

with "Castroist subversion", and to conclude that, the effectiveness of OAS being what it was, Ottawa had done well to keep its distance. The Toronto Globe and Mail, September 27, under the heading, "Not a club of equals", offered four criticisms of the OAS vote:

- a) it pushed weaker states dependent on U.S. aid, trade and investment into upholding Washington's self-proclaimed right to play the policeman in the hemisphere;
- b) it showed how dangerous it would be for Canada, if an OAS member, to be faced with the choice of publicly thwarting a policy held by the U.S. to be vital, or of giving up our own policy of divorcing trade from politics;
- c) it proceeded from a notion of "hemispheric solidarity" which substituted a spurious geographic closeness for more meaningful economic and political affinities; and
- d) it underlined the enduring sterility of the U.S. policies of containment, embargo, boycott, blacklisting into which membership of OAS "might fatally draw us".

The Globe and Mail declared that Canada could play no useful part until the United States decided to lead OAS in promoting democracy and economic and social reform. The paper spoke of "our future solidarity with Latin America, which we eagerly hope for", and