

But, by and large, those were not the choices made by Canada. One choice we have made is to keep our feet firmly in the Western camp. The values we have brought to our foreign policy flow from our profound commitment to freedom and democracy. And that commitment comes from the fact that we have built our country by inviting the world to come here and to grow together in peace and freedom. Our foreign policy has been based on supporting abroad what has brought people here. We have pursued this in many ways:

- our support for refuseniks and dissidents behind the Iron Curtain;
- our fight against apartheid and our support for non-racial democracy in South Africa;
- our activism in the U.N., the CSCE and elsewhere in defence of human rights; and
- our alliances through NATO and NORAD which have served to protect our own freedom and our own democracy.

That is one connection between the nature of Canadian society and the nature of Canadian foreign policy. But there is another. And that relates less to the causes we pursue than the approach we take. It flows from the fact that Canada is not a natural phenomenon. For 25 million people to occupy the second largest piece of real estate in the world is not natural. For a country of that size to be able to safeguard our security and our culture and our economy is difficult. For a country which stretches East and West to survive when its natural links run North and South is a challenge. And for a country composed not of one culture but of many, to remain whole is not easy.

But in this challenge we have succeeded. We have avoided civil war and revolution. What we have achieved is unique - a voluntary association of many traditions, and different cultures. The accomplishment of Canada has been to recognize that diversity is not a blemish but a blessing, and to accept that the interests of each community, can only be secured if the interests of others are respected. That Canada has done so well for so long is a testimony to the enduring value of a sense of compromise, which sees advantage in balancing interests, balancing views, balancing powers and responsibilities. That is a lesson of increasing relevance to the world.

As John Holmes, once said: "As managers of the unmanageable, I would stack Sir John A. or Mackenzie King up against Bismarck or Bolivar any day. If they aren't comparable to Lincoln it is because they made sure not to have his problem."