

activities which have the risk of damaging the environment of another state, was omitted from the Declaration and referred to the General Assembly for consideration. The two countries, with a large amount of support, introduced a resolution on the duty to consult which in the Canadian view also embodied an interpretation of the scope and significance of Principles 21 and 22. Canada felt that this resolution could have resulted in an undermining of the principles as an agreed basis for the development of international environmental law. The Canadian delegation, with the support of other delegations particularly New Zealand and Mexico, attempted to ensure that the legal effect of Principles 21 and 22 of the Declaration on the Human Environment. In the result, the two key principles of the Stockholm Declaration remain in the form unanimously adopted at the Conference; unfettered by subsequent General Assembly interpretation.

The Ocean Dumping Conference held in London in November presented yet another opportunity for follow-up action on the Stockholm Conference. This Conference was part of the Stockholm Action Plan and Canada took a leading role, encouraging the elaboration of a Convention which is both enforceable jurisdictionally and environmentally sound. As adopted the Convention is enforceable not only against vessels registered in the territory or flying the flag of a contracting state but also against vessels and fixed or floating platforms under the jurisdiction of a contracting state and believed to be engaged in dumping. This is the first international maritime agreement which specifically makes provision for both flag state and coastal states jurisdiction. So as not to prejudice the work of the Law of the Sea Conference, the Ocean Dumping Convention specifically defers resolution