

It would serve little purpose for me to dissect at length this farrago of misrepresentation and distortion which calls, among other things, for the withdrawal from Korea of all foreign armies without any mention of the fact that the United Nations forces are in Korea only in order to resist aggression. I should merely like to remind you that over the past months I have participated in attempts by the United Nations to achieve a cease-fire - though not one on any basis which could be called "appeasement" - in Korea and, once that has been established, to arrange discussions (in which the Chinese Communists would be included) looking towards a peaceful and honourable settlement of outstanding issues in the Far East. Although those attempts were pursued with the greatest vigour, they were not successful. Responsibility for failure rests on the shoulders of those countries who plotted and engineered the aggression in Korea, which is now publicly supported by the Canadian Peace Congress; and who refuse to cease that aggression on terms approved by the United Nations.

It will now be apparent, I hope, how cunningly all these demands have been framed to promote the interests of the Soviet Union throughout the world. The proposals regarding atomic energy would sterilize the greatest military asset which is held by the West at the present time. The restraints on public discussion suggested in the name of peace would tend to blind our people to the danger in which we stand. The Korean settlement which the Peace Congress advocates would rob the Republic of Korea of the military support which it is now receiving from the United Nations and would leave it to the mercies of its Communist enemies. Nor is it surprising that these demands mesh so subtly with Soviet interests, since the peace campaign which the Canadian Peace Congress represents in our own country has been launched on the initiative of the Soviet Union and operates under Soviet directives. On November 29, 1949, the Cominform adopted a resolution which reads as follows:

"The struggle for a stable and lasting peace, for the organization and consolidation of the forces of peace against the forces of war should now become the pivot of the entire activity of the Communist parties and democratic organizations".

The same resolution went on to direct that,

"Particular attention should be devoted to bringing together into the movement of the supporters of peace the trade unions, women's, youth, co-operative, sports, cultural and educational, religious and other organizations, as well as scientists, writers, journalists, workers in the cultural field, parliamentary leaders who are in favour of peace and against war".

In Cominform double talk those last words mean "in favour of the U.S.S.R. and against the strengthening of the defences of the free world".

To a fanatical Communist there need be, I suppose, no inconsistency in a peace movement which is at pains to justify the acts of aggression of the Soviet Union and its friends and satellites. To the faithful fanatics, the Soviet Union is the principal champion of peace in the world and any course which serves its interests must automatically be in the service of peace as well.