

nobody really cared. Any perception in English-speaking Canada of the need for a European counterweight to the United States was largely cultural. For Quebecois the threat on that score was somewhat closer to home. Jean Lesage and Daniel Johnson recognized Quebec's underweight and soon parlayed Franco-Quebec relations into political gain within Quebec and *vis-à-vis* Ottawa. Europe then appeared briefly in vogue as "national identity" became a national cause. Even the terminally Anglophone began to recite the credo of two founding nations. President de Gaulle, however, soured that in 1967 and English Canadians have seldom felt as wounded.

Canadian attentions were, in any case, elsewhere. In government, it was maintained that Canada and the United States shouldn't disagree in public. Canadian businessmen were hypnotized by the challenge of cracking Canada's biggest and most affluent and richest market. The universities were "into" the newly independent Africa, Asia, and elsewhere and probably tried to ignore increasingly obvious demerits at home. The Canadian vocation of the Sixties appeared in the universities elsewhere to be essentially anti-European. Europe appeared selfish, *fade* probably corrupt. As a Canadian public interest, Europe simply vanished.

Before there could be any realism in our view of Europe or appreciation that there was considerable potential in Canada-EEC relations, we should need a more realistic collection of views of ourselves. We should first need the assurance that we constituted something identifiable and distinct before we could begin to take seriously an external dimension of our satisfactorily representative of our interests.

Inevitably, of course, there would have to be a reappraisal of the Canada-European relation as part of this, but only as a dimension of a reappraisal of ourselves.

#### Distinct from U.S.

1967 champagne has turned pretty sour but the sobriety that followed the centennial celebrations has encouraged a somewhat more realistic view of the complexity of the Canadian group. There is now an increasing and generalized appreciation of the EEC, as a very heterogeneous group of people, we are socially developing in a somewhat different way from our U.S. neighbours. Generally, we are evolving in a more decentralized and a deliberately tolerant way.

Our methods of development are increasingly our own, chosen to fit our cir-

cumstances. Of course, this had — until the last war anyway — always been the case. Politically, hard times and our own geography have given us third- and fourth-party movements that have persisted, instead of being absorbed into the old parties. Left-right distinctions are facile, but we all heard Canadians last autumn say that George McGovern's proposals were already pretty old hat in Lilac — or Kelowna, la Beauce, or even Rosedale.

Canadians are exploring how we can exercise, through our governments and our economic and other activities, the where-withal necessary to assure the conditions and qualities we variously wish. Most other peoples are doing the same. The different quality in our experience is that for Canada as a whole this had first to be done against the very pervasive American fact.

There is still consternation that the distinctiveness of the Canadian group is not always taken into account by policy-makers or taxi-drivers in foreign capitals but the travellers among us can attest to much less confusion abroad on the point in recent years, variously attributable to de Gaulle's visit, Prime Minister Trudeau's image and the tragedy of October 1970. We are generally surer of ourselves, in the sense that we are clearer about who we are and the degree to which we are different from our neighbours.

The longer-range and more substantial phase will be the process of structuring Canada to enable us to develop and achieve what we variously need. Probably, the most important dimension is economic. As External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp wrote in an article in this magazine entitled *Canada/U.S. Relations: Options for the Future*, "in the face of the inherent pull of continental forces" the only option

Canada has decided to appoint a full-time ambassador to the European Communities in recognition of the growing political and economic importance of the European Common Market to Canada. External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp announced on December 21 that James Langley has been named Canadian Ambassador to the European Communities. Mr. Langley, Canadian Ambassador to Belgium and Luxembourg, had also been accredited as Ambassador to the Communities. Canada will now accredit a separate ambassador to Belgium and Luxembourg. The European Communities include the enlarged European Economic Community, the European Atomic Energy Community and the European Coal and Steel Community.

*Distinctiveness of Canadians seems clearer in recent years*