

the presumed popular sympathies evoked wherever those pictures are seen. The Government's application of pepper spray in Vancouver greatly intensified TV coverage of that people's summit, to the pleasure of the organizers if not the victims.

On balance, it is likely that the collaborative impulse among Canadian NGOs will prevail over confrontation—but only if the department and its ministers extend encouragement. Canadians who attended Vancouver or Santiago events report their own impression that they, more than nationals of any other country except possibly the United States, were willing to meet the government delegation and work co-operatively on policy. Even deeply skeptical critics of Canadian policy accept the legitimacy of collaborative attempts alongside the antagonistic tactics of protest.

Advancing the cause of consultation requires, among other things, far better feedback and follow-up by DFAIT than it has provided since the Vancouver or Santiago summits. All the NGO people approached in this study, and several of the officials, volunteered that departmental follow-up with interested NGOs has been scant and unsatisfactory. Even those groups most eager to work with the department have felt left in the dark as to their effect on policy, if any, or their potential role in implementation. This is causing disillusionment, if not downright resentment, among people who might have thought of themselves (in optimistic moments) as DFAIT's partners in a good cause.

Recommendation: Integral to every exercise in public consultation ought to be formal procedures of follow-up, implementation and evaluation by DFAIT and its citizen-partners. That is the time to address questions of what worked and what didn't, and for the department to reassure participants that consultation—whatever the outcome—has not been a charade.