

We can go on describing and discussing variations on this theme - and I am sure it would be entertaining. I would like to offer (humbly and without proof) my own viewpoint. But before I do, let us have a quick look at the empirical evidence - such as we have - because mine is a rather more pragmatic approach than a matter of doctrine or philosophy.

What are the facts? The fact is we don't have many facts. If we try hard we can come up with examples of intervention, by or on behalf of foreign corporations with business interests in Canada, which have tried to - sometimes successfully - influence action in Canada contrary to declared Canadian policy. There are cases of strong representations by the United States Government against Canadian measures or impending measures on behalf of U.S. corporations with interests in Canada; cases of Canadian corporations controlled in the United States who have resisted Canadian policy, say, in trade with China, because they were concerned about possible application of U.S. laws or U.S. public opinion; cases of action by Canadian companies whose decisions have been strongly influenced by United States anti-trust law, even though Canadian laws would have permitted quite different decisions; cases of Canadian enterprises who have rather automatically opposed policies in Canada in virtually the same terms formulated by their parent companies in opposing similar policies in the United States when circumstances in Canada were quite different; cases where parent companies have directed their Canadian subsidiaries to follow a particular line of policy because they believed it to be in line with expressed interests of the United States Government without regard for a different Canadian interest. And there are other cases too. But we can say this; all these cases taken together, at least all the cases that we know about, do not loom very large in the total complex of our economic and political life. It can hardly be argued on empirical grounds that, up to now at least, the large fact of large foreign control over Canadian enterprises has significantly limited Canada's freedom in domestic or international politics.

This is an important fact. But is it a conclusive fact? We may have been lucky. Over most of our recent history - at least since the United States has had a major stake in Canadian industry - there has been a remarkable symmetry between Canadian and United States economic, political and strategic policies. We have moved more or less together toward objectives that we have held in common. This has made it possible for enterprises in Canada, controlled in the United States, to guide themselves by consideration of maximizing return, without worrying about mixed political loyalties or mixed political attitudes or mixed political directions.

Some may say that this phenomenon is itself the measure and evidence of our lack of independence. I don't believe this is so, because there is good evidence to show that we formulated these objectives quite independently and in our own national interests.

But our policies have varied from time to time - on trade with China - on Cuba - and on a number of smaller issues. In some of these instances, difficulties have arisen, and on occasion we felt the heat and have experienced some frustration. What would the situation be if there were to occur more important and more frequent conflicts of policy? This could happen - and this