h of its ition of rudeau nt with umanhere. should cern to of those by the erverto s, Cane Inter-Rights. olations tensify considng posi-

e years ns with e. This ppears policy ilation, articuation to anada's develugh its Develrojectulate a tion in adaptashould cisionid conealings alth, it ting its Brazil.

nt new f-power e interith the China, e is no ed this ntion of associby the at Canced in a sing the factors associ erve to ations erica. razil is onomic

progress, it continues realistically to classify itself as a "developing" rather than "developed" nation. And whether one likes to admit it or not, so is Canada. In many ways, Canada is truly an "affluent underdeveloped nation". As John Harbron points out in his new book Canada Without Quebec: If Canada is going to define long-range plans to serve her domestic needs, she will have an excellent model in Brazil - another huge western nation which, like Canada, is searching for new directions, although admittedly under the unsavory rule of its army and conservative technocrats. The recent spectacular growth of Brazil as an export nation demonstrates

the effectiveness of a strong economic strategy.

Canada-Brazil relations demonstrate a growing awareness on the part of Canadian makers of foreign policy that the Latin nations situated in the Western hemisphere share a common concern with development and can co-operate with Canada in resolving mutual political and economic problems. In future, Canada's external policies will have to reflect a more realistic appraisal of its ability to accomplish specific national objectives. But the main conclusion to be drawn here is that Canada's promotional ties with Brazil are a step in the right direction.

## Public influence on policy

## Does Don Jamieson read all those letters you write?

By Donald Page

We cannot expect to build a structure of co-operation that will prove solid unless it involves our people and unless they identify their interests with it.

We also accept the right, in Canada as elsewhere, of individual citizens to concern themselves with these matters and to enter into a dialogue with their governments where precept and practice appear to diverge.

For anyone reading these statements in the opening Canadian speech of October 6, 1977, to the Belgrade follow-up meeting to the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, there is no question <sup>that</sup> the public is expected to play a role in the making and implementation of foreign policy. The old distinction between domestic and international concerns are becoming blurred and human rights are now consid-<sup>ered</sup> part of the legitimate diplomatic bag-<sup>gage,</sup> not because states want to interfere in <sup>the</sup> affairs of other states but because people <sup>everywhere</sup> are finding it more difficult, if <sup>not</sup> impossible, to be indifferent to the <sup>denial</sup> of human rights.

Although the publicity given to human <sup>rights</sup> has accentuated this transnational <sup>concern</sup> with the problems of others, the <sup>growing</sup> public awareness goes beyond the purely human ones to embrace most multilateral issues. Acquisition of seal-pelts on the ice-flows, manganese nodules on the deep sea-bed and foreign-satellite debris have illustrated the point that almost every domestic issue has an international projection and, equally important, almost every international happening affects in some way the management of domestic concerns. Since Canadian foreign policy has become increasingly "the extension abroad of na-

Dr. Page is deputy director of Historical Division in the Department of External Affairs. Before joining the Department he taught history at the University of Saskatchewan and edited Volume 12 in the Documents on Canadian External Relations series. The views expressed here are those of Dr. Page.

21