

we thought that that was the name of the game four and five years ago when we were negotiating this whole matter, and we thought that that was what in fact the treaty in front of the Senate, which is now withdrawn, was saying -- here is a way to manage that resource." And I cannot hide our disappointment, as MacGuigan said -- or our bitter disappointment, as LeBlanc that they would say/ --not so much that the treaty is withdrawn but that it wasn't passed by the Senate. But now they have to deliver in some other way, and if we don't think that they are going to deliver in some other way, there won't be any peace on that front. That is quite clear. And we haven't accepted the delinkage yet, either. We want to see what their intentions are in that particular -- you know from

the outset we've said that the boundaries are one thing, the management of the fisheries is another, but they have to go together. It doesn't make sense to have a boundary in fisheries if, when it comes to managing the stock, you don't agree. So, the two go together, in our spirit, and if the Americans want to delink them, this goes against our whole approach to that. But if they are telling us, as they did, "Well, don't worry, though we are delinking it, it is in order to come up with a management program which would give you the same satisfaction, and especially will preserve the species for the present and future generation of fishermen." Well, we will have to wait and see. But, as I say, we haven't accepted the delinkage. We haven't said that we would accept one treaty and not the other. It will depend on what they come up with.

So, that is peace for now, but I think that is the attitude we adopted, and have to adopt. It is a new