

of 2J+3KL cod, cod which, today, is sacred to the Hon. Member for Gander—Twillingate (Mr. Baker).

Mr. Tobin: Watch your blood pressure, John.

Mr. Crosbie: Of the 9,500 tonnes, the EEC has allocated 7,200 tonnes to Germany, 1,545 tonnes to France and approximately 800 tonnes to England. Luckily for us, that treaty expires at the end of 1987. So let us put those facts in context. That is another Liberal treaty.

Finally, the last treaty I want to mention is an agreement or exchange of notes signed on June 20 and June 28, 1984, when Senator De Bané was Minister of Fisheries and Senator MacEachen—they have both gone to their rewards—was the Secretary of State for External Affairs. That was an exchange of notes in which Canada and France agreed that in this disputed area, known as 3PS, neither country would harass the ships of the other because this was a disputed zone. That is why today when France says it wants nine vessels licensed to fish in this disputed zone, 3PS, we license them.

Why do we license them? Because we want to establish, when this matter goes to arbitration, that it has been accepting licences from us over these intervening years and therefore appears to be submitting to the fact that we have some control or authority over these waters. That is why they get licensed.

In any event, under this exchange of notes we cannot prevent France from fishing in this area. France cannot prevent us from fishing in this area. We have the right to say what the quotas should be in this area. The quota set is 42,000 tonnes for this whole area. We have assigned 6,400 tonnes to France, which is really for St. Pierre and Miquelon, and 35,600 tonnes is available in that quota for Canadians. This is a quota which our scientists say can safely be caught in zone 3PS, the disputed zone.

But the French ignored and are ignoring now the quota. They will not accept the 6,400 tonnes. We cannot force them to accept it. If two sovereign states have a disagreement, they can either reach an agreement between themselves and resolve the disagreement or they can agree between themselves to go to arbitration and have a third party adjudicate the difference of opinion or the dispute and settle it that way. There is only one other way, a third way. That third way is that they go to war with one another. They can attempt to use armed force. One attempts to force the settlement he wants on the other.

There are three possible ways. I was dumbfounded tonight to hear the Leader of the NDP try to grandstand in this House by suggesting that recourse should be had to the third method, the use of force. He suggested that we had chased the Spanish trawler just a few months ago. He presumably meant by that that we should chase out the French trawlers. He suggested that we should use force.

Well, the difference is monumental between the two situations. Clearly, the Spanish trawler was in the Canadian 200-mile economic zone with no right, no claim of right to be there. It was violating international law. But in zone 3PS

international law does not recognize as yet either French rights or our rights. So we have no right to chase the French vessels out. We will only have that right if we can get to arbitration, if the French will go to arbitration with us and an impartial third party sets the boundaries, decides what economic zone St. Pierre and Miquelon are entitled to as two small islands within the perimeter of continental Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador. If that occurs and an impartial third party sets the economic zone and the territorial limits of St. Pierre and Miquelon, then of course we could take action and we would have international law to back us up.

Is anyone in the House seriously suggesting—does the Newfoundland Government seriously suggest—that we should use armed force to settle this matter with France? No, they do not. Our adhesion to the United Nations would prevent us from doing so. No civilized state uses force against another civilized state in the present world today to settle these disputes. So we must have an agreement.

What stage are we at now? Up to the present time the Government of Newfoundland has been fully consulted in this matter. So has the industry and the union involved. There is a group of industry advisers, four from the union and the industry and one from the Government of Newfoundland, a group of five, that has been advising the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans which has been consulted all through the piece, with the exception of last week. I for one am not *au fait* with, nor do I agree with, and I think the Government should apologize for, the lack of including these representatives in the discussions that went on in Paris last week.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (2140)

Mr. Crosbie: It was unacceptable, as far as I am concerned. But that is a procedural matter.

Mr. Manly: It is more than a procedural matter.

Mr. Crosbie: I am making my view on that clear in the name of proper federal-provincial relations, and in following what has been done to date, these representatives should have been fully involved last week. That was an error. That is the position.

We are trying to get France, a nation of some 40 million or 50 million people, to go to arbitration on the question of St. Pierre and Miquelon. They feel no immediate compulsion to go to arbitration; it is not a pressing matter to them. It is a pressing matter to who? The fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador, and to the fishermen of the maritime provinces it is a pressing matter. That is why we are anxious to get France to arbitration. But France knows that there is more compulsion on us to do this. They do not care about the fish resource off St. Pierre and Miquelon. They are prepared to sacrifice their own few thousand people in St. Pierre and Miquelon. They do