

RULE 1 HELD THAT THERE WAS NOT A "US POLICY" IN CANADA OR A "CANADA POLICY" IN THE US, AND THAT AS I HAVE DESCRIBED ABOVE, IS DEFINITELY NO LONGER THE CASE, AT LEAST UP THERE.

RULE 2 HELD THAT BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS AT THE POLITICAL LEVEL SHOULD BE LIMITED. IT PROBABLY STILL HOLDS TRUE, AT LEAST IN MOST INSTANCES, GIVEN THE CHARACTER AND COMPLEXITY OF THE ISSUES.

RULE 3 KEPT US FROM ROCKING THE MULTILATERAL BOAT WITH OUR DIFFERENCES ON BILATERAL OR MULTILATERAL ISSUES. WHILE I THINK THAT THE RULE STILL HAS SOME VALIDITY, THERE ARE DIFFERENT APPROACHES ON SOME

ISSUES, SUCH AS NORTH/SOUTH QUESTIONS, DISARMAMENT, CENTRAL AMERICAN OF THE SEA AND OTHERS, WHICH DO COME OUT. IT IS NO LONGER POSSIBLE TO CONDUCT FOREIGN POLICY WITHOUT ARTICULATING A NATIONAL POSITION ON THE BASIC ISSUES

OF THE DAY. BUT WE ARE CONSCIOUS OF THE NEED NOT TO UNDERCUT THE OTHER'S POSITIONS AND TO CONSULT AS FULLY AS POSSIBLE AND I THINK THAT ON THE BASIC MULTILATERAL ISSUES WE CONTINUE TO BE MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE ON THE

FUNDAMENTALS. THIS WAS, FOR EXAMPLE, VERY MUCH THE CASE AT THE RECENT CANCUN SUMMIT ON NORTH/SOUTH RELATIONS.

CANADA, OF COURSE, HAS A PREFERENCE FOR MULTILATERAL SOLUTIONS TO CONFLICTS. IT SUITS A COUNTRY OF