would be room for the Third World objectives of independence and self-determination.

Second, we do not believe forms of government or economic systems are matters to be imposed from outside. Obviously, we will seek to explain to Third World countries why we believe as deeply as we do in free and representative institutions; but their social, economic and cultural circumstances are totally different from ours. The example of the success of our societies will of itself be the most convincing argument we can present. But short of international consensus, as in the case of Iran, or the Soviet Union over Afghanistan, or Rhodesia, we will not impede trade flows to reflect our view of their choice. In extreme cases, trade-facilitation measures may be diminished, as was the case with a developed country, South Africa, in 1977. But we have not traditionally cut off aid relations, directed as they are towards improving the standard of living of people, when governments adopt positions we do not favour.

The third principle is that we expect that governments of all countries will be vigilant in the observance of their first and fundamental obligation — to their own people. Gross violations of human rights are and must be a source of concern and action on the part of the international community. However, when considering the appropriate response, I favour action which is effective and which stands a real chance of influencing the government in question. I oppose hollow gestures and the withdrawal of mechanisms which benefit Canadians, withdrawals which will not change the minds or the practices of the offending government. Especially in cases where the momentum for democracy and human rights of the foreign government is in a progressive rather than a retrogressive direction, we must try to use private counselling and positive reinforcement rather than strident public denunciations.

Fourth, we believe that it would be inappropriate for our foreign policy to reward adventurism and interference. Countries of the Third World face desperate and formidable challenges. It is for this reason that we have withdrawn aid programs from those countries whose scarce resources are diverted to war and conquest.

These four principles may set us apart from some other developed countries, but that does not mean we cannot work with them. We will examine, for example, the invitation of the United States and Mexico to work together to promote economic development in the Caribbean and the Central America region. For our part, this task is well in hand in the Commonwealth Caribbean, and we expect that our major emphasis will continue to be on these islands.

We may well not endorse all of the foreign policy imperatives of the American – or indeed of the Mexican – government, in promoting this initiative, but we can, I am confident, find common cause in the overriding need to develop the region and therefore find ways of reconciling our differing objectives. National motivations need not be identical for a common plan of action to be established.

For too long there has been a tendency to consider Latin America and the Caribbean as a single area, ignoring the fact that it is an area made up of 39 independent countries, dependent colonies and territories where the languages spoken are English, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch, in which at least 20 have enjoyed political