

★ The Inter-Parliamentary Union has, therefore, made a contribution of the greatest value to the development of those international institutions on which the fate of all nations depends.

I should like, as the Minister responsible for External Affairs in the Canadian Government to consider with you some of the fundamental problems of world affairs today. You have been discussing such themes and I note the stress which you have laid on political goodwill, on mutual confidence and on a realization of common interest as the prerequisites for real negotiation on world issues.

There is a growing realization throughout the world that the United Nations can deal effectively with a wide range of problems involving security and economic development. Nevertheless, there remain problems of relations between the great powers which can not be dealt with in that way in the immediate future.

The division of Germany and the permanently dangerous situation with respect to Berlin are not really made better by the passage of time, even if we are grateful that sufficient restraint is shown to avoid having them become worse. The general problem of European security, relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the division of Korea and Vietnam and the current conflict in the latter country are all examples of situations which one can view only with serious concern.

These dangers are, moreover, compounded by the inability of the powers chiefly concerned to find a mutually agreed way towards disarmament and by the fact that China has become a nuclear power while still dangerously isolated from those moderating influences which affect the thinking of many other nations.

These basic problems, which affect the security, self-confidence and well-being of all nations, are still at least partly derived from, and are certainly exacerbated by, the conflict of ideologies. I note in the reports of the 1964 meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union the point that the solution of international economic problems is impeded by the continuation of what we have come to call the "cold war".

We have advanced somewhat from the days when it appeared that the security of one system could lie only in the destruction of the other. Progress on many issues, however, which in my opinion need raise no ideological differences at all, is often impeded by irrelevant and outdated language and suspicions about the final victory of a political system. This certainly runs counter to the emphasis given by the Inter-Parliamentary Union to "objective study" of issues and equally certainly prejudices the development of that "political goodwill" without which serious negotiation cannot begin.

In spite of these basic problems that remain, there have been moderating influences at work in recent years, and we have welcomed changes in tone and even in specific matters of negotiation and contacts. A détente has been achieved and, if the phrase "peaceful coexistence" means that alterations in political systems will come about only by