

agreements with the U.S. or other countries.

This option would require close co-operation of government, management and labour. It would require as well the close co-operation of all levels of government. Since the option involves a deliberate strategy, some degree of planning would be involved. But considering the wide range of government involvement in the economy already, I doubt whether this option would radically alter relations between government and business. Working out the required consensus between the federal government and the provinces would require close consultation, but I see no reason why this need lead to friction. On the contrary, the basic harmony of federal and provincial objectives in industrial development could widen the area of federal-provincial co-operation.

Much the same could be said of the cultural dimension. The kind of policy instruments required to support an independent and flourishing national culture already exists. What may be necessary is the extension of policies which have already proven their worth to sensitive new areas created by the age of mass communication.

These, then are the three options. Now that you know what they are, I can make some general comments on them.

First, options are not policies. They provide a framework within which policy decisions can be taken. They can give a basic orientation to policies. But they are not policies themselves. Within the limits of any one of these options, quite a wide range of different practical measures could be adopted. Depending on circumstances, quite different policy mixes could be consistent with the option in question. All the option gives you is the sense of direction in which you want to be heading.

Even this may over-state the case. There is a real difference between the first option on the one hand and the second and third on the other. The first is not really a strategy at all. It is reactive. It involves waiting on events. It means facing individual issues as they arise, and deciding these issues on their own merits, not in relation to some larger purpose. In this sense, it does not pretend to tell you where you are going. The second and third options, by contrast, involve choosing a goal, acting rather than reacting, and judging individual issues in relation to the goal chosen. In the case of the second option, the goal would be integration with the U.S. in some form; in the case of the third option, the goal would be an economy and culture less vulnerable to the continental pull.

All three options are of course abstractions. Like all abstractions, they tend to simplify complex matters. But the distinctions they draw between the various courses open to Canada are basically valid and useful. None of these options is a straw man, set up only for the sake of being knocked down. Nor is this a case of three alternatives, of which two are plainly unacceptable extremes and the third merely a compromise with no virtue other than the fact that it is a compromise. On the contrary, each option has a perfectly respectable argument that can be made for it. Each has to be thought through in its own right. And you will find that the article on Canada-U.S. relations tries to pursue the logic of each option