

and important contribution of the delegation from India under the leadership of Dr. Senn.

We also had occasion to work very closely with the delegation from Mexico, particularly Dr. Robles who represented that delegation on the First Committee. I should like to pay a war tribute to Prince Wan of Thailand, the President of the Conference, to the able chairmen of the five main committees and in particular, Professor K.G. Bailey, Solicitor General of Australia, who presided over the deliberations of the First Committee which dealt with the vexing problem of the breadth of the territorial sea and fishing zone.

I should like to relate to the House, if I may, an anecdote which occurred on the Friday preceding the very tense and dramatic voting on Saturday in the second last week of the conference when Mr. Dean made a very brilliant exposition of the United States proposal lasting for 45 or 50 minutes. The hon. Mr. Drew representing the Canadian Delegation spontaneously walked up to the podium without notes and, taking about 45 minutes, put forward in one of the most brilliant presentations the case of Canada and the smaller nations as opposed to those who had so-called traditional fishing claims in distant waters. Professor Bailey, the chairman, got up and told the assembled delegates that they would rarely see such a high standard of parliamentary presentation of argument as they had witnessed that day and the whole convention floor of delegates of 86 nations took time out to applaud these two very fine men.

It is my impression that the significance of the Canadian proposal, which was adopted by a simple majority vote of the Committee but which did not get the necessary two-thirds majority in the plenary session, was made quite evident in spite of the bitter opposition from most of the major powers. It is my impression that the majority vote accorded the Canadian proposal in committee represents the first time in any United Nations conference that an important substantive matter has passed without the support of any of the five permanent members of the Security Council. I wish the House could see the picture as I saw it with the United Kingdom, the United States, China, France and the U.S.S.R., together with all their friends over whom they have influence and exercise persuasion, massed against Canada, India, Mexico, Libya and many of the newer and younger nations reaching out for some claim to fish in the waters off their coasts. I wish hon. members could have been there to see the little nations, in spite of all the pressure of the five permanent members of the Security Council united on one side of a very important substantive issue, mustering a majority. I believe that is the first time the five permanent members have been defeated when they were on one side of an issue.

Although the Canadian proposal was rejected in the plenary session, a new concept of international law has been introduced which must surely be taken into account in any future consideration of this question. In the early stages of the conference the United States of America supported the Canadian proposals. Later, however, the United States Delegation