



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 31

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Friday

6 May 1988

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of events that have occurred in the last twenty-four hours, and in talking to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) and the representative for the NDP Party, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), I wish to seek leave of the House to suspend the normal rules of the day in order to debate the following motion:

I move, seconded by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), that this House of Assembly go on record as condemning the actions of France yesterday concerning the arrest of five Newfoundland Fishermen and that a resolution be drafted by an all-party committee to be passed today clearly outlining this Province's outrage of such an action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Does the hon. the Premier have leave?

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that is completely in line with the comments made in this House yesterday afternoon by my friend, the MHA for Fogo (Mr.

Tulk), when this was suggested, and we are happy to give leave and to support this proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, just to be clear on how we are proceeding, it is my understanding that debate will commence immediately on this motion as the all-party resolution is being drafted, and then the resolution will be brought back to conclude the emergency debate.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Yes.

MR. LONG:
Fine, Mr. Speaker. We will be glad to give leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I understand there is leave.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I wish to thank the Leader of the official Opposition and thank the member for the NDP for giving leave; I called both hon. gentlemen this morning before the House opened.

Just for clarification, we know the rules by which we will be governed, since we now have established this procedure from now until one o'clock to debate this particular resolution for now

condemning the actions of France, then very shortly we will have a draft resolution available which then, I would take it, somebody from the Official Opposition, whom the Official Opposition will designate, plus the hon. member for St. John's East - it is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) - from our side - will get together to go over that draft resolution to see whether it meets approval, or if any changes or amendments might be needed to it to get a consensus. Meanwhile, we will continue to debate in the House this particular resolution that leave has just been given for. We will have that as soon as we can, and hopefully, then, we can get into the debate on that resolution.

Then comes the matter of speaking in the House. I understand from our House Leader (Mr. Simms), in a discussion with the official Opposition House Leader, that the arrangement is that both leaders would have thirty minutes and every other member would have fifteen minutes, in order to give as many members of the House as possible an opportunity to address themselves to the resolution. I would just like to hear from the member for St. John's East on that, if that is okay.

MR. LONG:
That is okay.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
So I can proceed, then, I take it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
It is agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, let me say in launching the debate on our condemnation as a Legislature for the action taken by France yesterday that I spoke last evening with our federal representative in the Cabinet of Canada (Mr. Crosbie), and at that point in time they did not have much information. I provided as much information as I could to Mr. Crosbie on the matter, and I have not heard from anybody in the federal government yet this morning.

But this morning, in a special Cabinet meeting that was held at 8:00 o'clock, the Cabinet further discussed this matter. We have sent a Telex off to the Prime Minister on behalf of the government expressing our outrage over the actions taken by France on the evening of May 5, 1988, and the unwarranted detention of a Newfoundland inshore fishing vessel in waters off the South Coast of Newfoundland.

This flagrant action by the French violates a long history of harmonious practices by the small boat fishermen of Newfoundland and St. Pierre - Miquelon in these waters. Traditionally, small boat fishermen have fished side by side in waters between St. Pierre - Miquelon and the Burin Peninsula. We go on record as commending the Secretary of State for its External Affairs, Mr. Clark, for suspending the mediation talks, and we also end the Telex by saying that the Government of Newfoundland cannot support any resumption of these talks until the full implication of France's actions has been determined.

So we do not want Canada to resume these mediation talks tomorrow, we need to sit down and to clearly study the implications of what France has done yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, this whole question of France's rights in Canadian waters, or in Canada, has been the subject of many, many debates over the years. We can go back to treaties that were signed between Great Britain and France right up into the nineteenth hundreds. The Treaty of Utrecht, the Treaty of Versailles, and I think the Treaty of Paris, all are involved historically in the ongoing battle between the British Empire and the French Empire over territories around the world. Now being a Province of Canada, in 1988 we still find Canada and ourselves debating this whole issue of France's ongoing rights, however defined in Canada, and have been for the last number of years.

We had, as we all know, the 1972 Treaty, which we think was a mistake, signed between Canada and France which gave certain rights to the French as it relates to St. Pierre and Miquelon, fishing rights and so on. After that, we had this infamous January 24 agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of France concerning trying to resolve both the boundary issue and the fish issue, France's right to fish in Canadian waters.

Unfortunately, over the years Canada has allowed itself to be put in the position that even though it is a national boundary that is to be determined here, they will do it and have, over and over again, made the linkage between the boundary and France's right to fish, so that what has

happened over the years, and Canadians and a lot of Newfoundlander's are not totally familiar with this, is that Canada itself has allowed to be used in determining a boundary St. Pierre and Miquelon, which is still French territory under international law and international treaty, to have the boundary issue become linked with France's ongoing right to fish, so that in trying to resolve the boundary the only part of Canada that compromises and sacrifices anything in order to get that boundary clearly defined is Newfoundland and Labrador.

One of the fundamental principles which has always guided our advice to the federal government has been, Please, Canada, delink it, do not make the resolution of the boundary issue dependent upon France's ongoing right to fish in Canadian waters. Because when you start doing that, then ultimately, given that there has to be compromises and mediation, for a resolution of it more and more fish are going to have to be given to France in order to get the whole thing solved.

We were very, very upset and outraged when the Canadian government entered into secret talks with France and signed that January 24 agreement. We were not involved. We did not know about it. And one of the clauses in that agreement set the principle for not only having the business of fishing rights being resolved, but going so far as to indicate that Canada was prepared to provide additional fish, outside what was surplus to Canada's or Newfoundland's need, in an attempt to get a resolution to this matter. So we had a series of meetings ensue which saw the

Canadian government: putting certain tonnes of non-surplus 2J+3KL, or Northern cod as we call it, on the table in addition to other fish being put on the table as well.

We have always taken the view, Mr. Speaker, that, yes, we recognize international law. We recognize, unfortunately and regrettably, that that right to fish is still there, but it should be defined in any agreement with France based upon fish that was available, in other words, surplus fish, and that we were prepared as a province to advise the federal government in their negotiations with France. Yes, they have a right to fish, but that right can only be defined on what is. You cannot define something on what is not and, therefore, any resolution of fish quotas for France should be done on the basis of surplus species of fish, in other words, fish that was surplus to Canada's needs, and in that way define France's right to fish.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the fishery of Newfoundland and you look at what has happened since the 200-mile limit, an attempt to try to bring some sensible scientific managerial control over the resource, it only makes good sense.

We were prepared, and we told the Canadian government over and over again, that if ever this went to arbitration we think that we would have a good case before any independent arbitration to argue. Yes, France, you have a right to fish but that right has to be defined on what is available, and that that would be surplus stocks. Already Canada has offered France thousands and thousands, tens of thousands of

metric tonnes of fish which were surplus to Canada's needs, which could be used to fulfill the international obligation of Canada to provide fish to France. But once you move beyond that, as Canada has done, then we have fish on the table from the 2J+3KL cod stocks, off the East and Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, in addition to all the surplus fish that has already been offered to France. France has been extremely unreasonable, and in every point along the way has put roadblocks in the way of a resolution to this matter.

When it came down to the crunch, Mr. Speaker, and when Canada physically, if you will, offered Northern cod, a nonsurplus stock to the French, we walked away from the table, and every action since that time vindicates the position we took at that time, even though at the time most Newfoundlanders said we were wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
It is easy, Mr. Speaker, to stand up for Newfoundland and Labrador when times are easy, to stand on some theoretical premise, to stand on some theoretical idea, when you do not have to deliver on the goods. But, Mr. Speaker, when that theory became practice, when we had to put our money where our mouth was, we stood up for Newfoundland and Labrador even against some of our own people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
We told the federal government, I told Mr. Crosbie and I told the Prime Minister and I told anybody

who would listen to us, that you cannot deal with this country, France, in the way Canada was going about it, knowing the way that France deals all over this world; there was a book written a couple of years ago by a European which was called, as I said in the House some time ago, **The Quarrelsome French**. We have seen, we have reaped what we have sown on this issue, Mr. Speaker. Even though Canada went against the long-term best interests of one of their provinces in providing non-surplus Northern cod to the French, what did the French do? 'Give me more! Give me more! Give me more!' Then they deliberately announced, 'We are going to send a trawler into Sovereign Canadian waters. Canada, would you please arrest us?' They deliberately did it. This is a country which has seen Canada give them tens of thousands of tonnes of surplus fish, and offer to give them a significant amount of fish that we did not have to give them. That is how unreasonable the French have been:

Now, yesterday they have taken another provocative act by arresting or detaining, whatever the phrase is, a small Newfoundland fishing boat and bringing it into St. Pierre and Miquelon, and there is an historic understanding between Canada and France that in the small boat fishery, they will fish side by side off one another's rocks. Never before has either country taken this action, so why now, Mr. Speaker? It calls into question the whole approach Canada has taken on this matter. It calls into question their whole negotiating strategy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have said to the federal government over and

over and over again, you have to use some big sticks in the same way as France has been using big sticks. Canada seems to want to use in the world this nice, middle-of-the-road diplomacy - this will get you everywhere. And, I suppose, generally speaking, given that we are a middle power in the world, that has some merit. But that is a general, overall diplomatic policy to be followed. That has to be amended from time to time to deal with one specific country or another specific country, depending upon the politics and the attitude of that specific country. In this particular case, this general, nice, diplomatic approach that Canada takes does not work. It has failed miserably. It is almost as if Canada wishes to protect Brittany over protecting Newfoundland and Labrador.

How can any Newfoundlander or Labradorian, knowing what has happened to the inshore fishery over the last three or four years, for whatever reason agree with giving one single ounce of Northern cod to the French, when our inshore fish plants are closed down six and seven months of the year, when we have the lowest standard of living in Canada and the highest taxes to try to sustain ourselves?

So, now, we as a government here in Newfoundland and Labrador have to look carefully at our ongoing relationship where our powers exist with St. Pierre and Miquelon. We have to review all of our bilateral arrangements; we have some with St. Pierre and Miquelon. We have to look carefully at all our bilateral relationships.

I do not know how the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon feel, so one has to be careful whether they are just a pawn in the ongoing larger French political system at the present moment. But we are going to have to review them and look at them and we are going to have to even get tougher in the future than we were in the past as it relates to how we advise the federal government. And there are a lot of people, I am sure, in Newfoundland and Labrador who would say we have already been too tough, we should not have walked away from the table. That is what I heard, Mr. Speaker. Now it is clear why we walked away from the table. We knew who we were dealing with. The Canadian Government did not who they were dealing with.

So we are going to have to look carefully at everything that we do with St. Pierre and Miquelon, because in the final analysis they are a part of the country called France. We cannot help that. That was done historically in treaties long before we were here, we meaning us who are here now.

But it is a sad, sad affair that we find ourselves in a particular situation today, Mr. Speaker, which, I suppose, is no different than situations that we have been in throughout our whole history; the more things change, the more they remain the same, it seems, as it relates to Newfoundland and Labrador. Just as you think you are making one step forward, just as you think you are starting to make some improvement, all of a sudden you get an awful smack across the face. We get the 200-mile limit through The Law of the Sea Conference, and everybody around the world lauded this wonderful international agreement

which would protect us, only to find, as we find today, which exacerbates the existing situation, that we are really the only country - Province now - in the world that has a Continental Shelf that goes out beyond 200 miles where there is a significant fishery.

I have checked this out: Argentina and Australia have physically some Continental Shelf out beyond a 200-mile limit, but they have no fishery.

We are the only place in the world blessed to be unblessed. We have out there the Nose and the Tail of the Banks, which is not covered under international law, and so this great international initiative and accomplishment is soured only in Newfoundland and Labrador out of the whole world, because foreign nations can go out there and fish the spawning grounds before the fish come inside the 200-mile limit. We have been arguing that one with the Canadian government ever since I have been Premier and last year we finally got them to agree that Canada will try once more to talk to the other countries of the world about extending it, and that if that is not done, then they might have to take some more drastic action. How long that will take, one never knows.

We are being attacked now because our Continental Shelf is beyond 200 miles, and so the Nose and Tail of the Banks is being raped. We had an EEC agreement which allowed the European countries to fish so much fish off our shores, which has now lapsed. We have the French who think they can fish in Newfoundland now almost the same as they did 100 years ago. As a result of all of that, Mr.

Speaker, as we said at the time, we have other Canadians who believe that they have just as much right to fish off Newfoundland as we do. Forget history! Forget convention!

There is now a lobby group formed in New Brunswick and Quebec, with money, who, over the last three or four months, anywhere you go, at any fisheries meeting, are there lobbying the federal government to give them some 2J+3KL fish. They thought they were going to get some this year when the management plan came out for 1988. They were unsuccessful. But, Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of time. There are far more seats in Quebec and New Brunswick than there are in Newfoundland and Labrador. They can say, If the French nation can get some of your so-called nonsurplus fish, how about Canadians? It is only a matter of time when we will not only be threatened by a foreign power on their right to fish in Canadian waters, but by other Canadians who will see to it that they get some of that so-called surplus fish in 2J+3KL, while our fish plants are closed down, while our fishermen cannot fish.

So you have the French unresolved, provoking Canada to get more fish, and provoking us through actions like were taken yesterday.

You have the Nose and Tail of the Banks being raped because it is not part of the Law of the Sea 200-mile limit. You have other Canadians, and, no doubt, if this is ever solved and the French get some more fish, you will have the Germans and the other members of EEC saying, We are members of the EEC, too, as France is, and if one member of the EEC can get some fish off Newfoundland, so can we.

The only ones who are left are the Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to eke out some kind of an existence here as everybody else crowds around us and tries to take from us that which is ours historically.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have always taken the position as a government, on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, that there has to be some greater control for Newfoundland and Labrador in the fishery, however you define it out. That was one of the biggest mistakes in the Terms of Union. One of the biggest mistakes in the Terms of Union was that, that we need more say in the fishery, because we cannot do it with seven seats.

It is the same kind of argument that the West makes for Senate reform. If you have a Senate which is equally represented, then you have to have power that you could not get through the House of Commons.

And if we do not get it through some different arrangement on the fishery, this kind of action that we are taking today will be repeated over and over again. It is vital! The Leader of the Opposition thinks somewhat like the Canadian government. His statement was, Well, it is all right to give a limited amount of cod to the French to resolve this matter. That is his position. That is his position. And I understand where he is coming from in the larger context. The only problem with that is like Canada, you are not dealing with a reasonable group of people and you have to think of the consequences of that action. Because once you say that, you are also saying that

New Brunswick and Quebec and others must be able to have a limited quantity of fish when a dispute happens.

Because the Canadian way of solving things, and the Leader of the Opposition's way of solving things is, when there is a dispute, there has to be a settlement and, therefore, everybody has to compromise. We cannot afford to compromise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We cannot afford to compromise. We are not against compromise if you can afford to. If I am building a house and I only have enough land around me to put the house on, and of the land next to my footings on the house someone is claiming part of a foot that I can afford to compromise, because I will not be able to get out of my house, I will be on somebody else's land.

That is the situation we are into. It is not a question intellectually of understanding that compromise is a laudible concept, it is a question of being able to afford to and still live.

Then this other misconception about our position, which has been deliberately done by lots of people inside and outside the Province. We are not asking for everything in the fishery. We put out pamphlets showing everybody what federal control, licencing and policing of foreign fishing vessels, should still be in federal hands. International fisheries negotiations are still in federal hands. We talk about licencing inshore fishermen being in provincial hands and

negotiating the sharing of the TAC. This where our power comes from. There should be a requirement, mandatory not just consult, and then they still have all the power to do what they want.

It is some good for me to tell you, Yes, boy, we will involve you in this, we will consult you, when you have all the field so you consult and you go ahead with what you were going to do anyway. That is no point. You cannot get it through politics, through seats, because we do not have the people to have that many more seats in the House of Commons. You have to get it through a more reasonable sharing of powers between the two levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this incident yesterday and the deliberate incident three or four weeks ago of sending their trawler into Canadian sovereign waters, is beginning to demonstrate to Canadians, and especially Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, the cold, hard, brutal truth that we do not have the luxury to be what other people consider reasonable. We do not have that luxury if, in fact, we are going to build a vibrant society in Newfoundland and Labrador and stop the drain to Toronto or Calgary or Edmonton. We do not have the luxury. And any small society anywhere in the world has shown that. From Iceland even to Greenland, for God's sake, and other small societies, you do not have that kind of luxury.

Mr. Speaker, we have a copy now, I think, of a resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I have just passed it out. It is not signed by (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, no, I know. So we will have to get somebody from the other side to get together.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They have it now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Who will it be from the other side?

Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay and Minister of Fisheries, and the member for St. John's East.

I just hope, Mr. Speaker, that by the time one o'clock comes everybody in this House can get behind a resolution of condemnation and its detail, so that we can stand tall, proud, and right for something that other countries, including our own, are trying to take away from us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I would like to welcome to the galleries thirty Grade IX students, and their teacher from St. Peter's Elementary in Mount Pearl.

I would also like to welcome sixty-one Level 11 students. I see one of them is Jackie Efford, daughter of the hon. the member for Port de Grave - who are here with their teachers, Verdon Mercer and Edward Neil, from Assension Collegiate in Bay Roberts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much difference of opinion in most respects between what the hon. the Premier said this morning, and the official Opposition. Certainly, there is absolutely no difference of opinion as to the end to be achieved, what our goal is, and what our goal ought to be, but there are some differences as to the means of getting there, how that will be most effectively achieved. This incident yesterday has brought this matter to a head today and caused this emergency debate. Before anybody judges or condemns any particular action, it is normal to do a fairly thorough assessment to make sure that the action is wrong, particularly when it takes place in circumstances where there may be a difference between the parties concerned as to what is right or wrong in the area, and there is a difference between France and Canada and with respect to the boundary around St. Pierre and Miquelon and Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance we do not need to know precisely where the incident took place. We do not need to know that it would be on the Newfoundland side of the equidistant line between the two territories, because, Mr. Speaker, for decades and centuries the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon have fished in these waters without paying very much attention to lines or boundaries. It has been a practice of hundreds of years and the action of the French in those circumstances is terrible, is totally incomprehensible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

We do not need to do a fine detailed examination of the rights or wrongs in order to condemn it, it order to join with the government to pass an unanimous resolution of this House to condemn that action. It is capable of immediate condemnation, and that is precisely what it ought to have by all members of this House.

The Premier wondered, during his comments, how the people of St. Pierre felt, and whether they were just being used as pawns by France. In fact, I suspect I know how a great number of our people, particularly the people in Fortune Bay and on the Burin Peninsula generally, feel about it. There is great interaction between the people of the Burin Peninsula in particular, and the people of St. Pierre, and the fishermen of those two areas have a great understanding for one another and share in hardships on a daily basis. I doubt very much that this is the deliberate, provocative action of the people of St. Pierre alone. I suspect that it is attributable primarily, if not totally, to the Government of France. That is difficult to know with certainty, but in all of the evidence that we have before us that is the only rational conclusion to which one could come.

It is also consistent with another event that has been happening in the last few days. Prime Minister Chirac, in his political battle with President Mitterrand for the future presidency of France, has been doing other things, like arranging, some say by the payment of many tens or hundreds of

millions of dollars, for the release of the French hostages in Lebanon to achieve political support. He has also broken his agreement with New Zealand and released the people who were in jail as result of bombing the Greenpeace boat in Auckland Harbour, and has upset the government and the people of New Zealand immensely as a result of it. All this is toward the political end of gaining points for himself in the French presidential run-off election between Prime Minister Chirac and President Mitterrand.

That may well be as much a factor in this decision as a deliberate, provocative action to provoke further the dispute between Canada and France, or it may well be a combination of both. But one cannot look at the political events of the world of the last few days and not take that into account in this particular situation.

If that is indeed what is behind it, then the actions of the French Government are reprehensible, to disturb the good and peaceful relations between the fishermen of St. Pierre and the fishermen of this Province, who have for decades and centuries put out their nets together in the same waters and shared the same fish. I do not believe that there is anybody in this Province who wants to say today to the people of St. Pierre and to people generally that that should change. I suspect they want to continue on with the practices of the past for small boat fishermen, for the inshore fishermen, and therein lies the difference.

There is another concern that should be mentioned, Mr. Speaker,

and that is concern for the fishermen who are the pawns of this venture by the Government of France.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Both the Government of this Province and the Government of Canada must take that into account.

We cannot allow our fishermen, who are prosecuting their daily work for the benefit of this Province and for the benefit of this country, as well as for their own personal benefit, to bear fully the brunt and the cost of this endeavour by the Government of France. We have to take that into account as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier raised some other questions. I share his view that these issues as to the boundary around St. Pierre and Miquelon and whatever other rights France may have to fish in Canadian waters are independent of one another, and the issues must be resolved independently on the basis of their own respective merits. We cannot deny the fact that St. Pierre is part of France. It is part of a foreign nation, France. They do not have to simply wait upon our acquiescence as to how much waters they are entitled to as part of their territorial waters or part of their economic fishing zone. That should be determined at international law and their are clear principles of international law for determining it. We ought to go immediately to arbitration to determine that issue according to principles of international law and put an end to this irrational action, this tit for tat action back and forth between our two

countries and eliminate the difficulty and differences that exist between our people.

I was interested to hear the Premier's comment this morning that he acknowledges France's right to fish in Canadian waters. He acknowledges that. Well, I can understand his acknowledging it. It is there in treaties that are centuries old. What is uncertain is what are the exact limits of those rights. Now the Premier has his definition of it. He says it is confined to fish that are surplus to Canadian need. That is a highly desirable position. There is no question about it, it is a highly desirable position and we should do everything within our power to try and achieve that result, but, Mr. Speaker, is it the position at international law? We do not know. That should be determined according to the principle of international law. Let nobody doubt what our position is with respect to that matter, and what our position is with respect to other provinces. While we cannot in Canada, and we acknowledge that we cannot in Canada, dictate absolutely what the French fishing rights will be - that must be determined at international law - what we can dictate, Mr. Speaker, and let there be no doubt about it, is what are the rights within Canada. And we have said consistently from the beginning that nobody in this country, no other fisherman from any other province of this country should have rights to fish a limited total allowable catch in 2J, 3KL waters, or waters generally off the Coast of Newfoundland, unless and until the total needs and capability of the Newfoundland fishermen and fish plants are first met in full.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

No other province of Canada should have the right to fish 2J, 3KL waters so long as there is a capacity to catch and a capacity to process here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD:

What a switch!

MR. WELLS:

It is not a switch! It has been our position on the record for months and months. It is there. Read it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS:

It is there, read it. There are none so blind as those who will not see, Mr. Speaker. It was tabled in the House, as a matter of fact, months ago.

MR. TOBIN:

The day of the Throne Speech.

MR. WELLS:

No, it was not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly our position. The Government of Canada has the means at its disposal to regulate and determine that with certainty, even though it does not have the means to determine with certainty the extent of French fishing rights in Canadian waters. But we should act upon that which we can determine and make sure that the fisherman of Newfoundland and Labrador, who have prosecuted that fishery for centuries, have first crack at the total Canadian rights

in those waters, and to the extent that there is surplus fish available to that need, then we must share with our sister provinces.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the proper approach. But it is also proper, Mr. Speaker, to try and determine at the earliest possible opportunity the exact limits of the rights of France, if any, to fish in Canadian waters. It would be nice if we could persuade an international arbitration tribunal that the Premier's position is the correct one.

I cannot say with certainty, as a matter of international law, that that can easily be achieved. I have heard the Premier's expression about that this morning. I do not share his confidence that that can be so easily achieved before an independent international arbitral tribunal, but we should try to achieve it.

If, in the meantime, we can work out an agreement with France that would see those rights phased out after three years, eliminated totally after three years by means of agreeing to their having a limited catch in the meantime, then I would think that may well be a wise move on our part because it gets rid of the problem forever. I am not even certain that that can be achieved, but that is a matter of negotiation between the parties. If it could be achieved it would be a very desirable end, and may indeed be a small price to pay for our future security, and for getting rid of the uncertainty of international arbitral tribunals. Those, Mr. Speaker, are the directions which we ought to be taking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of other issues that the Premier raised this morning that I may well deal with on another occasion, but there is one thing he mentioned that I think I should deal with now. And he mentioned the approach to dealing with France.

France has had a particular and well-known record in international diplomatic relations. There is not much doubt about that. The Premier referred to one particular book that dealt with the issue. France takes a particular approach that puts the interest of France first and foremost, and not only first and foremost but it frequently says the interest of France is the only interest that is worth considering.

So with respect to that point, the Premier's comment is reasonably well taken. But that does not mean that we have to be equally irrational in dealing with them. We still have to deal with them on a proper and sensible basis that is sustainable in international law because we are dealing with international relations.

The Premier says that that justifies the position they took of walking away from the table, because, he said, he and his government knew who they were dealing with but the Government of Canada did not. I disagree with that. I am quite confident the Government of Canada knew whom they were dealing with. The fact that you recognized the attitude of France in its international relations does not mean that you have to act irrationally. The only alternative to walking away from the table, as the Premier recommends, is some kind of war. So long as France is maintaining

it has exclusive rights and Canada maintains it has exclusive rights, the only alternative to walking away from the table is war. That is irrational, if not insane, Mr. Speaker. It is not the right approach. That we ought to stand firmly and protect our position, of course, but walking away from the table is seldom the right approach, and I do not think it was the right approach when the Premier took it.

Now, he dealt with another issue that I want to deal with. He went on to deal with their position with respect to jurisdiction, and we will deal with the pros and cons of the detail of that on another occasion, but I want to deal with it in general terms now. He says our problem is we have only seven federal seats in this Province, and when it comes to Quebec, with its chunk of seats, and Ontario with its chunk of seats, and the two of them together with 60 per cent of the seats in the House of Commons, Newfoundland and Labrador is insignificant. He is right. He is absolutely right. That disparity has been the primary cause of the failure of this country as a federal nation ever since it was born in 1867. Every single thing that has ever been done, every single action that has ever been taken to correct regional disparities has failed miserably, one after the other, ADA, ARDA, DREE, DRIE, and anything else that you can think of. And now ACOA is in the process of similar failure. It is going to happen, it is on the way, its failure was announced in Mr. Wilson's budget this Spring. Because, Mr. Speaker, of the overwhelming voting power of Quebec and Ontario, everything that is ever done for this

Province is within twelve to eighteen months applied universally across the country, so it can no longer correct disparities. Not only that, but it tends to aggravate them because it gives those provinces, that already have superior economic power, an additional help which they do not need.

Now, that is what has happened, and that is what is wrong, and the same thing will apply to the fishery. So the Premier is right in that. What he is wrong in, Mr. Speaker, is his solution. His solution will never provide a solution, because what he wants is more power for the Province.

MR. WINDSOR:
That is right.

MR. WELLS:
The hon. minister says 'right'. That is not the solution.

MR. WINDSOR:
Oh, is it?

MR. WELLS:
Just listen now and you will hear, if you will do me the courtesy, I will explain why that solution is wrong. It is the wrong solution to it.

When we increase the power of the Province, we also increase the power of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. That is the fundamental failure of Meech lake. That is its fundamental failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
And we will forever be in a position where we will have seven seats and we will be outvoted

always by the overwhelming power of Ontario and Quebec, and as the provinces get more power those provinces will have it too. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is a limit on the power of Ontario and Quebec, a reduction of it, and there is only one way to achieve it in a federal system and that is by a Triple E Senate. That is the answer. What we need is to require the approval of both the House of Commons and the Senate to all exercises of federal legislative and fiscal power. Then, with a Triple E Senate, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and every other small province will have 10 per cent of the vote, will have a vote equal to Ontario and equal to Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
That is how we get our rights, that is how we protect our future. We are all headed for the same end and the difference is how we can effectively achieve it. That is how it should be done in a federal system. That is how it works in Australia, a British parliamentary system. The Minister of Health (Dr. Collins) the other day was deprecating my comments because I compared it with the United States, but he failed to mention that I also compared it with Australia where it works very, very well. They run a federal system where each state has an equal vote in the Second Chamber, the Senate, and that is the answer to Newfoundland's problem, and that is the answer to the problem of every other small province in this Nation, because only then, when the Senate has equal legislative power with the House of Commons, and when each of the small

provinces have equal voting power with the large provinces in the Senate, only then will we be able to assure that we get our just deserts in this Federation. As long as we maintain a situation where the ultimate and really only effective control is in a House of Commons dominated by Ontario and Quebec, we will forever be in the position that we are in now, and that is the fundamental failure of Meech Lake. And, it is the failure to look at it, and examine in detail the fundamental principles of federalism, that direct the Premier and others toward Meech Lake, because of the false hope that the Province is going to get more power and have more influence, but proportionately that much more goes to Ontario and Quebec, and that is our basic problem now.

I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) shake his head. He obviously does not understand the fundamental principle. I he did he would endorse fully what I say, and anybody who looks at the fundamental principles of federalism will see that, because that is the only place where we are ever going to get a fair say. The Premier is right when he says our problem is seven seats, and that is our basis problem. Compare that with ninety-five in Ontario or seventy-five in Quebec and we are overwhelmed every time, but we should go to the right answer, not more power for us because it is proportionately more power for Ontario and Quebec as well. The right answer is to limit the power to Ontario and Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to dealing with these issues that are before us today, the only differences between us is as to

the approach. We are all clear on where we ought to go and on what ought to be the end.

I have had a look at the draft resolution, just a quick glance at it, and I must say it appears to be in order. I am going to look at it in detail now when I finish speaking. But, generally speaking, it appears to be acceptable and in order.

Mr. Speaker, what we are asking is that Canada use the full force of its diplomatic and economic relations with France. And to be fair to this government, they have taken that position from the beginning in this dispute, and it is completely consistent with the position they have taken from the beginning. Except, Mr. Speaker, they have not themselves been consistent. Questions have been asked here in this House of Assembly in the last few weeks about the dealings the government itself has had with a major French company, with the Department of Development awarding it a major contract.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

There is another proposal that this government appeared to approve, and there have been indications in the last couple of days that another major arrangement is going to be made, and that is with CHC Helicopters, because that is dependent upon the conclusion of an agreement with Aerospatial, a French major helicopter producer. If the government is going to be consistent it must also put its own money where its mouth is, it must take the same action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

When it asked the government of Canada not to deal with France in terms of purchasing the Airbus for Air Canada, or not deal with France in terms of purchasing nuclear submarines until this matter is fairly and properly resolved, it may be that that is a reasonable and proper approach. But when it does that, it must also follow the same line itself; otherwise it is being hypocritical and we would have to understand the government of Canada totally ignoring the request of the government.

We are going to be taking a look at suggesting a couple of changes in the resolution, but we will discuss that with the committee when they meet.

Mr. Speaker, I and all of the members in this caucus will support generally this resolution as agreed. But I would ask the government itself to make sure that it follows the procedure that it is asking the government of Canada to follow in terms of its own economic relation with companies doing business out of France. That is likely to add to the impact and they ought to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that I would say before I sit down is whatever we do in response to this situation, because it is focused in St. Pierre, because that is the focus of it at the moment, we not lose sight of the traditional friendly relations and interactions that have existed between the people of this Province and of St. Pierre, even if a good portion of it is dealing in illicit liquor, that we not

lose sight of the close family ties, since there has been a great deal of intermarriage between the people of the South Coast of Newfoundland and the people of St. Pierre, that we not lose sight of what we have had for centuries. It is important that we act rationally and reasonably while, at the same time, firmly standing up for and protecting the rights of the people of this Province, particularly our fishermen. But it is important that we recognize where the real opponent is, and the real opponent in this case is in Paris, not in St. Pierre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that it is not with any great degree of pride that any of us or this Legislature is taking part in this particular debate today. We are not ashamed to be doing it, Mr. Speaker, but it is not with any pride that we have to do it.

Now, I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the few minutes that I have to get into a long, political wrangle or debate with the hon. gentleman. A number of his comments could easily lead to that, but there is one point I want to make in

relation to the hon. gentleman's comments. Mr. Speaker, it is simply this: To take the right position, the correct position, the only defensible, Newfoundland position, that we cannot afford to share stocks that are non-surplus to our own needs and to our own capacity and to our own economic viability, is a soundly defensible position. It is an eminently sensible Newfoundland position. But, Mr. Speaker, to take that approach in dealing with other Canadian provinces, which is right and proper and we support it and it has been the foundation of our fisheries policies since eons in time and we are solidly behind it, can you then say out of the other side of your cheek, in the same debate, that we will not and should not and must not and cannot share with other Canadians, but we can somehow find a limited supply from the same source to share with foreigners!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, that is not putting words in the hon. gentleman's mouth. It is not quoting him inaccurately. I do not want and do not intend to further get into a political hassle on this most important motion, but I cannot let that go unnoticed, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has said, and said again today, 'it may be a small price to pay to use some limited amount.' He has said it outside the House, he has said it in the House, and it was said again today, and at the same time take the correct position that we cannot use any amount to share with other Canadians. Now, you cannot square that, Mr. Speaker. You cannot say give it to the foreigners and not give it to

Canadians. That is only a part of what this debate is all about, but I think it is a vital part. It must be correctly and unmistakably and clearly understood that when something is non-surplus it is non-surplus for all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
But for the sake of all that is good and holy and right, it has got to be non-surplus for a foreigner. No such things as limited amounts or small amounts or little pieces, it is just not there. It is the foot in the door, Mr. Speaker, and it is that foot in the door that has caused us this difficulty since 1972.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
It is that foot in the door that has caused us our difficulties since 1713, 1853, 1905, with the London Convention, and then dastardly wrapped up in the 1972 Treaty. That is the foot in the door that has Newfoundland and Labrador where we are today. That has to be clearly understood.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened yesterday is unforgivable. It is provocative to the Nth degree. There cannot be a Newfoundlander or Labradorian walking on the shores of Ming's Bight today who is not ashamed and disgusted and frustrated with what took place yesterday, and not by any provocative action of this Province, not by any provocative action of this country because we have historically for decades and decades upon top of decades have fished shoulder by shoulder, cheek by cheek, and whatever other parts

of the anatomy you want to talk about, in the waters between St. Pierre and Miquelon and the Burin Peninsula, jigger by jigger. It has been historically the case that in small vessels we have not bothered each other. There are diplomatic notes governing the fact that we do not bother each other into the disputed zone for small vessels. That is a fact. That has been in force for years. But it has been historically a fact, that in small inshore fishing vessels, vessels less than sixty-five feet is the category we are talking about, we have bumped into each other, fished next to each other, hauled upon the rocks on each other's coast without bothering each other. That is the fundamental difference that has taken place in this particular provocative action over the last twenty-four hours.

That has all changed now, Mr. Speaker. There is a new set of international rules now that none of us are prepared to live by any more, we are not prepared to accept the fact that for decades this has happened, we are going to change it. Who made that decision, Mr. Speaker? France has made that decision.

Some of the media I have talked to over the last twenty-four hours tried to zero in on the arrest of the French vessel in Canadian waters just a few weeks ago. Mr. Speaker, it is like day and night. It is the difference between day and night. Those people, again, provocatively put on their sashes, deliberately put on their sashes, took the media with them and said we are going to fragrantly abuse your sovereignty, are you going to arrest us? Please arrest us. And we did. We did what was right. Canada did

what was right.

This incident is so different! This is a Newfoundland fisherman from Fortune Bay, or wherever he is from, doing what we have for decades done in the waters between St. Pierre and Miquelon. Doing nothing different, Mr. Speaker, not being provocative in any way, Mr. Speaker, but doing what we and they have done next door to each other for decades. So that has changed now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is time for this country - we have been saying this consistently as a government since this whole business started, going back now over the last several months and into over a year - to start dealing with the nation of France in the only language that the French understand. And that is not a war cry, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Leader of the Opposition talks about going to war. That is not a war cry. That is getting in touch with the reality of the irrationality that the hon. gentleman was talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

This particular nation has chosen deliberately and consciously to be irrational, but, that does not demand that we respond to irrationality with irrationality. But it certainly demands, Mr. Speaker, that the leaders of this country have to be determined to deal, as we have called on them over the last several months to deal, with France in the only language they understand.

And that is forceful, economic language. The French know no other way, Mr. Speaker. They have

not been doing it, it is not because we have not been demanding that they be doing it, that is the only language that this country is going to understand. We have to make it tough enough. We have to make it so tough that they will drop the irrationality.

Talking about walking away from the table, Mr. Speaker, who has walked away from the table twice in the last twelve months. Who Canada? No, Mr. Speaker. France has deliberately walked away from negotiations twice within the last twelve months. You talk about walking away from the table! So that is what we have to do. We, this government, Mr. Speaker, are not about to declare a war on St. Pierre and Miquelon. We understand and respect and realize that they have a right to exist. They have a right, historically, to whatever fish they have been historically fishing, some 5,600 to 6,000 tons a year, it has been, not the 50,000 that they are demanding. They have a right to expect that and we have an obligation and a duty to provide it, and we support that. But we cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that just as the fisherman of Newfoundland and Labrador are pawns in this international situation, so are the residents of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

We have bilateral arrangements with St. Pierre and Miquelon that are to their advantage. We have educational bilateral arrangements, we have forest fire protection, air-ambulance. It was only a few days ago that some of their residents applied for the re-issuing of their lobster buyers licences that they have in this Province. Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as of today - the Minister of Development (Mr.

Barrett) is also reviewing the other agreement that was talked about today - there is nothing sacred between us and St. Pierre and Miquelon and France.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We are not warmongers, Mr. Speaker, we are just ordinary folk who want to protect our rights, protect our heritage, so that our people, too, without trampling on the rights of the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon, can live with a bit of dignity and have a right to make a living. That is what this is all about. If Britain were ever to come back to Canada today demanding the colonial rights that France is demanding in waters adjacent to this country, we would be wiped off the map, Mr. Speaker.

It is totally unrealistic. You can get into all kinds of legal arguments about international law, you can get into all that, but I do not care, Mr. Speaker, somewhere there has got to be something in international understanding called justice that says that we cannot allow these goings on to be perpetrated on our people. It has gone on long enough. It has gone on too long.

And the Government of Canada has got to clearly understand that whatever the January 24 agreements were, whatever mediation accords there were, that it is all foolishness in dealing with France, because they have no intention, they do not understand anything only the tough, take-you-by-the-neck approach. That has been their approach in international politics for centuries. It has not changed for

centuries and it has not changed in 1988. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious piece of business. It behooves all of us as members, as legislators here in Newfoundland and Labrador, to speak with one mind, not with any squigglywiggly approaches, in condemning this treacherous action, this provocative action that was taken against one of our native sons yesterday in waters that he ought to have a right to fish in as long as the grass grows and the water flows.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker, we welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate and give our full support to the interim resolution which calls for a debate on condemning the actions by France yesterday, and also look forward to the adoption of a more detailed resolution as we move closer to the adjournment.

It is interesting to sit and observe the development of the political dynamics within a very short period of time, less than twenty-four hours, I guess, we have seen the action taken by the French Navy. I observed on some of the news last night that it was the front story, the lead item on **The National** across the country last evening and then again this morning, and then to come into the House this morning and suspend the Orders of the Day to have an emergency debate, obviously

reflects the seriousness of the matter, and also reflects the commitment, which especially of the people of this Province, to such a provocation by the Government of France. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is very critical for all sides within this Province, members of political parties, and for all sides across the country that we be conscious of minimizing some of the politicalization that surrounds this issue.

Both the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier have acknowledged this morning that the action taken yesterday by the government of France is essentially of a political nature, linked to domestic politics in France with the national election on there as are other actions that we have seen in the last couple of days - the release of the prisoner in the South Pacific and the release of the hostages by the French Government, and obviously the action taken by the French Navy was another initiative which was not unrelated to the national domestic political scene in France.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we would all do well to be conscious of how actions relating to the fishery, which is so critical to this Province, can be affected in a negative way once politics is brought into it. I have a sense this morning that the Premier may see an opportunity here to make equal political response, to respond in tandem, quid pro quo, that when we have what is essentially a political statement being made by the Government of France, that the government of this Province will respond in its own political fashion. I would advise the Premier and the government to not simply run away

with this issue in a political fashion. I wonder whether we might not see, as the sun becomes a more prominent feature of the landscape, the Premier might feel in his loins, the way he is proudly and confidently speaking this morning, that this is an issue we should take to the people. I do not know that. Of course, it is up to the Premier to decide what to do with this issue, but I would caution all sides against politicizing this issue in a way that might not allow for a clear resolution of what is obviously a more fundamental issue for the people of the Province than one that should be allowed to be caught up in politics.

I think we all recognize the federal government's representative, the Minister of External Affairs, Joe Clark, this morning acknowledged, as did all speakers this morning, that this seems to be essentially a political act, and it is not exactly clear how to formulate a proper response to an action that is motivated for ulterior reasons.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, in the issue of linkage that has been raised here, which I think will come back before us in the final resolution, that the Government of Canada be called upon to use all diplomatic and economic power to resolve this situation and to respond to the crisis that France has provoked, there is a danger, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, in insisting immediately on a measure of linkage to other levers the Government of Canada might have, especially in economic terms. I think there is no doubt, since this House is a provincial Legislature, it would make a lot of sense to call upon the Government of Canada to exercise

its full diplomatic force to respond to this situation. I would hope that the Premier of the Province and the provincial government have been able to sustain a working relationship with our federal representative in the Cabinet, Mr. Crosbie, over what has been a very difficult time on this issue in the last year, when we have seen the Premier and the person in the federal Cabinet carrying the ball for Newfoundland on this issue at loggerheads and carrying on quite incredible displays of animosity and hostility, disagreement and an inability to come together on what is a very critical issue. I would hope that at this point, in light of the actions taken yesterday, that the Premier and the government are able to develop a more positive relationship with the Government of Canada and ensure that in the House of Commons today the federal member responsible for Newfoundland and the federal Minister of External Affairs are fully briefed and that there is no problem in a breakdown of communications between the Province and the federal government. Because, of course, what the federal government does on our behalf is very critical in this situation.

I think the Minister for External Affairs gave an indication this morning that the Government of Canada sees this as a very serious matter and intends to use all the diplomatic power it has. Unfortunately the Government of Canada, because of other political reasons, is not in an optimum situation these days. We do not have an ambassador to France who could be recalled. It is unfortunate that the Prime Minister, in his wisdom, saw fit to call back Canada's Ambassador

to France at an earlier date to make his available for the Prime Minister's political purposes in the Province of Quebec. Just recently the Prime Minister has set a date for a by-election in Quebec in which Canada's former Ambassador to France will be seeking a seat for the P.C. Party.

So what we have now is Mr. Bouchard, the person who would ordinarily be on the front lines representing Canada and the interests of Newfoundland and our fishermen, who would ordinarily be there to take this issue and respond immediately, finds himself embroiled in a political campaign in Quebec and, as a result, Canada is left without a representative in France. I think that is an unfortunate situation, Mr. Speaker. But, in any case, I would suggest that there is an opening there that the Government of Newfoundland could call upon the federal government, as one diplomatic gesture of Canada's intention to deal with this matter in a very serious way; to leave the position of Ambassador to France vacant for the time being. That could perhaps be one among a series of initiatives, diplomatically, that the Government of Canada could take.

On the question of economic linkage, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I, for my party, and we in this party, would be quite concerned about the discussion that is already occurring with respect to the procurement of nuclear submarines by the Government of Canada. That the bidding war that is raging between Britain and France to make a deal with the Government of Canada for the purchase of nuclear powered submarines - somehow the issue that was brought to the fore

yesterday - should become a matter that is directly linked to the question of what Canada is going to do in its decision on purchasing nuclear submarines, is one that concerns me quite a bit, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me, in fact it had been suggested publicly before, that there might be direct linkage of the fisheries dispute to the purchase of nuclear powered submarines, in which case Canada would have a lever that it could use in negotiations on the fisheries dispute with France by saying that if we purchase the nuclear powered submarines, then France would concede that negotiations on the fisheries dispute would move in a direction that would favour the position of Newfoundland and favour the position of the government of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that might indeed be something that Canada might be able to use to its advantage, to say to the French that if you are as committed to the selling of nuclear powered submarines as you seem to be, with the advertising campaign that is being waged across the country battle it is involved with along side of Britain, then the government of France might be willing to concede some space and some room in its position on negotiations with Newfoundland and Canada on the fisheries question in order to succeed in its bid on the nuclear powered submarines.

I would simply submit, Mr. Speaker, at this point that we should allow this situation to be given some time. There are dynamics that are going to develop in Canada's relations with France on a diplomatic front, and no doubt economic questions will be raised, and the whole business of

our trading relationship is something that is called in question here. But, I would hope that the government of this Province would not as a condition place upon the government of Canada demands that the issue of nuclear powered submarines be essentially tied in any way to the very sensitive matter of the fisheries negotiations.

We in this party, of course, are opposed in an unequivocal way to the purchase of nuclear powered submarines, so it would be consistent that we would not want to see the fisheries dispute jeopardize a continuing debate that is being carried on across the country about the value of purchasing nuclear powered submarines. We would not want to see that debate prejudiced and perhaps an initiative taken in a premature way as a result of this action by the government of France yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that the debate, as we heard it from the Leader of the Opposition and the response from the Minister of Fisheries, and the challenge that the minister proposes to the Liberal opposition to make clear its policy on the issue of surplus or nonsurplus cod, especially when we see the increased demands from other provinces in the country for access to our cod stocks, coming after a very long and protracted difficult period of time in which the government of this Province walked away from the table and refused to continue to participate in discussions with France because they had some indication that the Government of Canada's negotiating team did not have the same bottom line position, the same principle position, that we cannot afford at any cost to share stocks with

France, then a result of the Government of Newfoundland walking away from the table seems to have opened the door for other provinces to enter the debate and to make demands on the federal government.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very critical issue of linkage here. Other than expanding the linkage to include economic areas, there is a linkage already happening at the negotiating table with the Canadian government's negotiating team acting on behalf of the Province with representatives from the fishing industry and from the fishermen's unions, and it is quite unfortunate that the Province left the series of negotiations when it did. Because the whole issue of whether non-surplus cod could be discussed at the table, depending on the conditions set by this Province, is, of course, one that is very critical to the resolution of the boundary issue, so there is a very sensitive set of negotiations that already exist.

The discussions about non-surplus cod and access to 2J-3KL and the position of the 3Ps zone, and what is happening to the fishermen on the Southcoast of the Province and to the fishermen of St. Pierre, and how to resolve the long standing question of France's right to fishing in Canadian waters, and to, at the same time, protect our Northern zone, but especially to protect the position of the fishermen from the Southcoast, is a critical aspect which involves, of course, the issue of the boundary dispute.

So, I would say to the Minister of Fisheries, around the time when the Government of Newfoundland

left the table and the Premier went on province-wide television, free-time, to explain his position, we and our party, as were members of the Liberal party and the Leader of the Opposition, invited to consultations with representatives of the federal government, who wanted to explain their negotiating position, and it was clear to me at that time, Mr. Speaker, that that negotiating team was in a very intense period of very sensitive negotiations and the issue of the linkage between the boundary dispute and access to non-surplus cod will continue to be a very sensitive issue. It is not one that can so easily be resolved by the Minister of Fisheries, or the Premier calling the Leader of the Opposition names, essentially, and attempting to make more of his position than may actually be there.

By way of conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that some of the debate that has occurred in the House in the last couple of weeks, with respect to the differences of opinion between the Minister of Fisheries and the Leader of the Opposition, reflect in my mind the absolute need, as I said at the beginning of my comments, to minimize.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:
By way of conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if I may have thirty seconds to conclude.

MR. SPEAKER:
Yes.

MR. LONG:

I would simply say that the intensity of the debate and the demarcation of positions between the two sides highlight the comments I made in the beginning of my remarks, the absolute need to minimize the degree of politics that are being played around this issue. I think that it is important today that all sides come together in a show of unity, and we declare the common ground that exists among us, and move toward adopting a resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To echo the sentiments of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, it is not with any great deal of pride that we speak in this Legislature this morning about this very serious issue. I guess it would affect all of us differently, and some would become very emotional one way while others would be affected emotionally another way. Having a very close relationship geographically - I represent the district closest to St. Pierre and Miquelon - and being a very close friend of many of the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon for close to twenty-five years, I am affected to the extent that I am depressed for two reasons, one there are so many of my friends in St. Pierre and Miquelon and, as well, two people whom I see on a weekly basis, from the town of Fortune, are directly affected in that they are with the crew. For twenty-three years in succession, by the way, I have been to St. Pierre and Miquelon. I have many friends there I visit regularly,

and they visit me regularly in Fortune. You kind of find yourself in a dilemma, I guess, but we have to come back to, as the Premier said earlier, what your first responsibilities are, and where your first and strongest loyalties are, and in this case, putting everything I have said previously and prior in place, my loyalties and my responsibilities, with the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries and this government, are to stand up for the people I represent. That is my first responsibility, namely, the people of the district of Grand Bank.

There has been a lot said on this issue over the last number of months. We talk about the possibility or the need or the reasons for giving or not giving France Northern cod. When I look at the situation is in 3Ps where the French allocation is 6,400 metric tonnes, last year they took approximately 30,000 metric tonnes; overfished by five times their limit. I go to St. Lawrence and Lawn, particularly Lawn, which is totally dependent on the trap fishery and I talk to the trap crews. Last year was the best year they had in twelve, and that was not a great year. Then I have to put that in context, in its proper perspective. I have a lot of feeling for the inshore fishermen, particularly from St. Lawrence to Point May, who are directly affected by what happens in 3Ps, and I have to say that overfishing certainly has to stop.

Then you tie that in with the federal government and France requesting Northern cod. If they get Northern cod, we will get a double whammy. Our inshore fishery is already very negatively affected by the overfishing in 3Ps, where the inshore fishery

right along the Northeast Coast has been a failure in the last number of years because of what has happened with the Northern cod situation.

Our trawlers are very dependent upon Northern cod, as the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage knows, and, as well, our inshore fishery is affected by Northern cod with this migration patterns.

So if France gets access to Northern cod, for the residents of my district, the inshore fishermen, it will be a double whammy.

As one representative in this House of Assembly, and particularly in this government, there is no way that I can accept or partially endorse in any way the overfishing in 3Ps, or any suggestion that France be given fish in 2J+KL. There is no way I can stand for that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I think the incident of yesterday is very closely connected and orchestrated with what we saw happen just a few weeks ago, where we saw the French trawler sail into our waters, fish illegally and publicly announce they were going to do it. Senator Albert Penn and Mr. Plantegeest were arrested and were brought into St. John's with the French flags wrapped around their shoulders. Then they came out of prison and protested about the conditions of prisons in Newfoundland.

Yesterday they seized a longliner from Grand Le Pierre, with the crew made up of people from

Fortune. They took them into St. Pierre, the boat was seized, not allowed to leave port, but what did they do? They accommodated the crew in a hotel. They are treating them like kings. The crew can go anywhere they want in St. Pierre, anywhere.

The Prefect last night visited them in the hotel to see if they were comfortable, wondering if they were having a good night. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the two are connected. And if you take the incident of the trawler and the incident of the longliner and you try to connect them with France's strategy on negotiations, personally I just wonder what kind of a slick operation we are dealing with.

Even though this is smaller, in the context of negotiations between Canada and France, it is all connected. And, I say, if you cannot trust France in these situations, how can you trust them in the larger global issue of trying to get a settlement on the boundary and fish quotas. You cannot do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS:

It just demonstrates to me, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with a situation here that is going to be impossible to resolve.

Now, what is very unfortunate about it, I guess, is if we compare Newfoundland to St. Pierre, we are sort of caught in a Canadian squeeze and St. Pierre is caught in a French squeeze. As I said, I am a bit emotional and affected by it because of my long connection with the islands of St.

Pierre and Miquelon and its people. On a clear night I can look out from Point May and see the lights. I talk to the people on the telephone. If they want something I pick it up, put it on the ferry and it goes out.

MR. BAIRD:

You played soccer there.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I tried to play.

The connection between my part of the Province and St. Pierre and Miquelon is more than just fishing. I am sure most of you realize that. There has been many a bottle of French wine passed over the side of a Newfoundland boat, when they were having some French bread and wine and so on. It is more than just the fishing, it is water related. More than fish has been the exchange between Grand Bank and St. Pierre. It is very unfortunate that the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon are caught in the bind they are in.

And I reflect back to what I said earlier, that for me as a Newfoundlander, where both my grandfathers were banker fishermen, one of my grandfathers, my grandfather Matthews, sailed from the Grand Banks in a dory because he got separated from his vessel in fog; he put up a sail and came right into St. Pierre, into the Grand Bank, right in the same area where all this happened yesterday.

Now, when you reflect back and you are part of it, your ancestors were part of it, the people I see on a daily basis - I mean, I can look out from Point May and I can see where this particular boat was seized yesterday, and that really torments me. It really torments

me that this kind of thing could happen. The people really caught in the middle are the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon. And I do not see any way for the Government of this Province and for the Government of Canada to bring France to their senses, except some way where the plight of the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon is going to be highlighted. I do not know any other way. It is not what you want, it is the last thing in the world that I want, but unless the focus is turned onto St. Pierre and Miquelon, I do not see any other way of bringing France to their senses on the issue.

What is also unfortunate, 30,000 metric tonnes of fish are being taken out of 3Ps, only 6,400 metric tonnes are allocated, and the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon are not the beneficiaries of the overfishing. If it were the residents of St. Pierre and Miquelon - not that we would say, great! - it would be a little more palatable that these poor people out there who are economically depressed, as we are, were benefitting from it. But who is benefitting? Saint-Malo; that area; that fleet. It is not the people of Brittany. It is not the St. Pierre and Miquelon residents who are benefitting from the 30,000 metric tons. If there were 15,000 metric tons taken out there, which would be half, and if it went to the residents of St. Pierre and Miquelon, it would be a boom town and we would have 15,000 more metric tonnes left there for St. Pierre and Miquelon and us to utilize. If it was cut in half! But you cannot get anywhere dealing with France, Mr. Speaker. There is no way that you can deal with them.

The two things this Province has consistently stood up for: The overfishing in 3Ps must stop, and that there be no cod from 2J+3KL, not a scale.

When I go around my district, which is totally affected by the fishery, there is no way that I can entertain either one. Not five metric tons. None! Because the people of my district need it. When you look at the hon. minister's district on the Northeast coast, where the fishery has been a failure for the past number of years, how can anyone suggest that we give Northern cod to France? We cannot. Our own people need it too much. Our own livelihood depends on it.

The other thing that really bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is when I hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition saying, Yes, let us give some Northern cod to France. Give them some to try to get a resolution. What? There is no guarantee that France are going to abide by their allocations in 2J+3KL anymore than they are doing in 3Ps.

MR. BUTT:
Right on.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Anyway, they are overfishing there, who is to say they will not overfish somewhere else?

AN HON. MEMBER:
No doubt they will.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Exactly! They will! And that is another very serious consideration to it all. What will stop them? You just cannot suggest give them some, because if we give them some they will go take more and then they will argue that they want

more, they need more, and that is the way it goes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I share the Premier's confidence, contrary to the Leader of the Opposition, when he talks about arbitration.

If you look at the Channel Islands case, France will have to argue that case in reverse. I think when you talk law and arbitrations you always talk about precedents, you reflect and research back. I think we have a good case, particularly in light of what happened with the Channel Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude, because there are other people who want to speak from both sides. This issue is very, very tormenting to me, and I think I have highlighted why. It is tormenting because I represent a district that is totally a fishing district. I am tormented because I am so geographically close to St. Pierre and Miquelon, and I am tormented because as a Newfoundlander and Labradorian I see France totally disregarding the rights of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who, for centuries, have fished the very waters that that vessel was seized in yesterday.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the French are claiming that the crew was not arrested. You talk about being slick! They can go anywhere they want in St. Pierre and Miquelon, but they cannot take the boat out of the harbour. You talk about slick! They cannot come home. No. 'Boys, here is your bottle or rum, go up to the hotel. Here is your food, but you cannot have the boat.' The keys to the vessel are being held by Mr. Jean Pierre André. He has the keys. I heard

him say so this morning.

MR. SIMMS:
The Canadian Consul?

MR. MATTHEWS:
The Canadian Consul.

So there is a whole mix going on here, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest in this Legislature this morning that not only can we not trust the top negotiators in France who are dealing with Canada, but I suggest that there are people on the Island of St. Pierre and Miquelon who should not be trusted either, for various reasons. Because if you listen to them publicly on the media of this Province, at times you would swear they were our best buddies. But I assure you they are not.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record this morning and congratulate all members and parties for consenting to this debate. I look forward to seeing the resolution and full-heartedly endorsing it on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a human side to this, as the gentleman for Grand Bank district has so well put it. There are five people here and their families who have been through quite a trauma in the last few hours through no fault of their own, and that is an issue that ought to concern all of us as legislators and Newfoundlanders

and Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, there is a larger human issue here, in that literally hundreds of fishermen, indeed over the years literally thousands and tens of thousands of fishermen have fished in what we now know as 3PS, as one fisherman put it to me on the phone last night, ever since Cabot came over. They have been there a long time in those exact same waters, midway between Brunette and Miquelon Head, as was Willoughby Bolt yesterday afternoon when he was kidnapped, is the word. He was kidnapped! He was taken against his will! He may have the run of a town, of a square mile of so of territory, but he is kidnapped, if you understand that kidnapping is placed in a situation that you do not voluntarily elect to be placed in.

When he left Fortune at four-thirty yesterday morning, he had no plans to be in St. Pierre last night. He is not there because of his volition, he is there, Mr. Speaker, because he was out minding his own business. He went out East/Northeast of Miquelon Head, about nine or ten miles, shot away his gear, then began towing to the Westward. Within fifteen minutes he was alerted by the French Navy people and told that he was going to be boarded. He was out there doing what his colleagues, his counterparts, and his ancestors have done for hundreds of years. Let that be clearly understood. He was minding his own business. He was well within the law. He was well within the traditional activity of generations of people on that coast.

The gentleman for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) also mentions the

dilemma that the people of St. Pierre find themselves in and I was delighted that he, the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, took a much more sane approach than his colleague the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), with whom he should have a word, who was up this morning, when he took hysterical leave of himself on one of several occasions, talking about sanctions in terms of hospital and air ambulance. First this is despicable, and secondly, it has no place in this particular debate.

The people of St. Pierre, whom I do not represent in this chamber but like the gentleman for Grand Bank I have had occasion to socialize with, I went there to try and learn some French with perhaps no more success than the gentleman had at soccer, but that is another debate -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) soccer.

MR. SIMMONS:

As I said, no more than.

But, Mr. Speaker, these people are the pawns in that particular game too, and we can be diverted chasing rabbits, as the expression goes, or we can focus on the main issue. I want to submit that we have not focused very much on the main issue in this particular situation.

I give you as exhibit number one the Premier's Telex to Ottawa which went out, apparently, this morning, May 6. He talks about the action and he calls on the government to do certain things: suspending mediation, and so and so. What shocked me about this particular Telex was the absence of any reference to economic

levers. Here we go again, talking out of both sides of our mouths. We have watched the Department of Development do it here, and they are about to perpetrate the second deed with this Aerospatiale deal for CHC. They have already done it and tried to justify it in this House. You talk about people talking out of both sides of their mouths, Mr. Speaker. They see no problem at all with aiding and abetting the French, whom they have all the right words for this morning: They are quarrelsome, they are terrible, they are cantankerous. But we do business with them, anyway. That is the net message going out to Paris from this administration. You can do what you like to us, you can arrest our people, harass our families in Grand Le Pierre and elsewhere on the South Coast, but we will do business with you. That is the message going out from that administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, they might do business, they might continue talking out of both sides of their mouths but we, on this side of the House, are not going to condone it. And one of the things we want to see in what is otherwise a good resolution, basically a motherhood resolution, not nearly as strong as the rhetoric that you hear from the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries this morning, but if they want to put some substance to that resolution this morning, Mr. Speaker, they will address -

MR. BAIRD:
Did you say it is rhetoric?

MR. SIMMONS:
I said what the Premier and the

Minister of Fisheries said is rhetoric, and I will come back to that, but I am talking about the resolution. I said we will endorse the resolution but we would like to see it fortified a bit. We would like to see it fortified so that the House would instruct the Government of Newfoundland to put its money where its mouth is.

It is all very well to sit down here in Newfoundland and say big bad Ottawa do this, do this and do this. We agree with them when they say that, but we want to, in the next mouthful say, and we the Government of Newfoundland, are prepared to do likewise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Right on!

MR. SIMMONS:
If you want the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, to stop the deal on nuclear submarines, to stop negotiating on airbuses, then you, Government of Newfoundland, have to stop dealing on the offshore issue, and have to stop dealing on the aerospatiale issue. You have to stop it. You have to suspend all that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you see the fact of the matter is that the Premier himself must take some of the responsibility for Canada's uninformed approach to the Canada/France fishing dispute. If Mr. Siddon and Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Clark do not know exactly how to deal with the French, and if we are to believe that the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries have all the answers on the nuances of dealing with the 'quarrelsome French', then the Premier has to take a fair amount of responsibility for not communicating that insight, that

knowledge to the Government of Canada. But as we know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's quarrelsome, tantrum approach to everything is absolutely legendary in Ottawa.

It is well known in Ottawa that the Prime Minister of this country takes no pleasure at all in dealing with the Premier of this Province; he does it only under duress, only as is absolutely necessary and never more often.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am told that the big political quandary on the offshore - there are issues to be settled out with the consortium, I understand - in Ottawa these days is how to get it moving and at the same time minimize the political credit to the Premier of this Province.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is the big political quandary they have in Ottawa these particular days, how to minimize the credit to the Premier of Newfoundland and, at the same time, launch the offshore in a way that will benefit the people of Newfoundland.

The Premier goes on about no clout because we only have seven seats. If I heard it from anybody else in this country, I could take it with a grain of salt. But having been lectured by his Minister of Fisheries this morning about talking out of both sides of mouths, to hear him whine about no clout and seven seats, and then to hear him in the next mouthful stoutly defend that sellout called

Meech Lake, that sellout which ensures, Mr. Speaker, that we will never have any clout because they would remove from us any regional balance as provided for in a proper Senate - that is an issue I will deal with separately - but to hear him again talking out of both sides of his mouth on that is an issue that I have difficulty remaining silent on.

But let me come to the Minister of Fisheries. He is not in the Chamber, but he knows that I only have limited time and I would assume that he is within earshot. Mr. Speaker, I submit to him that the reason the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier have so badly fumbled the ball on this whole issue of Canada/France is because of an obsession, an obsession with childish, crude, petulant dispicable politics. And we saw it this morning again, the minute he got up. He was not on his feet thirty seconds when he was characterizing the commentary from my friend from Windsor - Buchans, the Leader of the Opposition, characterizing it in partisan political terms. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing I would like to say in this debate this morning and say particularly to the Minister of Fisheries, I know him well, and I know him as a man who cares very deeply about Newfoundland, but I am watching what is happening to him these days and his rhetoric is getting the better of him, his rhetoric is mobilizing his soul.

MR. TULK:

We all care.

MR. SIMMONS:

He has lost track of what really matters. And I make to him an appeal on behalf of Willoughby Bolt -

MR. SIMMS:

What do you call this, if it is not rhetoric?

MR. SIMMS:

- and the other four people on that boat, Mr. Speaker, I make to him an appeal and it is this: On this one if on nothing else, in the name of God, for God' sake, I say to the Minister of Fisheries, leave your cheap partisan politics at your caucus room door. Leave it back at the caucus room door, because Willoughby Bolt is not interested in your partisan politics. He is not interested in that at all, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, who is right? That is the issue that arises out of this debate this morning. Who is right? The Premier said this morning, very clearly

MR. SIMMS:

What is right. Not who is right, what is right!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a little protection. I have some things I want to say. The gentleman for Grand Falls may not agree with them, but I do not need any coaching from him on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

You need coaching from a lot of people..

MR. SIMMONS:

Whatever you say. You have always been right before.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said

this morning that France has rights in Canadian waters. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there anybody in the Chamber who would disagree, who would deny that the Premier said that this morning? He said France has rights in Canadian waters. I am sorry! He said France has fishing rights in Canadian waters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does he mean by fishing rights? Who is he fooling? Does he mean they are allowed to paddle boats over here, start their motors over here, fix their outboards over here, mend their nets over here? What does he mean by fishing rights? Surely fishing rights means the right to catch fish. Surely it means that, or it means nothing. The Premier stands there and he says clearly, France has fishing rights in Canadian waters..

The Leader of the Opposition today, and many times formerly, has said the same thing in other words and suddenly it is a great big sin, and the Minister of Fisheries gets up and flips his lid, as he so often does in a bit of rhetoric spite, and he goes on with his grandstanding about not one cod, and so on and so on and so forth. Now, put the two together. Who is right? Is it the Minister of Fisheries who says, 'No cod.' Or is it the Premier who says, 'France has fishing rights in Canadian waters?' Now, I extrapolate the fishing rights to mean the right to fish, the right to catch fish. What is the point in being out there if you are not going to catch some fish?

Mr. Speaker, this morning the Premier was very critical of Canada's approach in all of this. He used words like, 'Canada is a

nice, middle-of-the-road diplomat,' and he went on to say, 'That does not work with the quarrelsome French.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to him that Brian Mulroney has not exactly been sitting up in Ottawa waiting for that brilliant insight from the Premier of Newfoundland. I have a suspicion that the Prime Minister of this country knew beforehand exactly what he was doing, and I will tell you why. He is not nearly as naive about this as the Premier suggests. Rather, the Prime Minister of Canada has based his actions on a well-calculated strategy which completely ignores Newfoundland in all of this because that Premier, with his tantrum approach to everything, has put himself in a position where he can be ignored by the Prime Minister of this country, even though he is of the same political stripe. That is what is at the heart of this issue, Mr. Speaker. We have lost our voice. We have lost our ability to bargain. We are not taken seriously any more because of the hysterical rhetoric coming from the Minister of Fisheries, and the tantrum approach practiced so often, so completely by the Premier.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in all of this there is the beginnings of a solution. We have to stop the convenient rhetoric. It was interesting to notice yesterday that it was my friend from Fogo who raised this issue in the House. The minister and the Premier very quickly indicated to the House that they knew it too, but they had not taken the initiative to do anything about it and that characterizes better than anything else, Mr. Speaker, what this crowd is up to. If there are any political points to be

grabbed, they will grab them. Otherwise, they do not want to have anything to do with any solutions.

Well, I throw the challenge to them this morning, Mr. Speaker. I ask them to leave their politics back by the caucus room door, and I ask them, Mr. Speaker, instead to join us in a good substantive resolution which will put in place some levers that will begin to hurt the French.

If the nice diplomatic approach is not working for the quarrelsome French, let us hit them where it hurts. Let us get the Government of Canada to suspend any arrangements on Airbus, suspend any arrangements on the nuclear submarines, Mr. Speaker, and at the same time, and in tandem, let us - Mr. Speaker, we know the time is up. I am trying to make a final sentence before the buffoon from Burin - Placentia West gets up and makes a fool of himself.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if we are going to ask the Government of Canada to do these things, let us put our money where our mouth is and suspend any arrangement we have concerning offshore with the French companies, any company of French registry. That is the beginning of a solution, Mr. Speaker.

Send the French a strong message, quit the rhetoric.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, today is, indeed, a very sad day in this Province. Like my friend and colleague from Grand Bank, I too, as a matter of fact, both of us share some mutual friends in St. Pierre and Miquelon. As a matter of fact, some of my friends from Marystown who I went around with first when I moved there back in the early '70's, are married and living in St. Pierre, and some of the people from St. Pierre live there. So, today, is indeed a very sad day, in that regard. When you see people from the Burin Peninsula that, right now, as explained by my colleague from Grand Bank, are basically captives on that island, it is what I consider to be a very, very sad day.

I do have Mr. Speaker, some personal connections, I guess, with St. Pierre, as the Minister of Fisheries alluded to earlier. We do have some bilateral agreements, one being in the education field. The members from my own family, I guess, like the member for Fortune - Hermitage, went to university there to study French.

Mr. Speaker, putting all that in place, the fact that we have a situation in this Province today, indeed, in the country as it relates to the arrest of the hard working fishermen, Mr. Speaker, from the Burin Peninsula, and indeed, like all Newfoundlanders, it is unfortunate that the member who represents the district where the skipper of the boat is from stood here for the last ten to fifteen minutes, and did nothing, Mr. Speaker, except attach the Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Shame! Shame!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, he talked about people talking out of both sides of their mouth at the same time. What an expert, Mr. Speaker, talking about the offshore, when he was in Ottawa when the Royal shaft was administered to this province every minute of every day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Where was he then, Mr. Speaker?

Where was he when the federal Liberal government tried to close every fish plant in this Province? We are talking about the fisheries. Where was he when DeBane came to St. John's and held a news conference with the member, Mr. Speaker? What did they announce? What did they announce for Burin and Grand Bank? Closed, Mr. Speaker, lock, stock and barrel!

And he had the audacity to stand in this House today and attack the Minister of Fisheries who was standing up for the rights of the people of Burin and Grand Bank, and other parts of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

You got him, you got him, Glenn.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot take lies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh!

MR. PEACH:
Flick him out.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I cannot take lies. The member for Burin - Placentia West, and he and I have many differences and I would expect him, as a man of integrity, to base his differences on fact, not fantasy.

He knows very well that while a Premier was saying on national television some fish plants would have to close, I opposed it, and I, in a meeting with the Prime Minister, arranged for the Burin plant to remain open. Now, let him not lie to this House, Mr. Speaker. I will not take it, Sir. I will not take it:

MR. BAIRD:
Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. SPEAKER:
To the point of order, the hon. member is not making a point of order. He seems to be trying to explain some other matter. It is certainly not a point of order. I will just look into this matter of mentioning a lie. I noted he did not directly accuse anyone of that, but I will look into the matter further.

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I am not sure. Did Your Honour order the hon. member to withdraw the reference?

MR. SPEAKER:

I am looking into that matter. There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
But you will be taking that matter under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have already said that.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage does not like the truth. I can tell you, there is one member in this House who will not stand by, by the way, when unparliamentary language is used - I am sure the Speaker has said he will rule on that later, as I understand it - I will not stand by and see my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, attacked in the despicable manner which he was this morning by the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

The facts are true, Mr. Speaker. He stood in Ottawa and stood by the federal Liberals when they sold this Province right down the tube as it relates to the offshore fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:
He cannot, Mr. Speaker, deny that he was not here in St. John's with DeBane and he cannot deny what he said about Burin and Grand Bank and the other fish plants when he was announcing the restructuring. There was no plan for them! They were closed lock, stock and barrel, Mr. Speaker, and that is where the member stood! The

member for Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, who is there, can tell you the same thing. That is where he stood on the fisheries and he stands in this House today and attacks a man like the Minister of Fisheries and the Premier who are working for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, working hard for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

What about the lawyer for the offshore?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, he talked about the offshore. He said, it is well known in Ottawa that the Premier is not respected by the Prime Minister.

It is also well known in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and well known in this Province that when the member for Fortune - Hermitage was the member for Burin - St. George's, he was not taken very seriously. He was not taken very seriously or he did nothing. It is one thing of another, as it relates to the fishery in this Province. He was not taken seriously when he talks about the offshore. The only reason why the offshore is not being developed is to try and minimize the publicity the Premier is going to get.

Mr. Speaker, we did not have to minimize much publicity for the member for Burin - St. George's when he was up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

We did not have to minimize then.

He talks about the offshore, Mr.

Speaker. The Atlantic Accord will give the Premier and this government and the people of this Province all of the levers. There was no Atlantic Accord under the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. No wonder he is leader, Mr. Speaker. I can refer to some of the statements that he made in the court case, and I will in due time, as well as other members in this House, about why Newfoundland should not have jurisdiction.

They have sold this Province, Mr. Speaker, long enough, the Liberal party. Long enough, Mr. Speaker! And the member for Windsor - Buchans, I can tell the member for Windsor - Buchans some of his statements too as it relates to how he was going to settle the university deficit when he was the Minister of Labour in this Province, and I could tell him some other stuff.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a sad day in this Province and the member for Fortune - Hermitage should not be allowed to attack the Minister of Fisheries the way that he did.

Mr. Speaker, he talked about the Minister of Fisheries talking about the Meech Lake Accord speaking out of both sides of his mouth at the same time. Mr. Speaker, where did he stand last year on the Meech Lake Accord when he came into this House? Where did he stand then, together with his leader, the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island? He supported it! Now, he has switched his loyalties with his leader and his principles, Mr. Speaker. Talking out of both sides of your mouth the same time, Mr. Speaker! Yes, Mr. Speaker, he ought to talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, this incident that has happened is regrettable, is unfortunate, and it should not be tolerated. We, Mr. Speaker, as a government and under the present leadership that we have, we will stand, Mr. Speaker, we will stand and safeguard the interest of the Newfoundland fishermen.

We will stand up to Ottawa too and ensure that they take the appropriate stand as it relates to the fisheries. The hon. gentleman, why does he not tell us about the 1972 treaty and what government was in Ottawa?

AN HON. MEMBER:
Was he there then?

MR. TOBIN:
No, he was not.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very serious situation on our hands. As the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries and my colleague from Grand Bank alluded to, and I can say too, Mr. Speaker, that I represent a very large fishing constituency in this Province, a very large fishing constituency.

The inshore fishermen in my district, the people from Burin and the people from Little Bay and the people from Placentia Bay, to a large extent, we depend upon the fishery from 3Ps, Mr. Speaker. Like my colleague from Grand Bank and I am sure like the members of our caucus, we cannot accept or tolerate the over fishing of that stock, nor should we be expected to.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the largest if not the largest fish plant in this Province and fleet of trawler men and I differ with the Leader of

the Opposition and his stand. I do not think we should give any of that non-surplus fish, Mr. Speaker, to the people of France or anyone else! I think that we have got to take a stand!

I would hope that the Liberal Party would disassociate themselves from the stand of the Leader and not be on record as supporting giving additional non-surplus cod from 3J+2KL area to the Northeast Coast. What about all the members from the Northeast Coast? What about the member from Twillingate and the member from Fogo? How can they, Mr. Speaker, tolerate giving away more of that fish when the inshore fishermen down there do not get enough to live on? How can they tolerate the position of the Leader of the Liberal Party in that regard?

I do not tolerate it, Mr. Speaker, and I will not tolerate it. I believe that this government is on the right course as it relates to our offshore fishery and our inshore fishery. I believe that the direction that has been set by the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is indeed the direction that we should follow in this Province.

I believe the incident yesterday evening has clearly indicated to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that what the Premier of this Province was saying last year, Mr. Speaker, was something that needed to be said and the action that needed to be done, as it relates to the fishery in this Province. I think that was a clear vindication, Mr. Speaker, of what our stand has been as it relates to this incident.

You have got the people from St. Pierre, Mr. Speaker, and I agree

with what my colleague from Grand Bank and others, including the Leader of the Opposition, what they had to say this morning, as we address this issue. And this is, the people of St. Pierre and Miquelon are indeed a group of individuals unfortunately that are sort of pawns of the federal government and caught up in this whole systematic approach to the people of France.

The people of St. Pierre and Miquelon are not great beneficiaries of the over fishing of the fish off our coast. They are not, Mr. Speaker. These Islands, which I have visited, and I am sure most members have visited, are by no means rich. They have not benefitted from the fish off the shores of Newfoundland and St. Pierre and Miquelon. For years, for decades, for a lifetime, we are here for 500 years! And what has kept us here? What has kept the people of Newfoundland and Labrador here for 500 years? It has been the fishery, Mr. Speaker. And for decades the people of St. Pierre and the people of Newfoundland has fished from other shores. They have been in the rocks. As my colleague for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) said, Mr. Speaker, we would be out fishing on the same ground, tie on to one another, have a chat, pass over the side a scattered bit of grub or whatever the case may be, Mr. Speaker. They had been friends. They had worked together.

Now we have seen a situation where these people have been placed in what is, in my opinion, a rather delicate and unfortunate situation. The people of St. Pierre and Miquelon have long been friends of the Burin Peninsula and the South Coast and vice versa.

There has been a good relationship develop over the years. There has been a good development, Mr. Speaker, with the general and ordinary people in Newfoundland and Labrador, with the Burin Peninsula. And as I said, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Wells) comments on that. There has been a great relationship develop. It is unfortunate that they are now caught up in this terrible mess, this mess of international politics. This mess is caused by the fact that there is a presidential election on the go in France.

Why should the people of these little Islands and the people of this Island have to become pawns of such a structured operation that we have now seen put in place. I mean, you see them coming in here announcing to the public with a camera crew aboard, I believe, 'We are going to go out and fish illegally in your waters. Will you come and arrest us?'

Then, Mr. Speaker, they are arrested and they are brought in, and Senator Penn and others stands on the deck of the boat, wrapped in the French flag and saying, 'Here we are. What are you going to do about us?' What a blatant attempt to get publicity. Mr. Speaker, what a blatant attempt is taking place today in St. Pierre.

We have these people who were arrested, justifiably so, who were put in prison. They came out and they complained about the terrible conditions that was taking place in the prison system in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, now they have arrested this boat, brought her in, give the keys to Jean-Pierre Andrieux, and put the

people up in hotels, Mr. Speaker, treating them, giving them wine and everything else he wants to drink. What a sham! What a sham!

Mr. Speaker, I believe, my time is running out. But I want to say before I close that we have to get control of where we are going from here, Mr. Speaker. We have to support this resolution.

I would hope that the Liberal Party would change their stand, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the giving away further fish from the Northern cod stocks. I would hope they change their plan on that, Mr. Speaker. We have been impressing upon the Leader of the Opposition for the past several months since he starting making these statements in the Throne Speech and in the news media and other places. We have been trying to impress upon them and I call upon him again today, Mr. Speaker, to change that stand.

I want to commend all members for giving leave to the House today to discuss such a vital and important issue. I want to do that, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that all members will support it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:
In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say, "God guard thee, Newfoundland".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, like the members opposite, I take no real pride in having to take part in this debate, but, in light of the fact that circumstances of recent days dictate now that we entertain this kind of a resolution and debate, of course, gives me, I suppose, some pleasure in that I am able to stand in my place and say these few words concerning the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any Newfoundlander in his or her right mind would condone the actions of the French, as to what happened yesterday. I do not think any Newfoundlander would want this Legislature, their elected representatives, to turn this into a political type debate. I think the matter is altogether too serious to have this debate downgraded to become a political free for all and name calling, as we have seen. I am not going to get involved in it, but I think some of the comments made when the member for Burin - Placentia West commenced his speech left something to be desired, and the question, of course, would have to be asked: Is it any wonder that we are not taken too seriously by the people of this Province, when, on such an important issue, one that affects, I suppose, directly and indirectly, the livelihood of almost every Newfoundlander - even though at the present time there are only five Newfoundlanders incarcerated or, as my friend from Fortune - Hermitage said, being held, kidnapped, by French authorities on the Island of St. Pierre, this issue, one way or the other, will affect every Newfoundlander now and in the

future. So it is a very important issue.

I view the actions of the French authorities, Mr. Speaker, as being inexcusable, unforgivable, and provocative. I do not know how else to describe it. I think that the French authorities must not be allowed to get away with what they have done.

I notice in the telegram that the Premier has sent to the Prime Minister he very carefully avoided making any reference to the possibility of imposing trade sanctions. Well, I think that is a mistake. I think the Premier should suggest or recommend to the Prime Minister that economic sanctions be imposed. In recent days we have heard comments coming out of Ottawa pertaining to the awarding of a contract for a multibillion dollar nuclear submarine project. We have heard rumors. In fact, I think now it is more than rumored. It is pretty well an accomplished fact, that Air Canada will be entering into negotiations with France for Airbuses, another multimillion dollar contract.

Surely, if the Government of Canada are going to take this matter as seriously as it should be taken, then what choice do they have but to impose sanctions?

Of course, to make matters worse, - now, I do not want this to appear that I am attacking any minister or the government - but I do not think we can allow it to go unnoticed that it was only last week that I questioned the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) with respect to a contract that was recently awarded

by his department to a company in which a French company has a very large component part, a company that was based in Paris.

Now, I would strongly suggest to the minister that he seriously consider cancelling that contract. I do not think there is any justification whatever for allowing that contract to stand under the present circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, to that end we have recommended one slight addition to the resolution proposed by the Minister of Fisheries. This is the resolution and I have reason to believe that the minister will be accepting it, at least I hope he does.

We are asking the House to instruct, or at least to recommend to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and to all of its agencies, that they cease forthwith the conduct of business with companies of French registry for as long as the St. Pierre fisheries and boundary dispute remains unsettled.

That is not an unreasonable addition to that resolution. In fact, it will give it some teeth. We hope that the government will see fit to include that addition to the resolution. You cannot have it both way, you cannot in one breath ask the Government of Canada to impose economic sanctions if we are not willing to do the same thing.

That is why, I think, it is now necessary for the Minister of Development, and for his colleagues, to give some very serious considerations to cancelling that contract and to cease forthwith the awarding of any further contracts to companies

of French registry as long as this matter remains unresolved.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of French jurisdiction and French access to Northern has been bandied around quite a bit in recent days. Some of the comments of my leader, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Wells) is being distorted and I can only surmise that they are being distorted for political reasons. I do not think that is the thing to do.

The Minister of Fisheries, this morning, alluded to comments made by the Leader of the Opposition and I do not think it is called for. I have a lot of respect for the minister and he knows that. We all know that. I think we all respect him, but I think this morning he let himself down somewhat in that some of the things he said need not have been said. Certainly, the way in which he tried to twist and distort the comments that we have made by our leader is uncalled for.

There is another thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it is only minor but to me it is important. I have been in this House now for a long time. I have probably been here longer than any other member sitting in this House and I have seen a lot of debates going on. I sat through a number of very important debates and special resolutions.

I have seen Premier Smallwood, when he was Premier, get up and make a very impassioned speech on an important resolution, one that affects Newfoundland, and I have seen the leaders of the oppositions, many of them, get up and respond. I will say one thing for the old days, I will call

them, that when that kind of a situation arose, both sides remained silent and at least when the Premier was speaking, members of the Opposition had the respect and the courtesy to remain in their chairs and to listen to what he had to say.

I do not know what is happening to our system, but back in those days the Premier would have stayed in his seat and listened to what the Leader of the Opposition had to say and members opposite would have done likewise. But, I noticed this morning, and this is to our shame, I think, this morning we listened very attentively to the Premier - and why should we not? He is the Queen's First Minister and he deserves that respect. We listened, we did not heckle and we sat in our seats. The moment our leader took his place and started to speak, the seats just about emptied. The Premier was the first to leave, I think. I believe at one point I counted four members in this Chamber, while the Leader of the Opposition was replying to the Premier on this very important issue.

Now, that would cause rise to the question, Mr. Speaker, just how serious are the government. How serious are they, Mr. Speaker, when they get - and the Premier made an excellent speech. I do not think anybody disagreed with him. He made an excellent speech and made good points. But, surely to God, the courtesy should have been extended to our Leader, who is here as Leader of Her Majesty's official Opposition. It is not a small matter. It is indicative of the whole attitude of this House and the depth to which we are sinking, Mr. Speaker, in many respects, with the nagging back

and forth.

Let me tell you what the Leader of the Opposition said this morning. I am not here to defend the Leader of the Opposition. I support his position and I will defend it in my district or anywhere else in this Province, but what he is saying is this. Now, would members please listen?

He says, 'If it would be possible for Canada to negotiate a fair and satisfactory settlement of the boundary dispute with France, it might well be that to give them a small quota would be a small price to pay.' That is what he is saying. Now, let me carry that a step further.

The leader is saying that if by giving France a small quota for a limited period, if that will bring them back to the table and effect a satisfactory settlement, then by all means that will be a small price to pay. Let me tell you why it will be a small price to pay. I am sorry that the members who represent the South Coast districts are not here this morning.

Last year we all know that France overfished by some 20,000 metric tons. This year we know that France will be overfishing by another 30,000 metric tons. Now, how long with that last? Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to take the attitude that we stand on our rights and that there be no Northern cod to anyone, not even a cod tail, if, by giving them a small quota we can bring some sanity to that situation and a resolution -

MR. RUSSELL:
Never.

MR. W. CARTER:

The member for Lewisporte says never. He would rather stand by and see the South Coast fishery destroyed.

MR. RUSSELL:

Not true.

MR. W. CARTER:

He would rather stand by and see it destroyed.

MR. RUSSELL:

I will not stand by and (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

He would rather stand by, Mr. Speaker, and see the South Coast fishery destroyed, and that is what is going to happen to it. If some resolution is not effected, the South Coast fishery could very well be destroyed. Then, of course, how will that impact on the rest of us? He represents a Northeast Coast district as I do. What will happen to the fishermen and the fish plants on the South Coast? Do you expect them to forget fishing? Of course not. They will then be turning their sights on the Northern cod and on the Northeast Coast. The question, of course, that must be asked is, how long, then, will those stocks last?

The position taken by our leader is rationale, sensible and, more importantly, it is honest. I would suggest to you that the position taken by members opposite has not always been honest.

Mr. Speaker, my time is just about up, but I want to again go on record as supporting this resolution. I think it is an unforgivable act on the part of France. It is the kind of thing that we see on television.

Sometimes you wonder if it is Newfoundland we are talking about and the South Coast, or is it Iran or the Persian Gulf where terrorism apparently is the in thing. I view the actions of the French in this case almost like a mild form of terrorism. It is like the sort of thing you would to expect to get, like I said, from Gaddafi, or some of the far East, or Middle East countries.

It is unforgiveable. Newfoundlanders must not put up with it. Whatever pressure needs to be brought to bear to bring sanity to the situation, I think it must be brought to bear. Trade sanctions, of course, are one way of doing it. I think the Government of Newfoundland must follow suit in order to expect the Government of Canada to take trade sanctions seriously. Surely, we have a responsibility to ensure that we do likewise.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say on it, except, again to say, that I view the actions of the French authorities as being very serious, very provocative, unforgiveable, inexcusable. I think the Government of Canada now must do what has got to be done to ensure that it does not happen again.

Thank you very much.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I, along with all my

colleagues, in this House this morning, would like to share the concerns of all of us with respect to this unfortunate situation which occurred yesterday.

I do not know if anybody could have anticipated that this action would have, in fact, taken place. There is absolutely no similarity with respect to what has happened involving the small boat fishermen of our Southcoast and the action which occurred by the Government of Canada, certainly full supported by this Province, with respect to the arrest of the fishing vessel from St. Pierre which was deliberate and with provocation, was an attempt to bring an issue and a focus for political reasons in France. Any attempt to suggest similarity in those two actions are totally without foundation and irrelevant.

This government certainly used what has happened in its most serious context. There have been a number of issues that have involved this government and this department that have involved companies in France and the French government. We have dealt, up to now with some of the reasons with which this was done, and for which it was done, all of which is justifiable. I take no backwater on what has been done, in that regard.

But the game has now changed, the game has now changed dramatically. This government cannot support the continuation of initiatives and actions which we entered into. I can assure members of this House, that I will be recommending to a special Cabinet which will be called today that we will suspend immediately the existing contract which

involves a French company, with support by the French government, with respect to offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

The only other activity that I am aware of that this department and I think this government is involved in with respect to any issues involving the government of France or any French companies, is an involvement at a world food trade show called the SIAL Food Show which will be occurring in Paris in the Fall of 1988. I have instructed officials of my department this morning to withdraw the obligation of this government to attend that particular exhibition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:

We will also be instructing officials of my department that there will be no assistance provided by this government to people, it will be recommended to Cabinet that this form of assistance, which has normally be extended to Newfoundland companies and individuals to attend these facilities, will also be stopped and not be proceeded with.

As I understand it, this will be a subject for the discussion of Cabinet today. I think it is starting at one o'clock, a special Cabinet committee, an emergency cabinet.

We view all of these issues as very serious, and everything that we can now identify that would have involved this government in any action in collaboration or otherwise with the government of

France or any companies associated with France, that all of that activity, subject to my colleague's approval, will be deferred today.

All of my colleagues certainly on this side have spoken at great length and with eloquence focused on the issue and I do not think it is necessary for me to readdress the comments or repeat what has been said. It is not that it all has been said, but certainly what has been said has been said very effectively.

I would like to assure members of this House that this action has commenced and before the day is out should be implemented.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member, I did have the opportunity of checking on what the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage said. He said, "Mr. Speaker, I cannot take lies," and he followed later on, "Let him not lie to this House, Mr. Speaker."

I call on the hon. member to withdraw these comments.

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw anything that is unparliamentary and I will say it outside the House, there is no doubt.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de

Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that other members of this House want the opportunity to speak and, as we have a limited amount of time left, I am going to try to make my remarks as brief as I possibly can to give members on the other side an opportunity.

It is a very emotional issue. It is a motherhood issue and, no doubt, it affects every Newfoundlander and Labradorian, not only people directly involved in the fishery but people indirectly involved, everybody. So we can go on and on for hours and hours and speak about this issue and still never say enough about how what took place yesterday affects every Newfoundlander and Labradorian.

I am not like the Minister of Career Development and the Minister of Social Services. I am not from that particular part of the Island and I do not know those people in a personal basis or the people from St. Pierre and Miquelon, but I am closely related to the fishery of this Province, as I represent a very large fishing community and I, myself, and my family, have always been involved very heavily in the fishery, and I know what I am talking about. I know what it means to every Newfoundlander.

I will give you an example of how Newfoundlanders have been treated, not only by the French country, but by our own country, by our own Federal government. Just last week a sixty-five foot vessel came into this port just up in Bay Bulls from Port de Grave with

60,000 pounds of fish from the 3NO division, and a vessel sailing side by side from Nova Scotia with 110,000 pounds of fish. The two of them were fishing side by side in 3NO. One was arrested and lost 60,000. The Nova Scotia boat was allowed to go free! That is the kind of treatment that Newfoundlanders are getting from other parts of this world! Always the Newfoundlander is suffering! Never is the Newfoundlander represented and has the freedom to fish the way they should be able to fish.

You go to the Minister of Fisheries and he says, 'Well, the problem is that we have more surveillance, we have more fish resources in Newfoundland than they have in Nova Scotia.' The captain of that vessel from Port de Grave was from Nova Scotia. He quit immediately and went on board the Nova Scotia vessel and laughed at the fishermen from Port de Grave. He said, 'I will go out there now, I am on a Nova Scotia vessel, and I will catch what I want. Nobody will bother me.' The Newfoundlander is suffering again.

One of the points I want to bring up here this morning - I am surprised that nobody from the government side brought it up - is what about the cost that is going to be incurred by these fishermen who were arrested yesterday. Who is going to pay their fines? Who is going to pay the bail? If there is any, who is going to pay it? Why has somebody not made that statement. Why did the Minister of Career Development not touch on that issue? Is that not a concern? All we are concerned about is the politics, condemning the Opposition like the Minister of Fisheries.

We, on this side, did not start it. The Minister of Fisheries, the minute he stood to his feet, he had to start to make this into a political debate. We agreed to give the House unanimous consent. We agreed with the Orders of the Day to be changed. We agreed it was an important issue. We did not bring up dirt to go slapping back and forth. It is too important for that. The Minister of Fisheries did and, certainly, so did the Minister of Social Services. You have got to make political points. It is absolutely ridiculous. This affects every Newfoundlander and Labrador. This does not merely affect the politics of somebody giving a vote in a district. It has been ongoing for years and nobody has done anything about it. Ottawa is not doing anything about it. You are the government that is representing the fishermen of Newfoundland. Why did the Minister of Development sign a trade deal with France? Why did it have today, for this to happen, to cancel it? Why was Air Canada discussed? Why were the submarines discussed? Why was it settled before? Why did it have to reach this situation? After the horse is gone out of the barn, you close the door. That is not the way you represent the people of this Province.

MR. MATTHEWS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is really wideranging in his discussions here. What he is saying is tied into jurisdiction,

which this Premier and this administration talks about, that we need more of. But his leader asks the question, what would we do if we had it. That is the point of order. What would we do if we had it, he said.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that shows exactly the attitude of this government and why we are in the situation we are in today. That is as much intelligence as the hon. minister has to make a statement like that.

I am talking about cutting off trade relations with France. Why was it not done before? Why did it have to happen today? You are doing it today? It is going to be done. Why was it not done yesterday? Why did it have to reach this point? That is the situation.

You are the people who are representing this Province. You are the people who has the same government, to conciliate, to inflict prosperity on this Province. There is no excuse for it. You have let the fishermen of this Province down.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make those few clear points. But I would like the next speaker or the Premier when he stands up to say who is going to pay and protect the fishermen. It is a good point and it certainly should be taken care of.

The other thing is that the people of this Province recognize that it

had to reach this situation before the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) and the Premier would take the steps that they are taking today. They are going to recognize the fault and where the fault lies. It will be on their shoulders. They will recognize that.

Another thing the Premier himself spoke about which everybody in this Province knows it is wrong, he walked away from the talks. That is wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. EFFORD:
Who represents Newfoundlanders when there is nobody there to speak for them? You may disagree with what they are saying and you may not agree, but once you walk away then you have no part, you do not know what the talks are about. You had no part of the discussion, you are no part of the decision making.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
That is a complete mistake.

I do not disagree with the Premier.

MR. EFFORD:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
I do not disagree with the Premier in his stand and fighting for Newfoundlanders. I do not disagree with any argument he has put forth. We should stand by our own. But to walk away from the talks is not the answer. If you

get into an argument, if you get into discussions, you walk away and the other two people are sitting down, they make a decision about your future and you have no say into it. It is absolutely irresponsible for any premier or any Cabinet minister to take that position, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
Absolutely irresponsible! And every Newfoundlander and Labradorian knows the responsibility that you walked away from, your responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on my left to allow the hon. member to speak. It is impossible to hear what he is saying.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

That is what happens. That is the reason, as I said earlier, why we are placed in this situation. Newfoundland is going to continue to suffer, every Newfoundlander fisherman is going to continue to suffer if we do not change our attitude, if we do not try to convince people up in Ottawa that we mean something down here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
If we meant anything to the

Federal PC Government in Ottawa, they would not have any trade relations on anything with the country of France whatsoever until they come to an agreement. We do not matter down here. We are such a small body. We are a small insignificant number. It is like one of the Tory members said a while ago, 'Give them welfare. That is all they need down there. Forget about them. Just throw a few dollars in their lap and let us not listen to them.'

That is the attitude of Ottawa. That is the attitude of your government, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It sounds like yours.

MR. EFFORD:

That is the reason we are in this situation. But now you are going to jump on an emotional, motherhood issue, now you are going to play your politics and now you are going to try to convince the people that you are fighting Newfoundland. But it will not work, because every Newfoundland fisherman who is suffering economically and who is suffering because of the attitude of Ottawa and the attitude of this government, that is what is going to tell the tale, Mr. Speaker.

I say to the Premier he is not going to wrap himself in the flag on this issue. You are not going to wrap yourself in the flag in the issue and take it around to the people. You go out on the wharf and you tell the people what you did to lead up this situation.

MR. SIMMS:

Do not be so partisan!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Take the full responsibility, Mr. Speaker, and we will tell the people. People certainly know, Mr. Speaker, what the situation is.

MR. PEACH:

Who is going to believe you anyway?

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to go out and convince Newfoundland fishermen who is at fault here. Ottawa is no better than France, absolutely no better than France.

France did something yesterday that nobody in this country agrees with. We do not agree with the actions taken by France. It is totally irresponsible for France, and it is totally irresponsible of the federal government to allow this situation to take place.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a good resolution. It is something that will probably come too late. The sanction should have been put earlier, but the point about all this is that we have to recognize the seriousness of the situation and what we should have done before.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I say again, it is very clear to the people on this side that we are willing to support this, and we are willing to stand and fight, but it is very clear that we disagree with the position taken by the federal government. We disagree with the position taken by the provincial government in the way they have been working on the trade negotiations, and not cutting off the economic sanctions in the past, and it had to be brought to this point. Mr.

Speaker, we, on this side, will co-operate in whatever way we can, but the only thing, Mr. Speaker, that we would like to see is a complete attitude change in this government to convince Ottawa about what they feel about Newfoundlanders.

That is the problem, it is the attitude. We are nothing under their feet. And all the Minister of Social Services could do, and he will stand over there now, not even in his seat, and all he could do in his position this morning was to stand up and attack the Leader of the Opposition.

When you debate an issue so serious as this, how could you possibly stand up and waste ten minutes attacking the Leader of the Opposition? It does not make any sense. It is not the answer to the problem.

When the opposite critic for fisheries asked the Minister of Development and the Minister of Fisheries weeks and weeks and weeks ago, time after time in Question Period to cut off trade relations, to stop trade relations with France, they would not even listen to them under no circumstances. They just put it off, and put it off with no answer whatsoever. Why today? If it was not necessary last week, why today?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Because they have taken more action on it.

MR. EFFORD:
As I said, we had to wait till the horse got out of the barn, and then we are going to close the door.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The horse is not out of the bran.

There is no agreement.

MR. EFFORD:
Oh, no, where are the fisherman from Fortune, where are the fisherman from Fortune?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
There is no agreement on the fisheries (inaudible).

MR. EFFORD:
Oh no, the horse is not out of the barn, Mr. Speaker. That is one thing about it, it had to take this situation to awaken the Minister of Development and to awaken the Premier.

The only thing that I can say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, very clearly is that we support the resolution and the people of this Province know who the government of their future should be and who are is going to represent them properly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

If the Premier speaks now, he will close the debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I think what we have to do first is to approve the motion that was moved by me, and seconded by the Minister of Fisheries this morning: "To go on record as condemning the actions of France yesterday concerning the arrest of five Newfoundland fishermen, and that a resolution be drafted by all party committee to be passed today clearly outlining this Province's outrage at such an

action."

So, can we now call for that resolution to pass? Then we can get on to the second resolution and pass it. So there are two steps.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have two resolutions.

MR. SIMMS:

The motion that was introduced by the Premier at ten o'clock this morning has to be passed first.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour of the resolution please say 'aye'.

HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

The motion is carried.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution which has been agreed to by all parties says:

WHEREAS, Newfoundland small boat fishermen have fished in waters between St. Pierre/Miquelon and the South Coast of Newfoundland for hundreds of years;

WHEREAS, for these hundreds of years there has been no interference by France in these fishing activities;

WHEREAS, St. Pierre/Miquelon small boat fishermen have traditionally fished in waters between St. Pierre/Miquelon and the Burin Peninsula;

WHEREAS, there has been no interference by Canada with the small boat fishery from St. Pierre/Miquelon in these waters;

WHEREAS, France on the afternoon of the 5th day of May, 1988, flagrantly interfered with the fishing activities of a Newfoundland inshore fishing vessel by intercepting and detaining the vessel;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House of Assembly unanimously condemns these actions by France;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to demand the immediate release of the Newfoundland vessel and its crew of Newfoundland fishermen;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to use the full force of its diplomatic and economic relations with France to protect and safeguard the interests of Newfoundland fishermen and to take every measure to ensure that such provocative action is never repeated;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House recommends that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and all its Agencies cease forthwith the conduct of business with companies of French registry for as long as the St. Pierre Fisheries and boundary dispute remains unsettled.

That much has been agreed to by all sides.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Talk about great minds!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There is no need for me to elaborate on it. I am prepared to sit down and just let us vote unanimously on the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

I share the Premier's comments. I do not think anything more need be said, it has been addressed in the motion. The issues of the resolution are clear, and we are in full support of the resolution as it has been read by the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour of the resolution, say 'aye'.

HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

It is carried unanimously.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, before putting the motion to adjourn I want to advise members of the business of the House for the next week. Today we had intended to do the Concurrence debate with the Social Services Estimates Committee but that was overtaken by other events today.

On Monday it will be Resource Estimates Committee concurrence debate, and concurrence will continue on Tuesday. Wednesday, of course, Private Member's Day,

concurrence will continue on Thursday. Monday, Tuesday and Thursday will be concurrence debates, and Friday if necessary, to try to conclude the budget debate, if we can reach that stage. So next week will be devoted to finishing the concurrence debates - the 75 hours will be up.

The budget debate will still have to be called, so the Minister of Finance can eventually close it. That is how it works.

MR. TULK:

Did you say on Friday?

MR. SIMMS:

Well, it may not be Friday. It is up to hon. members themselves. I really do not care. But I can tell them that Friday will be used for the purpose of dealing with budget aspects.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I move that this House adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 9, 1988, at 3:00 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOURTH SESSION, FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND:

Hon. P.J.McNicholas.....Speaker
Mr. Glenn Greening.....Deputy Speaker
Chairman of Committees
Mr. Kevin Parsons.....Deputy Chairman of Committees

MEMBERS

NAME	AFFILIATION	DISTRICT
Mr. K.Alyward.....	Lib.....	Stephenville
Mr. R.Alyward.....	PC.....	Kilbride
Mr. Baird.....	PC.....	Humber West
Mr. Baker.....	Lib.....	Gander
Mr. Barrett.....	PC.....	St. John's West
Mr. Barry.....	Lib.....	Mount Scio-Bell Island
Mr. Blanchard.....	PC.....	Bay of Islands
Mr. Brett.....	PC.....	Trinity North
Mr. Butt.....	PC.....	Conception Bay South
Mr. Callan.....	Lib.....	Bellevue
Mr. J. Carter.....	PC.....	St. John's North
Mr. W. Carter.....	Lib.....	Twillingate
Dr. Collins.....	PC.....	St. John's South
Mr. Dawe.....	PC.....	St. George's
Mr. Decker.....	Lib.....	Strait of Belle Isle
Mr. Dinn.....	PC.....	Pleasantville
Mr. Doyle.....	PC.....	Harbour Main
Mr. Efford.....	Lib.....	Port de Grave
Mr. Fenwick.....	NDP.....	Menihek
Mr. Furey.....	Lib.....	St. Barbe
Mr. Gilbert.....	Lib.....	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Mr. Greening.....	PC.....	Terra Nova
Mr. Gullage.....	Lib.....	Waterford-Kenmount
Mr. Hearn.....	PC.....	St. Mary's-The Capes
Mr. Hiscock.....	Lib.....	Eagle River
Mr. Hodder.....	PC.....	Port au Port
Mr. Kelland.....	Lib.....	Nascopie
Mr. Long.....	NDP.....	St. John's East
Mr. Lush.....	Lib.....	Bonavista North
Mr. Matthews.....	PC.....	Grand Bank
Dr. McNicholas.....	PC.....	St. John's Centre
Mr. Mitchell.....	PC.....	LaPoile
Mr. Morgan.....	PC.....	Bonavista South
Mr. Parsons.....	PC.....	St. John's East Extern
Mr. Patterson.....	PC.....	Placentia
Mr. Peach.....	PC.....	Carbonear

[CONTINUED]

[CONTINUED]

Premier Peckford.....PC.....Green Bay
Mr. Power.....PC.....Ferryland
Mr. Reid.....PC.....Trinity-Bay de Verde
Mr. Rideout.....PC.....Baie Verte-White Bay
Mr. Russell.....PC.....Lewisporte
Hon. Mr. Simmons.....Lib.....Fortune-Hermitage
Mr. Simms.....PC.....Grand Falls
Mr. Tobin.....PC.....Burin-Placentia West
Mr. Tulk.....Lib.....Fogo
Dr. Twomey.....PC.....Exploits
Ms. Verge.....PC.....Humber East
Mr. Warren.....PC.....Torngat Mountains
Mr. Wells.....Lib.....Windsor-Buchans
Mr. Windsor.....PC.....Mount Pearl
Mr. Woodford.....PC.....Humber Valley
Mr. Young.....PC.....Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY:

Premier A. Brian Peckford.....Energy
Mr. R. Alyward.....Forest Resources
Mr. Barrett.....Development and Tourism
Mr. Blanchard.....Labour
Mr. Brett.....Municipal Affairs
Mr. Butt.....Culture, Recreation and Youth
Dr. Collins.....Health and Deputy Premier
Mr. Dawe.....Intergovernmental Affairs
Mr. Dinn.....Mines
Mr. Doyle.....Transportation
Mr. Matthews.....Career Development and Advanced Studies
Mr. Peach.....Minister Responsible for Housing
Mr. Power.....Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Mr. Rideout.....Fisheries
Mr. Russell.....Environment and Lands
Mr. Simms.....President of the Executive Council
 President of Treasury Board
 Government House Leader
Mr. Tobin.....Social Services
Dr. Twomey.....Public Works and Services
Ms. Verge.....Justice
Mr. Warren...Minister Responsible for Northern Development
Mr. Windsor.....Finance
 Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Mr. Young.....Consumer Affairs and Communications

CONTENTS

FRIDAY, 6 MAY, 1988.

By leave, the Order Paper is suspended for an urgent debate concerning French Government actions off Newfoundland's South Coast involving the detention of local fishermen and the Canada-France boundary dispute.

Premier Peckford.....	1608
Mr. Wells.....	1608
Mr. Long.....	1608
Premier Peckford.....	1608
Mr. Wells.....	1616
Mr. Rideout.....	1623
Mr. Long.....	1627
Mr. Matthews.....	1631
Mr. Simmons.....	1635
Mr. Tobin.....	1641
Mr. W. Carler.....	1646
Mr. Barrett.....	1650
Mr. Speaker, Unparliamentary Language ruling.....	1651
Mr. Efford.....	1652
Premier Peckford.....	1656
Mr. Wells.....	1658
Two resolutions moved by Premier, passed unanimously...	1657
Adjournment Motion.....	1658