

The key element is the degree of consistent and rational discipline which both governments are able to exercise when translating the many competing domestic pressures upon them into policy decisions affecting the other country's interests. I should simply reaffirm the obvious -- that individual decisions taken by each government must be examined for their relevance to the overall Canada-United States relationship if we are to devote the sensitive effort required to maintain a constructive relationship.

Another central element to the successful management of our relations is a disposition on both sides to consult with each other about potential issues whenever possible. Both sides have accepted this principle to the point where prior consultation and discussion is a day-to-day feature of our government-to-government relations. This provides opportunities for both sides to ensure that their concerns are given a fair hearing. This is important if there is to be a sensible accommodation of one another's interests, and if the number of surprises we spring on each other is to be kept to a minimum.

However, in a very limited number of cases, both governments will have to be prepared to live with some differences -- as we each live with our differences with other nations -- without calling into question the state of the overall relationship.

Let me cite one example. The Third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference -- where Canadian and U.S.A. positions reflect areas both of differences and agreement -- is a dynamic example of the interplay of relations at both the multilateral and bilateral levels. Both governments attach the highest priority to the successful conclusion of the Law of the Sea Conference, the most important and complex exercise now taking place in the development of international law.

It is not surprising that two neighbouring coastal states such as the United States and Canada, both of whom have a wide range of essential interests at stake in the Conference, share the same basic positions on many questions: both want the session which 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.