

TRANSCRIPT OF SPEECH BY J. ALAN BEESLEY

CANADIAN COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

24 OCTOBER 1980

Chairman: Our last panelist combines perhaps the best of both the worlds of the two associations meeting here today; Mr. Beesley is one of our most distinguished diplomats and he is also a legal mind, a legal gentleman, a Q.C., and we have therefore an opportunity of combining both of these backgrounds. Of Mr. Beesley, I would also refer you to the notes that you have and therefore will not take up your time in repeating them. I might just mention that I believe - he may correct me on this - I believe he is being named, or has already been named, in addition to his other distinguished offices, Ambassador to the Law of the Sea Conference which perhaps is a recognition of a long-suffering diplomat who has brought great honour to our country. Mr. Beesley ...

JA : Thank you, Madam Chairperson ...

Chairman: Chairman will do ...

JAB : I must say that those last few comments represented the first occasion when I was glad that everything was being recorded, and I would ask you to send that straight over to External Affairs, specially to the Personnel Bureau. The fact is that I am both delighted and apprehensive to learn that our proceedings are being recorded. Pleased in that I will have a record of what I said afterwards, I'm a little apprehensive in that everyone else will also have that record. I have two speeches, the one that I prepared to

...2/

deliver and the one that I'd really like to deliver, and if I switch from one to the other occasionally, let me plead guilty in advance to allowing my convictions to overweigh my normal prudence. Perhaps the first thing I should say to illustrate my prudence is to ask the Chairman (is that correct) whether we should all break for coffee, because I'm going to be the one that keeps you late and I'm quite willing to have a break now if you prefer. But having asked, can I ask you to nod or shake your head?

Chairman: No, no I think they want to hear you, Mr. Beesley ...

JAB : Alright, well at least I have a captive audience, so I will proceed. One thing I should make clear to you, that here quite sincerely, I'm here not to inform so much as to learn and that's one of the great advantages of being invited to participate in this kind of conference. When I'm abroad, it's different; I have a representational role and I think all diplomats of all countries ought to remind themselves occasionally of the fable of the great man who rode into a village on a donkey and all the villagers went out to greet them and lay down palm leaves and said wonderful things and the little donkey thought it was all for him. Now that's something that can happen to diplomats. It's diplomatitis. In the U.N., in the United Nations, you know, someone speaks and it's traditional for subsequent speakers to refer to the brilliant speech of Mr. So and So, Mrs. So and So, Ms.(?) and after a while, the person who made the speech begins to nod thinking it was quite brilliant. I once had a

...3/

friend actually do what was lampooned in a cartoon the other day, begin a speech by saying "fellow distinguished speakers", and I think this is something that happens. Today I'm very conscious of the fact that if I occupy a category different from those of previous speakers, it's really one that is quite different from that suggested. It's not whether or not I happen to formerly have had legal training and served my articles, called to the bar, etc., that's not what's different; it's rather that I believe that the people we've heard speak are not only well known to you but you know what they stand for. With me, some of you may know me, some of you may know what I stand for, but the difference is really that in my own view, I've come here to find out if I'm still in touch, if I'm still relevant, and I'd like to ask you that at the end of what I have to say. Undoubtedly, some of you will tell me whether I ask or not. My reasons for saying this are that there are some fairly radical transformations going on, not only on the international plane but on the domestic plane and not only on the domestic plane, but in Government, and not only in Government as a whole, but in the Department of External Affairs in particular. And so what you have come to expect from us may not be what you will receive in the future. Now that may be good, it may be bad, it may be a neutral fact, but it's something that I wish to underline at the outset of what I have to say. I found listening to that I was nodding my head because he's one of those who influence me and members of my generation of foreign service officers, as did others such as Norman Robertson, Jules Heger, Ed Ritchie, and if it's not too controversial a thing to say, our respective Ministers. I think Mr. Chapdelaine has left his legacy not merely on external affairs and on foreign policy, but on Canada and little further needs to be said in

the light of what we've just heard from him. I will touch on some of the questions he touched on. But the point I'm underlining at the outset is that foreign policy is not made by computers. You can churn out a foreign policy from a computer but only if you put the right program into the computer. Ultimately, it has to be people that do it and I don't think you can get a very creative, imaginative or constructive policy from a computerization approach. That is often said about committees, that committees don't create; they simply consolidate and reach agreement on the lowest common denominator. That hasn't always been my experience as I may have a chance to say later, but the human element is so important in both the formulation and in the implementation of foreign policy, that I will only ask you to bear that in mind throughout our discussion after the panel. I find that, from a personal experience, I've always found it, I ~~remember~~^{recall} when ...²... first joined the Law of the Sea Conference and we were on a panel together (this is a part of the speech I didn't intend to deliver but here I go), he was asked on the panel if personalities had any influence on the Law of the Sea Conference. He said, "Certainly not, these things are policies very carefully evolved by Governments, and they're not the kind of thing that can just be shifted according to whether you like the colour of somebody's eyes or not." A year or two later, I teased him about that because I expressed a contrary view and he couldn't have agreed more wholeheartedly that interpersonal relationships are one of the very central factors in a negotiation. And similarly, not so much personalities, as we commonly use the term, but the capacities of the individuals you choose to formulate your policies and implement them is extremely relevant in terms of

the kind of policy you want to achieve. Now just to proceed a little further along the road of controversy and to clear the air in case anyone wonders what I'm talking about, I think we have a first-class Foreign Minister, an excellent Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I know that because he says so many things I agree with. But having underlined that, let me turn to some of the substance of what these people should, in my view, be up to. Now I think that it's relevant since I'm speaking to you and since reference has been made to Lester Pearson for me to refer to something I wrote some time ago, but I brought it along in case it was felt to be relevant and I believe it is. This is the statement from Mr. Pearson's memoirs: "Everything I learned during the war confirmed in strength in my view as a Canadian that our foreign policy must not be timid or fearful of commitments but activist in accepting international responsibilities. To me nationalism and internationalism were two sides of the same coin. International cooperation for peace is the most important aspect of national policy. I've never waived in this belief even though I've learned from experience how agonizingly difficult it is to convert conviction into reality." I believe that's still a foundation stone of Canadian policy, bipartisan policy I would say, although of course much of our activity is, as suggested by, directed now into some of the less exciting foundation stones for peace rather than merely towards some of the more controversial perhaps, the more well-known aspects, such as peacekeeping and peacemaking. We haven't abandoned that role. It's often suggested that either we have or that we should; we know that that's essential. We don't deny the fundamental purposes for which the U.N. was created, but I couldn't agree more with what said, that it is a primitive approach to judge the U.N.

and in the process judge the world community on the basis of whether or not conflicts still break out. I don't want to say more about that, except perhaps to make the obvious comment that were we to judge any nation state or any community, any city, by the basis of whether or not outbreaks of violence occur whether they be murders, or robberies, or rapes, we might be giving bad passing marks to most communities around the world. And I'm talking about communities with a very well-developed system of law, with judges, juries, prisons and all the rest. We don't have that on the international plane, so to judge the success or failure of the institution which the U.N. represents, or the international community which attempts to work out solutions to problems under the aegis of the U.N., is valid up to a point but it is I believe superficial to make a judgement only on that basis, and I've been one of many, many Canadians and of course many non-Canadians involved in contributing to the process of developing the basis for a peaceful world by worrying away at specific concrete problems, problems that may be directed towards the law of the environment, for example, and people would say, "Well, where is the threat to peace there?" Well, I recall a very bitter dispute between Argentina and Brazil which is, at root, an environmental issue. I know now of certain disputes, of a lesser order I hope, between Canada and the United States which are environmental in nature. I would personally as a lawyer, of course, tend to view the problem of acid rain through the light, or in the light of the tremendous body of principles and law that has developed since the Trail smelter case, but be that as it may, even disputes on the environment can cause very serious frictions between states. If we talk about resources, well,

whether it's the first, rather a fumbling attempt to develop a law of outer space or whether we're talking about the law of the sea, or whether talking about the series of U.N. proposals on permanent sovereignty over natural resources, there is of course no more sensitive, no more controversial issue than resources. Well, do we leave that to the economist? Obviously, as a lawyer, I think it's too important to leave to the economist, so the lawyers attempt to develop a system of law to regulate relations between states on economic issues. There's already, as you can see, an interdisciplinary approach needed and that probably is the next point I would like to emphasize: That to develop law in today's world on the international plane requires an interdisciplinary approach. Moreover, it requires an approach that doesn't occur in the clichéd ivory tower. It's certainly not something that can occur within what used to be the confines of external affairs. It not only is something that requires consultation with other, many other Government departments, but with the provinces, with academics, with representatives of industry, very often with labour as well as management, and of course, particularly importantly, with interest groups such as environmentalists, but also, if I can use the term interest group, groups such as those represented here today. I don't think anyone should ever minimize the importance of the input of associations such as the United Nations Association or the Canadian Council of International Law. If ever you think you're not taken seriously, well I suggest that this is an incorrect appraisal of the situation. Even you're taken seriously when things are not done that might be done were not for the fact that you would raise a protest. So your influence is there and I think, frankly, that foreign policy and thus international law, as one aspect of foreign policy, is everybody's concern. Now I've tried to implement that view by not hesitating to go to

seminars, meetings, confrontations I might say, whether they're in the maritimes or whether they're elsewhere, whether we're talking about what's going on in the law of the sea that will affect the claims of Newfoundland or other east coast provinces concerning offshore resources, or whether we're talking about the effect of the Law of the Sea Conference on Canada's nickel industry. I realize, of course, that no pronouncement of mine is as weighty as any that might come out of the Globe and Mail and I think agrees with me there, but I should tell you about the interrelationship in case it isn't evident; it's often pointed out to me that I'm gradually getting to learn as much about the law of the sea as and I say that sincerely because he is a genuine expert. He takes the subject seriously and he's devoted himself with the continuity that he claims he's become a big bore. Well, he never bores me because I read every column with bated breath wondering what he said about me most recently. His last comments have now been picked up by the Mayor of Sudbury who is now demanding that there be a national coalition from sea to sea to prevent the ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention. I don't blame him because he did that on the basis of the knowledge that I had as much chance of winning the battle on the nickel production issue as the Blue Jays had of winning the world series. That's direct from I'm probably the only Canadian who really had a hope that the Blue Jays might win. I believe in hanging in there, anyone who knows me will say. Turning to what the role of law is with respect to foreign policy, I think I have to say a word or two about that old-fashioned phrase "the rule of law", because we used to think about it a lot and talk about it a lot, but now I think we approach

it slightly differently. I think it's important to ~~know~~^{note}, however, that those concerned with international law and with advising and implementing international law, have to attempt to ensure, in the case of Canada, that Canada's role in international affairs is conducted in accordance with recognized principles of international law. I am quoting as well as others in saying that. Now, ideally it's self-evident that there's no conflict between this aspect of the responsibilities on international law and a basic function of protecting a country's national interest. The reason I say that is that even from a purely national point of view, international law ~~is~~^{as} the basis for developing world order or even the lesser goal of stable relations between states, benefits all states, so I think it's arguable that far from being incompatible with the protection of national interest, adherence to the rule of law may be seen as a very specific invaluable form of protection of national interest. However, and I guess it's the that attracts most of the attention amongst those concerned with Canadian initiatives in international law, occasions do arise when the perception is made that international law does not reflect the national interest adequately and even perhaps the general international interest where the law is undeveloped or has become out of touch with contemporary needs. Now, in such instances, it may be necessary, certainly on a subjective evaluation it may be deemed necessary to seek to bring about changes in the law. Now we've done that on many occasions in many different fields of law and I make no apologies for that and I've certainly been in the forefront amongst those advocating changes in the law in certain fields, changes perhaps where they're out of date or the creation of new law where we're dealing with a field that is unregulated which was the case in

outer space, and I think again comments are à propos. I remember stating in more than one outer space negotiation that we had to have regard for the possibility that one of these outer space objects might fall on Montreal - I don't know why I picked on Montreal, but I tended to and I tried to do that to illustrate what a disastrous effect it would have. It wasn't any pleasure to me when we lost the battle to have that convention made binding in terms of the dispute settlement process. We were told several years running that we were holding up the convention and that the perfect was the enemy of the good; and finally, we did agree, we caved in and agreed to ~~non-binding~~ non-binding compulsory settlement disputes. Well, of course, we're still living ~~but~~^{with} the results. It can be said of course we would have never got compulsory disputes; we were down to, I think, five of us - several developing countries plus Canada - but it's indicative that the lawyers were at least in the forefront attempting to establish rules that would regulate relations between states before the need really arose, and I continue to believe that that ought to be the role of the lawyer in the field of international law. In other words, the role of an activist,, and one that is not merely responsive to events. In terms of how we reconcile national interest with the international community interest, there's no simple answer to that. It's far more an art than a science, and the judgement that may be made in advance of the development or implementation of a policy may have to be altered by events. But it is important, I believe, that the interests of the international community must at every level be taken into account. In my own view, it's a role of the legal advisor to guard against the law being regarded as a mere instrument of policy - an approach inimical to the very concept of the rule of law in my view.

So it's not too hard to describe in general terms what the role is and what the objective is, but it's a lot more difficult to implement it and that's where you have to fall back, again of course, upon the people who are fulfilling these functions and assuming these responsibilities. Much turns on how national goals are pursued and at that stage I would refer again to the mix of inputs that go into the development of a position and the launching of an initiative, if I can use another old-fashioned term. Ultimately though, and I think every public servant knows this - certainly every diplomat knows it - policy is made by the Government, whether it be federal or provincial, and public servants implement the policy. They don't make policy; they can contribute to the development of policy and if they're any good, that's exactly what they should try and do. Again though, it's my personal view, that if public servants don't care enough about the issues to try and make an input and put forth views on which they have convictions, then we develop increasingly a series of bland policies that are really non-policies. Ministers are quite capable and ~~parliament~~ are quite capable of developing policy options and they do; but given the complexity of the world in which we live - I hate to repeat such clichés but that is a valid one, clichés often are - it's just not possible for any Minister or any group of Ministers to be abreast of all the developments on which their country may have to take position and so, to some extent at least, they must rely on advice from officials, advice from academics, advice from outside experts, etc. Ultimately, if we have officials who simply are interested in keeping their nose down and advancing their career by keeping out of trouble, well, I've forgotten the precise quote of who, well I should remember it because it's on a poster on my son's door in his bedroom and it is in paraphrase

that it is an attempt to always take the cautious role which creates the greatest danger, I believe that that's still true, by shying away from problems we don't solve them. Now what about law as a basis for relationships between states? Does it really mean anything or is it simply an argument used? I don't think anyone would deny that any state involved in any kind of serious dispute likes to be able to cite legal principles in support of its position. I think it's rather more than that; it's gone well beyond that. It's been pointed out by several speakers, I believe all of those who've touched on this question in the brief time that we've had, that there is a vast interlocking network of treaties. I had the good fortune to spend three years in Geneva working with the ILO in its standard-setting processes, WHO in the standards that it sets in health, ITU, international regulation of radio and now space, WMO, and the world weather I learned that all of these institutions were making a contribution to a developing world order and there was always a legal aspect but it would've been foolish and, to my mind, counter-productive to try and approach any of these institutions and the work they did as a true lawyer in a sense that one of legalistic rather than legal. But all of these institutions, and later I found this with the IAEA in Vienna and, I didn't find it to quite the same extent with OPEC but I got to know about them while in Vienna too, all of them make a contribution not merely in a concrete problem-solving way as is commonly accepted, but they make another kind of contribution. They set up standards, they often develop actual treaties, agreements, and governments take these treaties seriously. In spite of the Globe and Mail and that view of the world and the U.N., the fact is that states do take their treaty obligations seriously. And when we think of the number,

the range, the diversity, the complexity of the treaties in force around the world, the number alone is fantastic as well as the breadth of scope of such treaties. What is equally interesting is the extent to which they are adhered to out of self-interest, not because of a sudden new idealism that emerged since the second world war or since Vietnam, all through that period, but just out of self-interest, it makes sense for states to regulate their conduct by agreed rules and that's what they've been doing quietly for many, many years and you'll find Canadians involved in it at every stage. I also learned, of course, through serving in Geneva, in Vienna and down at the U.N., that all of your diplomats out of the Department of External Affairs I found are extremely effective Canadian negotiators coming from a wide spectrum of Canadian life and I find that, I used to think this anyhow, that Canadians seem to have an aptitude for diplomacy - I still believe it - because we don't instinctively take a dogmatic approach; we may occasionally take a approach, but that's a national characteristic we can't too much about. On the other hand, we don't, we don't assume that what's good for us is good for the world because we know better. We don't get anywhere with that approach. I think Canadians grow up with not so much an ambivalent view of life but a knowledge of the complexity of life. I think our bicultural, bilingual heritage teaches us that, if nothing else does. If it didn't, our federal system certainly would and I think this is an advantage when you're on the international plane because you know that very seldom is anything black and white. There are shades of gray and the process of institution building or law creation or peacemaking is always, in my view, based on the same kind of approach; namely, an attempt to determine the interests at stake, including of course our own, for we may have to take national that is

to say domestic and international interests into account to determine what our national policy is but if we don't have some ability to with the views of other people representing other states, then we'll just have a series of flashy initiatives that go nowhere. We've had a few but I think they're the exception to the rule. The process, as I see it, is nearly always the same; it's a matter of trying to determine the interests at stake and the opposing party and then seeking common ground. Often, by means of little devices, such as the floating of an anonymous draft that occupies the middle ground and thereby forces the opposing sides to start debating what's wrong with that middle draft thereby leaving behind their monotonous reiteration of their preferred positions. That's a technique that we often use. But I'm talking about the business knowing in advance that we're not a great power, we're not a major space power, we have very little military might on our own, we're of some significance economically but we don't have an automatic hundred million market, indeed we're one of the few countries - I often say this in Australia - like Australia, we're a primary producer, we're also a mineral exporter, in many ways we share some of the interests of the developing countries, but we're also developed states with a certain amount of technology and we live by trade. And so for these two countries, particularly for Canada, I think we know at the outset that we don't fit neatly into any particular category but because we don't, we don't have anyone automatically looking after our interests. That's the fact of life for Canadians. I think the image lives on that we're well liked and well loved and therefore nothing much bad is ever going to happen to us. That's If you're not out defending your interests nowadays, they don't get defended. Now I'm aware from many, many contacts and negotiations with

the EEC, for example, that although they like to be nine when they like to be nine, and they like to be one when they like to be one, they can never be overlooked, and they're always there to defend one another's interests. The group of 77 will defend each other's interests, the Latin group will defend their interests, and so on. The USA doesn't need to be a member of any particular group, it is a multinational group in itself, but Canada doesn't have that kind of protection and so we have to begin the process of any exercise in foreign policy by trying to analyze what are our national interests that are at stake and it's not so difficult but it sometimes requires a very widespread consultation process. Even then after we've finished it another exercise must be carried out and that is to determine where our likely allies are and in the field in which I've worked I have found, for example, that in disarmament, it isn't necessarily the case that what's good for the great powers is good for Canada. I think and I worked together often enough to have reinforced that mutual view. In other fields, such as outer space, once again what would suit the space powers might not suit countries like Canada. We used to describe ourselves as a victim-oriented country, and we wanted a victim-oriented convention. Well I think we've at least proven that one out, haven't we? In the field of outer space we became the victim. So I think it's necessary to know who your friends are and obviously, I think it was Mr. Pearson again who said that the United States is our closest friend whether we like it or not, and I subscribe to that; they are our closest friend in every sense of the word. But sometimes the USA needs us too, if only as a pin prick occasionally. In fields like the law of the sea, we did things that appear pretty radical. They never seemed radical to me, but we set out and created interest groups. We were the first

ones to call together the coastal group, and once it got going we turned over its management to someone else because we had other axes to grind. We were the first ones to call together the states with wide continental shelf. We were the first ones to call together the states with land-based nickel interests at stake in the conference, and so on. We usually try to get other than a role of leadership, we don't see, I don't think we fancy ourselves as leaders, but sometimes we have the capacity to play the role of capitalists, and to get a group together without which there would not be solutions because we can have 150 nations milling about, all they can do is disagree. But when they sort out their interests and begin to realize that there is a common bond between this group that may cut right across Eastern European, Western European and North-South boundaries and then they can sit down with opposing interest groups, then the process of negotiation begins. I won't deal with the law of the sea beyond that except to say that pretty well everything that's said about the Law of the Sea Conference is true. It has failed year after year in completing its task, it's succeeded year after year in completing one segment after another of its overall task which was always the plan of course although it doesn't always accord with the plans of the people who report on it, and I can understand that, it's such a complex process. If I have to defend the conference, I would only say that if you added up all the months it's met and stack that up beside all the months the Disarmament Commission has met, all the months the MBFR group have met, then I guess the Law of the Sea Conference is the shortest one on record. But because it breaks for a period of months in between sessions, a very necessary and desirable feature because without it we would simply go on where we left off in terms of disagreements. But by breaking we can rethink the situation, give

further thought to possible solutions and get a little bit used to some of the solutions that we don't really like. So I think the law of the sea is a good example but I won't bore you all with a long discussion about it. Having said what I think is to some extent at least a very superficial perhaps discussion of the extent to which law ought to be the basis for relations between states, not only in terms of war and peace, because I agree with that. I'm just not that optimistic that it will happen all that soon. I rather believe that if we remove areas of controversy successively one by one by regulating affairs between states, there'd be less and less reason to have uses of force in open conflict. After all, that's what we've done domestically in country after country and what we're trying to do abroad. One of our difficulties perhaps is in carrying onto the international plane some of our concepts of social justice. I take that very seriously. I believe that it's going to take a long time for us to get used to the concept that we're our neighbour's keeper on the international plane but if we don't, then I think that while we're solving some problems that we're creating others. Now I'd like to turn to one or two other things before concluding. I'm sure you'll all be glad that I do have it in mind to conclude eventually. I did want to touch on one thing because it's always nice to show how prophetic we are on occasion and I don't get that chance too often except with my family. I wrote an article in 1972 called, "The Sixties to the Seventies", when I'm supposed to be talking about the eighties, and what I find troubling is how much of what I said then is either still relevant or at least still seems so to me. It may not be the same thing of course, but I did say this: It's interesting to note the range of action in two major areas of law which have required much of the attention

of successive legal advisors during the sixties and which will undoubtedly continue into the seventies; namely, questions touching on the nature and extent of the right of Canadian provinces to participate in action on the international plane and problems relating to the jurisdiction, sovereignty and territory of Canada. If I can make another brief quote, I don't want to comment directly on these issues, but rather to indicate that there is a real relevance here as I see it at least in terms of Canadian foreign policy.

I did say this: "Canada, Canadians rather, appear to have realized that in the early stage in the evolution of the Canadian nation state that it would be necessary to modify both internal empire law of the British Empire and international law in order to lay the basis for Canada's gradual and peaceful evolution from colony to nation." The temerity of Canadian politicians and statesmen is surprising in retrospect when one considers the extent of the changes they wrought. Certainly there is no precedent for their action in consistently moving towards independence by peaceful means policies bold and inventive in concept however gradualist in implementation. These were before the days of politics of confrontation I suppose. The development of the Canadian nation state has continued to reflect these early characteristics of willingness to bend both constitutional and international law in order to achieve acceptable accommodation. While I'm a little dated, I can't be right on everything, but it is worth noting that if we really wanted to be bold about our constitution and I'm speaking frivolously now, I think we wouldn't be worried about whether we were going to get the British Parliament, Westminster, to agree to anything. We would simply make a unilateral declaration of independence and leave it at that, but I'm not seriously proposing that, I just want to

introduce this notion of degrees of boldness. If we really wanted to take a very inventive and imaginative approach, we probably wouldn't need to go back to Westminster, but we might spend a week or two developing the legal basis for what we would do but I think it's there. I think though that to speak seriously about what's ahead there's no doubt that the eighties are going to be a very difficult time for Canada, primarily in the economic field but they're going to be difficult in other ways too. We can't dodge issues on the international plane, we certainly can't dodge them domestically. I don't believe we can retreat from these problems or retreat from responsibility in attempting to cope with them. That may all sound like a truism but I think it's important to bear this in mind if we're making radical changes in the structure of government, in the institutions that we look to for the development and implementation of policy. I don't wish to suggest anything pejorative or otherwise about changes going on, I would simply say that it's fairly obvious that changes in the structure of government or in institutions charged with the primary responsibility for the development and implementation of foreign policy, presumably shouldn't take place in isolation from groups such as those sitting around here today. I assume you're all making an input; if you're not I'm very surprised but then I just got here from Australia but I would expect that at least a part of the discussion over the next few days would focus on the people part of the exercise. I think it's necessary and desirable that we take a conceptual approach to foreign policy; otherwise, you never do have a foreign policy. But if you don't focus on the question of how to achieve foreign policy, that is to say, the mechanisms and institutions but ultimately the people,

the role (let me raise a very controversial issue, the role of the Department of External Affairs, for example, whether we still need a professional foreign service or whether it's really outdated as some say and based on the concepts that pertained around the time of the Congress of Vienna - I don't think it's any secret but I don't share that view, but if we're going to change our structure in order to conform with that view, well you people ought to care, you ought to care a lot more than me, I'm getting on, I'm near the end of my career, I can survive, but if you want to create a foreign policy, then you better think about these things).

Thank you very much ...

Chairman: Thank you very much Mr. Ambassador, I'm sure that I've done what I was instructed not to do and allowed you to go way over your time because I know that that was the wish of those of us who listened to you with considerable interest. I believe there is coffee available now but if we want to have some discussion, I would ask you to perhaps bring your coffee back in, do what you will, if it's Irish coffee we'll have a good discussion. Thank you very kindly.