

and brought under control. For, as the Prime Minister put it only recently, in this nuclear world of ours "we cannot afford any permissible kinds of international violence".

A decade and a half or so back, we were facing a somewhat similar situation in Europe. We decided at that time that we could not afford to let the situation set a trend. And we joined together in the North Atlantic Alliance to resist that trend and to arrest it through the combined deterrent power we were able to muster between us. I am convinced that our action in that situation was instrumental in gradually converting the Soviet Union to the advantages of a policy of peaceful co-existence. And, although our interpretation of that term does not quite coincide with that which the Soviet Union would like to give it, I think it is fair to say that, certainly since the confrontation over Cuba in 1962, the Soviet Union has accepted the implications of the nuclear stalemate and the fact that war can no longer be regarded as a tolerable instrument of policy.

But the position of China is different, and it is with Chinese encouragement that the authorities in North Vietnam are conducting their campaign of covert aggression against South Vietnam. And, if that aggression is not brought under control in Vietnam, can we seriously envisage that similar situations will not arise elsewhere in Asia: in Thailand, in Malaysia - perhaps in India? And can we be sure that there are not sources of instability in Africa and in Latin America which will not be susceptible of being exploited in a similar way? And if we cannot be sure of that, are we right to resign ourselves -- as some would have us do -- to letting the surge of events sweep over Vietnam? Or is this doctrine of covert aggression something that concerns the international community as a whole in its efforts to consolidate peace and security in the world and to establish a sound and viable basis for relations among nations?

I have tried to set the situation in Vietnam in this broader context because that is the context in which, I think, recent developments in that country must be seen. Nothing could be more dangerous, in my view, than to oversimplify the problem we are facing. That would be particularly dangerous at a time when all our attention must necessarily be focussed on achieving a solution in Vietnam. Because I very much doubt if we can expect an unrealistic assessment of the situation to yield either practicable or durable solutions.

As far as the Canadian Government is concerned, we are deeply concerned about the implications of the present situation for world peace. We appreciate the very grave risks of a widening of the present conflict, which must be avoided at all costs. We are directing all our efforts to that end. We wish to see peace restored in Vietnam -- and, when I say Vietnam, I mean the whole of Vietnam. I believe that is also the course which the overwhelming majority of Canadians would wish to see followed. But I know you will understand me when I say that the peace that is