

say the same of the so-called scientific commissions which were engineered by the Communists to prove their case.

The distinguished representative of the Soviet Union said here on Monday that the impartial commission, proposed by the Assembly to investigate the charges, was set up on "an improper basis" and could only have presented conclusions "dictated by the United States." Mr. Malik's researches are usually thorough, but it seems to me he must have forgotten that the Assembly proposed that the countries to be represented on the commission would be Brazil, Egypt, Pakistan, Sweden, and Uruguay. If he has not forgotten, as the distinguished representative of Brazil pointed out to him this morning, his references to these independent states provide us with one more indication of the distorted vision which Soviet eyes seem to have of the outside world.

If the impartiality and objectivity of the proposed commission is conceded, then the only other argument left for the refusal of the Communists to admit them, is the equally transparent excuse that the Chinese Communists and North Koreans were not present at our proceedings when we decided that an attempt should be made to have an impartial investigation of the facts. This argument was used by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union on Monday and by the distinguished representative of Czechoslovakia this morning. It pre-supposes that we, in this Committee, were going to conduct our own investigations of the facts, hear evidence on both sides, and sit in judgment on this matter. But nothing of the kind was ever proposed. No one can pretend that the members of this Committee, whatever our other merits, would be competent to set ourselves up as such a court of inquiry. No, our proposal was to have that inquiry conducted, not in New York, but on the spot, where presumably, if anywhere, there was evidence to back up the charges; and not by political representatives who might have been partial to one side or the other, but by scientists from neutral countries. The fact that such an inquiry was turned down flat is, to my mind, conclusive evidence that there was never any substance behind these charges whatsoever. As the leader of my delegation, Mr. Pearson, said in the Canadian House of Commons on May 12, 1952, "the charges are in fact so false, so fantastic, that it would normally be unwise to dignify them by official denials."

The United States delegation has, if I may say so, acted with great restraint in not demanding an outright condemnation of those who, having repeatedly made false charges and broadcast them from the roof-tops for many months, refuse any and every attempt to secure an impartial investigation of the facts. It would, I suppose, have been too much to hope that the Soviet delegation would, for its part, have refrained from submitting a resolution. But the temptation to try to distract the Committee's attention to a subject less embarrassing to the Soviet Union was too great. We therefore have before us a resolution asking all governments that have not already acceded to or ratified the Geneva Protocol to do so.

This quite gratuitous piece of advice is proposed some twenty-eight years after the event. It comes before this Committee when we are considering certain specific charges, and not the general question