

WELL, THOSE WERE THE OLD RULES. SOME STILL APPLY, BUT MANY ARE CHANGING, SOME QUITE MARKEDLY. HERE ARE THE NEW VERSIONS OF THE OLD COMMANDMENTS, AND HERE'S WHY THEY'VE BEEN CHANGING.

RULE 1: NO INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE GENERALLY INFORMAL MECHANISMS FOR MANAGING THE RELATIONSHIP.

NO CHANGE, REALLY; THE RULE STILL APPLIES. COOLNESS TO THE IDEA OF PROMOTING SPECIAL AND SEMI-OFFICIAL CANADA/US COMMITTEES OF PRIVATE CITIZENS AND OF SPECIFIC INTEREST GROUPS, IS STILL CURRENT IN GOVERNMENT, AT LEAST IN CANADA, ON THE GROUNDS THAT SUCH COMMITTEES WOULD WORK IN THE DIRECTION OF TRYING TO BURY LEGITIMATE DIFFERENCES. THE ONE COMMON INSTITUTION PROPOSED IN RECENT YEARS WAS A FISHERIES COUNCIL, INCLUDED IN THE TREATY ON EAST COAST BOUNDARIES, WHICH WAS REJECTED BY THE SENATE. NEED I EMPHASIZE HOW FAR READING THIS INSTITUTIONAL INNOVATION WOULD HAVE BEEN --- THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN JOINT MANAGEMENT OF A COMMON RESOURCE. ANOTHER EXAMPLE. THE IDEA OF A JOINT SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE ON THE ACID RAIN PHENOMENON HAS BEEN REJECTED BY THE US SIDE.

RULE 2: NO INTERMEDIATION.

PROBABLY MODESTLY CHANGING. ARBITRATION HAS BEEN USED ON THE GEORGES BANK DISPUTE. THE REFERRAL OF