

You are promoting these conditions in China today.

Non-use of force

I have referred a number of times to sovereignty, equality and non-interference. These are the foundation stones of international law. Their obvious corollary is the non-use of force in international relations. Thus, if we are truly attached to the rule of law, we are obliged to condemn the Soviet Union's invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. We are obliged to support international efforts to achieve the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops and to restore to the Afghan people, who are fighting a war of liberation, the right to determine their own future.

It is, however, all too easy to forget that the rule of law is indivisible. None of us can pick and choose where we wish to see it applied. If we frustrate the rule of law in one area — in the uses of the sea, for instance — we encourage its frustration elsewhere. We make it more difficult to pursue the peaceful settlement of disputes and, more important still, the avoidance of dispute.

Law, as I said at the outset, offers us our best hope of overcoming the differences that prevail in the world. Law may never allow us to achieve a universal consensus. It may, however, allow us to come close to realizing an old Chinese ideal: "From union comes mutual affection; from difference, mutual respect." Indeed, as between Canada and China, despite our differences, I believe that we are already going beyond mutual respect to mutual affection.

S/C