

families and work for more freedom in those countries. New waves of immigration during the past 20 years from Asia, Africa and the Caribbean have led to the establishment in Canada of communities with deep personal concerns about problems in parts of the world that previous Canadian governments paid little attention to. These developments were reflected in testimony about the problems of Sikhs in India, Baha'is in Iran and Armenians in Turkey, and about the dispute between Sinhalese and Tamils in Sri Lanka. Though Canada has not had the colonial connections that have influenced many Western European countries, immigration has enlarged the perspective of Canadians and increased their awareness of the suffering of people in other countries.

At the same time growing interdependence has prompted a relentless internationalization of the national agenda. Fiscal and monetary policy may still be formulated by the Bank of Canada and the Department of Finance, but they have to adjust to what occurs on the floor of the recently established Chicago foreign exchange market. The oil trail that begins in Calgary's Petroleum Club now leads to the skyscrapers of Houston and the royal palaces of Saudi Arabia. And, no less, the moral imperative that draws people from church halls into the struggle against injustice in Canada leads them from there to concern for the peoples of Central America and South Africa.

As domestic affairs have been internationalized, foreign policy has been brought home and opened up for debate. Formerly private and corporate dealings have acquired a public and political character. The comfortable tradition that external affairs is the prerogative of the Crown (in Canada of ministers and mandarins) is now being rudely disturbed by the pressures of participatory democracy. Canadians are knocking on the door of this country's foreign policy with more than messages to deliver: they want in.

The combination of global awareness, interdependence and participation are transforming the very nature of foreign policy—and nowhere faster than in Canada. Our hearings made us aware of just how much international relations has ceased to be the preserve of government. For example, the attempts of two post-war governments to increase the proportion of Canadian exports going to markets other than the United States have been overtaken by the sales success achieved by Canadian businesses in the United States. Witness, too, the Canadian missionary teaching in Haïti whose decision to close down his school to protest government interference may have contributed to the fall of Jean-Claude Duvalier. Hundreds of voluntary organizations engaged in Third World development now constitute a community in partnership, sometimes uneasy partnership, with the Canadian International Development Agency. Their activities in scores of Third World countries have become part of the expression of Canada abroad.

The foreign policy agenda has always been shaped by influences and events occurring beyond national borders and over which governments often have little control. The new dimension is an active and concerned public, prodded by the mass media, that reacts to international events quite independently of government. The single most important illustration of this phenomenon is the extraordinary extent to which Canadians' perception of what Canada's foreign policy should be are penetrated and shaped by the foreign policy debate in the United States. Canadians spend a great deal of time watching and reacting to Americans in the world. The reasons for this are apparent. The United States is a superpower. As a major actor on the world stage and the leader of the Western Alliance, it is inevitably the focus of international attention. The open nature of the U.S. foreign policy debate, which comes to English-speaking Canadians as part of their evening entertainment, invites the vicarious participation of concerned next door neighbours.