view among many U.S. policy makers and negotiators that international law should conform with U.S. law, rather than the other way about. Thus too U.S. negotiators often seem to expect the representatives of other countries to give the same automatic deference as they do to the procedural and institutional peculiarities of the U.S. system.

The extra-territorial exercise of U.S. anti-trust jurisdiction is a field rich in examples of this kind of attitude, not a few of them involving Canada. The effects on the USA's foreign relations have been serious indeed. Australia and the U.K. have already passed laws to protect themselves from such extra-territorial interference, and Canada will be joining them soon.

But let me stick to the field of fisheries. Take tuna. The consensus emerging from the Law of the Sea Conference recognizes the exclusive sovereign rights of coastal states over all living resources of the 200-mile zone. U.S. law accordingly asserts such rights over the rich coastal fisheries off the USA, but does not recognize that these same rights can extend to tuna, owing to the fact that U.S. fishermen take huge quantities of tuna off the coasts of other countries. Here again Congress has usurped the

...11