

Supply—Fisheries

Mr. Morris: Mr. Chairman, no Atlantic provinces member on this side of the house with any serious concern for the way our fishermen were treated in the last 20 years could or should sit silently in this house and not rise to try to refute some of the statements and the policy—if that is, in fact, what it is—which were enunciated on the first item of the Department of Fisheries estimates by the hon. member for Charlotte, and then to a lesser degree by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano and the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate. I must say I am sorry the hon. member for Charlotte did not stay in his seat in the house during the whole debate. He stayed only long enough to hear his own speech.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to be unfair. The hon. member for Charlotte told us last evening that he had a long standing engagement which would prevent his being here today.

Mr. Morris: Then I withdraw the remark immediately, Mr. Chairman. I did not hear that observation by the hon. member for Charlotte. What I want to ask is, is it not symptomatic of the nature of the erratic Liberal policy for the fisheries that its spokesman for fisheries in the house is now to be, not the hon. gentleman who was its minister of fisheries until last June—you might expect that—but no, the fisheries critic for the opposition now is to be the hon. member for Charlotte, though we have had—

Mr. Robichaud: He could tell you a great deal about fishing that you do not know.

Mr. Morris: You would think that the hon. member who occupied the position of minister of fisheries would continue to give us the benefit of his experience.

Mr. Pickersgill: He did.

Mr. Morris: We have now had an admission from the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate that he has his eye on the position. If it should happen that the opposition should come back to this side of the house—

Mr. Pickersgill: It will.

Mr. Morris:—and the usual practice follow, the hon. member for Charlotte might very well become the minister of fisheries, and I think we must judge his remarks by his hopes.

What is the policy he would set for the Atlantic coast fisheries? I suggest to you that it is largely one of fear of or hate for the United States. I sat here and listened to his words very carefully. I did not interrupt him. He has had a long experience with the fisheries and I am interested in his remarks.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

He said that we had no better friends than the United States. He said that Canadians have never had a better president than Franklin Roosevelt. But unsuspecting members on this side of the house need to know that this remark derives from the Roosevelt family connection with Campobello island and the hon. member's constituency. Having said these things, he went on to say that if we were to augment our Canadian trade with the United Kingdom or with other overseas markets it would anger the United States into retaliation.

Mr. Pickersgill: What a perversion!

Mr. Morris: Mr. Chairman, that does not sound to me like a very confident friend.

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman quote the phrase from the speech of the hon. member for Charlotte?

Mr. Morris: It is on page 3176. Apparently the United States does not have an enemy in the hon. member for Charlotte. It is just going to be cordially disliked by its very dear friend. When he prophesies a vengeful retaliation which is as hypothetical and about as unfriendly a thing as he could have alleged—

Mr. Pickersgill: It was the *Globe and Mail* that did that.

Mr. Morris:—is he not proving exactly why it is that we had better expand our area of trade instead of keeping all our trading eggs in one basket and leaving ourselves, by his prophecy, open to every shift or whim of one single export market? If the United States could ruin our fisheries industry and if the hon. member really believes so little in the United States despite his protestations of friendship—and he is the official opposition critic on fisheries—that is a clear indictment of Liberal trade policy which would put our fishermen, if you believe him, in the position where a whim of vengeance in Washington would be sufficient to ruin our Atlantic coast fishermen. Possibly that was true under the previous administration. It is interesting but I think not wholly confirmatory to have the hon. member's unintended admission that it was true but it is not likely to be true under a new government.

Mr. Pickersgill: What about oil?

Mr. Morris: His statement is not a policy, Mr. Chairman; it is simple fear-mongering. It is divisive and it seeks to separate the fishing community from the rest of Canada. It says to us for the people in the west, "Go get markets for wheat", but it says to the people of the east, "don't dare; it will ruin the fishing industry." It ignores the fact that