

other on many fronts. In fact, these areas are so intimately interwoven that contact between them is assured in the future, regardless of the small number of formal agreements between them.

Unfortunately, there is an inherent flaw in the pattern of these interactions which should be corrected without delay. Canadians are much more exposed to the cultural presence of United States and Europe than Americans and Europeans are exposed to the cultural presence of Canada. This is particularly true of the American presence in Canada as a result of the free flow of people and products between the two countries. What should be done to rectify this adverse imbalance? Some favour preventing the flow of products and people from Europe and particularly the United States into Canada through various protective devices. There may be certain areas - most notably the mass media - where some form of protection may be justified or necessary, if only to assist Canadian producers to develop to the point where they are able to compete on a more equitable basis. However, in general, a much more effective solution - and one that is much more in keeping with Canada's present political and ideological make-up - would be to expand Canada's cultural presence in United States and Europe to the point where it is highly visible and very well known. If the cultural revolution which has swept Canada in the last two decades has established anything, it is that Canada's creative accomplishments - in the arts, science, sports, recreation, the mass media and the environment - compare favourably to that which is available elsewhere in the world. Rather than protecting Canada from intrusions from United States and Europe, it would be eminently more sensible to establish a strong Canadian presence where it counts - in the cultural capitals of Europe and United States. In this way, Canadian identity would receive a much-needed shot in the arm through an aggressive policy of offensive expansionism rather than through an anemic policy of defensive restrictionism. For Canadian identity will never really be achieved until a strong Canadian presence has been established in those countries with which Canada has its strongest traditional ties.

If Canada's international ambitions are furthered by strengthening Canada's presence in France, Great Britain and the United States, they are also furthered by strengthening Canada's presence in countries which reinforce the country's bilingual nature. Hopefully, this will be done for reasons of necessity and desirability rather than expediency. For, just as it is fitting that English-speaking Canadians should have opportunities for close contact with Anglophone peoples living elsewhere in the world, so French-speaking Canadians should enjoy similar opportunities with Francophone peoples throughout the world. The reason for this is that understanding is much deeper among peoples who share a common language, since peoples which do not share a common language cannot communicate easily in many of the most basic forms of communication such as language and dialogue, plays, books, literature and academic exchanges. In consequence, the right to communication in one's own tongue for French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians is essential, not because of all the recent political agitation which surrounds contemporary changes in Quebec, but rather by virtue of the fact that these two language groups need the stimulation which flows from interaction with similar linguistic groups living elsewhere in the world. If necessity and desirability are not sufficient to ensure equitable treatment, then political expediency should be allowed to balance up the scales of justice. For Canada can ill afford an external cultural policy which limits the rights of Canada's two major linguistic groups.

If the bilingual nature of Canada should act as a criterion for determining the selection of geographical areas and program countries, so also should the