

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 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 "peace 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.

POSSIBILITY OF MINIMAL AGREEMENT

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 notions of international co-operation which 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, which 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.

ENCOURAGING DEVELOPMENTS

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 agreements 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 some importance in opening up contacts between people in public life in the countries concerned. There has been an exchange of delegations between Canada and the Soviet Union in the field of northern development, an area of obvious common interest, and in the field of scientific research.

We have welcomed the decisions of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia to participate in the World Exhibition of 1967 and there has been a mutually satisfactory agreement concerning large wheat sales to the Soviet Union. Finally, I might mention the establishment of diplomatic relations with Hungary and our interest in extending further our diplomatic representation in Eastern Europe. In the Far East, we have had limited trade and press contacts with China.

TRADE AND GOODWILL

I should hope that the expansion of commercial relations between groups of countries with different economic systems and different trading interests would contribute eventually to lessening tensions. Recent history does show that co-operation among nations to overcome their difficulties and to promote the growth of their mutual trade plays a helpful part in developing better relations between them in other areas as well.

While long-term trends are encouraging, there are some immediate and difficult problems of great concern to all nations. Perhaps the most important example is disarmament.

FIGHTING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Canada has played an active part in the negotiations in this field to find some means of halting the further spread of nuclear weapons. Proposals to this end in the form of a draft treaty have recently been tabled in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva. Although these proposals have not been immediately accepted, the Canadian Government gives them its full support in the belief that they constitute an equitable basis for discussion of this vital question. Canada participated actively in the preparation of these proposals and several Canadian ideas are reflected in them.

It is our earnest hope that these proposals will receive the careful study and consideration of other governments represented at the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. In our view, they provide a suitable basis for negotiations leading to a non-proliferation treaty embracing both the non-nuclear and nuclear powers. Canada is prepared to join other nations in a determined effort to achieve progress with a sense of the urgency which this important issue demands.

GENERAL DISARMAMENT

On the question of general disarmament and of relations between the leading powers, there are two