

state, and the conclusion of the two east coast agreements required long, delicate and even painful consultations with our fishermen and provincial governments before conflicting interests could be reconciled and an internal consensus achieved which enabled us to say to the U.S. negotiators -- naively perhaps -- "it's a deal". We understand the internal difficulties arising in the USA, but we must ask why these cannot be resolved before a treaty is solemnly concluded. We must wonder too about the wisdom of Congress in institutionalizing these difficulties and weakening the executive in the field of international fisheries relations through legislation giving substantial powers over foreign interests to regional fisheries management councils. To see the matter in the round, one has only to imagine what the U.S. reaction would be if it were Canada which could not deliver in respect of the east coast agreements.

I recognize, of course, that the U.S. constitutional procedures for treaty ratification are indeed more complex and unwieldy than Canada's. In Canada, parliamentary approval is sought only for some of the very most important treaties, and treaty negotiation and ratification is a matter of executive