

Supply

Another problem is that this is an opposition day motion, and I am no expert on the rules here, but these are traditionally understood to be and accepted as non-confidence motions. Now there has been one in recent history—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. Time is running out. Resuming debate.

On a point of order, the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood.

Mr. Mills: Mr. Speaker, seeing that the minister has been so accommodating this morning, I wonder if we could get unanimous consent of the House to ask a few more short questions of the minister.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): As you know, the period for questions and comments is over. Resuming debate.

[*English*]

On a point of order, the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish of course to question your judgment and your ruling, but I am sure you will agree that the House is the master of its own fate and its own time; that the House can determine at any time under any rule, under any restriction, under any impediment imposed upon it by rule its own decisions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. The hon. member is right, but the hon. member must ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I so do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is there unanimous consent to extend the question and comment period?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood.

Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of the House on this.

I listened attentively to the minister when he went through a long list of all the actions that he has taken, from the international meetings, foreign ministers of fisheries, ministers of external affairs, media campaigns,

public relations campaigns, Greenpeace and environmental groups.

My question is a very simple one. What do all these people say to the minister when he presents the facts that our fish stocks are being raped or slaughtered? We have all these environmental organizations that are touting sustainable development day in and day out. Whenever they spot a little problem in whatever riding it is, they come with the banners and the placards and seem to raise quite a fuss.

What do all these people say when he pleads this cause of the fish stocks and the people of Newfoundland? I would be curious as to what they report.

Mr. Crosbie: With respect to environmental groups and the like, in our conversations with them they have exhibited sympathy and said: "Yes, this is certainly an example of violation of the rules of sustainable conservation and Brundtland".

But this is an issue on which they have to be careful or they do not seem to be able to mobilize themselves into enthusiastic support of the position, perhaps because it is a government that is concerned in taking the action. They seem to want to keep clear of governments, that somehow they are going to be suspect if they are on the same side as government.

Perhaps we are not using them effectively. As I mentioned in my remarks, Mr. Maurice Strong suggested that we should be giving them a briefing, that we should send a delegation to New York to make sure that the non-governmental organizations are properly seized with it.

Some of them, you see, have got old scores to settle with the Canadian government because of the seal hunt. The feelings between certain groups and us are not the friendliest because of the tactics they used to stop the seal hunt because the seal was never an endangered species and the problems that have resulted since. Perhaps that is a factor as well.

With respect to governments, we have acceptance from countries like the U.S.S.R., now Russia, Cuba. Japan observes all the NAFO rules, Norway and so on. There is a small group, and the small group basically is Spain and Portugal which is determined by the policy of the EC, South Korea; Panama is really Spain and Portugal again, who say: "There is the freedom of the high seas, that anything you do will derogate from freedom to fish on the high seas". They use all kinds of excuses. A couple of years ago it was: "Your scientists don't co-operate with our scientists, so why should we accept the views and recommendations of your scien-