
	Editorial Information/Information rédactionnelle	2
<i>Eric Kierans</i>	Meech Lake or Else: Of course we can reject the agreement—but we still have to deal with the perennial question of centralism, to which it was the answer.	3
<i>The GATT:</i>		
1. <i>Habib Massoud</i>	A Dying Dinosaur: Regional trading blocs, able to embrace “controlled liberalism”, will soon replace the outmoded system.	7
2. <i>Harvey Filger</i>	A Damaging Principle: The “Most-Favoured Nation” approach sounds fine in theory, but works against Canadian interests.	9
<i>Myron J. Frankman</i>	A Planetary Vision: The old world organization, built around the nation state, will no longer do. If the world is to survive, we must create a new order.	11
<i>Richard C. Zuker</i>	An Environmental Measuring Stick: Everybody talks about the need to conserve resources. But how do we know how we’re doing? Here is a way to begin the task.	15
<i>Deborah Coyne</i>	Seven Fateful Challenges: We move into an era of bewildering changes, with leaders and institutions unable to cope. Something has to give.	18
<i>Morton Weinfeld</i>	The Politics of the Birth Rate: Baby bonus payments and decent day-care centres can be sold as transfer payments. They may not boost fertility rates or guarantee equal opportunity for women, but they can improve the welfare of children.	24
<i>David Kilgour</i>	The Outer Canadians: The first National Policy created stable, strong communities in Central Canada; a new National Policy must do the same thing for the rest of the country.	27
<i>Larry A. Swatuk</i>	Rearming Development: Canada should increase military assistance to Zimbabwe and other Frontline States.	30
<i>Andrew Petter</i>	When Rights Go Wrong: The American example proves that the “notwithstanding clause” in our Constitution is a necessary bulwark of Canadian rights.	33
<i>Reprise: Letters from Our Readers</i>		
<i>Michael Rushton</i>	Deficits and Debt: A Comment	34
<i>Finn Poschmann</i>	Lurking Wit or Strange Figuring?	36
<i>Patrick Fafard</i>	Another Country?	36
	En Résumé	37
	In Summary	39
CARTOONS: <i>Frampton 3, Jenkins 11, Todd 19, Raeside 27</i>		

CANADA IS POISED ON THE EVE OF THE final decade of the 20th century—a century in which the rapid pace of social, economic, and technological change is without historical parallel. Yet, our values and aspirations remain constant. This is reflected in our continuing commitments to respect human dignity, to promote basic rights and freedoms, to advance equality of opportunity, to share, to strengthen our sense of community, mutual responsibility and compassion for the less fortunate, to improve the quality of life and the environment for ourselves and future generations.

But what must and does change is how we maintain these values and pursue our aspirations in the new social context. In particular, we must ensure that the role of the state in representing and promoting the broader public interest changes enough to allow us to meet the challenges and opportunities we face both internationally and domestically. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

We now find ourselves with our political leadership and institutions totally unprepared to cope with the new challenges, whether social, economic or moral, and regarded with profound suspicion and cynicism by large numbers of Canadians. Immediate action is required to restore public confidence in our leaders and public institutions. Only if this is successful will we be able to take the steps necessary not only to ensure our physical survival and that of the planet, but also to prevent a serious and potentially irreversible degeneration in the moral fabric of contemporary society.

With particular reference to the deepening social malaise, we now face a number of urgent challenges. These include reviving our sense of community and social solidarity, reducing intergenerational tensions, giving meaning to life and respecting human dignity and self-worth, and eliminating unemployment and poverty. The public action required to overcome these challenges involves something very different from our traditional approaches to the role of the state and a very different type of leadership at all levels of society.

Reviving our sense of community and social solidarity requires something very different in the age of instantaneous communications, of televisions, videos and computers, and in which the family, church and schools play a much reduced role. Reducing intergenerational tensions requires something very different in a time of deficits, accelerating environmental degradation, an aging population and a substantial shift to single parent and two working-parent families. Giving meaning to life and respecting human dignity and self-worth requires something very different in our service-oriented, information-based society, which has given rise to both increased leisure time and increased numbers of mind-numbing, unfulfilling jobs, intensified economic uncertainty and an acute sense of vulnerability and powerlessness.

Eliminating unemployment requires something very different when the difficulty is ensuring access to education and training, and the distribution, as much as the creation, of work opportunities. Finally, eliminating poverty, hunger and homelessness requires something very different in a time when the focus is on our material self-interest, and when our collective commitment to assist the less fortunate and to narrow the gap in income and wealth between more affluent and poorer Canadians is seriously weakened.

It is time to demand much more of our political leaders. They are the animators of the state, elected to positions of public trust. We need them to articulate and pursue the broader public interest and be much more than mere brokers

SEVEN FATEFUL CHALLENGES

*We move into an era of bewildering changes,
with leaders and institutions unable to cope.
Something has to give.*

by Deborah Coyne

among special interests. We need them to be principled and genuinely committed to public service as opposed to the pragmatic pursuit of power. We need them to be forward-thinking and innovative rather than bogged down in old debates over civil and political rights as illustrated by the Meech Lake constitutional stalemate. We need them to inspire the equally essential leadership required at all levels and in all sectors of society, notably, the community and business. The purpose of this paper is to set out some of the specific challenges which they must undertake in order to merit our support and confidence in the crucial years ahead.

The first challenge facing our political leaders is once more to articulate and foster the realization of our collective goals and dreams. According to philosopher Michael Ignatieff:

“We need to project a collective image of a society which is great, not because of a strong defence and booming private economy, but because it has really good schools, it really invests in universities, science, etc. A society that proves that it cares about citizens by the quality of its public service. [In this connection] it is the symbolic dimension that is important; for example, these services can be provided with private capital or in a private-public partnership. But the government is always there to correct the unfair distribution of social outcomes by markets, to define the arena, the rules, to make the rules . . .”

We must also develop a new social ethos and encourage a new sense of social solidarity in the context of contemporary

society. This means strengthening our moral commitment to the values of compassion, social justice and mutual responsibility and promoting a greater appreciation of the advantages of sharing and the value of community spirit. For this sense of community, of "belonging", is increasingly essential in our fast-paced, bewildering electronic age. It is essential to the quality of life, to give meaning to life.

To pursue this vision of society, however, requires a new language of political discourse and places a serious obligation on those in public life to convince the securely affluent in society that they have a direct moral, and not merely material, stake in, for example, eliminating poverty and unemployment, and in narrowing income disparities among Canadians. Only in this way can we make meaningful progress towards greater social justice.

Our political leaders must also recognize that the traditional welfare state structure and approach no longer work and indeed now impede social and economic progress. As Michael Ignatieff describes in his brilliant book *The Needs of Strangers*, while the state has certainly made great advances in meeting the basic material needs of the less affluent, the administration by the welfare state has not met our needs for social solidarity.


The public debate must now produce a new vision of Canada that focuses on the dignity, worth and advancement of the individual, not simply on the satisfaction of basic material needs. The vision must better balance the liberal, individualist emphasis on maximizing personal freedom and self-interest with the need for greater social solidarity. In other words, as Ignatieff argues, we must actively seek to change the "society of strangers", of "us" and "them", that has resulted from the evolution to date of the welfare state. The complicated bureaucratized transfer of income among strangers, from the affluent to the welfare dependants, has increasingly attenuated the already fragile basis for a shared sense of moral community. It has permitted us to isolate ourselves from those we purport to help and to allow the poor "to slip into voiceless anonymity".

Creating a new sense of "fraternité" and community spirit requires public action in a variety of different areas and in a variety of different forms. Take, for example, the area of "family policies". It is no longer good enough simply to talk about and promote specific legislative programs such as child care and parental leave, however important they may be.

Rather, our leaders must emphasize their role in encouraging and creating incentives for people to define their own needs and find their own solutions, and in then using public action to support these choices. Our leaders must talk about the basic values that would strengthen the family life and recognize that the most effective deployment of the resources of that state is to support appropriate community infrastructure at the micro level, volunteer organizations etc. that are self-directed and independent of "the state" in the traditional sense. For example, support could be given to innovative initiatives such as combining child-care centres with senior citizens' homes, which help to create links across generations in the absence of the traditional family bonds.

The same reorientation of political leadership and the role of the state applies across the whole range of social challenges we now face, notably, drug abuse, the Acquired-Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), illiteracy, homelessness and child poverty.

With respect to drug abuse, for example, we must recognize that those who are caught up in the web of drug



trafficking and drug abuse generally suffer from family fragmentation and limited economic solidarity with fellow workers who are carrying part-time, unstable, low-paying and, above all, meaningless monotonous jobs.

The "solution" to the drug abuse problem is not to increase law enforcement and treat drug abuse as primarily a criminal matter. The long-term remedy involves the expansion of opportunities for meaningful work together with the restoration of cultural and family solidarity, of the ethos of personal responsibility, and of the moral authority within the community. As a special report of *New Perspectives Quarterly* (Summer 1989) persuasively argues, this can only be accomplished by authentic indigenous means through programs such as addict rehabilitation, community patrols etc., continued education against abuse in the schools and outreach groups, such as voluntary and religious organizations like the church or The Nation of Islam. What is required, therefore, is a "drug containment approach" rather than a law enforcement approach, in which criminal law sanctions are focused on drug use that poses a demonstrable danger to others and on "swift non-parole prosecution of large scale traffickers".

Drug abuse is far less prevalent among immigrant groups which maintain a sense of community and collective self-awareness. Studies clearly indicate that ethnic solidarity and kinship networks are critically important to fostering social mobility through self-employment and providing the all-important sense of security and mutual support and responsibility that is lacking among the population most affected by drug abuse.

We should recognize that these kinds of community networks must be fostered if we are to deal effectively with other challenges such as AIDS and illiteracy. This is because it is essential to have some means of reaching down through

Cartoon: Todd

society and helping those in need, something that no state apparatus, however well-meaning, can accomplish. The role of the state, then, is to implement the necessary framework policies and standards, and to ensure that these networks have access to sufficient resources to deliver appropriate services.

A second related challenge for our political leaders is to appeal to our sense of altruism. In this connection, the evidence still strongly supports the accuracy of the commentary about the hedonistic baby boomers, their me-first attitudes, and apparent overriding focus on the acquisition of tangible wealth and "the art of higher shopping" described so well in books like Lewis Lapham's *Money and Class in America*. And there will likely be a steady continuation of the now 10 year "cocooning movement" in which many people seek isolation from the problem of economic and social uncertainty by reducing social contact and retreating into a world of videos and Sony Walkmans.

Yet there is much room for optimism. One hundred and fifty years ago, De Toqueville predicted that "the time will come when men are carried away and lose all self-restraint at the sight of the new possessions they are about to obtain. In their intense and exclusive anxiety to make a fortune, they lose sight of the close connection that exists between the private fortune of each and the prosperity of all."

But ultimately, as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. points out, we grow "bored with selfish motives and weary of materialism as the ultimate goal". Problems become acute, intolerable and threaten to become unmanageable. We once again turn to collective public action to advance our democratic ideals and to overcome domestic challenges.

During the 1988 American election, Flora Lewis highlighted this latent altruism, this search for greater meaning and purpose to life, in an analysis of Jesse Jackson's appeal. In her view, Jackson "is demonstrating again the recurrent hunger of society for some sense of ideal, for making effort beyond mere personal enhancement and greed... What Mr. Jackson offers isn't feasible, but he shows that while people want competence and reasonable solutions, they also want something to stir and justify their energy".

But to appeal to our altruism and, more generally, to revive confidence in the potential of public action, we must recognize the danger presented by the emergence of a "cost accounting mentality" toward government. As Michael Ignatieff perceptively points out, the nuts and bolts of our society is taxation.

"My taxes go to help people I don't know; their taxes go to help me and they don't know me... What's come apart is people's willingness to pay the way for strangers... If I start to think whether I get value for money out of the civic bargain entirely on my own terms—logic will lead me to want to opt out eventually because, in fact, I pay for weapons systems, schools, etc., that I don't want."

Of course we expect our leaders to be at all times fiscally responsible. But the governments they lead are not private businesses and the pursuit of the public interest cannot be dominated by concern for the bottom line. Instead, our leaders must foster a new sense of public obligation and of confidence in public action, and then ensure that all policies are guided by an overriding concern for equity in all its dimensions: horizontal equity among similarly situated Canadians; vertical equity and the need to narrow the income gap between more affluent and poorer Canadians; and generational equity to ensure consideration of the quality of life of future Canadians. Most importantly, all policies should be both formulated and implemented in an open accountable way that maximizes the meaningful involvement of Canadians.

A third challenge facing our political leaders is to recognize that the issues today and the solutions to them do not fit into the old left-right analytical framework. To overcome global and domestic crises now requires collaboration and cooperation on an unprecedented scale at all levels—community, business, national, global, the cultivation of new ethics and sense of mutual responsibility, and a shift away from our traditionally confrontational political style. In this connection, Gwynne Dyer notes the usefulness of the Brundtland Report's concept of "sustainable development and growth" as a "business-friendly ideology" but capable as well of uniting many of the progressive social movements of the 1980s. The emergence of the Green parties in Europe is the most obvious manifestation of the increasing political power of this new coalition. In a similar way, Dyer notes that the philosophy of "common security" first enunciated in the landmark Palme Commission report in 1982 is resulting in hitherto unknown links between professional soldiers and the European peace movement.

The "soft-ideology", of course, has its detractors. French commentator Jean François Hugyhe argues that "la disparition des grands clivages droite-gauche serait la marque d'une société figée, préférant désormais faire semblant de s'entendre... C'est le temps des idées molles."

In a similar vein, Quebec commentator Lise Bissonnette writes: "C'est la guimauve comme projet de société... Le vocabulaire de l'heure a le préfixe niais: consensus, consultation, concertation, communauté, convergence. On juge l'Accord du Lac Meech et celui de libre-échange à leur climat convivial plutôt qu'au texte, on colloque plus que jamais à l'école et à l'université, on échange aimablement aux lignes ouvertes, on a le droit de parole."

And finally, the venerable *Economist* magazine encourages us to "embrace crunchiness": "A crunchy policy is not necessarily right, only more certain than a soggy one to deliver the results that it deserves... Sogginess is comfortable uncertainty. Societies are strongest when people are clear where they stand."

The most articulate response to such criticisms is best captured in the following passionate riposte by Denis

A WORD ABOUT DISKS

If you have written an article for submission to *Policy Options* on a word-processor, please send in a copy of the disk on which it was written, which will be returned to you.

This will save us type-setting time, and reduce the possibility of errors made in transcription.

Please indicate both the word-processing system used and the software. We use an IBM-compatible system and WordPerfect 5.0, but we can easily convert your disk as long as we know how it was originally processed. Thank you.

Walter Stewart, Editor *Policy Options*

Guindon to Lise Bissonnette:

"Si nous sommes de plus en plus 'soft' c'est peut-être parce qu'à droite comme à gauche, aux États-Unis comme en Russie, on constate que les idéologies n'ont rien réglé au sort de l'humanité. . . . Si être 'soft' signifie la mort de la droite et de la gauche au profit de solutions visant une plus grande qualité de vie, je dis 'Vive la soft idéologie et bof pour le reste!' Si être 'soft' signifie être capable de discuter entre personnes de toutes tendances politiques des solutions aux problèmes de l'heure plutôt que de palabrer sur la minceur ou la largeur de l'État, je ne crains pas du tout la fin des idéologies."

Guindon's reply reflects the general, even universal, trend towards emphasizing concrete problem-solving and meaningful co-operation to deal with most of the critical issues of the day, not only within western societies but also within the so-called communist world. This convergence with respect to both the definition of and approach to the threats to contemporary society, notably, environmental degradation, human rights abuse, the arms race, AIDS, drugs, child poverty, homelessness and illiteracy, will greatly facilitate the collective global action that must run parallel to the necessary public action at the domestic level.

A fourth challenge for our political leaders is to adapt better to the electronic, technology-driven environment. In particular, they must accommodate the impact of the overwhelming presence of television on our perception of the world around us and our understanding of public affairs.

There can be no doubt that society has been irreversibly altered by the advent of television. Its impact extends from family relationships and the raising of children, to the educational system, arts and culture, etc.

Neil Postman is perhaps the leading exponent of the dangers of television, since publication of his landmark book *Amusing Ourselves To Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. He warns that television is bringing ruin to any intelligent understanding of public affairs and is leading to the trivialization of public discourse.

"Television limits freedom of expression and choice because its only criterion of merit and significance is popularity. To compete with entertainment programs, news and public-affairs programs will become more visual and more personality oriented."

This need for news "to entertain" is illustrated by the trend toward docu-dramas and away from documented news film.

Equally serious, according to Postman, "the television culture obliterates the distinction between the child and the adult. T.V. amplifies the present out of all proportion and transfers the childish need for immediate gratification into a way of life. We end up with Christopher Lasch's 'culture of narcissism' — no future, no children and everyone fixed at an age somewhere between 20 and 30."

The critical danger for political life is that this brings with it less emphasis on issues and substance, an increase in the importance of image, style, and public opinion polls, and much less concern for long-range policies.

Another commentator, journalist George Galt, describes this problem more precisely. In his view "television denudes stories of their historical context and zooms us around the world from one trouble spot to another without taking the time to explain the immensely complex social and political realities that loom behind this hijacking or that explosion. . . .

We grow "bored with selfish motives, and weary of materialism as the ultimate goal."

Watching the news we come to feel, not only that the world is blowing up but that it does so for no reason, that its ongoing history is nothing more than a series of eruptions, each without cause or context. . . . Everything begins to seem the work of chance . . . and the news itself, while fostering this impression, at the same time purports to comprehend the chaos. And so we have the correspondent solemnly nattering among the ruins, offering crude 'analysis' and 'background' as if to compensate us for the deep bewilderment that his medium created in the first place."

The impact of television also feeds into the newspaper and magazine industry. In order to compete with T.V., they must become more "televisual", as consultant Céline Thérien puts it, "comme *le Journal de Montréal* qui présente l'information sous forme de petites capsules rapidement assimilables au détriment du développement analytique".

Despite the foregoing critical analysis, however, television has the capacity to make us better informed and more sophisticated in our approach to public affairs and, according to observers like Michael Ignatieff, even now we are becoming more careful about filtering information we receive through television.

Educators, too, are optimistic. According to Céline Thérien, "Il n'est pas la télévision en soi qu'il faut condamner mais l'utilisation qu'il en est faite. Les étudiants éprouvent des difficultés à développer leur point de vue car la télévision leur présente les faits isolés, éphémères, sans racines. L'univers est pour eux sans continuité".

Thus when we speak of the need to ensure that our children are literate, we should no longer focus solely on the classical sense of being able to read and write. Of course classical literacy is essential to our ability to think, form ideas, hope and imagine. But we must also focus on adequate televisual literacy so that children can choose sensibly from the over 50 channels that may be available, develop sufficiently critical perspectives, and take full advantage of the soon-to-arrive revolution in interactive television.

All this demonstrates how irreversibly the electronic information age has changed not only national but international society, especially given the potential for intercultural communications and greater understanding and dialogue within and across national boundaries.

Thus we must simply make much greater effort to adapt to the new environment, make creative use of the new media of communication and minimize the negative aspects as we have done in respect of similar phenomena in the past. At the very least, this means ensuring high quality public broadcasting

We need to look at long-term investments in public spending, not merely daily cash-flows.

and appropriate regulations to provide an adequate counterbalance to the commercially-driven private television networks. And with specific reference to public affairs, the recent inauguration of CBC Newsworld is a welcome initiative.

Afifth challenge facing our leaders is to minimize intergenerational tensions and to articulate and pursue public policies within a longer-term framework. Among other things, this requires that all public action recognize and accommodate both the current needs of the younger generation as well as the needs of future generations.

For example, Michael Harrington warns that the welfare state has created a new division among workers that cuts across the well-recognized ones of skill, gender, religion and so forth. Older and younger persons are potentially placed in antagonistic positions as a greater and greater proportion of state social expenditures are devoted to the care of the aging, while a shrinking younger generation is responsible for the financing.

To understand the implications of this new division, we must understand the pressures facing younger Canadians. For example, projections indicate that the current generation of Canadian children will be the first in this century that cannot reasonably expect a better life-style than their parents. At the same time, given the changed family environment, notably, the greatly increased incidence of single parent families, marital breakdown, two working parents, this new generation has necessarily matured and developed a strong degree of self-reliance at an earlier age than their baby-boom parents. But they are likely to find it very difficult to fulfil their aspirations in a society which places a high value on tangible rewards and in which the television and other media tell them that one must become a doctor or lawyer to truly succeed, while the real employment growth is in the lower-paying, service sector jobs.

We also know, however, that despite its immersion in a consumer culture this generation also values highly a sense of community spirit, albeit in a "modern sense". Teen gangs, for example, are generally a benign social phenomenon and have been a characteristic of every generation. Teenagers are seeking community in the absence of the traditional loci of "belonging"—the family, the church, the schools. As one observer notes: It is perhaps natural that, given our consumer addiction, the shopping malls became the community centres of the 1980s.

What we require of our political leaders now is to be sensitive to these new trends and concerns of the younger generation. They must, as Michael Ignatieff advises, develop a new language of "belonging" that will embrace what is good about modern life and they must articulate and encourage innovative ways to strengthen community spirit and a sense, however fleeting, of social solidarity particularly in our fast-paced, urban centres.

Above all, our leaders must adopt a longer-term perspective and ensure that the intergenerational impact of all proposed public and indeed private policies is weighed and accounted for before their implementation. For example, we must analyze public expenditures in a much more discriminating way so as to recognize that many of the services provided by governments are indispensable to society, and indeed to the private sector, and contribute to society's productivity for many years.

In this connection, it has been suggested that we need to develop a capital budget for the public sector that will account for capital expenditures such as long-term investments in public health and education, pollution controls and community infrastructure. At present, our outdated system of public accounts operates on a cash-flow basis and treats such expenditures effectively as current expenses. New accountancy approaches would permit a much more meaningful discussion of the concept of a balanced budget, and consideration of which expenditures contribute to economic growth and productivity and provide a net social benefit.

In addition, when establishing any new programs and initiatives, we must ensure adequate current funding in order to prevent us from passing on an unsustainable financial burden to future generations of Canadian workers. More generally, we must strengthen the reciprocal obligations between generations and ensure that the large baby boom generation that is entering middle age, recognizes its responsibility to moderate consumption and channels enough income into such long-term investments as education, training, public infrastructure and the environment.

Another, more specific, example of the urgent need to account for intergenerational impacts involves wage settlements, particularly in the context of long overdue pay-equity adjustments. The nurses' strikes in both Quebec and British Columbia in 1989 provide good illustrations of how public pressure is finally leading to recognition of the value of the nursing profession, something that will continue to increase in the coming years with the aging population and rising health care expenditures.

Yet, as journalist Jean Francoeur points out, the current imbalance in favour of the baby-boomers in the profession means that any settlement will increase the wages for the older workers more than for the younger ones. Clearly this does not go far enough to ensure the critical attractiveness of the nursing profession for the younger generation—the nurses of tomorrow who will be desperately needed to care for the older baby boomers. In Francoeur's view, this is a blatant example of "mauvais arbitrage intergénérationnel; une nouvelle manifestation de l'égoïsme collectif des enfants du 'baby boom'."

Asixth challenge for our political leaders is to recognize that the real threat to our survival as "civil societies", as political scientist Ralf Dahrendorf puts it, is the emergence of a group of persistently unemployed persons. More specifically, despite a sustained period of economic growth in the

1980s, little progress has been made towards reducing the high levels of unemployment. Indeed, economic growth has become dissociated from employment and, to a large extent, has been built on unemployment as firms "downsize" to increase productivity.

The result of this "jobless growth" combined with an inexorable shift towards a service-oriented economy and low paying part-time jobs is a situation of precarious, intermittent and often unfulfilling employment for many Canadians, and increasing disparities in income and wealth. Moreover, technological advances and investment patterns seem to be creating a "technonobility", with the information and skills to control new production processes, and "technopeasants", whose lives are moulded and directed by them.

The critical challenge now is to recognize that an essential component of respect for human dignity and self-worth is ensuring that all people have the opportunity for meaningful work. Among other things, this requires public policies to ensure a fair distribution of work opportunities and to eliminate jobs that involve "de-skilling" such as the deadening, monotonous monitoring of a computer screen, while encouraging those jobs that require "re-skilling", retraining and education. It also requires meaningful reform such as to the unemployment insurance system that will reduce (not exacerbate as does the current federal government's reforms) the sense of economic uncertainty and vulnerability as people of necessity shift jobs and careers more and more frequently.

Meanwhile, the crucial fact to note about the growing ranks of the unemployed is that they have no stake in society. Dahrendorf argues that in a very real sense society does not need them, and Michael Harrington warns against the sophisticated capitalist option which could well take the form of providing custodial care for large numbers of people who are already marginalized and for the many more who will quite likely follow them.

Yet a society which appears to accept the existence of a group which has no real stake in it has put itself in jeopardy since, ultimately, tyranny will emerge under the guise of the law and order needed to prevent breaches of cultural norms. This is already evident in the misguided attempts to approach the drug abuse problem primarily through the enforcement of criminal law sanctions, rather than focussing on the underlying reasons giving rise to the widespread resort to destructive addictive drug habits in the first place.

A final challenge that faces our political leaders is to provide firm moral leadership, especially as government inevitably becomes involved more and more in adjudicating matters of values. This is illustrated by the increasing need for public action in areas such as employment and pay equity, conflict of interest guidelines, codes of ethics, particularly in respect of corporate and financial activities, etc.

But the recent immoderate abortion debate, for example, demonstrates all too clearly the extent to which our political leaders have not adapted to this need for moral leadership. If we cannot deal civilly and constructively with the issue of abortion, how on earth will we deal with the even more challenging socio-biological issues of controlling genetic engineering and reproductive technology? And will we ever succeed in developing what Alvin Toffler calls a "national biopolicy" that is urgently required to guide the efforts of the diverse researchers who are even now effectively in a position to redefine "humanness"?

There is a clear desire in society to re-examine the very basis of our moral community.

Conclusion

The foregoing has set out a perhaps daunting, yet absolutely critical, set of challenges for our aspiring political leaders that involve a profound reorientation of the role of the state and public action. In the meantime, it is fortunate that, despite the current lack of political leadership and the ineffective use of state powers, society is changing. For example, the concern over the decline in our moral values and the immoderate pursuit of self-interest is eloquently expressed by our authors, song-writers and filmmakers who typically identify underlying social trends well in advance of our politicians. The recent popularity of movies such as Denys Arcand's *Jésus de Montréal* and of novels like John Irving's *A Prayer for Owen Meany*, indicate the interest in re-examining the very basis of our moral community and values such as friendship, co-operation and compassion.

Philosopher Susan Sontag notes perceptively on an optimistic note in her book *AIDS and Its Metaphors*, that the social response to AIDS has been more than a mere reaction to danger. It has expressed a positive desire, the desire for stricter limits in the conduct of our personal lives as more and more people are drawn to programs of self-management, self-discipline with respect to diets, exercise and so forth.

But forward-looking leadership and public action are required to complement and supplement such social responses. This is the only way to strengthen in a durable way the moral fabric of society. This is the only way to promote our distinctive values and aspirations while confronting the reality of new social, economic and technological elements of society. Finally, this is the only way to make real progress towards our ideals of greater social justice, liberty and equality and to build a better world for future generations. □

Deborah Coyne is a member of the *Policy Options* Editorial Advisory Board. Educated at Queen's, Osgoode Hall Law School and Oxford, she has practised and taught law in Toronto, and now lives in St. John's, Newfoundland.