

time being, those areas where we cannot get complete agreement. I am not saying that this is what we will do but it is a possibility.

As the matter now stands, what advantage would it be to Canada and to Canadian fishermen, if we were to take a unilateral position that would not be accepted by the international court of justice? It would mean that we would set back our position by twenty-five years at least. So there are now two approaches to this problem; they would be either to re-assess our position or to start establishing co-ordinates. Or, and this is the one I know Members here would probably prefer, to have another conference on the Law of the Sea, because there may have, and I think there has, been a change of attitude throughout the world.

A number of countries at the last meeting who may have been opposed to the proposal which was then made may look at it now with a different mind. It would be much more practical and to the better advantage of Canadian fisheries if we could arrive at a solution acceptable to the majority of countries taking part in the Law of the Sea Conference.

On the other hand, if we force the proposal and one of the countries involved takes us before the International Court of Justice, and our proposal is turned down, where do we stand? As I say, we would put our position twenty-five years back.

Mr. CROUSE: Mr. Chairman, just one other question and this will be my last. When this legislation was introduced on May 20th, 1964 by the Honourable Paul Martin, he stated, and I looked up his quote:

on proclamation the 12-mile fishing zone will be established. I must emphasize there is no doubt, and there can be no doubt about this point..."

That was on May 20th, 1964 and the legislation was, I believe, proclaimed in July of that year. Is it safe then, Mr. Chairman, to assume that the eight countries mentioned the other day by the Minister, namely France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, still do not comply with the legislation as passed? Is this a safe assumption?

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Not exactly, Mr. Chairman. Those countries which have just been mentioned had either treaty or historic rights with Canada. What we had to do was pass a special order in council allowing them—which is an international practice and is not new, on our part—allowing them to carry on under the same conditions as they were fishing before this Act was passed, we would then negotiate a phasing out period with them. This is what we have been doing. Again, this is an international practice which is internationally recognized.

Mr. CROUSE: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister tell us of the state of agreement with these eight countries on the phasing out period?

Mr. ROBICHAUD: I cannot give details. This would be giving details of the negotiations. But a number of those countries—and I hope I am not forced to name them because we have agreed, in negotiation, that we would not give the names until the negotiations were completed—have come to agreement with