

Government Organization Act, Atlantic Canada, 1987

opposed to it in western Canada or central Canada. What we are very strongly opposed to and will continue to be opposed to is the militarization of the economy. We are opposed to a trade deal which the Government is rushing into that will make it possible for the U.S. to say that a whole range of Canadian programs constitute unfair subsidies.

The Economic Council of Canada very seriously suggested that the programs of this agency can be targeted as constituting unfair subsidies. The one area exempt from that is defence procurement. We are saying that this is the wrong way to be going with respect to regional development. We should have other options available to us than simply saying something was in the interest of national security, therefore we are going to be giving defence contracts to different parts of the country.

That is the way things are done in the U.S. They do not have our kind of regional development programs to assist parts of the country facing economic difficulty. What they do have are military procurement contracts which are dropped on practically every congressional district to try to maintain support by the people for the military industrial complex. We are opposed to that complex, and I would like to see members of the Government opposed to it as well.

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, my two questions require a yes or no answer. Is the NDP committed to increasing expenditures or decreasing expenditures for defence purposes? In addition, would an NDP Government have given the defence procurement contract for the naval frigates to the City of Saint John, New Brunswick?

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, we have not arrived at any final figures with respect to what our defence expenditures are going to be. However, I can guarantee they will be less than the price tag for the fancy new submarines that "Little Boy Blue" wants to buy.

Second, with respect to the contracts which have already been let to Saint John, certainly we support those contracts, and that is where they would stay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

Mr. George Baker (Gander—Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few words concerning this Bill.

The attitude of the federal Government towards Atlantic Canada, as you know, leaves a lot to be desired. Nowhere in this Bill is the fishery or agriculture mentioned. I just got off the phone speaking to a lady who is the mother of a fishing captain off the south coast of Newfoundland. His name is Mr. Willy Bolt. He is from Grand Le Pierre and he got in his boat this morning at five o'clock and sailed out of Fortune Bay with five crew members aboard, two from Port aux Basques and three from Grand Le Pierre. They steamed out towards St. Pierre and Miquelon. At this very moment, and for the next 10 minutes, they are being towed into port in St. Pierre, having been arrested by the Government of France. It is a 65-foot

dragger that was dragging for codfish in the disputed zone around St. Pierre and Miquelon off the south coast of Newfoundland.

You know what we as a Canadian Government did recently, and I applauded the Government for its attitude towards Atlantic Canada in this case. It arrested a French boat that came into Canadian waters and said: "Please arrest me because I am fishing illegally". However, at this very moment there is a French patrol vessel towing a 65-foot Canadian dragger that was fishing legally in the disputed zone off the south coast of Newfoundland with five crew members aboard.

We talk about the attitude of the Canadian Government. I will tell you what its attitude is. Over this vessel being towed flies an RCMP helicopter. Then there is a fixed-wing aircraft belonging to the Coast Guard. There is a fisheries patrol vessel in the area. What did the Government of Canada do in the past three hours since the vessel had a cable forcibly hooked on, was forcibly boarded and is being dragged into port at this very moment? It will be in port in exactly 12 minutes from now. What did the Canadian Government do? I have been speaking to the family members of that vessel and I know, putting the time together, that the Canadian Government was notified 15 minutes before the vessel was boarded. It was noted by official text from the Government of France that a "Canadian vessel, the *Maritimer*, has violated the 12-mile territorial sea around the nation of France off the east coast of Canada and will therefore be arrested". We, of course, have to thank the RCMP for notifying the families of what took place.

● (1740)

Some arrangements have been made for the crew members aboard to telephone home between ten and twelve o'clock this evening, that is, Newfoundland time, which is two and a half hours beyond our time here. That is all well, fine and good. But there was not one single word of complaint or objection from the Government of Canada to the Government of France up to this very moment while the vessel is being forcibly towed to port. There was not one word of official objection.

I suggested to the Government—perhaps you might consider it to be a bit too forceful, Sir,—that at least what should be done is for the Canadian patrol vessel in the area to stick its nose in front of the French patrol vessel, communicate with it and say, "Look, you are not allowed to arrest somebody aboard a vessel in the disputed zone according to the agreement", which the Government keeps referring to in the House, the 1972 agreement which says that neither nation shall board another's fishing vessel in the disputed zone of area 3ps. But no, Mr. Speaker, the Government did not do that. In fact, the Government has not objected to the fact that this action took place by the Government of France. We will be hearing more about this in the next 24 hours.

The Official Opposition has put together a motion to be dealt with tomorrow in the House deploring the fact that the Government of France has carried out an illegal act in a