

these developing circumstances, we shall have to ponder very carefully whether an answer to the rising power of Asian Communism is to be found in its further isolation and containment, or whether it lies in broadening contacts at a variety of levels in an endeavour to penetrate the curtain of ignorance and blunt the edge of ideological differences.

We must proceed forward, but without illusion. We must not assume that all the barriers to a détente are down. The basic problems remain. Our way of life is still challenged on a massive scale by a materialistic philosophy which denies the spirituality of man and subordinates the individual to the requirements of state and party. That philosophy is still backed by the national power of countries who in the past have not hesitated to have recourse to armed force to subjugate their neighbours and whose leaders still proclaim their goal to be the expansion of Communism to the whole world, even though those leaders may differ as to method.

#### Power Must be Maintained

We must not forget that the cohesion and military preparedness of the nations which make up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have undoubtedly played a major part in bringing about the more hopeful climate that now exists. By the same token, the maintenance of that strength, pending more reliable and sustained evidence of a durable détente, is one of the best guarantees that international Communism will not have recourse to military adventures in the continuing pursuit of its stated goal. There is still a need to maintain in the West the collective military power to deter aggression, and Canada's action in rendering its forces capable of making an effective contribution to the collective deterrent should be seen as part of the equation which for the time being keeps the peace.

#### A More Civilized Relation

But an understanding of the military might of the Soviet Union and of the consequent necessity of military might in the West to maintain what I have called "military equipoise" is not in itself enough. Under the umbrella of mutual deterrence, as I said recently to the Special Parliamentary Committee on Defence, the major nations have been groping towards a more civilized relation. Now, someone once said that countries do not have friends, but only interests. While I do not entirely agree with that somewhat cynical aphorism, I do believe that in a world of nuclear stalemate, which is bringing about changes in the thinking of leaders and in the alignment of states, common interests are perhaps as sure a guide to peace as traditional friendships. If we are to exist in peace, as we must, alongside nations whose political philosophy we reject, as we do, it is in finding areas where the interests of the two sides happen to coincide that the key to peace will lie rather than in some vain hope that the other side will suddenly abandon its global objectives.