

Where there are differences is in the means of achieving those goals -- that is, in the broad sense, in tactics. As I said earlier, it seems to me that tactics are what the foreign service will be primarily concerned with in the future. If you accept that, then perhaps you will agree that the role of the foreign service has changed rather than diminished in importance.

Well, where does Canada, and the Canadian foreign service, fit into all of this? Canada is a small country and, though we are better off than most other countries, when it comes to the matter of power we are definitely not in the big leagues. We are, however, entering into a period where the postwar centres are shifting. The pre-eminence of two nuclear super-powers is likely to remain without serious challenge in the strategic area for this decade at least, but there are new and vital power centres developing in the Far East -- both China and Japan; South Asia is really no one's "sphere of influence"; and, clearly, the possibility of the current phase of European integration, leading to greater cohesion as an independent power centre, is an element of signal importance. The major international issue will clearly continue to be world security and the means of reducing and, one hopes, eliminating the causes of international tension. That will be a long and difficult job, requiring patience and dedication and involving the leaders of major countries. There will, however, be ample scope in the new multi-polar environment for smaller powers such as Canada to contribute to negotiations leading to a safer world.

This international focus at the highest level on security questions will not diminish the great importance of a host of other issues. In the Canadian foreign policy review published in 1970, it is stated that foreign policy is the extension of domestic policy into the foreign environment. That gives a key to what working in the Canadian foreign service of the Seventies is likely to be about. It will increasingly be concerned with problems that affect the lives of people directly -- economic security, the quality of life, education, problems of the environment. Many of these problems have a global dimension, and are of concern to people and society generally as much as they are to nations. With the great increase in travel, in informal exchanges among professional groups -- scientists, economists, engineers, educators --, the international scope of such problems is underlined. I am sure, in your studies here, you are reflecting about how the many political, social and economic problems might be tackled internationally in the future. If peaceful change in the international environment is to be achieved, it may well come from below -- from continued expansion of the kinds of informal exchange I have been talking about, through which a genuine and comprehensible community of interest could develop to provide the underpinning of solutions of major security issues.

Canada is struggling not only with the many and familiar problems of modern society, social, economic, and political, but is also struggling with the working-out of a viable and genuinely acceptable relationship between two major groups -- French-speaking and English-speaking -- based on equality of status, opportunity and influence, and this is clearly reflected in Canada's foreign policy. Some want other solutions -- separation, for example -- but they are clearly in the minority. I do not wish to be presumptuous, but it seems to me that the Canadian experience in trying to work out a harmonious