

This is not the occasion to address conflicts between the national interest and the international good, except to note that the ultimate safeguard is the intrinsic appeal of the common good of all mankind. But Canada has less reason than most countries to anticipate conflicts between its national aims and those of the international community. In fact, from the time of our full emergence as an independent state with the Second World War and well before our present economic interdependence with the rest of the world, internationalism has been a trademark of our foreign policy. I believe that almost all Canadians accept it as one of our foremost national values.

The foreign policy review of 1970 divided Canadian values, as applied to foreign policy, into six categories which could thus be treated as the main themes. The events of the 1970s required the review and adjustment of many of the policy directions within that overall framework. But as a framework for our aspirations, I believe these themes remain valid.

In my view, these themes -- fostering economic growth, safeguarding sovereignty and independence, working for peace and security, promoting social justice, enhancing the quality of life and ensuring a harmonious national environment -- continue to reflect the aspirations of Canadians and indicate a continuity in Canada's foreign policy goals. The strategies required to realize these goals today are different from the strategies of the 1970s. The relative priority of the goals may also differ, but the goals themselves remain.

What sort of world were we facing at the outset of the 1970s when that review took place? It was a different world, a world which was, frankly, more hopeful. There was more confidence then about our economies. We believed that money and technology transfers could overcome a number of global problems and advance the development of developing countries. Social programmes could easily be expanded both at home and abroad; the disfavoured people in our own societies and the disfavoured countries of the world could be helped simultaneously. The term "oil shock" would have brought a blank stare. We were entering a period of economic expansion on a global scale. The fruits of this expansion would allow progress to be made on a number of fronts. Meaningful disarmament initiatives appeared possible. The Soviet Union appeared to be moving toward greater co-operation with the West.

I do not have to go through a litany of things which altered our views during the 1970s. It is not necessary to describe the incredible global impact of two oil shocks and two recessions as well as other developments which diminished the early hopes of the 1970s.