

destruction only, in our view, intensifies the need for the recognition of a broad coastal-state security zone. Demilitarization of the broadest possible area of the seabed would make such a zone much less necessary, since no state would then have any right to make any military use of the continental shelf. With only nuclear and mass-destruction weapons prohibited, the possibility arises that states may attempt to emplace conventional weapons or military installations on the continental shelf of another state. Obviously, no coastal state could accept with equanimity the emplacement of offensive installations near its shores. If any state has the right to make any military use of the continental shelf, even for defensive purposes, it is the coastal state and the coastal state only. The exclusive sovereign rights of the coastal state to explore the continental shelf and exploit its resources are not compatible with any degree of freedom of military activity on the shelf by other states. The possibilities of conflict between foreign military activities and the coastal state's exploration and exploitation of the shelf are only too obvious.

#### VERIFICATION AND INSPECTION

Without a provision for effective verification and inspection procedures under an international arrangement, states with a less-developed underwater technology will not have any assurance that the nuclear states are complying with the treaty. It is easy to see that particularly troublesome problems would arise if a state emplaced military installations on the continental shelf of another state and then attempted to deny that other state access to the area or installation. In our view, a military installation by a foreign state on the continental shelf would be contrary to existing international law. Canada maintains that the coastal state has an unrestricted right to verify foreign activities on its shelf and it has the right to be notified of and associated with actual inspection procedures undertaken by foreign states.

In summary, the U.S.-Soviet draft treaty is unfortunately silent on a number of important questions. The seabed arms-control negotiations excluded con-

sideration of the problem of submarines armed with nuclear missiles. Thus the draft treaty bars only a potential nuclear presence from ocean space, while leaving the existing mobile presence intact.

The draft treaty is described in its preamble as a step towards the exclusion of the seabed from the arms race and expresses a determination to continue negotiations concerning further measures leading to this end. With this description and this determination we are in complete agreement. The debate in the United Nations General Assembly will indicate whether or not the co-chairmen of the Conference on Disarmament have put forward a treaty which provides a truly multilateral basis for seabed arms-control measures consistent with the other requirements of a regime for the continental shelf and the seabed beyond national jurisdiction.

I have only traced the bare outlines of some of the more vital issues in the developing area of the seabed. I have not, for instance, taken up the problem of marine pollution which may arise from exploitation of seabed resources. This is another crucial aspect of the seabed question, to which the Canadian Government intends to give the most vigorous attention both domestically and internationally. My purpose today has been to illustrate our active concern that the seabed and ocean-floor should be preserved from any form of submarine colonialism and from the vicious circle of the arms race.

Perhaps some of the visions of vast wealth to be had for the taking from the sea are utopian. We know too little about the resources of the seabed, but it is certain that the costs and risks of exploiting them will be high. Perhaps visions of new and nobler forms of peaceful international co-operation under the sea, while the old and imperfect forms continue on land, are equally utopian. We know too much, perhaps, about the nature of man and the nation state, and it is unlikely that either will undergo some sort of "sea change" at "full fathom five". Nevertheless, there is an urgent need for the law of the sea and seabed to keep pace with the exciting but potentially dangerous growth of underwater technology. We intend to make the fullest possible Canadian contribution to the development of this area of international law.