

Finally, we take a third approach. If one considers Table 3.0, which combines all developing countries' commitment to sustainable development with the Canadian interests and values cluster, the list of priority countries would change as follows:

<u>AMERICAS</u>	<u>ASIA</u>	<u>AFRICA</u>	<u>EUROPE</u>
Mexico	Indonesia	Egypt	
Brazil	China	Botswana	
Colombia	Malaysia	Madagascar	
Uruguay	Thailand	Ghana	
Jamaica	India		
Chile	Philippines		
Venezuela			
Trinidad and Tobago			
Honduras			
Bolivia			

Only Bolivia, Honduras and Ghana appear on all three lists.

5. Issues for Discussion

One must be cautious about drawing conclusions about specific countries on the basis of a statistical snapshot which is, in some cases, several years old. Neither recent advances nor recent retreats in implementing sound policies are reflected here. Moreover, the statistical snapshot presented in this paper is sensitive to the particular indicators chosen, the weight attached to each and the way in which indicators are combined within and between clusters.

Nevertheless, the results highlight a number of issues which merit further analysis and discussion in the foreign policy and development communities and among the wider public:

- To what degree do the assumptions underlying the Paper and each of the different approaches draw support?
- To what extent is there is a trade-off between support to governments most committed to sustainable development and support to governments of the least developed countries? How should this trade-off be resolved? Is greater attention to conditionality (performance criteria) in Canada's bilateral assistance programs the answer? Should less bilateral assistance and more non-governmental and multilateral assistance be devoted to countries whose governments are performing poorly?