

reactions aroused by Mr. Vichinsky's speech were at once relayed to Moscow and displayed in the Soviet Press. Is it not fair to assume that Mr. Vichinsky knowing that everything which can be regarded as news gets wide publicity in the papers of the North American continent, deliberately planned to thus secure some evidence for domestic consumption of the validity of the line which the Soviet Government has been pursuing for months past.

The second and perhaps even more important purpose of this campaign may very well have been to endeavour to frighten certain portions of public opinion on the North American continent about the possibility of United States intervention in Europe ultimately leading to war and thereby prevent acceptance by the public and by Congress of the Truman and Marshall plans for aid to Europe. Without such aid it is reasonable for Russians to expect that the regimes based upon private ownership and private enterprise will collapse and give way to regimentation by communistic bureaucrats and that Governments modeled on theirs will in fact be subservient to Moscow's influence and only too willing to implement that higher loyalty which Moscow seems able to inspire in those it has trained in its communistic institutions.

Now, all this is not merely a matter of ideology; it has become a very concrete problem for each one of us. We, in Canada, have an economy based upon the principle of multilateral trade and multilateral currency conversion. We buy from the United States commodities to the value of hundreds of millions of dollars more than we sell in that market and unless we can use the surpluses from our sales to other countries to pay for our United States purchases, we will have to cease making these purchases. We are, therefore, vitally concerned in the prompt restoration of European economies and in the removal of those troublesome threats to peace and stability which block the path to such restoration, and it was not merely words I was speaking when I said to the General Assembly the other day on behalf of the Canadian Delegation:

"The fact remains, however, that these problems must be solved and that procedures and practices which obstruct such solutions must be changed. This can be done by the voluntary abandonment of these practices; by agreed conventions or understandings which will regulate them; or, if necessary, by amendments to the Charter. We must hope that no member of the Security Council will flout clearly expressed world opinion by obstinately preventing change and thus become responsible for prejudicing, and possibly destroying, the Organization which is now man's greatest hope for the future.

Nations, in their search for peace and cooperation will not and cannot accept indefinitely and unaltered a Council which was set up to ensure their security, and which, so many feel, has become frozen in futility, and divided by dissension. If forced, they may seek greater safety in an association of democratic and peace-loving states willing to accept more specific international obligations in return for greater national security. Such associations, if consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter, can be formed within the United Nations. It is to be hoped that such a development will not be necessary. If it is unnecessary it will be undesirable. If, however, it is made necessary, it will take place. Let us not forget that the provisions of the Charter are a floor under, rather than a ceiling over, the responsibilities of member states. If some prefer to go even below that floor, others need not be prevented from moving upwards."

Since then, we have been elected to membership on the Security Council. Our conduct there will be along the lines of the above cited statement. We will go to the most extreme limits to make the United Nations work as a universal one world organization, and I still hope we

/can