

States had reached another juncture (I refer to the events of August, 1971), it was decided to attempt to bring together a single statement of the general principles we think should apply to what must surely be the most complex - and productive - bilateral relationship existing in the world.

My Department had, in the meanwhile, gone into the publishing business itself in a modest way. The old "External Affairs Bulletin," which was intended purely as a source of reference material, was superseded just over a year ago by a new publication called "International Perspectives". This venture was something of a calculated risk. I gave instructions that it was not to shy away from controversial material merely because it was controversial; that it was to be stimulating, to encourage debate, and to allow free expression of representative points of view, without regard to what the government policy on the issue might be. We hired an experienced newspaper man on a part-time basis as editor to ensure that these instructions would be carried out.

I doubt if any other Foreign Ministries in the world have publications comparable to it. In any event, we used a special edition of "International Perspectives" to present our three options for the future of Canada-U.S. relations and, in subsequent editions, we have published reactions.

I cannot say that the appearance of that long-awaited, loudly demanded and - if you will permit me - lucid study of Canada-U.S. relations produced a sensation compared to the publication of Xaviera Hollander's memoirs. In fact the study was barely noticed when it appeared in October of last year. Of course, there were minor competing events such as the general election campaign which revolved around more easily understood issues than Canada-U.S. relations, such as the length of the Prime Minister's hair and the variety of his vocabulary.

But it has by no means been ignored and I venture to predict that to an increasing extent the debate about Canada-U.S. relations will revolve around the three options discussed in that paper. It is even beginning to have some effect upon the direction of Canadian Government policy! Just the other day for the first time a report to Cabinet passed under my eye which referred to the Third Option in support of its recommendations.

At any rate I make this submission to you: far from reluctantly meeting the demands of public opinion in the area of foreign relations, the Government has actually stimulated demand, invited criticism, acknowledged it when it came, and even, if you can believe it, applied these public expressions of view to the conduct of our foreign operations.

I do not suggest that foreign policy can be conducted in the full glare of television klieglights. The process of negotiation depends to an enormous extent on confidentiality. Premature public exposure of a negotiating position can only serve to harden attitudes and a completely open negotiation would very quickly resolve itself into repetitious declarations of rigid positions until some way could be found of getting out of the glare and back to closed and confidential discussions. On the other hand, once