


STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

GOVERNMENT

CANADA

No. 49/42 STATEMENT BY MR. PAUL MARTIN, MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, AND CANADIAN DELEGATE TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON THE SOVIET "PEACE" RESOLUTION, IN THE FIRST (POLITICAL AND SECURITY) COMMITTEE ON NOVEMBER 15, 1949.

Mr. Vishinsky devoted a considerable amount of his time in his speech yesterday to the address made by the head of the Canadian Delegation at the opening of this Assembly. The importance and the validity of that speech were apparently fully appreciated by Mr. Vishinsky, for it certainly aroused the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. All that I have to say for the moment, in reply, is that nothing was said by Mr. Vishinsky which even he would regard as an adequate answer to what Mr. Pearson had said. Certainly, abuse and oratorical emphasis do not provide an answer. There is a saying which applies to this situation -- "If you wish to disturb a man's equilibrium, tell him the truth." That is exactly what Mr. Pearson did. That is exactly what Mr. Vishinsky did not like.

The Soviet resolution and the vigorous statement with which Mr. Vishinsky has supported it has had at least one good effect. It has drawn our attention to the existence in the world of concern and even fear lest the unsolved problems in international affairs lead us into another war. Mr. Vishinsky could quite easily have drawn this point to our attention without launching an attack of unparalleled violence against two of the world's great powers. We already know that Mr. Vishinsky does not like the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. Neither he nor any of those associated with him in the Government of the U.S.S.R. has ever concealed for a moment the fact that they regard these governments as evil and they confidently look forward to the day when they will be destroyed. He has made it equally clear that he holds this attitude also towards all the rest of the world, except for the small and uncertain number that votes with the U.S.S.R. on all occasions. Mr. Vishinsky did not need to put a special item on the agenda of the United Nations in order to tell us this. He has already found innumerable opportunities in our discussions, no matter what the item on the agenda, to inform us that all the world's ills can be attributed to the men who sit in Washington and the men who sit in London.

Mr. Vishinsky would have served us much better, since he insists that we consider what he calls the preparations for a new war, if he had told us in a sober and objective manner what he regards as the major issues in world affairs which threaten the peace, and if he had given us some practical suggestions of ways in which these problems could be solved on a basis of compromise and negotiation. We should probably have disagreed with his analysis, and I feel sure that we should probably also have had many reservations about his suggestions for settlement. If, however, these suggestions contained the slightest indications that some flexibility existed in the Soviet position on any of the problems which we now have reason to fear, my government, at least, would certainly have put its full weight behind any process of negotiation by which settlements might be reached. This would have been a practical and substantial contribution towards relieving the fears which Mr. Vishinsky has drawn to our attention by putting this item on the agenda.

We must regret, therefore, that all we have before us in the Soviet resolution is a proposal in the most general terms for a pact of peace amongst the five Permanent Members of the Security Council. It seems strange that in asking these states to join his country in a pact of peace he has denounced two of them, in the text of his resolution,