

*Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen*

mits members, other than ministers of the Crown, to move motions. That is the limitation placed on Standing Order 43. Even so, there are examples of ministers having moved such motions and of ministers having seconded such motions.

I am not sure whether it was three other occasions when I allowed—although I will take the hon. member's word for it—parliamentary secretaries to move motions under Standing Order 43. However, there are several precedents where parliamentary secretaries have moved motions under Standing Order 43. I have a record of one moved by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Corbett) seconded by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) on November 6, 1979. I have one moved by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) at the time he was prime minister. I have one moved by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Duclos), seconded by the hon. member for Edmonton North (Mr. Paproski) on March 21, 1979. The precedent is there. The reasons for that precedent are, I think, quite different from those which would preclude parliamentary secretaries from asking questions, as was ruled by my predecessor. However, my predecessor has not ruled on the matter of motions under Standing Order 43. He has allowed them. It is also my feeling that they should be allowed.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Madam Speaker, I seem to be surrounded by questionable precedents. Of course I respect the ruling of the Chair, but there is one area which I intend to raise, if it occurs to me proper to do so, where the provisions of Standing Order 43 might be used on the basis of information in the hands of a parliamentary secretary by virtue of his position. I think that would be totally improper.

**Madam Speaker:** If I may reply to the hon. member, and I do it now because I want to be enlightened on this question, it seems to me that the Speaker could disallow a motion in one case or the other. The Speaker could say that it is not in order or that it is not proper to be put to the House during the period reserved for motions under Standing Order 43. In a sense, I suppose I am a depository of that kind of judgment. Sometimes I may not be able to make judgments because these things happen so quickly, but it does seem to me that this judgment is in the hands of the Chair. However, I am willing to discuss the topic with the hon. member at some future time. The hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse).

I am sorry, I have notice of a question of privilege from another hon. member and I do have to take them in the order in which they come. The hon. member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) has given me notice of a question of privilege. I will hear him first, and then the hon. member for South Shore.

**Mr. McKnight:** Madam Speaker, I submitted my question of privilege in the hope that the hon. member whom it concerns would be in the House at this time. The hon. member is not in the House and I would like my question of privilege deferred until such time as both he and I are in the chamber together.

**PRIVILEGE**

MR. CROUSE—STATEMENT MADE BY MR. LeBLANC DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It concerns the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc) and, in particular, the response he gave today to questions I raised in the House. I regret that he is not present at the moment, but I feel it is important that I put my remarks on the record. He implied that I am speaking for my own interests in the fishing industry and not for the fishing industry as a whole. This allegation has been made on previous occasions by the same minister.

I wish to state for the record that I have sold all of my interests in the deep sea fishing fleet which, through my own initiative, I brought into being. I established the fleet in 1948 and sold all of my interest in 1968. At that same time I sold all of my financial interests in the Canadian fish processing industry. I no longer have any capital invested in this particular industry.

Therefore, when I rise in my place and raise questions relating to the fishing industry, I do so because more than one-third of the people in my constituency, whom I have represented for more than 24 years, are involved in the fishing industry, either inshore, mid-water, offshore or through ancillary industries. The minister's reply indicates not only an insensitivity to the interests of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland fishermen, but an insensitivity as well to the interests of the shore workers in the plants of both provinces.

● (1610)

On November 22, Mr. Lawrence Wilneff, president of the Canadian Seafood and Allied Workers said, as reported in the *Halifax Chronicle-Herald*:

—the management plan will likely lead to plant closure during the last three months of next year unless there are massive changes made in the scheme.

He said plant closures would force workers to go on UIC benefits for part of the year, resulting in some 40 per cent reduction in their pay.

Obviously my questions were related to the hard-working people I have been elected to serve, not only the fishermen of that area but the plant workers in my constituency and throughout all of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. I wonder why the Newfoundland members have not been actively pursuing this matter as well, because the people they have been elected to serve are also affected.

In closing, I demand a retraction of the minister's allegations. I submit to this House that he has no right to impute motives to me when I am carrying out my duties in this House.

**Madam Speaker:** The minister is not present in the chamber. I presume he will want to reply to the hon. member. Therefore I will leave the matter open until the minister is again in the House, to give him the opportunity, if he wishes, to reply. The matter will be left open for the time being.