

SSEA: Well, you know, China, India are coastal states.

Q. Oh, yes. Isn't Russia?

SSEA: Yes, of course.

Q. But these coastal lines are not comparable, let's say, to Canada's while its population is ten times as large. I'm asking if you think this is inequity?

SSEA: I don't think so. I believe that if we were urging, or if the Law of the Sea Conference itself, were urging a régime that would deny to the distant fishing states participation in the harvest contiguous to the coastal states, then that might be a valid observation, but that is not our view. But we would want to take from the economic zone contiguous to the Canadian coast a harvest required by our needs and the rest would be available to other countries. And it may be of interest to you to know that we have already discussed, well, with Poland, with Portugal, Norway and Spain, and we have concluded with these four countries bilateral understandings.

Q. Are those bilateral understandings for a two hundred mile zone?

SSEA: They are based upon a régime that would prevail in a situation of extended Canadian jurisdiction...

Q. Would you pursue that a little further?

SSEA: I will be happy to pursue it, but let me just pursue the nature of these agreements, because we are saying to these countries through these discussions that a harvest surplus to our Canadian requirements will be available to you for your fishing fleets, and we have entered into these bilateral understandings and agreements. In some cases that involves the acknowledgement on the part of these countries of a régime that would be in a play when extended Canadian jurisdiction occurs. It seems to me that that is important from the point of view of your question, but it is also an indication of Canadian policy towards achieving an international recognition of an extended jurisdiction for Canada. When unilateral action is recommended for the Canadian Government we always presume and assume that if unilateral action is taken it will have been preceded by bilateral negotiations, and whatever régime comes into effect, whether through a multilateral negotiation or a bilateral negotiation, will have been negotiated.

Q. Well, what, then, is the meaning of this exercise that brings you here if Ecuador, Peru, the U.S., Iceland, yourself, all unilaterally make your deals and declare the domain yourself? The U.S. Congress isn't waiting on here, Iceland didn't wait on here, and Ecuador and Peru have had it for years. What, then, are we talking about? What's the value of having an international treaty if you, Canada and we, the U.S., do this all by ourselves?