

"social" agenda, including core labour rights agenda - as a mere, and inconvenient, political price to be paid in order to secure the necessary political backing for the ongoing project of globalization. This is still the shallow, segregated view. On the integrated view there is no segregation between the social and the economic. Rather than a set of luxury goods that can be purchased with the fruits of sound economic policy, human rights, democracy, the rule of law, social stability, human capital, social capital are simultaneously, the necessary preconditions for sustainable economic progress and constitutive of it. This is the most basic policy lesson identified in this study.

Our review of the debate about international labour standards confirms the importance of all three of these dimensions of policy coherence. Policy incoherence generates, legitimately, allegations of at least, inconsistency and probably hypocrisy which are fundamentally debilitating and which fuel anti-globalization sentiment. So, for example, the discrepancy between Canada's rhetoric and its ratification rate concerning ILO core Conventions needs to be addressed. So too, any discordance between Canada's approach within the ILO on the core labour rights agenda (where Canada has played the leading role, for example, in the creation of the ILO Declaration on Core Labour Rights) and within, for example, the World Bank or WTO would be damaging. The Bank's reluctance or inability to deal with the freedom of association and collective bargaining, generates an unacceptable degree of international policy and coherence. These sorts of possible policy inconsistency, and there are surely many others that could be noted, engender and fuel opposition to the project of economic integration. But it is the imbalance created by the incoherence of the non-integrated approach which is the most critical cost because it is poor policy and is widely identified as such by critics of globalization.

As we have repeatedly noted, the project of integrating the labour rights agenda into a coherent approach to constructing just enduring societies and economies is bound to be difficult. The history of labour law, Departments of Labour, the ILO, and regional trading arrangements concerning labour is one of marginalization. Domestic and international policy thinking has, and to some extent still does, adhere to the view that labour rights are purely redistributive, a cost and not part of the "real" policy action of creating wealth in the first place, which lies elsewhere in domestic Departments of Trade, Finance, and internationally at the WTO, etc. This is a deeply entrenched view. One should not be too optimistic of our ability to overcome it in the short term. Nonetheless that is the key and overarching policy goal.

This requirement for a consistent and coherent articulation of an integrated view carries with it the implication of two further dimensions of sound approach - the need to take the long view and the need for a non-unilateral approach. If we accept the integrated and "coherent" view of the relationship between core labour rights and successful societies and economies, then it is obvious that attacking core labour rights in isolation is unhelpful. Rather, addressing systemic violations of core labour rights abroad must be part of a larger project of development which requires a co-ordinated, systemic, and participatory approach to constructing societies and economies. This requires a long and a broad view. Attempts to isolate core labour standards violations and to punish for them, in a search for a "quick fix", is likely to be misguided. (I