

concerned, we have special arrangements for North America and the United States. So NATO is by no means the only device available to us. Nonetheless, it is the most important in that circle. In that sense, it remains an indispensable forum. Unless the international system changes radically in a generation or so, I do not really see it ever losing its importance as a focus for dealing with the management of the East-West relationship, and with preparing coordinated positions to deal with the arms control and disarmament issues we hope will be successfully negotiated over the next decade or so.

[HILL] How about the pursuit of Canada's own particular interests? For example, what about this problem of the Europeans acting more and more together, and then dealing directly with the Americans, within NATO? Is this making things more difficult?

[TAYLOR] It is always a risk. I suppose the beginning of wisdom is to recognize the risk is there. Once you have recognized it, then you immediately start taking steps to ensure the risk is minimized. I guess we will just have to go on doing that. It is hard to imagine that a country with Canada's assets will ever be totally disregarded and negligible weight in the international system. The country has the weight it has. It is one of the strongest and freest countries in the world. It has tremendous assets, and these weights show up in international discussions. Canadians are not perhaps totally conscious of that, because we live, almost as a national obsession, in the shadow of the United States. The easiest - in fact, sometimes the only - international comparison that comes to Canadian minds at all is a comparison with the United States. But the United States is ten times as populous as we are; it is ten times as rich; and it is a nuclear superpower. Of course, people know this. These things are all clichés. But nonetheless it is material for reflection that our instinctive standard of international comparison is with a country that itself is unique in the international order. We are inclined perhaps to view ourselves through a distorting prism as a result of making that kind of comparison so often. We appear rather differently to many people outside the country. In any event, I have no doubt that we have the wit and the ability and the resources to defend our interests.

Europe goes on coalescing. We knew from the time of the debate in Canada thirty years ago over the first British application to join the Common Market, that an expanded European Common Market in a lot of ways was going to produce short-run damage to specific Canadian interests. That was true. That has happened. We would not have spent all that time worrying over and arguing against the Common Agricultural Policy if that were not true. Our interests in some ways, and in some important ways, have been damaged. Nonetheless, I suppose the broad feeling of people - and here I think we probably share a certain commonality of view with the United States - is that, seen in a broader perspective, the movement in Europe lies in the logic of history, and that it is a movement broadly speaking to be applauded, not to be resisted. Our attitude - and I think this, on reflection, has been the attitude of Canadian governments for a generation now in the face of the European movement - has been, on the whole, not to be grudging about it, but to applaud and to wish the Europeans well, to be perfectly prepared to let them see their interests and work their way through to new forms of political and economic association, and to adjust our own relations with them as a function of that; but to go on pointing out at every stage that, before they make up their minds and cast everything in concrete, we would like an opportunity to be heard, and to point out where particular steps that they are proposing to take, or particular policies that they adopt, are damaging to our interests. I think we should go on doing that. Our objection to the European Community that exists now - and it is an objection a whole lot of Europeans have themselves to the Community that has been created - is, for instance, that it has a massively distorted common agricultural policy, which is profoundly damaging to world markets and price structures, to the economies of countries with an important agricultural sector like Canada; and that all this really is