

Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act

international meetings and discussions, but this implied situation is not in accordance with the facts. For example, the meetings held at Geneva were far from being failures. The five conventions approved at the end of the 1958 conference contain 113 articles which in their scope and importance offer conclusive testimony to the measure of success which was then attained. Established law was defined and codified. New laws were written. Rules affecting such subjects as the continental shelf, the conservation of the food resources in the oceans of the world, the measurement of coastal base lines and a wide variety of other new as well as old legal questions were settled. In the opinion of those attending the conference it was an outstanding demonstration of conciliation, of mutual goodwill and the progressive development of international law which in itself is the very spirit of the United Nations.

• (3:50 p.m.)

As a matter of fact, there were only two questions remaining to be settled after the 1958 conference and these two questions were still not settled following the 1960 conference. These questions dealt with, first, the breadth of the territorial sea and, second, the size or area of the fishing zone. I agree that these are thorny problems, but if international agreement could be reached on these matters, a better international climate would be created in which the solution of our fisheries problems and many other outstanding problems could be resolved very much easier than now appears possible.

I believe that if we are to solve our problems as nations we must co-operate one with the other in the hope of reaching mutual understanding and agreement on the course to be followed for the betterment of all mankind.

Mr. Sharp: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: Unilateral action or damn-the-torpedoes-full-speed-ahead action may be all right in wartime, but there is still a lesson to be learned by comparing the fruits of consultation with the effects of independent action.

Obviously, in other fields, consultation with the parties concerned is still considered the desirable course to be followed. Here, I refer to the negotiations going on in another but nevertheless related field at Geneva where the 25 nation disarmament committee has been working for eight years on a treaty to ban the installation of nuclear weapons on

the world's ocean floors. The final draft of a treaty has been approved by the United States negotiators and it is now under examination by the Soviet Union where approval is anticipated. The new document will join the 1963 treaty banning atmospheric testing of nuclear devices, the 1967 treaty banning nuclear weapons in outer space, and the 1968 nuclear non-proliferation treaty on the list of achievement since the disarmament committee began its work in March of 1962. Surely, if we can agree internationally not to blow the people off the face of the earth with nuclear weapons we should be able to agree internationally on the proper methods of conserving our fisheries resources in order to provide food for the people of the world.

I cannot help but wonder what is happening between our Department of External Affairs and the state department in Washington. On the surface there would appear to be little or no consultation on matters of importance between our two countries. Consultation seems limited to the sending of notes back and forth, similar to the one published in *Hansard* by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) on Friday, April 17.

Mr. Sharp: What about the meetings in Ottawa and Washington?

Mr. Crouse: The minister made his speech. I did not interrupt him at that time but listened attentively to him. I hope he will give me an opportunity now to put my views on the record with regard to international negotiations which should have been undertaken, but which obviously were not.

In our opinion, the Department of External Affairs is falling down on the job. The finger points to the minister in charge of this department who obviously lacks the ability to cope with our international problems. I say this because we now know that only five days ago, five days before the state department rejected Canada's proposed extension of jurisdiction beyond the three-mile territorial sea to prevent pollution, President Nixon signed a bill giving the United States jurisdiction beyond its three-mile limit for pollution control. Two other bills are now before the U.S. senate which would give the United States government jurisdiction beyond three miles for anti-pollution purposes. The U.S. federal water pollution control act of 1970 authorizes U.S. officials to board ships as far as 12 miles off the coast to enforce anti-pollution regulations to be formed under the bill, and to make arrests. Shipowners and operators are