

It is also not surprising that there are important Law of the Sea issues on which the perspective of our two countries has differed, for example, on some aspects of the role which 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 which 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 will come into effect no later than January 1, 1977. Canadian and U.S. officials are consulting to pave the way for continuing harmonious and mutually beneficial 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 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.A. 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 pace of change in the world has made it essential to have much greater communication and interaction between nations. Coping with the implications of change in the international community will challenge statesmen around the world in the coming years. Many economic, social and technological developments affecting us all will need to be examined in a much broader context than the purely national, or indeed the bilateral, and in a much more compressed time frame than has been required in the past. The fundamental problems of population, food, inflation, energy, and the interrelated political and social consequences associated with global economic disparities, are international in their scope and complexity and soluble only through international co-operation. In the perspective of Canada/United States relations, this calls for breadth of vision in our respective policy making.