

RULE 3: No LINKAGE. A CARDINAL RULE. THERE WAS A TACIT UNDERSTANDING THAT YOU DON'T NEED TO LINK ISSUES WITH YOUR FRIENDS SINCE LINKAGE IS IMPLICITLY AN EXERCISE IN SEEKING ADVANTAGE, AND IF ISSUES ARE BEING TREATED SOLELY ON THEIR MERITS, LINKAGE WOULD BE UNNECESSARY. MOREOVER, CANADIANS SENSED THAT IF LINKAGE EVER BECAME THE RULE OF CONDUCT, THE BIGGER POWER COULD ALWAYS OUT-LINK THE SMALLER, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE ASSUMED ASSYMETRY IN RESPECTIVE DEPENDENCE. LINKAGE WOULD ALSO HAVE REQUIRED DIFFERENT, MORE COHERENT TECHNIQUES IN THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT FOR DEALING WITH CANADA. THE ISSUES WOULD HAVE TO BE CENTRALLY MANAGED WHICH PROBABLY WASN'T AN AVAILABLE OPTION.

AS A CAVEAT, HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE RETICENCE TO LINK ISSUES WAS NEVER WHOLLY ACCEPTED IN CONGRESS. FOR EXAMPLE, CONGRESS LINKED BORDER BROADCASTING AND CONVENTION TAX ISSUES.

RULE 4 WAS NOT TO EXPECT ISSUES TO LEND THEMSELVES TO THE "QUICK FIX". CANADA-US ISSUES WERE LONG-TERM AND LOW-KEY, SLOW TO BE RESOLVED. THIS DIDN'T IMPLY BUREAUCRATIC IMMOBILITY BUT SIMPLY A RECOGNITION THAT,