

I know that Mr. Vishinsky and his colleagues will be cynical about this aspect of democracy. Their cynicism means only that they do not believe it is possible to govern with the freely expressed consent of the people who are governed. Their own political machinery excludes the possibility of political opposition and provides no means by which the strains and tensions within their society can find expression.

Under the system in the U.S.S.R. it is not possible for a man to make his own decisions. He must accept what is called the party line, which means the decisions handed down by the dictators. It is considered dangerous to the State if a man has an active conscience of his own: such an individual conscience is considered a danger to the rulers, because there is a state conscience. Similarly, personal moral and political convictions are considered dangerous, and a highly organized and pervasive state propaganda system seeks to substitute, for the free mind of man, the pattern of state-controlled thought.

The Soviet Delegates may not really know, therefore, what we are talking about when we speak of government by negotiation and compromise, either domestically or in international affairs, since they consider that force is an inevitable aspect of their government at home. It is not surprising that they also accept the inevitability of conflict in world affairs. The point I am making is of great practical importance. We believe that every problem which now troubles the world can readily be settled. If however, the leaders of the Soviet Union are convinced that war must come, and are teaching their people that war must come, then our hopes are indeed illusions. If the rulers of the U.S.S.R. could bring assurance to the peoples of the world on this point, they would be doing more to strengthen peace than could be accomplished by the signing of a dozen pacts.

Mr. Vishinsky says that he wants peace. But he turns his powers of vituperation - and I must admit that Mr. Vishinsky is very good at vituperation - against all nations who join together for collective security against aggression. Mr. Vishinsky seemed particularly bitter about the North Atlantic Pact. This Pact amounts to a declaration, by a group of peace-loving states, that an attack on one will be treated as an attack on all. It is not aimed against any specific country: it is aimed against any state which commits aggression. Mr. Vishinsky's vituperation on this subject reminds me of the proverb:

"The wicked flee when no man pursueth."

I can assure Mr. Vishinsky that no one who does not intend to commit aggression, or who does not plan to dominate the territory and people of other countries, need have any fear of the North Atlantic Pact.

I will tell Mr. Vishinsky just what the North Atlantic Pact does mean. Let me quote from a statement delivered in the Canadian House of Commons, on March 28 of this year, by Mr. St. Laurent, my Prime Minister:

"The purpose of the treaty is to preserve the peace of the world by making it clear to any potential aggressor that, if he were so unwise as to embark on war he might very well finish up in the condition in which the Kaiser found himself after the first great war. He might very well find himself in the position in which Hitler and Mussolini found themselves after the second terrible war. They were not told in advance what they would have to take on and overcome. I think it is fair, both to ourselves and to any possible aggressors to tell

/them....