

of anti-pollution standards is an essential part of the good order and good management needed to ensure preservation of the marine environment throughout the world. To the extent that exceptionally vulnerable localities and regions may be given the more stringent protection they need under special international agreements, Canada considers this approach to be the most desirable. But Canada considers that no state can be asked to surrender its ultimate right of self-protection to a system of *exclusively* international anti-pollution rules and standards. This would presuppose an international law-making body which would have the expertise and objectivity to make the right decisions for all areas, and the power to impose them on all states, whether willing or not. No such body exists at this time, and it seems most unlikely that one can be created at this stage of international political development.

Similarly the Canadian approach to the exploitation of continental shelf resources calls on the states of the world to agree to at least a framework of minimum rules and standards for the prevention of pollution from this source, leaving them free and indeed encouraging them to adopt stricter standards for themselves. Little controversy arises on this point, as the sovereign rights of the coastal state over the exploitation of its continental shelf are already recognized. The only difficulty may perhaps lie in persuading some states to accept even the minimum internationally agreed rules and standards. As for the seabed beyond national jurisdiction, the internationally agreed rules and standards developed for the continental shelf could serve as the model for those to be imposed in this outer area by the International Seabed Authority.

The whole of this Canadian approach to the prevention of marine pollution would temper the old exclusive rights of both coastal and flag states. It would ensure recognition of the fact that clean seas are at least as important as free seas. And, under appropriate safeguards, it should harm the interests of no state and protect the interests of all.



On February 4, 1970, the *Arrow*, a tanker operating under a flag of convenience, ran aground on Cerberus Rock in Chedabucto Bay, N.S. More than 190 miles of shoreline were affected from the resulting oil spill. The above illustration shows the extent of pollution. Shoreline contamination is indicated by heavy lines.

What would have been the extent of the damage if the accident had involved the *Globtik Tokyo* (483,664 tons) rather than the *Arrow* (18,151 tons)?

