

leaders are in a position to take decisions on the web of issues facing the world today; they can cut across lines of authority within their own internal systems and make commitments to broad new directions, on the basis of co-ordinated objectives and some degree of equitable burden-sharing.

In this sense, individual leaders are right to submit themselves at Summits to pressures from their peers to move towards mutually shaped goals, to be prepared to "bend" their national "instructions" in favour of a broader interest, and thus to mediate the necessary change to their populations. Summits thus do have implications for domestic policy-making; but these implications are not always direct and the instruments to be used and techniques to be followed in carrying out understandings reached at Summits will necessarily depend on the circumstances of each country.

Reaffirmation of commit- ments

At this point, most of the Summit leaders are new (or re-elected). President Reagan, Prime Ministers Suzuki of Japan and Forlani of Italy have recently been chosen. President Thorn of the European Community Commission took office as of the beginning of 1981. German Chancellor Schmidt was re-elected last autumn and the French presidential elections take place this May. Because so many leaders are new and since most can look forward to a considerable term of office, it is timely, perhaps essential, for leaders to reflect together on what their objectives are, which are the key issues facing the West, how these issues should be grappled with. They need to reaffirm their commitment to consultations, to avoid — to the degree possible — unpleasant surprises or unilateralism — especially given the uncertain outlook in such areas as money and finance, trade and protectionism. They may at some point want to go beyond that to set some kind of joint program, as they have to a degree already on energy, perhaps even to consider possible further arrangements to implement it, recognizing of course that they will need also to continue to work with their partners in existing international fora.

Canadian view

For our part in Canada, we attach a good deal of value to the Western Summits. They should continue to be available to do the sort of things they do now. From my perspective, the Summits could usefully go further, and begin to take what I shall call the macro-political approach. Somehow, I believe, we in the industrial world need a manageable locus for concerting our views and objectives, our policies and activities, on problems facing the West from the outside, as well as for getting our act together among the industrialized democracies.

It is particularly important, from a Canadian point of view, that this kind of consultation and concertation be effectively taking place among our closest friends, since we are placed in a very delicate position in the case of persistent and major unresolved differences between, say, the United States and major European Community countries, or Japan, e.g. monetary problems in the early Seventies, trade issues, or views on the future of *détente* today. We are accordingly anxious to contribute in whatever ways we can to overcome the current differences on economic and political strategy among the industrialized democracies and believe the Summits could be helpful in doing so.

Ottawa Summit

I should underline that leaders should not be expected to reach definitive conclusions on these matters at Ottawa; indeed, by their nature, these issues are constantly before