at issue is a new equity, a new international economic order, and a new lawmaking process. The economic zone and the concept of the common heritage of mankind are bold inventions that will bring us closer to this new equity and new economic order. But perhaps the most revolutionary change has been in the lawmaking process. The traditional law of the sea resulted largely from the state practice of the Western maritime powers, codified in the 1958 Geneva conventions. Most of the developing countries had no voice in this process. Today, however, they all have a voice and all insist on being heard. Therein lies the revolution: the decolonization of the law of the sea.

Many of you may recall the story of the monkey-keeper by Lieh Tzu. In the land of Sung, long ago, there was a monkey-keeper who dearly loved his monkeys. The day came, however, when he could no longer afford to feed them as well as before. Fearing that they would no longer obey him, he decided to trick them into accepting short rations, "Here are chestnuts for you," he told them. "You'll get three each morning and four each evening. Is that enough?" The monkeys angrily refused his offer. "Very well," he said, "four each morning and three each evening. Is that enough?" Delighted, the monkeys agreed.

But men are not monkeys. The developing countries will not accept keepers, nor short rations — at the Law of the Sea Conference or elsewhere. They are today sovereign and equal members of the international community. In insisting on the exercise of their sovereign equality — in their rejection of keepers and short rations — they have Canada's full support.

Extension of international law

Before concluding, I would like to discuss briefly one other major development in contemporary international law. Traditionally, international law has been concerned with relations between states. Today, the increasing involvement of governments in commercial activities, the burgeoning of international and intergovernmental organizations, and the spread of transnational enterprises, have all combined to extend the domain of international law. This phenomenon demands creative new approaches, for which we can find inspiration in our respective domestic legal traditions.

Both your government and mine are heavily involved in international trade, directly in some cases, and through our various agencies in other cases. Inevitably, many complex practical problems are beginning to surface. We in Canada are about to deal with some of these in a State Immunity Act, which will clarify and codify our judicial practice. We welcome China's encouragement of the work of the International Law Commission on the jurisdictional immunities of states and their property. We are impressed with your efforts to provide stability in international trade and investment through the instrumentality of domestic law. Here too your past affords lessons for us all. Unequal treaties are not true treaties, which can only be based on mutual benefit. The extra-territorial application of foreign laws is a violation of sovereignty. Commercial disputes can best be resolved through direct, amicable consultations, supplemented where necessary by conciliation, arbitration or other proceedings. What is required in all commercial relations, especially where different economic, social and legal systems are involved, is certainty, predictability and confidence.