

France suggests that the 1972 Fisheries Agreement should not be taken into account, because Canada has not given it proper effect. Yet France is obliged to admit that the fishery of St. Pierre and Miquelon has grown under the Agreement. The islands have received benefits far beyond those contemplated in 1972, and their catches have more than doubled in the 10 years that followed signature of the Agreement.

The controversy that began to mark the implementation of the Agreement in the mid-1980s cannot be attributed to any failure by Canada to meet its obligations. Problems arose from other causes. After a decade of steady but sustainable growth, French catches in the disputed area skyrocketed to unmanageable levels. France chose to escalate the boundary dispute, and the result was the breakdown of the relationship in 1987-88. This was an isolated development and will not be repeated once the boundary has been settled by this Tribunal.

Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Court, it has not always been easy in political terms for Canada to extend to St. Pierre and Miquelon the privileged treatment they enjoy under the 1972 Fisheries Agreement -- treatment in some respects better than that given to Canadians. The fishermen of Newfoundland have a natural sympathy for their neighbours in St. Pierre and Miquelon. They do not resent the provision made for the islands under the 1972 Agreement. For them, this is truly an "arrangement between neighbours." But Newfoundland fishermen have found it hard to understand how France could enjoy the unique benefits of the 1972 Agreement and still claim a vast slice out of Canada's 200-mile zone.

In fact, Canada would never have entered into the 1972 Fisheries Agreement if it had anticipated a French claim anything like the one now advanced. The 1972 Relevé de Conclusions is evidence that both Canada and France contemplated a 12-mile zone for St. Pierre and Miquelon at that time. It is troubling now that France should claim a zone so many times that size and in the process should manifest so little regard for the value of the 1972 Fisheries Agreement.

Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Court, it is especially troubling to hear the French suggestion that the Canadian zone is large enough to compensate for what France seeks to carve out of it for St. Pierre and Miquelon. The overall area of Canada's Atlantic zone has no more to do with the equities of this case than does the overall area of France's collection of zones around the globe, which together give France the second largest area of maritime jurisdiction in the world.

Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Court, relations with France occupy a high place on Canada's national agenda. Our two countries share a language, a history and a heritage. We have