Cabinet and Cabinet committee documents were still to remain confidential for 30 years.

When Volume 1 appeared in 1967, the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs at that time, referred in the preface to the "continuing threads" of the foreign policy of a country, representing the ideals as well as the interests of its people. There are many of these threads in Volume 12, indicated by the repetition of some of the chapter headings used in earlier volumes: Conduct of External Relations, Imperial (later Commonwealth) Relations, Relations with the United States (including boundary, territorial and fisheries questions), and Relations with Individual Countries.

When both the United States and Canada extended their fisheries jurisdictions 200 miles from their respective coasts last year, it was understood that negotiations would have to take place regarding certain parts of the maritime boundaries on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Special

negotiators were appointed and work was begun. Good use has been made of the volumes, as well as the files, but the two governments did not feel bound by past developments and wanted a fresh start on the problem, moving from a legal basis to a negotiating one.

Consideration has been given to lessening the period of confidentiality. Perhaps we need a certain distance from the events of 1946 to understand them better. As with the U.S. and Canadian Governments, we recognize that Volume 12 reflects only the history of its time. It is not an immutable basis for future policies but the report of one more step in Canada's development from colony to nation.

Canada. Department of External Affairs. *Documents on Canadian external relations.* Volume 12, 1946. Edited by Donald M. Page. Ottawa: 1977.

Letters to the Editor

Human rights . . .

Sir,

I was pleased that your July/August issue was in large part devoted to human rights as an issue in international relations and I would like to take the opportunity to comment on this subject.

Geoffrey Pearson asked what governments could do about the actions of other governments that violate human rights flagrantly and persistently, and offered as one suggestion the greater use of commissions of fact-finding and enquiry.

I would certainly endorse such a suggestion; it is a pity that it was made, however, with no reference to the International Labour Organization. Mr Pearson mentions the 1919 establishment of the ILO in his second paragraph, but it seems to have quickly been relegated to historical interest.

This is unfortunate, given that the ILO is the one working instrument available to states that can, and have, satisfied the dictum that: "Without facts, judgments are rendered suspect".

The report of the Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission on Freedom of Association in Chile and the report of the commission appointed to examine the observance by Chile of ILO Conventions I and III, both published by the ILO in 1975, not only stand as examples of what Mr Pearson suggests but must be credited with doing a great deal to contribute to the deserved erosion of the perception of the Pinochet regime in many countries and among many governments.

A further illustration relates also to the articles which follow Mr Pearson's. Prior to the opening of the Belgrade review, the Canadian Labour Congress was pleased to be able to let the Secretary of State for External Affairs know that many Western trade union movements felt that their governments must utilize the work of the ILO during the review.

Mr Jamieson assured the Congress that the Canadian delegation was to be provided with copies of the report of the ILO Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations, which "contains some important information that