

case we argued that our rôle had been enhanced at a time when Canada had enjoyed a preferred position and a wide range of opportunities as one of the few developed countries to have emerged unscathed, and indeed strengthened, from the Second World War. The Canadian rôle was bound to be affected by the recovery of our friends and former enemies and by other changes in the configuration of world power.

In your case, it seems to us that you have drawn substantially similar conclusions, subject, of course, to the very different scope of your rôle and responsibilities in the world. The Nixon Doctrine is evidence of a growing conviction among Americans that the time has come for others to share a greater portion of the burden of world leadership and its corollary that the assured continuity of United States involvement required a responsible but diminished American rôle. It is the sense of the Nixon Doctrine that it will enable the United States to remain committed in ways that you can sustain without placing undue stresses upon your human and other resources.

These perceptions on both sides have their counterpart in the rôle that national objectives and national interests are henceforth to play in the conduct of foreign policy. In the American case, the greater weight to be given to the shorter term national interest is the function of the diminished rôle you see for yourselves and of the enhanced capacity and potential of your international partners.

The Canadian foreign policy review, if anything, goes even further. It defines foreign policy as the extension abroad of national policies. The test of a sound foreign policy is the degree of relevance it has to national interests and basic national objectives. The most appropriate policy for the nineteen seventies, therefore, our review concludes, will be one which strengthens and extends sound domestic policies dealing with key national issues.

In sum, the broad premises and underlying perceptions of the two foreign policy reviews are remarkably similar. It is in their implications for two quite different entities on the world scene that they inevitably differ.

Let me remind you very briefly of some of the realities of the Canada-United States relationship.

Canada and the United States share the North American continent north of the Rio Grande. Our economies are interdependent to the point where they might better be described as interlocked. Total trade between us exceeds 20 billion dollars annually, each is the other's best customer. If we were economies of the same order of magnitude the problem would be different and certainly less acute. But we are not: there is a factor of 10 or more to