

sites. The Canadian Government concluded that there would be an unacceptable risk in the transport of a large volume of pollutants through these difficult waters and that we would oppose the passage of large crude or product carriers through Canadian waters in the area. We made these views known to the United States Government on June 7, 1973, and through the United States Government to the State of Maine. On a number of occasions since that date, we have continued to express our opposition to this project.

The Maine Environmental Protection Board has now come to a decision in the matter of the Pittston Company's application. There has not, as yet, been an opportunity for us to devote careful study to the conclusions of the Board. It would thus be premature to comment substantively on them although the general tenor of the decision seems to be encouraging to us. However, the Canadian Government's opposition to the carriage of large quantities of pollutants through Head Harbour Passage is well known. The Government will be examining the details of the Board's decision in this light.

There are a number of transboundary issues that are currently being discussed between Canada and the U.S. Several of these are in the vicinity of the border of New England and Canada. Discussion and consultation will help permit solutions to be developed in individual cases that will satisfy both Canadian and U.S. concerns. We have a long tradition of operating in this manner and we intend to bend our best efforts to maintain this tradition.

With the longest coastline in the world, Canada is very aware of the need to protect the marine environment. The sea plays an important part in the lives of many regions of Canada as it does for this region of the U.S.A. and therefore Canada has taken a great interest in questions concerning the law of the sea. I am sure you here in Boston share this concern and are also paying close attention to developments at the Third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference which resumed this week in Geneva.

Canada strongly supports the idea of a 200 mile economic zone. We think it important that we have the exclusive right to manage all living resources within the zone and that we obtain appropriate protection for the coastal state's interest in the fish stocks of the continental margin beyond 200 miles. The future of our own fishing industry depends on the effective management of these resources and on the right to reserve to our own fishermen that portion of the total resource within the zone which we have the capacity to catch.

Canada is also seeking rights in the economic zone which would provide coastal states with more extensive powers over marine pollution. In addition we have a special concern to ensure that very vulnerable areas such as ice-infested waters are protected from pollution. Canada believes that coastal states must have the authority, with appropriate safeguards, to deal with particular geographic, navigational or ecological situations not adequately covered by international rules and standards.