

I mentioned yesterday that we decided in 1964 that it was necessary to do it alone, and so we did; we passed the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act laying down the legislative basis for delimiting the territorial sea from straight baselines rather than from the sinuosities of the coast, and established a nine-mile fishing-zone contiguous to our three-mile territorial sea. Subsequently, we established straight baselines over long stretches of our coast. The United States, while expressing its disagreement with our legislation, followed suit in 1966 in establishing its own nine-mile fishery zone. It is, however, a reflection of the close and friendly relations between our two countries that it was agreed from the outset on both sides that the fishermen of either country would be allowed to fish freely in the contiguous zones of the other. This remains the Canadian position with respect to any new Canadian fishing-zones.

There are now in process discussions in many capitals concerning the desirability of a third Law of the Sea Conference, the agenda for such a possible conference and many other difficult and delicate questions. The United States has made known, as has the Soviet Union, that it would be willing to support an agreement providing for a 12-mile territorial sea, a high-seas corridor through international straits and certain limited rights to coastal states over offshore fisheries. As I have stated previously, we shall participate actively in any such conference. We cannot, however, accept the notion that a coastal state's fisheries conservation and protection jurisdiction must cease at 12 miles from shore.

The developments since 1960 have proved that there is no magic in the 12-mile limit. Unlike the deer and bears in national parks, who become aware after a period that they are safe when they enter the sanctuary of the park, the fish do not seem to know that they are safe -- except, of course, from Canadian fishermen -- when they enter the 12-mile limit. Massive fishing expeditions by other states covering the surface of the sea with trawlers and mother-ships are rapidly depleting the living resources of the sea. We cannot wait longer for the international community to realize the danger and move to meet it. Once again, Canada, after long and serious deliberations, has decided to go it alone.

I shall now turn to the question in which all parties have expressed great interest, namely, the implications of the establishment of a 12-mile territorial sea for Canada's Arctic sovereignty. I should like to emphasize that there is no difference of views concerning Canada's sovereignty over the islands of the Arctic archipelago or Canada's sovereign rights to explore and exploit the mineral resources of Canada's northern continental shelf. There is no need even to comment concerning Canada's long-established and universally-accepted sovereignty over the land....

With respect to the seabed, Canada is a signatory of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf, which recognizes the "sovereign rights" of coastal states over the continental shelf adjacent to their coasts for the purposes of exploring and exploiting its natural resources....

The Convention says that the rights are exclusive in the sense that, even if the coastal state does not exploit them, they cannot be exploited by other states without the express consent of the coastal state itself. The