

Mr. S. V. OZERE (*Assistant Deputy Minister (International), Fisheries Department*): Mr. Chairman, as honourable members probably know, the system in the United States is a little different than ours. Under the constitution of the United States, each state has control of its own fisheries and the federal government only participates whenever a treaty is negotiated. Therefore, in the federal set-up, they have nothing comparable to the Ministry of Fisheries. They have what is known as the Fish and Wildlife Service, which devotes itself mostly to research in fisheries and things of that nature and also administered the fisheries of Alaska until Alaska became a state.

For some years now, the Secretary of State's Department, which is the equivalent of our External Affairs, has had in its set-up what is known as a special assistant to the Undersecretary of State for Fisheries and, so far as I can make out from the reports we have received, only the title will be changed. There will be a new appointee because the present special assistant is retiring in September and a new appointment at a slightly higher rank will be made.

Mr. CROUSE: Another question, Mr. Chairman. We have been told that the 12-mile limit cannot be established as envisaged by Bill S-17 because of objections by the United States. We have also been informed, or I have been led to believe, that other countries, specifically the seven besides the United States which the Minister mentioned the other day, would drop their objections to our implementing the 12-mile limit if the United States and Canada could reach agreement on this matter.

We have been told for a period of almost two years that negotiations have been going on and, while I do not expect the Minister to tell this Committee the clauses under which they are negotiating with the United States, I would like to know if he can tell the Committee just what the United States is objecting to in this legislation which we passed some two years ago?

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Mr. Chairman, I think I have made it clear that I could not give exact details as to the objection of the United States. I have stated that they were objecting to our proposal which is based, as was said before this Committee, I believe by Mr. Ozere, at one of our previous meetings, on the proposal similar to that made to the government by the Fisheries Council of Canada. The Fisheries Council of Canada requested that a number of bodies of water be considered as Canadian waters; this is the basis of the objection. But I am not in a position to give details regarding what bodies or what parts they are objecting to.

They are objecting to the principle, in general, which is based on the proposal that was submitted to the government by the Fisheries Council of Canada.

Mr. CROUSE: This then, means, Mr. Chairman, that we are practically in a deadlock with our American counterparts, does it not, over this?

Mr. ROBICHAUD: No, I would not go that far. I would not say we are in a deadlock. We certainly have not as yet been able to get approval to our proposal but, as I have said at the first meeting, we are expecting a firm reply from the United States and, when this is received, it will be considered by the government. And if a change or a new policy has to be adopted I cannot say now what position will be taken. It may be, as I have stated, that we may be starting immediately to establish certain co-ordinates and leave aside, for the