

and personnel) to cultural promotion as there are those who believe we don't do enough. Nevertheless, as it becomes increasingly evident that the economic difficulties currently experienced throughout the world are likely to be the norm rather than the exception in the foreseeable future, justification for all public expenditure becomes the more important.

I do not believe that we Canadian taxpayers should be supporting cultural programs abroad simply for their own sake, for the sake of the individual whose work is being supported, or indeed for any more abstract principle of national glory or self-image.

In answering the question of why then I favour continuing our program of promoting international cultural relations (and, indeed, modestly expanding it as Government austerity programs and other priorities permit), I will also be answering the third criticism which suggests that cultural policy and foreign policy are distinct or indeed separable. Of course, they are not. Cultural policy is inexorably linked to political, economic, commercial and industrial policy, and is a vital aspect of overall relations between countries and between peoples.

An irreverent colleague of mine has suggested that the cultural aspect of foreign policy is nothing more or less than the first base bag in the day-to-day game of geopolitical hard ball. You can't pretend it isn't there. You can't sneak past it without stopping to assess your position from its vantage point, and you can't bring home the winnings of the game unless you build upon its potential. The winnings are, of course, the advantages which accrue from mature and mutually satisfying bilateral relations between countries.

Cultural relations promote better understanding between people and nations. They allow one country to begin to know and appreciate the makeup of another, and it is on the basis of such understanding that long-term mutually beneficial relationships between countries thrive. Cultural diplomacy is the mortar with which the foundations of stable international relations are made. On the basis of regular government-sponsored exposure to another cultural background, trust and understanding can often flourish, leading to the development of a multiplicity of interpersonal and corporate relationships.

Let me give you a specific example.

Since before the Second World War, Canada has tried to increase not only the volume but, more importantly, the quality of our exports to Japan. That is, we have endeavoured to increase the Canadian value added to the products we export. For years we gleefully imported Sonys and Toyotas, calculators and heavy machinery, but sold only rocks and logs. Why? The reasons are, of course, complex but many relate to a fundamental lack of understanding of each others' needs and aspirations. Is it any wonder that the Japanese seek to buy mainly our raw materials when often we are perceived as little more than prospectors and lumberjacks? There is nothing to be ashamed of in the image of Canada as a land of forests and wheatfields, Indians, Eskimos and Mounties. But it is vital to Canadian commercial and industrial interests

---