

of that year. The Maltese proposal called for the United Nations to undertake the "examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the seabed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind". Thus, attention was focused on the crucial question — what are the "limits of present national jurisdiction" over seabed resources? This issue will culminate at the Law of the Sea Conference at present scheduled for 1973.

Canada's External Affairs Department and this branch have put a great deal of time and effort since 1967 into putting forward to the representatives of other states the Canadian position as regards exercising sovereign rights to explore and exploit seabed resources out to the limit of the submerged continental margin. We have been working in this respect both in the United Nations Seabed Committee and in the General Assembly by means of formal interventions and private discussions, as well as in various other forums.

There have been positive results. For the first few years following the Maltese Resolution of 1967, the implications of the Canadian wide-shelf seabed resources position were not clearly understood by many other states, some of whom may have regarded it as an imperialistic stance. Recently, this situation has changed markedly.

Practicality of Canadian stance

At the March 1971 session, we made an especially concerted effort to explain that Canada is not being over-nationalistic and grasping in its approach to seabed resources, but sensible and practical in taking into account the special interests and responsibilities of coastal states. We explained, for example, that the coastal state is itself the authority with the most intimate knowledge of the problems off its sea-coasts and with the immediate interest in dealing with them (multi-resource development conflicts, anti-pollution and safety measures, etc.) and thus it is the coastal state that is in the best position to exercise controls over the sea-

bed of its adjacent continental margin....

Canada made a proposal at that session designed to help break the deadlock in the committee's work arising from the complex interrelationships between the ultimate definition of the limits of national jurisdiction and the nature of the regime to be developed for the international seabed area....

This Canadian proposal involved: first, the early determination of the limits of the minimum non-contentious area of the seabed through the definition by all coastal states of either their Continental Shelf claims or those limits beyond which they would make no claims; and secondly, the establishment of transitional international machinery for managing this non-contentious seabed area. Thus, coastal states could either define the maximum limits they now claim or, if they preferred, the maximum limits beyond which they would not claim under any circumstances. A third, but not essential, element in the Canadian proposal involved an arrangement whereby the machinery would receive from each coastal state a percentage of the revenues derived from all its offshore areas.

Canadian work bore fruit

Although this proposal itself was not generally accepted, our especially concerted efforts at the March 1971 session on top of our cumulative work over the previous years certainly bore fruit. At the July-August session of that same year 1971, for the first time a good deal of support was expressed by a number of delegations, in addition to the Latins, for a wide juridical shelf. Moreover, on the basis of developments at our latest session, in July-August of this year, 1972, what had been a formative trend a year ago has now become a strong movement within the Seabed Committee.

There seems no doubt that at least many of the delegations now envisage some sort of exclusive-economic-zone approach as being the keystone for reaching agreement on the controversial question of national limits of jurisdiction. The most noteworthy contributions of the past session in this regard were made by Caribbean-area

states, including Mexico and Venezuela, and by African states. In all of these the move was toward the assertion of coastal states' rights. Although expressed in various ways and utilizing a variety of terms, such as "patrimonial sea" and "economic zone", these approaches by other states are closely akin to and would appear to have been influenced by the Canadian wide-shelf approach....

Bell Canada reports ding-dong business

Bell Canada Chairman R.C. Scrivener stated in his company's annual report for 1972 that record levels had been reached during the year in the number of subscribers, in local and long-distance calls, in operating revenues and in share earnings. "A buoyant economy increased demand for services and required greater expenditures than ever before in both operating and capital costs," he said. Earnings per common share amounted to \$4.12.

At year-end, Bell Canada had more than 6,742,000 telephones in service — a net gain of 447,000 during the year. Mr. Scrivener reported that, "because of the mobility of our customers, the company was called upon to install four phones and disconnect three to gain one".

Telephone calls handled by Bell Canada climbed to more than 40 million on the average day, totalling 14.8 billion in the year. Long-distance calls rose to 351 million, an increase of 15.2 per cent, and accounted for 41.3 per cent of 1972 operating revenues.

Some 92,000 telephones were added to the company's network through "bargain month", a marketing program that enabled Bell Canada residence customers to add certain optional telephone services without paying the installation charges.

A highlight of the year, reported Mr. Scrivener, was the inauguration by Bell Canada and other companies of the Trans-Canada Telephone System of a program designed to emphasize computer communications with the object of providing Canadian leadership in this rapidly growing industry.