

for some very heavy artillery in the propaganda warfare. It was said at the Assembly that we had forced these people to come to Canada, that they were driven to labour in forests and mines, that the conditions under which they worked made them slaves, that they could never escape from their servitude. Thus was a constructive and intelligent policy, the benefits of which had been joyfully accepted by the few thousands of people when they were available, pilloried and debased and sullied in the organization through which it had been arranged.

At still other times a conflict arises from the basic difference in our forms of social and political organization. Take, for example, the most vociferous or the great debates at the last session of the General Assembly - the debate on war-mongering. The discussion went on for days. There were speeches two, and two and one-half hours in length. There were charges and counter-charges, quotations and counter-quotations in an atmosphere which became more and more heated and in language which became more and more disheartening but there was really no use talking about the question at home. The plain fact is that a State organized on the Russian model has one kind of a press and we have another. In a controlled press everything that appears is, in some way or another, a direct reflection of the views of those who exercise control. With us, it is otherwise. If anyone in this country feels strongly that either his own government or any other government is a menace he is at perfect liberty, within the libel and sedition laws, to say so with any paper and ink he can find for the purpose and it is essential to our system of Government that he should be able to do so. No amount of argument can ever remove the discrepancy between our two systems in this respect, and so long as items such as war-mongering find their way into agendas of United Nations conferences we shall have to resign ourselves to a great deal of futile and windy talk.

There is, then, a great and prolific debate going on between the East and West. It is discursive, voluminous and persistent. It reaches down into almost every conference and committee and sub-committee and drafting group of the United Nations. It envelops and holds fast every group of negotiators. There is nothing so discouraging as to watch, with gradually sinking spirits, the particular assembly or council or commission from which you had hoped so much being slowed down almost to a standstill by this pervasive argument which settles upon it and clogs it in the manner of a great snowstorm gradually deadening the life of a modern city.

At the present time, there is very little we can do in the presence of this basic division between East and West except to ride out the storm. It is not enough, however, merely to be passive for many of the values in our way of life are at stake. In the propaganda debates, for example, we are at a great disadvantage because our national life is so organized that almost everything is done under public scrutiny. We believe that our weaknesses and our mistakes, that our stupidities and our scandals, should be freely known and freely discussed. In this way, of course, we are making available to those who wish to destroy our