

international institutions and negotiating forums. These must be maintained, and strengthened where necessary.

Third -- this is the conclusion -- the concept of national "role" has to emerge from a critical analysis of what is needed to make this international system work, and a pragmatic examination of national vocations. It doesn't emerge from any abstract or wishful notion of what a nation might like to be seen to do, or what it once did.

What does this mean for Canada? It means that we, like others, have to start with an accurate sense of our own interests, capacities and problems -- but above all our interests -- as we look at the world. I want to suggest to you strongly that there is no contradiction between doing well in the world and doing good in the world. If we're not doing well economically we'll be more likely to retreat into protectionism and insularity, more likely to lose the resources necessary to make a positive contribution to development and to peacekeeping, and to famine and refugees, and more likely to lose the inclination to play a positive international role, as we grow more preoccupied with economic problems at home. There is an obvious connection between sane domestic policies and a sane international system. Policy coherence is as much an international, as a domestic concern for an open country like Canada.

To really appreciate the nature of Canadian interests, in their present configuration, is going to involve a rather painful reappraisal. The Green Paper that initiated the current International Relations Review began this process with a little reality therapy on current facts of Canadian life. I wanted it to emphasize our critical dependence on foreign -- particularly US -- markets for our prosperity; our declining share of world trade and sagging competitiveness, the importance of our getting serious about structural adjustment; the evolving security challenge facing our country. The key message I wanted conveyed through the Green Paper was simply this: we have to do better. The status quo won't work.

Doing better means involving Canadians in the international issues that bear on their competitiveness and security. It means provoking their interest and listening to their concerns. Parliament's Special Joint Committee is doing a good job of that now, in hearings across the country.

And there will be other Parliamentary initiatives. In ten months in this portfolio, I have used Parliamentary statements on motions, allowing debate and questions on five occasions so far. The former government did not once in five years use this mechanism to allow for wider House of Commons discussion. We invited Committee debate on the North Warning System before we proceeded, in contrast to the