

the bottle". Whether we can achieve some rational way in which the potential — the peaceful potential — of nuclear energy can be employed while, at the same time, equally strong potential for destruction can be minimized. I merely mention this briefly to illustrate the diversity and the complexity of the issues with which we have to cope in trying to determine what Canadian foreign policy ought to be.

So let me, then, asking that question rhetorically, proceed to try to give you some ideas as to what I think it ought to be. Basically, I regard Canada's foreign policy as having its roots in advancing and improving our own national interests. I don't make any apologies for that particular approach, because it seems to me that one can, against that kind of yardstick, assess almost any course of action you would wish to take. I don't use the word "national interest" in any narrow or selfish or even wholly economic sense. What I think it is important for me to say is that Canada's national interest is going to be advanced much better, much more rapidly, much more securely, if there is peace and stability in the world. Almost any initiative that we would wish to undertake as Canadians, as the Canadian Government, as the Canadian people, in the international sphere can, in fact, be defended against that yardstick.

But, looking at it in a more narrow sense, we should have a foreign policy that is designed to help us achieve the level of economic stability and security that is essential for our further progress. One has to look at some rather dramatic figures that aren't stated often enough perhaps but, I think, signal clearly where a good deal of the emphasis must go in terms of our activities and in terms of how we assign our resources. If one takes the United States, the European Economic Community and Japan (two countries and a grouping of countries), those three together account for over 85 per cent of all of Canada's external trade. So, of the 140-odd countries in the United Nations, if one is looking at it strictly from the perspective of advancing the Canadian national interest, it becomes perfectly obvious that the essential element must be the closest-possible links and co-operation with Japan, with the United States and with the European Economic Community.

If one takes that three-way grouping and separates it still further, the fact is that better than 60 per cent is with the United States. You have a situation where not only is the United States our neighbour in the geographic sense — it is also the major customer for our products and (I don't think there is any question about this) the most important country in terms of whether our economy will move forward or not. I believe (and, indeed, the Government believes) that the maintenance and the enhancement of our relations with the United States must take a primary priority. It is, therefore, the centrepiece, as it were, of our foreign policy.

Now that does not mean that we are going to come closer to the United States — or that, indeed, we are going to be engulfed by them or that we are going to seek to have some kind of "continentalism" in North America. Because the European Community is also tremendously important, not only in economic terms but also in terms of the general political posture that we wish to take — an outward-looking posture in the world. That is why we have developed the "Third Option". I do not wish to become academic or to go to any great lengths as to what the components of the Third Option actually are, but I think it is evident that we have had a considerable degree of