

Following Hugh Stephens' remarks, Michelle d'Auray, Assistant Deputy Minister, Policy, Heritage Canada, outlined her department's approach. She said that as the line between domestic and international policy becomes finer, Heritage Canada aims to ensure that Canadian choices/voices/spaces (i.e., Canadian values, interests, cultural products and services, etc.) are available to Canadians and are accessible to others. The question is, how to secure Canadian/domestic public space, including public institutions, law and regulatory systems, trade and other economic agreements in the context of globalisation? How to sustain Canadian choices/voices/spaces while promoting openness at the same time?

Some preliminary efforts have been undertaken to develop the cultural diversity approach by Heritage Canada (including Minister Copps' initiatives, co-operation with UNESCO, the Francophonie, and other organisations). Michelle d'Auray agreed with Hugh Stephens of the importance of shoring-up capacity of the two departments and moving forward collaboratively. She also drew attention to Canada's relationship with the United States and the special Canadian approach to diversity. Some U.S. officials have already started to use the language developed by Canada on culture and cultural diversity – a development that can be interpreted as a modest success. Moreover, the message, delivered through various channels such as the arts community, academic community, and Missions, has been reaching others beyond the trade-oriented American audience. The danger of the United States usurping the Canadian idea of cultural diversity and adopting it as its own was raised.

Colin Jackson, Calgary Arts Centre, pointed out that capacity to "set campfires" and share stories must be built so that Canadians can live up to their role as the "world's boy-scouts." *While the culture community should be supported, the Canadian government should apply values/norms in its own actions/processes (i.e., in the way it negotiates or mediates, for instance).*

Ann Medina addressed semantics of the ongoing discussions about culture and cultural diversity. She said that the expression "Third Pillar" and the word "culture" do not necessarily evoke the right ideas/concepts. The "Third Pillar" tends to isolate "culture" into an artificially separate category. Meanwhile, "culture" is mostly perceived as the arts (i.e., theatre, dance, music, painting). *There is a need to conceptualise culture more broadly as permeating other aspects of Canadian public (foreign) policy and as encompassing a range of collective values and norms (political, social, economic, etc.). Whatever the tool-box of the culture or Third Pillar approach might be, it must itself demonstrate the values Canada wants to promote (including openness, tolerance, the ability to listen, multiculturalism, etc.). We must move beyond older concepts. Vision and leadership are necessary.*

Hugh Stephens said that while the fundamental idea behind the Third Pillar is still there (i.e., to have a Canadian foreign policy which includes a value-agenda), it is necessary to take it further. The Third Pillar has led to new initiatives in governance and institution building. *Efforts should be made to include other DFAIT officials in the discussion. A memorandum could be developed. Co-operation and continued engagement are key.*