

The fact, nonetheless, remains that our prosperity and defence remain intimately linked with the prosperity and defence of the United States; and this will continue to be the case.

Most of the world is affected by the health of the American economy; the Canadian economy is intermeshed with it in so many important ways that we are affected most of all. Nor is it only economic trends that have their influence in Canada; our societies are so close in so many ways that developments in the United States in almost any area are bound to have some effect in Canada — even if it is only that we react to them. This is quite apart from conscious efforts on the part of the United States to influence us. Naturally there are such efforts from time to time, just as we ourselves try, from time to time, to influence the United States. On neither side has this led to expectations of anything less than the vigorous pursuit of our respective national interests; neither of us confuses the other with Santa Claus.

What there is on both sides, most of the time, however, is a general expectation that, as North Americans and allies, as people both of whom have subdued a wilderness and as countries committed to a liberal democracy, we shall see things more or less the same way, that we share most of the same basic values. This is not always so, but it would surely be to Canada's disadvantage if negotiations on specific issues started from the premise that our positions were necessarily antagonistic.

Similarly, it should not be forgotten that Canada's interests are often well served in a multilateral context by our working in close co-operation with the United States. This does not mean that our policies are, or should always be, the same, but they will often be similar, or at least complementary, when our objectives are basically the same. By working together in the United Nations and its agencies, in the International Energy Agency, and in world financial and economic organizations, we can help bring Canadian goals we share with the United States closer to achievement. And, on an increasing range of issues, the U.S. welcomes our support in the furtherance of those objectives on which we hold similar views. This need not, and does not, mean that we cannot take different positions from those of the United States when our perceptions or our interests are different. Canadians are alert to the danger that we may be seen by other countries as no more than an appendage of the United States. But if Canadians think that such a posture for Canada is an objective of the United

States, I think they are wrong. The U.S. accepts that there are valid North American views other than its own. It welcomes the Canadian voice in world councils both when we agree and when, in the course of seeking wise solutions to international problems, we may from time to time disagree. It should be a commonplace of international affairs in this complex and interdependent world that no one country or group of countries has a monopoly of the right answers. We need each other's ideas more and more. This is true for Canada as it is for the States.

Not very many of those Americans who think about Canada these days are "continentalists" in the earlier over-simplified sense, however much they may urge greater co-operation or sharing of resources in certain specific areas. There is considerable understanding of our determination to preserve Canada's independence and distinct national personality, and growing recognition of the value to the United States of our doing so. There is no significant body of American opinion suggesting the transformation of Canada into a carbon copy of the United States. America today is a society seeking to rediscover the mainsprings of its heritage, the original inspiration of its cherished way of life. It seeks renewal within its own borders and more pragmatic and mutually accommodating relations with other countries. In our determination to assert our independence, therefore, we should not forget that we may sometimes be pushing against an open United States door, so long as our conception of independence is not founded on anti-Americanism for its own sake.

No other choice

Looking back three and a half years to the formulation of our Third Option, it hardly seems reasonable that we could have made any other choice. Far from heralding a deterioration in Canada-U.S. relations, it has been followed by a perceptible and genuine improvement. We are now working more on the basis of realities, not illusions. There are still problems, of course. There always will be in a relationship as intimate and varied as that between Canada and the United States. But they are on the whole different from and less abrasive than those that made up the list in 1972, and none of them appears incapable of solution.

One of the fundamental challenges in our relations is that we recognize, on both sides, the inevitability of occasional conflicts in our national interests and policies. A second is to manage our relations so that

*A society
in search of
mainsprings
of its heritage*