decision. We have therefore submitted this new reservation to Canada's acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court relating to those areas of the law of the sea which are undeveloped or inadequate.

"It is well known that there is little or no environmental law on the international plane and that the law now in existence favors the interests of the shipping states and the shipping owners engaged in the large-scale carriage of oil and other potential pollutants. There is an urgent need for the development of international law establishing that coastal states are entitled, on the basis of fundamental principle of self-defence, to protect their marine environment and the living resources of the sea adjacent to their coasts.

"In spite of this new reservation, Canada's acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the court remains much broader than that of most other members of the United Nations, and it is the hope of the Government that it will prove possible to reach agreement with other states on the vital need to develop the law to protect the marine environment and its living resources so as to make it possible for Canada again to broaden its acceptance of the court's jurisdiction."

PRESS INTERVIEW

The Prime Minister was interviewed by representatives of the press after his statement. Part of the interview follows:

Question: Sir, without asking you to condense it in 30 seconds, the letter to the United Nations is in anticipation of a challenge of this policy?

Answer: It is in anticipation to the possibility that some nations won't agree with our policy. The statement – the position we take is that international law that now stands does not sufficiently protect countries on the pollution aspect of international waters. And it is important for Canada to take forward steps in this area to help international law develop....

Question: Does this mean that any country which objects, sir, will have to deal with Canada directly?

Answer: Yes, that means the courts themselves in this particular instance will not be able to adjudicate on a case which will be binding to Canada.

Question: Mr. Prime Minister, would you outline what the anti-pollution control measures are – the 12-mile limit and so on. It also mentions a 100-mile figure there – I wonder if you could clarify this?

POLLUTION ZONE BILL

Answer: Well, there are two aspects of the two bills actually which we introduced. One is with a view to prevent pollution in the Arctic. This is the one which draws a loosely defined 100-mile zone outside from the Canadian islands in the Arctic and saying that within this zone we will exercise certain anti-pollution controls and these controls will be developed by regulation. I'm gladly prepared to say that we will only adopt these regulations after we have consulted with other nations, such as the United States, who are interested in sailing up there. But the important thing is that we do, from Parliament, have authority to ensure that any danger to pollution there, and therefore any danger to the delicate ecological balance of the Arctic be prevented or preserved against by Canadian action. This is the first bit of legislation – it is not an assertion of sovereignty, it is an exercise of our desire to keep the Arctic free of pollution and by defining 100 miles as the zone within which we are determined to act, we are indicating that our assertion there is not one aimed towards sovereignty but aimed towards one of the very important aspects of our action in the Arctic.

TERRITORIAL SEA BILL

If I can give the second part of the answer – the 12 miles – this is another bill – this is merely an extension of the territorial sea of Canada which is now three miles to 12 miles. This is following some almost 60 nations of the world which have done that. We are absolutely certain that international law is moving from the three to the 12-mile limit, therefore we are asserting that Canada's territorial seas henceforth will be coming under the 12-mile limit law.

Now, on this there is no reservation in the courts. If some nation takes it to the courts and establishes that international law says it's three miles and not 12, then we will stand by the judgment of the court. In other words, in one case where the law exists, it may be developing from three to 12, but the law exists, we're prepared to stand by the judgment of the world courts, world opinion.

In the other case, where no law exists, or where law is clearly insufficient, there is no international common law applying to the Arctic seas, we're saying somebody has to preserve this area for mankind until the international law develops. And we are prepared to help it develop by taking steps on our own and eventually, if there is a conference of nations concerned with the Arctic, we will of course be a very active member in such a conference and try to establish an international regime. But, in the meantime, we had to act now.

NOT AN ASSERTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

Question: Would not the prosecution of any violation of the pollution regulations in the Arctic, be an exercise in sovereignty, a sovereignty claim?

Answer: It would be an exercise of authority given by Parliament to the executive branch to apply a certain statute. Now, this doesn't necessarily mean that you're asserting sovereignty over those seas any more than the continental shelf doctrine, for instance, entails sovereignty with it. When the Truman document was proclaimed in 1945 saying that the continental shelf of the United States was part of the United States for the purpose of developing the shelf, there was no claim that this was an assertion of sovereignty by the United States over those waters, or even over the sea-bed in the normal sense. There-

(Continued on P. 6)