

nor able to take on the world's problems. Some believe the State should withdraw from many traditional areas and leave people alone to conduct their business. Some maintain that we are on the threshold of the "withering away of the State," and, in particular, of the State's demise as the main actor on the stage of international relations.

I do not believe the State's days are numbered. In the past the State adapted to new conditions and it can do so again. Western states met the challenge of legitimacy by extending the franchise, they met the challenge of social justice by creating a safety net of programs to help the disadvantaged. In international relations, the recent Israel-Jordan Peace Accord has shown us once again that the State can be remarkably flexible, particularly in times of crisis and change, and will undoubtedly continue to be so.

My optimism rests on the values held most strongly by Canadians and by people everywhere who insist that, at the end of the day, there is a place where responsibility lies: that place is the State. Whether the State consists of a federal or provincial government or, perhaps in the not-so-distant future, a European Union government, there must be a centre of responsibility and accountability if there is to be democracy. People cannot directly demand an accounting of bodies such as the UN; neither can they call on a non-governmental organization [NGO] or a multinational corporation to explain itself in Parliament. Democracy means that people are able to exert a measure of control over their lives through their representatives.

We have witnessed what can occur if people do not feel they have a government which is responsible and responsive to them in a meaningful way. In some societies, religious and ethnic fundamentalism has arisen because people feel powerless: one response has been to take up arms. In other societies, political withdrawal grows as people conclude that their participation "just doesn't matter."

In this new era, we have to manage the State and the instruments available to it to maximize the opportunities afforded by the changing international environment. We must "go with the flow," in a sense, but at the same time push the transnational currents in directions which will realize the benefits and objectives our people seek. A more subtle hand at the tiller than before does not mean, however, disengagement from international affairs. Only by active participation and positive results — necessary to maintain the state's credibility — will we be able to keep the support of our people and achieve measurable results.

The challenges of the 1990s are predominantly transnational, involving many players. Some problems are local, but have the potential for spill-over into neighbouring countries, such as the ethnic disputes in the former Soviet Union. Some are regional, such as the nuclear aspirations of North Korea, but are part of a global