

It is possible to agree with the Americans on some issues, and disagree on others. That is what we do. For example, they embargo Nicaragua; we don't. They invite Government-to-Government research in SDI; we decline. They pursued a policy of so-called constructive engagement in South Africa, which didn't work; we have led the application of a policy which holds better prospects of bringing peaceful change to a subcontinent threatened by chaos. The Americans and the British quit UNESCO; we stayed, to reform it from within, and we are succeeding. From issues through acid rain, to Arctic sovereignty, to the nature of our aid programmes, Canada and the United States have different views. Sometimes by sitting down and discussing our differences, we make progress, as we are, gradually, on acid rain - and on trade. These are important questions, important disagreements. We lose neither independence or influence by pursuing Canadian interests for Canada reasons. The alternative approach - to get out of NATO, to get out of NORAD, to get out of trade talks - would be to refuse to pursue Canadian interests because the Americans happen to share some of them. That would be absurd and, among other things, would limit our ability to contribute to progress in acid rain, in arms control, in the fight against protectionism, on other vital Canadian interests. That would be to abandon Canadian interests - in real terms, to abandon Canada's influence and independence, by becoming a preacher instead of a player. The Prime Minister and I are here to advance Canada's interests internationally, not to walk away from challenge.