

John Holmes is the Director-General of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and a former Assistant Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs. The excerpts which follow are from a paper first delivered at Northwestern University and subsequently adapted as an article in International Perspectives, a journal of the Department of External Affairs, entitled "Focus on the Constant Dilemma of US-Canadian Relationships."

The dilemma has many horns and Mr. Holmes dealt with them in some twelve pages. We have sought to give not all of the meat, but some of the flavour.

US-Canada: A View From the North

[BOGEYMAN OR FAIRY GODMOTHER]

We suggest often enough what we do not want the United States to be and do. We give too little thought to the more difficult question of what kind of role we do want the United States to play in the world.

We give the impression in Washington that we should just like the United States to go away and stop bothering us at all. . . .

One principle that seems agreed upon for the United States is that of non-intervention. However, no sooner have we banished the Americans to isolation and military impotence than some of the same voices insist that they intervene promptly and forcefully in East Bengal or Rhodesia or Haiti or Czechoslovakia. We can't make up our minds whether we cast the United States in the role of bogeyman or fairy godmother.

We cannot expect utter consistency in the policies of any great power or smaller power for that matter. Utter consistency would be dangerous anyway, as it would be incompatible with the minimum flexibility necessary for the world to survive. Nevertheless, it is necessary for non-American critics to construct some rough positive image of the role we see for the United States, not only with respect to our own countries but in the world at large. . . .

If, as is likely, we assign to the United States a positive and active role in maintaining world security and promoting prosperity, then we must accept the fact that the United States must maintain armed forces, cultivate its own economic capacity, favour countries it considers to be its partners and expect that some sacrifices should be shared.

[OIL, GAS AND WATER]

What concerns Canadians is that the United States, more and more worried about the sources

of power to maintain its industry and standard of living at its current high level, will take a ruthless attitude toward resources existing on this continent. . . .

Canadians have shuddered for reasons that are hard for Americans to understand.

. . . It is not surprising that Americans are confused because a great debate rages in Canada on the subject and there are contradictory points of view. There are Canadians only too happy to exploit the American need. . . .

They assure their American friends that economic nationalism in Canada is just the "yacking" of a bunch of reckless professors — and they are only partly right. Increasingly, the Federal Government is responsive to those voices that argue that Canada, if it is not to remain a hewer of wood and drawer of water for a wealthy, populous American industrial state, must conserve these resources to develop its own industry and population.

[PLEA FOR UNDERSTANDING]

The State Department, through which Canadian diplomats deal, is not the decisive organ. To secure attention for its opinions and its interests, a foreign government has to campaign on many fronts. It has to get involved in the political side of government but avoid involvement with opposition elements in such a way as to turn the powers-that-be sour.

We can plead for a wider and deeper understanding of Canada or we can make American legislators more conscious of the strength of our own bargaining hand. We shall probably do both. Well-meaning Americans from time to time suggest that Canada might have observer status in the Senate or some formal right to a part in the