basic positions on many questions: both want the session that will start in New York in August to score a breakthrough on the outstanding problems of the conference, so that a fair and workable treaty, responsive to current needs and realities, will be in place in the very near future; both countries support the coastal state's sovereign rights over fisheries resources off its coasts and the special responsibility for salmon of the state in whose rivers salmon originate; and both countries support the reaffirmation of the coastal state's sovereign rights over resources to the outer edge of its continental margin.

It is also not surprising that there are important law-of-the-sea issues on which the perspectives of our two countries have differed -- for example, on some aspects of the role the coastal state should play in protecting the marine environment off its coast, and on some of the specifics of the legal regime to govern the international seabed area that is the "common heritage of mankind". What is important to note, however, is that, where there have been or still are differences in approach, our two countries have consulted at various levels in order to bridge differences in flexible and practical ways.

Many of the general issues being considered at the Law of the Sea Conference could have practical implications for a number of bilateral issues between our two countries. There is a recognition, however, that specific maritime problems between our two countries should be resolved at the bilateral level. Both governments are co-operating to ensure that maritime issues do not escalate into serious bilateral irritants. As you are no doubt aware, on June 4 I announced that the Canadian 200-mile fishing-zone would come into effect no later than January 1, 1977. Canadian and U.S. officials are consulting to pave the way for continuing harmonious and mutuallybeneficial fisheries relations following the coming into effect of the proposed U.S. and Canadian 200-mile zones. On the question of deep-seabed mining, Canada is concerned about a United States proposal made during the last week of the recently-concluded conference on the law of the sea, which would have the effect of placing controls on land-based nickel production to protect seabed exploitation of this resource. Canadian officials will be discussing this matter shortly with their U.S. counterparts. I cannot, of course, guarantee that no serious bilateral problems will arise in the law-of-the-sea/ fisheries field, but I can at least say that our two governments are making a concerted effort to resolve problems before they disrupt our relations.

Examining some future opportunities

I should like to conclude by looking to the future. The accelerating

8