

Adjournment Debate

Bill S-12, an act to amalgamate the Montreal Board of Trade and the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Montreal.

Bill C-87, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending the 31st March 1993—Chapter No. 43.

[*Translation*]

The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the precedence list on the Order Paper.

[*English*]

Mr. Edwards: Madam Speaker, I hope it is an appropriate time to intervene on a point of order and to suggest that we call it 10 o'clock.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Would there be unanimous consent to call it 10 o'clock?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Madam Deputy Speaker: I think I had a smile thinking that the hon. member was calling it 10.30.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Madam Speaker, I appreciate your sentiment and oh, that I could have agreed. However, under the circumstances I think you will appreciate that I would want to be heard on the adjournment debate. I will be as brief as I can.

I am speaking in amplification to a question I asked the Minister of Employment and Immigration last Friday. There was a lot of concern for my riding shown by the response that the minister gave. I know that the minister really did not intend to be flippant. I understand. I have never been a minister but I do know they have fantastic responsibilities and to come to the House and answer questions for one hour a day is another part of their responsibilities and I know that tempers get short.

• (1810)

The minister did indicate that it took a demonstration to get this side of the House to ask questions on the desperate situation of those people who are without compensation in my riding and the six ridings in Newfoundland.

I want to keep this on as positive a note as I can. I know I have made 27 interventions on that specific subject in this House and I think the Speaker and the government have been pretty good about allowing us to air this issue.

We had an emergency debate on February 19, an opposition day on March 12, and last night from 10 p.m. until almost 1 a.m. this morning. We had an emergency debate on the plight of fishermen and plant workers in Newfoundland and Labrador because of the dreadful condition of the northern cod and gulf cod stocks.

A number of points were made. The reduction in the cod catches and stocks both offshore and inshore is mind-boggling. It has resulted in two concerns. One is the concern for the likelihood of a moratorium which will affect the offshore and the inshore in the long term. However, the purpose of the debate last night and the focus of the debate was—and if it wandered off it should have been—on the short-term requirements for those people who have in a general sense been without compensation since May 15.

In my specific case I am on my feet this evening for 60 families that do not have compensation because they had not worked long enough in Port Union at a plant with 1,200 people, at the time employing 850, and 155 trawlermen.

I am pleased to report that today I received a letter from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and he did say he was taking a personal interest in the 60 people. I hope he is still considering some kind of compensation. However nothing has happened and it is a little bit wearisome to hear about, as much as we do appreciate it, the previous \$584 million in 1990 and the \$57 million the year before.

These are not normal times. These are times when people are required to take notice. Some things have happened that have never happened before. In 500 years there has never been a consideration, even a discussion, of a moratorium on any kind of fish stock.