

are not merely goals; they are not simply expressions of hope. In the opinion of the Canadian Delegation, they reflect international law as it is accepted by Member States. We consider it most important and significant that the two major space powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, should both have declared their intent, provided the declaration is approved by the General Assembly, to conduct their activities in outer space in conformity with these principles. For its part, the Government of Canada also wishes to state its willingness, if the draft declaration is adopted by the General Assembly, to conduct any activities in outer space in which it may be involved in conformity with these principles.

It follows from this view of the legal significance of the draft declaration that the principles should conform with the known intentions of all potential space powers. This point has to be borne in mind in considering the implications of including in the draft declaration an additional legal principle that outer space should be reserved for peaceful purposes only. There have been some suggestions that Member States should accept the same limitations on the use of outer space as they have previously done with regard to Antarctica. I take it that this analogy is intended to suggest that Member States should agree to exclude weapons from outer space before weapons are devised which involve the use of outer space. I believe, however, that the situation in outer space differs from that which existed at the time that the treaty was negotiated making Antarctica an arms free area. To my knowledge, no states had weapons in Antarctica or had weapons systems which could involve the use of Antarctica if war were to break out. With regard to outer space, it is my understanding that intercontinental