

is good, or appears to look good, in the future.

Finally, in terms of these possible roles for the Commonwealth, it seems to me also that the Commonwealth is of enormous value in terms of what has come to be called the North-South dialogue. That here once again, uniquely in terms of all of those world forums to which I made reference earlier, the Commonwealth marries both the developed world and the developing world. It is the one place where there come together in a single organization countries such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, highly developed, with a great technological achievement to their record and a whole range of other benefits and experiences. It marries them and brings them together with some of the least-developed countries in the world and, for example, at a heads-of-government meeting of the Commonwealth, you have, as equals at the table, leaders from some of the most successful countries of the world industrially and some of those that have the farthest distance to go. And in that common experience and around that common table a great deal can be done in the absence of tensions and the like that is almost impossible to achieve in any other forum, and so I put the greatest possible weight on the Commonwealth and its organizations dealing in the whole question of what used to be called "foreign aid"; but what we are speaking of here really is in the sense of Commonwealth aid and then broadening it out into the North-South dialogue generally.

Here, once again, I believe that we have the chance to demonstrate by example that the techniques that we devise among ourselves are effective and are workable and therefore there are more people in other countries who are likely to emulate them. We, in Canada, for example sometimes wonder — and I do personally — whether our attitude towards foreign aid, in which perhaps to a greater extent than most countries we move on the basis of "no strings attached", no ideological commitments, we sometimes wonder if we are not perhaps being somewhat naive in this regard. But the fact of the matter is that by doing this, by saying that assistance to developing countries is something separate and apart from our wish to see them move in a particular democratic direction or whatever the case may be, we gain more respect from those countries and therefore legitimate influence on our part is more readily received. They are more open, when it comes to an issue that is of concern to us, to respect and to support our point of view, because (to put it crudely again) we have not sought to "ram it down their throats". And so, in this foreign-aid field in particular, I want to give every possible encouragement to the Commonwealth associations and, of course, particularly to the central office, which is organizing these efforts here in London.

There is so much more that I could say on specifics, but in many respects I fear that I am speaking to the converted and I know from experience that many of you are wiser in these matters than I am.

But let me end, as I began, by reverting to my concern about the proliferation of organizations and about the dangers that the Commonwealth can be caught in some kind of squeeze which will destroy its usefulness or, if not destroy it, then certainly dilute it significantly.