

welcomed the opportunity that was mine to go to Moscow at the end of the meeting of the general assembly and I had a very interesting time.

I could make my appeal for understanding between the west and the Soviet Union on the basis of a human interest story about my own experiences in Moscow. If there were time to tell such a story, which there is not, I could indicate something of the experiences I had and something of the vigour of life I found there. If I had time to describe conditions as I saw them I would point out that it is a different world and that we cannot make comparisons between conditions there and conditions here, but that having in mind their past of only thirty years ago the fact is that they have made tremendous progress. I found what one would expect to find in any country, that is, things that were surprisingly good and some things that were disappointing. But the general picture as I have tried to give it, when speaking elsewhere with more time at my disposal, is that of a great group of human beings who have chosen a way different from ours, but a way to which they are thoroughly devoted, and on the basis of which they are going ahead. They are a group of people who have unlimited faith in their destiny and certainly a solidarity that cannot be questioned.

It is true that there are some things about the system in the Soviet Union, and they have some ways of doing things, that do not satisfy me. May I say very clearly that in our western world, in our democratic tradition, we have something that is priceless, something that we must guard with everything that we have. But the way to guard it is not to sing songs about it or wave flags or make speeches denouncing other ways; the way to guard it is to see to it that our democracy achieves in terms of social and economic conditions something that is better than other people are trying to achieve in their way. That is what counts, and will count as time goes on. I urge upon everyone the importance of realizing the significance and force of that concept.

I started out to say that I felt I could make an appeal for understanding of the Soviet Union and her people, and the building of a bridge between them and us, on the basis of a human interest story, but I prefer to do it on the basis of political and international realism. I confess that the world seems a lot smaller to me now than it did a few months ago, having found it possible to get half way round it in a pretty short time. One realizes, perhaps more clearly than before, that the neighbour to the north of us is just about as close as is the neighbour to the south. We never even discuss whether we should be on friendly

terms and have friendly relations with the United States of America; we take that for granted. It seems strange that we should have to discuss and advocate friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

I suggest that in a world which has become as small as ours—in a world where surely it is a basic consideration that war is unthinkable—we must find ways and means of living together on this planet whether or not we like the systems that other people may have chosen. Accordingly, so far as relations between the west and the Soviet Union are concerned there are three possibilities. One could take the position, if he were completely lacking in grey matter, that we cannot get along, and that sooner or later one must get rid of the other. Surely that position, at least in the atomic age, is unthinkable. The second position one might take would be to agree to get along together but to maintain a sort of armed camp relationship, tolerating each other but not really establishing a friendship. That might survive for a time, but I have no faith in that kind of relationship having any chance of lasting in our present-day world. We do not talk of our relations with the United States on that basis. We take it as a matter of course that between the United States and Canada there must be positive friendship, and we do not even marvel at the fact that we have three or four thousand miles of frontier without a fortification. That situation is dictated by the proximity of the two countries, and I suggest that the proximity of Canada and the Soviet Union also dictates that an armed camp relationship is not good enough. We must go on and achieve positive, friendly relations if we are to build anything that is permanent and lasting.

I am trying to be realistic about this; therefore I should face up to the main argument that is sometimes posed seriously against the position I am taking. That main argument is that we may have been fooled by what has been taking place; that perhaps the Soviet Union is bent upon a policy of expansion step by step which in due course will gobble up the whole world, and the sooner we wake up to that fact the better. This is an argument I have heard expounded in this country, but I deplore it, not only because to me it is warmongering but because I think it ignores a basic economic fact. To put it in the simplest way I can, the basic fact is that whatever else we may think about the Soviet system, there is all the difference in the world between the economy of the Soviet Union and the economy that did exist in nazi Germany under Hitler. There is not the slightest ques-