

# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES



INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 54/45 DISARMAMENT

Canadian statement on disarmament made by the Vice-Chairman of the Canadian Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, Mr. Paul Martin made in the First Committee on October 13, 1954.

The speakers who have preceded me have already, I think, sufficiently outlined the earlier stages of disarmament negotiations. I do not, therefore, propose to take up the time of this Committee with any general exposition of this problem. Instead, I shall try to suggest, as briefly as I can, what seems to me to be the essential perspective of international relations and world politics in which the disarmament problem should be viewed. Within the particular field of disarmament problems I propose to address myself to those aspects which, in the view of the Canadian delegation, present the most important unresolved differences between the views enunciated by the Government of the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and the Governments of some of the Western Powers on the other. I shall also have a suggestion to make as to the procedure which, in my view, we can most usefully follow if we are to make further progress in this important field.

It is, I think, worth while reminding ourselves, as we discuss this item on our agenda, that armaments are a symptom rather than a cause of international tension. They are, as a great student of the art of diplomacy has recently pointed out, primarily the reflection of international difference and only secondarily the cause of them.

Any actions, however, which diminish international tensions and contribute to a real understanding in world politics are direct contributions to the solution of the problem of disarmament. Without such relaxation it is arguable, of course, that concentration on disarmament negotiations alone is unlikely to be productive. If the Soviet Union wishes to make a real contribution to disarmament, permitting progress on such matters as the conclusion of a peace treaty with Austria would be a major contribution to this end. So would actions to grant a real, rather than a spurious, national autonomy to those many European peoples the control over whose destinies has in the past fifteen years been forcefully assumed by Moscow. Now I have no desire to broaden our debate, and certainly no desire to initiate any controversy. However, I do feel that in a matter of this importance we should be realists as well as idealists. I have no doubt that Mr. Vyshinsky could point his finger at various Western actions which have been, in our view, defensive but which he might claim have caused concern in Moscow and