

---

Canadian foreign policy. Its principles of national unity, political liberty, the rule of law, human values, and the importance of undertaking international responsibilities, enjoy equal prominence in subsequent policy doctrine. The Gray Lecture spoke for a generation, but took on new life nearly a quarter of a century later in the themes of *Foreign Policy for Canadians*.

The dilemma for government is this: if it does not occasionally set out in public the principles of its foreign policy, it is open to accusations ranging from secrecy to "ad hocery" to incompetence. But once it does set out its principles, or even its options, it risks not only misunderstanding but also the accusation that the policy or its principles are old, stale, or overtaken by events. The public appetite for the new is not one that can easily or appropriately be fed by foreign policy.

Each of these case studies – culture, the Cruise, and the Third Option – is instructive in a different way about foreign policy and the public interest. There is the necessary co-existence of national and cultural objectives. There are the assumptions and premises about our national security, broadly shared between government and public, which nonetheless do not moderate a sharp debate over the testing of the Cruise missile. And there is the risk of misunderstanding occasioned by periodic statements of policy such as the Third Option.

Each of these issues also has a common thread in the role and impact of the media. They possess that consecrated reality which only the media can bestow. Press, radio and television themselves become actors in the debate, stirring a volatile chemistry of ministers, officials, groups, regions and publics. The media play a part not only in establishing what we should think about – but also in defining how we should think about it.

As an industry, the Canadian media are as sophisticated, intellectually and electronically, as anywhere in the world. As individuals, there are many outstanding Canadian reporters and commentators working in Canada and abroad. You will be hearing one of them later this morning. And yet I see a widening gap between those charged with directing or implementing Canada's foreign policy, and those responsible for reporting or interpreting it for the public.

You will understand that I have to tread carefully here. The omnipotence of the media is an intimidating force for any bureaucrat to contemplate. But something is going sour in the media approach to foreign policy and I think it important both to say so, and to do something about it. The CIIA itself provides an interesting example. Journalists such as John Dafoe and John Nelson were instrumental in founding the CIIA. And yet today there is, on your national council of about 60 persons, only one journalist – no publishers or network executives, and, I think, not one representative of the communications heartland of Toronto.

The gap between foreign policy and the media has several dimensions: the increasingly multinational character of information transmission, which either lacks a Canadian dimension, or is given some extraneous "Canadian angle" *en route* to our homes; a serious divergence of objectives and priorities, without benefit of the healthy, even competitive exchange between journalists and diplomats which is found in so many countries. Hence the absence or violation of agreed on ground rules, a certain animus