

A further point of some interest is that, through managerial exclusions, the pool of officers available to form the executive of the staff association is small and with a majority of young junior officers. The possibility of the association becoming a divisive factor within the service, representing not the service as a whole but only the more junior element, is a matter of concern to the whole service. It has been generally accepted that an adversary relationship between management and the general body of officers (all potential managers) would be detrimental to the service. Nevertheless, the collective-bargaining process itself imposes a certain separateness, which has required careful handling. In any event, the implications of collective bargaining in the foreign service are still being studied, and we have been working in a pragmatic way to fulfil the requirements of the Government's collective-bargaining legislation, and thus far the mutual-education process of management and the association has, I think, been of benefit to both. The Government itself has been re-examining the collective-bargaining environment and a Government study released in 1971 made a number of recommendations based on an examination of experience since the legislation was adopted. One of the study's recommendations was that the foreign service group in its entirety should be excluded from the collective-bargaining process. No decisions have yet been made, but I think the recommendation itself illustrates that the difficulty of applying a trade-union technique to a professional career foreign service has been recognized.

Another important fact about Canada to bear in mind that affects the foreign service is that Canada is a federal state. There are many such states in the world. What is peculiar to Canada is that, internally, power and jurisdiction are strictly divided between the Federal Government in Ottawa and the ten provincial governments. Compared, for instance, to the states in this country, the provinces of Canada have considerably more power and influence in national affairs. This division of jurisdiction provides room for vigorous and endless political arguments between the national and the provincial authorities. Although the Fathers of Confederation in 1867 envisaged a strong Federal Government, the influence of judicial interpretations of the Privy Council in London in subsequent years tended to favour the provinces, and this relative power tended to increase. As might be expected, disputes between the two levels of government have focused on the sharing of the tax pie. The game is for the provinces to induce the Federal Government to raise taxes - the unpopular part - and to let them, the provinces, spend the proceeds as they like - the popular part.

Externally, this division of jurisdiction also has consequences. In matters coming under provincial jurisdiction, the Federal Government is not in a position to bind the provinces through international agreements unless the provinces concur. Furthermore, there has been some controversy as to whether the provinces have in external affairs some jurisdiction of their own. As a federalist I have no doubt myself that, essentially, Canada is one country and the Federal Government has the monopoly of jurisdiction. This view has been contested by some governments, particularly that of Quebec, and has led to some complications in our relations with certain other countries. For the foreign service it is vitally important that the areas of jurisdiction be understood and that co-ordination on matters in the foreign affairs field of interest to both levels of government be careful and as complete as possible.