

the 12-mile territorial sea will have the effect of pushing the inner limit of Canada's continental shelf seawards a distance of nine miles.

The U.S. Government has made clear its willingness to accept a 12-mile territorial sea provided this is achieved by multilateral agreement and not by the continuing development of customary law through state practice. The Canadian Government sympathized with the U.S. desire for accepted rules of law on these questions. Canada has repeatedly shown its good faith in the multilateral approach to these questions by participating vigorously and constructively in every effort in the last 40 years to achieve agreed rules of law on the breadth of the territorial sea and the nature and extent of contiguous zones.

I do not wish to belabour the point, but I would remind the House and the international community that Canada attempted to get agreement first on a three-plus-nine basis -- three-mile territorial sea and nine-mile contiguous zones -- in 1958, and, when this did not prove possible, we campaigned for the famous "six-plus-six" formula comprising a six-mile territorial sea and six-mile contiguous zone for certain purposes. We warned that the law was developing toward wider and wider assertions of territorial sovereignty and that the international community must recognize the legitimacy of extension of jurisdiction beyond the territorial sea for limited specific purposes. Unfortunately, we had only limited and belated success in enlisting the support of the U.S.A. for our proposal.

Later, in 1960, we campaigned very actively for the six-plus-six formula. (We made representations in capitals all over the world through our diplomatic representatives there. Might I point out parenthetically that our efforts then and the exercise in which we are now engaged require the existence of a well-trained foreign service and the presence of Canadian representatives in capitals all over the world, for many reasons, but particularly when we are seeking the support of the international community, as now, for a Canadian initiative.... We are very fortunate in having a foreign service generally accepted as one of the very best in the world....)

It will be recalled that in 1960 our proposed six-plus-six formula fell short of success by a fraction of one vote. We did not, however, even then, abandon the multilateral approach. We joined with Britain in canvassing countries round the world to ask them if, in spite of the failure at Geneva, they would nonetheless join with us in a multilateral agreement based on the six-plus-six formula. We pressed the U.S.A. to join with us in these representations, but the U.S.A. declined.

Subsequently, when, as a result of our extensive and protracted canvassing efforts, we and our British friends found that we had the support of over 40 countries for such a proposal, provided the U.S.A. and other major powers would agree, we approached the U.S.A. again with this evidence. Unfortunately, we were told, after waiting a further period of many months for the U.S.A. reply, that the U.S.A. did not consider it timely or appropriate to join with us in our efforts. I hope it will not be taken as a sign of anti-Americanism but merely as an affirmative sign of Canadianism for me to say that we really are not prepared, in light of these developments, to accept the proposition that it is always desirable to proceed multilaterally instead of unilaterally.