

abuse, adjudication should apply both with respect to coastal States and other users, and both in the economic zone and international straits.

How then can we define the situations where compulsory dispute settlement would be appropriate? One solution would be to make an exception stating that there shall be no dispute settlement with respect to disputes arising in the economic zone or international straits, except in the case of a gross abuse or "abus de pouvoir" by either the coastal State or by other users. Another approach would be to state that there could be no compulsory dispute settlement except in the case of interference by the coastal State in certain specific rights of other States such as freedom of navigation or scientific research, or the abuse of such navigational rights by other states in a manner which damages coastal or straits States. I note that a basis for either approach is already to be found in Article 18 of the Single Negotiating Text.

This is a complex question, but I believe that it will be possible to find a middle ground between those who would reject any compulsory dispute settlement in the economic zone and those who would demand it on all economic zone issues.