

---

There are several other issues that I could talk about. Because we share the longest border in the world, we also had problems and have problems when that border is extended another 200 miles in various directions as a result of our two-country decisions to declare a 200-mile economic zone in the law-of-the-sea context. And so we once again have very intricate negotiations under way with the United States seeking to delineate where that invisible border, in effect on the ocean, is going to be. But here again there is a general atmosphere of goodwill and a confidence, on my part, that we can resolve the question.

Yet another is the St. Lawrence Seaway, perhaps one of the most remarkable demonstrations of two-country co-operation on the face of the earth. Now there is a necessity to look at it in terms of a revised toll structure. Well, as with the boundary question, Canada has chosen, consciously and deliberately, to do the negotiating in an atmosphere of goodwill without the overhang of the legal devices that are open to both sides but that we have said, essentially, we should rather not employ. In other words, we should rather go at it in a negotiating way with all sides putting their various propositions on the table but not employing the kinds of legal mechanism that are inherent in the various treaties.

Another almost insuperable problem, but one we have to solve, is the question of the protection of the environment. We share the same house in the sense of our part of the North American continent, and the pollution problems, both in the air and on the water, and the potential problems, for instance, that we have as a result of the tanker-route from Alaska to California and to the northern tier of states — all of these things. We must be deeply conscious of them in view of what has happened in the North Sea in the last few days. All of these things are matters that it is literally impossible for one side or the other to resolve unilaterally. We have to have the closest possible relation, not simply because we want to help the other side, as it were, but because this is something that knows no distinction of American or Canadian in the vast majority of cases. The huge rivers that cross our borders, the enormous amount of industrial activity very close to the border — all of these things call for skill and commitment on both our parts, and, once again, I am sure that that is going to be present.

I think I have already exceeded the time and I do not want to cut down on the question-period, and I have barely touched on multilateral matters, and I will simply say this — that, just as there are great similarities between Canada and the United States and between Canadians and Americans, both of us as countries clearly have not only the right but the responsibility to articulate our perception of what the world ought to be, and obviously there cannot be — nor should there be — a blind allegiance across the whole range of multilateral questions that each country supports the other on everything. Canadians obviously want to assert their individuality; they want to retain — in multilateral matters, in international matters — their right to disagree with the United States. It says something, however, for the commonality of our beginnings, and for the depth of our mutual conviction to democratic principles, that divergences of views are so rare. In international matters, I'd be hard pressed at the moment to identify any issue where there is anything more than subtle difference between us. And I am convinced, as I know your

---