

S.O. 29

colleague of mine from Newfoundland. I would much rather not be doing that this evening. The interests of my region would be served if Members from Atlantic Canada were here and were being heard. That is why we were sent to Ottawa.

In understanding why we were sold down the river, I want to refer to some correspondence which was exchanged between the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) this past summer when Canada's negotiating position was being ironed out. A letter was written to the Prime Minister by the Minister of Fisheries on June 24, 1986, in which the Minister of Fisheries put forward Canada's negotiating position, outlined all the things at stake, and concluded by saying:

I want to assure you that my goal throughout will be to manage our fisheries discussions with the French in a manner that does not jeopardize the cordial relationship between Canada and France—

What did the Prime Minister say about that? What did the Prime Minister say about the livelihood of Newfoundland and the blood which beats through the heart that is Newfoundland? He responded on August 19, 1986 by writing:

I agree that in dealing with this sensitive issue, we must weigh on the one hand the interests of Canadian fishermen and fishing communities and on the other our bilateral relations with France.

Mr. Forrestall: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Tobin: What is wrong with that is that the Prime Minister has said that the fishery in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, P.E.I., and northern Quebec is nothing but a bargaining chip to be used in setting cordial relations to facilitate cocktail parties between Prime Ministers of respective nations. That is not good enough in Newfoundland; that is what is wrong with that.

Mr. Forrestall: There is imputation of motive—

Mr. Tobin: What we have seen tonight is a Member, a cabinet representative, stand here—

Mr. Forrestall: Very serious charges—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) has been given the floor by the Speaker. During the debate most Hon. Members have listened, not always with great comfort, to what has been said by Members on both sides of the debate but have extended the courtesies which are usual in this Chamber. I would ask that all Hon. Members have regard for that.

Mr. Tobin: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for restoring order to the House. A Member would not have to speak so loudly if he did not have to speak over the sounds emanating, as unintelligent as they are, from the other side of the Chamber.

What has happened tonight? We have had an attempt by the Government of Canada, through the Hon. Member for St. John's West, to placate or to issue a placebo to the people of Newfoundland. He stood in his place and on the one hand

issued a gentle slap to the wrist of the Minister of Fisheries, saying that he does not entirely agree that the Minister of Fisheries should have gone to France and dealt with our livelihood without consulting the Premier of Newfoundland. Then, to be sure that he was being properly balanced, as the letter said, "on the other" the Hon. Member for St. John's West went on to tell the Premier of Newfoundland that the Government of Canada has the right to make international agreements. It is not the jurisdiction of the Premier of Newfoundland, and he is not going to be bossed around by the Premier of Newfoundland. I am not in the habit of defending the Premier of Newfoundland because I don't find that attractive. But it is not only the Premier of Newfoundland who finds what has happened distasteful; it is the Conservative Premier of Nova Scotia, who is the Premier of the province of the Hon. Member across the way, the Conservative Premier who today said that this agreement will cost the Atlantic economy \$200 million. That is what the Leader of the Hon. Member's Party in Nova Scotia has said, and walking away from the statement will not make it go away, Mr. Speaker.

• (2200)

It is also the Government of Prince Edward Island that finds this deal distasteful. The Government of New Brunswick, and the fishermen's unions in all of the Atlantic Provinces find this deal distasteful. For once, the Premier of Newfoundland, rather than being a voice in the wind, a lonely child putting forward a diatribe that is subscribed to by nobody, finds himself singing in chorus, in tune, with every other Premier and leader in Atlantic Canada. Surely then the Premier of Newfoundland deserves, as Premier, some consideration for the views he has put forth.

This has been a sad day for Parliament and a sad day for Newfoundland when one of our most prominent, one of our better known Members, one of our citizens, the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), when confronted with the choice that all of us face from time to time of standing up and being counted for Newfoundland, of being Newfoundland's voice in these hallowed halls, of being the apologist for Ottawa and Newfoundland, has chosen the latter course. That is a sad day, Mr. Speaker. It will not help the cause of those of us who want to see this deal abrogated.

Today in Question Period I rose in my place and said that the deal should be declared null and void, that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) should be fired because, failing that, the Government would put the Member for St. John's West in the impossible position of having no other recourse or option but to resign his seat in protest. I did not propose it. I suggested that he not be a victim, victim of the decisions of his Government. But tonight he has taken the knife in his hand and has exercised it on himself. It is not his commitment that is questioned by me, by Premier Peckford, by the Opposition Leader in Newfoundland, Leo Barry, or by Premier Buchanan. If he finds the breastplate of honour that he talked about tonight in this House tarnished, it is a wound