

persuasion and peaceful change, then further improvements in relations can be expected.

We should, however, have a clear understanding of what a phrase such as "peaceful coexistence" does mean. This is a problem about which one must speak frankly. There can be no exceptions made to what appears to be a doctrine of peaceful change simply because a particular area is under the pressure of some great power. We do not want to find that "peaceful coexistence" has yielded precedence to a doctrine of intervention expressed in the phrase "war of liberation". Our commitment to parliamentary democracy and to the procedures for peaceful international change set forth in the United Nations Charter do not permit us to interpret "peaceful coexistence" in any way other than that which I have indicated.

Surely it should be possible, even with competing political systems, to find the minimum of agreement required to deal with some vital matters of international business. Surely the international community should be able to help in situations involving bloodshed or hunger without regard to the final choice of a political system by the peoples concerned. Can we not agree that the only sane policy or diplomacy is one of peace, since the alternative is nuclear suicide?

I have, of course, been referring to the negative effects of ideological clashes. I can understand that people must take seriously the formulation of political beliefs by which their own societies are to be guided.

What we must do in this century, however, is to turn our ideological zeal to the positive task of developing those conceptions of international co-operation that will embody all that we have in common, our need of peace and of economic and social development. The longing for such new political formulations that led to the creation of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the League of Nations and then the United Nations exists more strongly today than before. The United Nations Charter indicates the direction of such thinking. It is our responsibility to develop that common ideology of peace.

There have, of course, been specific developments of an encouraging nature in the course of the détente I have already mentioned. The partial test-ban agreement of 1963, the agreement on a communications link between the United States and the Soviet Union and the agreement banning the use of weapons of mass destruction in outer space had an immediate effect on the confidence with which all nations viewed the future. Bilateral relations between the two most powerful nations have developed since then and we can hope that the impetus provided by these 1963 agreements will lead to further understanding.

Canada has increased its contacts with the Soviet Union and other states in Eastern Europe, and I hope that this trend will continue. I might mention some recent contacts and exchanges, since they provide examples of steps towards developing a mutual understanding and goodwill without which there will be no serious negotiation over major issues. The visit of a Canadian Parliamentary delegation to the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia this summer and the invitations for return visits were of