transport.

The Minister's reply two days ago was very like the replies he always gives. That is to say, he is at the very least evasive. There was no commitment to arrange a joint meeting with the employer and the unions. He accused me and the NDP of being "prepared to say that no company at any time should be allowed to look at how it can improve the productivity of its workforce". Nothing could be further from the facts, Mr. Speaker. He ignores, and not by accident, the fact that a reduction of 4,000 employees by the company is a reduction of 10 per cent or more of its entire workforce. Employees with many years of service will get their walking papers.

That is not what we were told when we were debating the Crowsnest freight rate changes. The Minister said that in British Columbia we were talking about direct expenditures by the railways of \$5.4 billion which will result in 87,000 person years of work. That will mean \$3.1 billion of labour income. Well, Mr. Speaker, what he did not say was that that work would be of a temporary nature. The former Minister of Transport said, in introducing the Bill at a press conference in Winnipeg, that 250,000 jobs would be created.

We fought that Bill because we knew there would not be this tremendous increase in employment. We knew that the result would be major lay-offs rather than increased employment. We knew the farmers cost of shipping grain would increase by 300 per cent to 400 per cent. In a speech I made in June of 1983 I said that we are not opposed to modernizing the system. I said, "We want the railways to get on with the job of upgrading their system in order to move all our goods. We know that our shipments of grain, sulphur, coal and potash will increase greatly in ten years. However, we do not want this to be done at the expense of the farmers or the railway workers. However, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what is