

of giving practical expression to these principles. Undoubtedly, useful things can be done in terms of improving the methods, procedures and machinery for co-ordination — revitalizing moribund inter-departmental committees, establishing new ones where required, canvassing the use of task forces, providing for better inter-departmental communication, sharing information about policies and plans. These are remedies rather than cures, however, and will certainly have to be reinforced by other measures.

In another part of the forest, the Personnel Management Committee is pushing forward with several inglorious tasks that may eventually make a significant contribution to better policy co-ordination. The committee is seeking to develop co-ordinated personnel policies and to rationalize the miscellaneous and often inconsistent personnel practices of the several foreign service departments. Whether or not all foreign service personnel are eventually integrated into a single service, the steps being taken to put them so far as possible on the same footing are bound to have beneficial effects for better co-operation between the departments concerned. The Personnel Management Committee is also developing programs for the secondment and exchange of personnel between foreign service departments, and also between foreign service departments, on the one hand, and domestic departments, on the other. Policy co-ordination is in many respects a "people" problem, and the more public servants there are who understand the policies and programs of other departments the more likely it is that the co-ordination procedures decided upon will be employed with perception and understanding.

A pervasive problem in relation to policy co-ordination is the very loose way in which the term "policy" is employed in government. Whether the questions being discussed are long-range or immediate, "policy" and a number of related terms are used indiscriminately without com-

monly understood distinctions of meaning — aims, goals, objectives, strategies, policies, tactics, programs, projects. This makes for difficulties in communication between one department and another, between officials and ministers and between government and the public. The situation calls not just for a standardized vocabulary but for more systematic and disciplined procedures in the formulation of proposals for the Government to consider and in implementation of Government decisions once a plan of action has been selected.

Foreign Policy for Canadians sets forth a conceptual framework that could be employed as a basis for developing a more systematic approach to the problem of formulating Canada's foreign policy. The approach outlined therein would require the definition of national objectives in all significant areas of government activity, under each of the six policy themes (economic growth, social justice, quality of life, peace and security sovereignty and independence, harmonious natural environment). It would also require the devising of alternative policies that might be employed to attain the national objectives and the relating of program proposals to the different policies identified as viable alternatives.

Not surprisingly, this kind of approach to the discussion and planning of Government business does not commend itself very strongly to senior officials accustomed to handling the problems of government pragmatically, as they come, and in relation to traditionally-recognized areas of departmental jurisdiction. Yet some better way than is now available should be found to ensure that ministers can make decisions on programs and courses of action on the basis of a comprehensive appreciation of the interplay of different national objectives and to enable officials to perceive the programs they are implementing as parts of a coherent whole. This is a problem of the integration of the Government's foreign operations that remains to be solved.

*Finding method
making decisions
based on interplay
of national goals*

To meet the challenge of coming decades, to be equipped to take advantage of new opportunities, to keep abreast of the rapid evolution of events, the Government needs a strong and flexible organization for carrying out its reshaped foreign policy. . . . Modern management techniques are called for.

The Government has decided that there should be maximum integration in

its foreign operations that will effectively contribute to the achievement of national objectives. . . .

. . . The Government's view is that, if its foreign policy is to be carried out effectively, the organization for doing so must be closely-knit, fully-qualified and responsive to the changing demands that inevitably will be made on it. . . . (*Foreign Policy for Canadians*, June 1970.)