

should be done if the CNR is to become profitable. Why has the Minister of Transport not included these things in the bill? Is he waiting until after the election to slip through the appendices of this bill—in other words, to eliminate rail service altogether in Newfoundland? That is part of the prescription: forgive another \$1,200 million in debt and that will really help out the CN. Eliminate the Crowsnest pass rates. There are not going to be any Liberal members west of Toronto anyway after the next election, so they may as well eliminate the Crowsnest rates. Eliminate rail passenger service; let us have a railway without any rails, without any passengers. That is what we want, a profitable railway that has no passengers, no trains, no freight rates and no cargo! At last we will be able to point to CN and say that after 100 years we now have a railway that is profitable. It has no passengers, no freight, no cargo, but by golly it makes money! That is why I am so anxious to support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I have not enough time to speak tonight and I am only warming up, but I did want to reveal the conspiracy that lies behind this bill. I also want to ask the minister some questions before he closes debate about five months hence—because the bill is not going through tonight or tomorrow or Friday. The bill is not going through until we get passenger service back in Newfoundland. Unless all the people on the mainland agree to have their passenger service taken away, we will not agree to this bill. We will agree to it only if ours is restored. We have a TransCanada highway that is falling apart. You can hardly drive a hundred yards without falling into the swamp.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

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

INDUSTRY—FLUORSPAR MINE AT ST. LAWRENCE,
NEWFOUNDLAND—PROPOSED PRESSURE ON ALCAN TO
OPERATE

Mr. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1977, I asked a question of the Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) about unemployment. After that question I asked about a work project in Newfoundland concerning the lower Churchill water reservoir, a project which was suggested by the Newfoundland government and put forward to the Ottawa government in June, 1977. I asked whether the Gull Island project is to go ahead either this year, next year or in five years' time. The environmentalists have said that they have to clear cut the sides of the river which is to comprise the reservoir. They said this work can be done now, that it will take 400 loggers three

Adjournment Debate

years to clear this reservoir and it will cost about \$4 million. The work they would do would be of permanent value and it must be done before this job goes ahead. It will re-employ 400 loggers laid off as a result of the closing of Labrador Liner-board Limited. The Deputy Prime Minister and President of Privy Council then said to me:

● (2202)

—I will take note of the hon. member's representations and ensure that whatever proposals have been made will be considered at the earliest possible date.

That was on December 6, 1977. I now come before you, Mr. Speaker, and it is February 7, two months later. Today during the question period, I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the "living" Prime Minister, what had been done about this proposal for employment on the lower Churchill reservoir, Gull Island River. The Prime Minister said that it was discussed in cabinet last week. I presume it will be produced at the televised extravaganza on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday as some great work project that the Prime Minister and his confreres have cooked up to pull out of their hats in front of the public. I am just reminding them now that it has been eight months since that project was put forward. And that has been eight months during which time 400 men were unemployed while the government up here dithered, neither accepting nor rejecting the project. The minister said on December 6 that he was going to consider these things at the earliest possible date, but two months have passed before they have been properly discussed.

Another question I asked on December 6, 1977 concerned the closing of the fluorspar mine at St. Lawrence, Newfoundland. The consultants paid for by the federal-provincial governments, B. L. Hodge and Partners of London, England, made a report to the two governments saying that it was feasible to operate this fluorspar mine and that it could be profitable if Alcan would operate it properly and make the necessary investments. But Alcan refused. They wanted to close the mine because they were able to import fluorspar more cheaply from Mexico than operate the mine itself. I asked if the government would put pressure on Alcan and tell Alcan that there would be no tax concessions, no tax relief, no help for Alcan in any way, shape or form if they did not continue to operate that fluorspar mine in St. Lawrence, Newfoundland and save the jobs of 300 men. And this silly, stupid answer that I had from the minister was that Alcan had informed him that the fluorspar from the mine at St. Lawrence was used mainly as a chemical in spray cans, and because of the drastic reduction in the use of spray cans in Canada it was no longer feasible to operate that mine. That is a piece of nonsense. A man that would believe that tripe from Alcan would believe anything. That is a "Hornerism" of the worst. It is a spoonerism disguised as a "Hornerism" but that is the answer I got. It shows the lack of concern for jobs in Newfoundland.

When Sun Life decided to move its head office from Montreal to Toronto there was a fuss and a furore. But when Alcan wants to close a mine for no good economic reason, move out of Newfoundland and cause the loss of 300 jobs, it does not