

over the living resources in the economic zone remains firmly embodied in the draft text. This affords strong international support for action already taken by Canada and other states to extend national fisheries jurisdiction out to 200 miles. Moreover, there were encouraging indications that land-locked and geographically-disadvantaged states may be ready to moderate their claims and seek a reasonable compromise with coastal states on the question of access to living resources of the economic zone.

Good progress was achieved on the question of rights of access and transit for land-locked states although the Group was unable finally to reach an overall compromise due to last minute reservations on the part of some land-locked states. It would seem, however, that with some minor changes, agreement on the relevant text in the RSNT (Part II, chapter VI) could be reached at the next session.

The last session may have also brought states closer to an agreement on a method of defining the outer edge of the continental margin (based on a formula drafted by Ireland and Canada) and on a formula for sharing the revenues derived from the exploitation of the mineral resources of the continental shelf beyond 200 miles, while safeguarding the sovereign rights of the coastal state over these resources. Some states, principally the land-locked and geographically-disadvantaged states, are still attacking the idea of coastal state sovereignty over the broad margin to its outer limits, but there is growing evidence of an emerging consensus which will accept the basic view of broad-shelf states.

On the question of straits and freedom of transit through them, it appears that solutions will likely be evolved through direct consultations between the major straits states and the major maritime powers. Finally, the Negotiating Group set up to deal with the delimitation articles met only twice towards the end of the Conference and was not in a position to reach agreement on proposals put before it. These included an amendment by Canada which supported the equidistance line as the general rule for delimitation purposes, "taking into account special circumstances, where justified, in order to reach an equitable result".

### Committee III

In Committee III, with respect to marine pollution provisions, negotiations at the summer session confirmed the emerging consensus in favour of a functional sharing of marine pollution jurisdiction between coastal, flag and port states. The long-standing Canadian support for a global "umbrella" treaty laying down basic environmental obligations now appears to be generally accepted and is already embodied in the draft text.