

virtually impossible for a private citizen of the U.S.S.R. to leave his country and we know from experience that the Soviet authorities will even separate man and wife and compel divorce rather than let one of their citizens join the other partner of a marriage outside the Soviet Union.

There are many other examples of this cultural iron curtain and this social savagery. At the last session of the Assembly of the United Nations a delegate of the United States gave a documented account of systematic efforts which had been made by Americans both public and private in the post-war period to arrange contacts between Americans and Russians. Suggestions had been made for exchanges of students, for visits to the United States by prominent scientists and artists. Efforts had been made to induce the Red Army Choir or the Russian ballet to visit this continent. None of these efforts bore fruit. The normal methods by which peoples grow to know each other and trust each other by personal contacts are systematically prevented. In the immediate post-war period, we ourselves tried in a small way to co-operate with the U.S.S.R. by exchanging information about techniques in the North country. We made available some unclassified information about agricultural and other techniques in Canada and received some interesting information in return. But soon after the war, the curtain was rung down in Moscow on our efforts to establish even the minimum contact between civilized states.

Having made this analysis of the situation we must now ask ourselves what we can do about it. We may at first be tempted to think that we should retaliate in kind. I doubt, however, whether this is the proper approach for us. Ours is a free society and even if we wanted to, we would find it difficult to apply adequate restrictions because they would be contrary to the principles by which we live. I am sure that it is in the interests of our society that we should have only those regulations which are necessary for the security of the state and no more.

Since we cannot and will not follow the Russians in their efforts to widen and strengthen the iron curtain, we must look for other more constructive and hopeful courses of action. I do not suggest that any of them will pay immediate dividends, but I am sure there are a number of things which we can do. We can in the first place recall continually to our minds and to our confidence the warm-hearted, lovable, hospitable, courageous Russian people whom we came to know during the war and with whom I am sure we can settle our differences once it is possible to make adequate contacts with them. We must also continue our efforts to resolve the problems that divide the Government of the U.S.S.R. from the governments of the free democracies. We must continue these efforts by every possible method of negotiation, conference, public or private discussion, meetings at any level, low, middle or high. In the meantime however, we must refuse to be led astray by empty words of those who talk of peace but who make no other proposal for safeguarding it except to recommend that we unilaterally disarm. We must not be fooled, ever, by any phony peace overtures.

It is also necessary for us to proceed as rapidly as possible with the development of the North Atlantic Alliance. So far, we have been primarily concerned with the defensive military arrangements under the treaty, and it has been right and proper that our first concern should be with our ability to resist aggression. In the long run, however, we shall have to make the treaty into something a great deal more basic than simply a military alliance. All members of the North Atlantic group are pledged by the Treaty, and especially by Article 2, to broaden the basis of their association, and co-operation in the solution of economic problems. In the long