

standards of free media? For what it's worth, CIDA has adopted a different approach: In at least three Asia-Pacific countries (Malaysia, Indonesia, Cambodia), small amounts of Canadian aid have supported modest seminars and training, for journalists and government officials, on the expected relationships between governments and free media—and on the professional obligations of responsible journalists. The aim is to elicit a respect for media freedom, not to impose it.

Issue Two: Human-rights policies need not operate by an on-off switch. Just as there may be degrees of bad performance by human-rights abusers, there are degrees of possible Canadian responses. In some cases a Canadian government might do nothing. (In diplomacy, inaction sometimes counts as action.) Then there is a roughly escalating range of options: confidential criticism and praise; diplomatic support or the lack of it in negotiations valued by the other government; technical aid (as in China and Indonesia) to local human-rights institutions; open condemnation, as in the United Nations; visa restrictions, particularly against members of the regime and its beneficiaries; opposition to financing from international institutions; cuts to development aid; outright trade embargoes; and any number of variations in between. Nor are the options exhausted with government measures; corporate codes of conduct, industry-wide or country-specific, might also suit the circumstances.

- Corporate codes of conduct are appealing in several ways: Free from the laborious procedures of political/diplomatic negotiation, they can be drafted