

objectives simultaneously, in ways that will satisfy every Canadian or every Canadian interest. Throughout the discussion we will ask: What compromises have to be made among Canadian objectives? Can we reconcile colliding interests and values?

Before we begin, we will have to agree on the map to use. The geography of Asia-Pacific is defined as much by history and interest as by latitude and longitude. (For example, APEC's 18 members include Canada, the United States, Mexico and Chile, but exclude Russia despite its Pacific coastline.) If only to focus the discussion, we take Asia-Pacific to mean all the Asian countries on the Pacific from Russia south, all the islands and island states of the Western Pacific, and New Zealand and Australia; we refer as well to Southeast Asia west to Burma, because increasingly these countries locate themselves as Asia-Pacific neighbours.

The Questions in Context: Economics and Security

Canadian trade ministers (as they are paid to do) zealously beat the drum for business. "The Asia-Pacific region is a giant that has stirred," is how one minister put it recently. "Listen to the statistics: by the year 2000, the region will account for 60 per cent of the world's population, 50 per cent of the world's GDP and 40 per cent of global consumption. By 2020, seven of the top 10 economies in the world will be in Asia-Pacific. . . . No company and certainly no nation can afford to absent themselves from this great new economic powerhouse." Since 1983, in fact, Canada has done more two-way trade across the Pacific every year than across the Atlantic. After the United States, five of Canada's next 10 biggest trade partners are Asian (Japan, China, South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan).

That is not to say, however, that Canadians own any inevitable share of the booming Asia-Pacific market for trade and investment. In truth, although two-way Canadian trade with the region has been growing, Canada's trade with Asia-Pacific was actually lower in 1996 than in 1989 as a percentage of Canada's total trade with the world. Moreover, Canada's share of the Asia-Pacific market has also declined. These two facts--expanding market, declining Canadian share--help explain the intensity of the "Team Canada" trade-promotion campaigns led by the prime minister; they also give some hint of the dilemmas when the pursuit of "prosperity" conflicts with other Canadian objectives. Promoting trade may not always coincide effortlessly with the promotion of human rights, or with encouraging an orderly regional peace.

Nor is peace in the Pacific all that secure. As the government's 1995 white paper pointed out, "there are serious security challenges in the region including unresolved border disputes, human rights abuses, an increase in weapons acquisitions, ecological degradation, population growth, and narcotics trafficking." By way of examples, think of Hong Kong's uncertain future; the unstable division of the two Koreas; jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea; the contested future of Taiwan; and environmental conflicts over cross-border pollution and fisheries. Among the big powers there is an impression of "a hardening of attitudes," as one study expressed it, in Japan, China and the United States. The U.S. strategic presence in the Western Pacific remains oddly ambiguous, and at the other edge of Asia-Pacific is India. Economic growth, the great