

activities they served to lessen the newcomer's sense of isolation in a new country. The second generation acquired naturally the ways of their adopted country and the third and fourth generations were thoroughly Canadian in outlook, but to the first generation of immigrants their native land would always remain a kind of sentimental and idealized symbol. This was especially true of the Ukrainians, most of whom had emigrated owing to circumstances which M. Manuisky had doubtless known at first-hand. The educated element in this emigration, which provided the natural leadership for these societies, had been brought up in an atmosphere of intense Ukrainian nationalism. The ideal of an independent Ukraine continued to have for them a sentimental value, but the remarkable growth of the Soviet Union had deprived this ideal of all practical meaning.

What worried thoughtful Canadians was the exaggerated importance which was attached in the Soviet Union to this sentimental nationalism. Attacks in the Soviet press, such as Zaslavsky's articles, invested Ukrainian nationalist leaders with a significance which they would not otherwise have. I felt sure that M. Manuisky's experience in handling problems of minority nationalism would support my contention that a minority national group tended to rally about any cause no matter how bad it might be if it felt that the attack on the cause was an attack upon itself. This had been the effect of Zaslavsky's articles. Those Ukrainian Canadians who were pro-Soviet took their lead from articles in the Soviet press which attacked the nationalist organizations. This tended to rally the nationalists around their cause while their leaders felt that they were making headway when so powerful a country as the U.S.S.R. took such vigorous notice of their activities.

From the Canadian point of view the effect of this controversy was to keep Ukrainian nationalism alive and thus to retard the process of assimilation. I suggested that the solution of this problem would be eased if the Ukrainian nationalists were ignored by the Soviet authorities while the Ukraine went on ahead with its programme of improving the life of the Ukrainian people.

I then asked M. Manuisky on a purely personal and unofficial basis what concrete steps for solving this problem would he recommend to the Canadian Government if he were an official of that Government and had to take into account the constitutional framework within which it had to operate. M. Manuisky evaded the issue by stating that if analogous statement were made about Canada in the Soviet Union, the Soviet authorities would deal very severely with the offenders. I said that if the Canadian Government attempted to use any form of repression, such as arrest, prohibition of the right to publish newspapers etc., the issue would become much greater than that of Ukrainian nationalism. The Canadian people would feel that their fundamental rights were threatened and would vigorously resist the Government's action. If any repressive action were taken because of anti-Soviet statements, then all the anti-Soviet elements in Canada would attempt to exploit popular attachment to civil liberties for their own ends and this would certainly have the worst possible effect on Canadian-Soviet relations. M. Manuisky suggested that at least a strong statement on this subject by the Prime Minister might help to