

to ensure that these parents have sufficient means to live up to their responsibilities. That is precisely the aim of Bill C-10.

I can see, unfortunately, that my colleague is most anxious to have the floor. I would gladly turn it over to her, but I think that tomorrow, even if it is in God's hands, we must continue our debate to ensure careful consideration of this bill. I am sorry.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Appoloni:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I want to make something very, very clear. In all modesty, I seem to be the person in this chamber who is most competent to speak for mothers, four times as competent. As a mother, I would like to state that family allowances are primarily for children, not for parents. I would also like—

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. I am sure the hon. member will have an opportunity to state her views later in the debate. That is certainly not a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):** Mr. Chairman, if there is somebody in this House who holds mothers in high esteem it is certainly me, that is for sure! But a mother cannot be a mother by herself, she needs a father. May I call it ten o'clock?

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to adjourn the debate, report progress and ask for leave to resume consideration of the bill at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

### TRANSPORT—RAIL SERVICE IN NEWFOUNDLAND

**Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang) will stay because this has to do with a question he was asked on October 17. It has to do with the subject of murder, the murder of the Newfoundland railway by the inattention and lack of caring of this government, particularly the Minister of Transport.

The Newfoundland railway had been in existence since the 1890s, built through much toil and difficulty by the people of Newfoundland. Since 1949 it has been owned by the Government of Canada which has given it to CN to operate.

On July 24 the Sullivan commission made an interim report on Newfoundland transportation problems. One recommenda-

tion of that commission, which the government had received two months earlier, is that the Newfoundland railway be abandoned, be done away with over a period of five to ten years. That recommendation was immediately repudiated by the Newfoundland members of this House. It was repudiated by the Progressive Conservative caucus in Ottawa on August 14. It was repudiated by Premier Moores and the Newfoundland government on August 22.

• (2202)

On August 3 I wrote the Minister of Transport and I have not had any reply yet, Mr. Speaker. On August 21 I wrote the Minister of Transport asking him what attitude the government was taking with relation to the railway and the recommendation which had been made, and pointing out to him that business was leaving the railway because of the uncertainty and that certain trains had been discontinued from Bishop's Falls to St. John's. On August 22, as I said, the province repudiated that recommendation.

I wrote the minister again on September 6. None of these letter were ever answered by the three-in-one minister—justice, transport and wheat. He is not doing his job properly in any one of the three. He did not answer my letter of September 6 pointing out that business was leaving the railway because of uncertainty and because government was taking no position. I asked what was the position of the Canadian government.

On September 12 the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) spoke in St. John's and said the Canadian government accepted the position taken by the government of Newfoundland that they would not accept the position that our railway should be done away with, and that the onus was now on all concerned to test the validity of the proposition that freight traffic could be increased and the service made more attractive to users. He said there had to be a new sense of commitment on the part of CNR, that it must accept the decision. That is what the minister's colleague said on September 12.

I asked a question in this House on October 17. I said that nothing was being done to see that the system continued or to assist CN in operating it. I asked the minister whether the government would accept its responsibility to meet any losses proven to be properly realized on the Newfoundland railway system so that CN does not have to meet them from its own revenue from elsewhere—which it should not have to do; it is a government railway—and would the government direct CN to manage the railway efficiently and try to attract traffic back and give it a real chance to put in new management? I asked, would they set the uncertainty at rest.

I pointed out to the minister that there were 20 more lay-offs and two more trains cancelled in breach of an undertaking the minister had given that there would be no more lay-offs while the Sullivan commission continued its work. The minister said he would investigate the lay-offs. He has not reported to me since October 17, this indifferent and neglect-