

(Continued from p. 1)

MR. PEARSON'S PEACE PROPOSALS AT UN

"If international discussions on political problems are not carefully prepared, and the preliminary diplomatic work not thoroughly done, they may merely underline and exacerbate disagreement and leave the position afterwards worse than before.

"We think that these considerations apply with particular force to consultation with the Soviet Union. We look back upon a long series of sterile discussions and negotiations with the Soviet Union in almost every international forum, whether it be the Security Council, the Council of Foreign Ministers, the Control Commission for Germany, the Far Eastern Commission, or any other body in which Soviet foreign policy has confronted all our efforts at compromise with a resolute and resounding 'nyet'.

BASIS FOR CONSULTATION

"I venture, therefore, to suggest a few criteria which must be fulfilled before there can be any hope whatever that such talks would lead to anything. In the first place there must be a sound basis for consultation agreed on in advance. There is not, for instance, such a basis when the Soviet Union proposes, as it recently has at the meeting in Prague, that the representatives of eighteen million Germans, chosen arbitrarily by a Communist machine, should be considered on an equality with the democratically-chosen representatives of forty-five million Western Germans.

"In the second place, there must be a real willingness to compromise and a genuine desire to find just solutions to problems. This does not mean that if one party does not get its own way from the very start, it is entitled to apply the methods of a Berlin blockade.

"In the third place, the consultations must not be simply occasions for propaganda where one party harangues audiences outside the Council chamber and publishes in its own press truncated and distorted versions of what took place.

"In the fourth place, no agreement between the Great Powers must be at the expense of the interests and freedoms of other nations which are not represented.

"Above all, we must not allow talk to become the delaying substitute for agreement. And we must not forget that peace talks - in an atmosphere of dissension and distrust - may encourage the foes of peace by disarming mentally, morally and physically those who believe in peace and desire to defend it...."

Mr. Pearson denied allegations that the United States was responsible for the fear and division existing in the world today, and declared:

"The truth is that the nations of the world outside the Soviet bloc know that the power of the United States will not be used for purposes of aggressive war. They know that the policies

of the United States - though we may not always support them, or even approve them - are not designed to lead to war. If they were, they would soon isolate this country from the rest of the world....

"We in Canada know this country and its people well. We know them as good neighbours who respect the rights of others; who don't ask for or get automatic support from smaller countries through pressure or threats or promises. We know that they accept the fact that co-operation between large and smaller countries can only exist on a basis of mutual confidence and mutual respect. If the Soviet Government would permit its people to learn the truth about the United States instead of filling them with information only about the worst features of its life and culture, they would make a real contribution to the removal of that fear, which is at present being instilled, directly and deliberately, in the minds and hearts of the Soviet people..."

CONCRETE EVIDENCE

"When Mr. Vishinsky talks about the peaceful aims of Communism and Soviet policy, we remain sceptical, and we find most of his evidence to support his case false and misleading. On our side, we have lots of concrete evidence to support the other view, of the aggressive, expansionist, war-like aims of Soviet and international communist policy.

"But let the facts speak for themselves. Let the map of Eastern Europe speak, let the thousands of exiles from countries that have lost their freedom speak, certainly those that are dead and in Siberia cannot speak. Let the Soviet 170 divisions and 30,000 tanks speak, confronted as they are by the few half-armed divisions in Western Europe. Let Yugoslavia, which knows something of Soviet policy and methods, and peace appeals, speak!..."

"...the free democracies are determined not to be deflected from their resolve to become stronger, not for aggressive purposes, not in order to force, at the point of the atom bomb, diplomatic decisions on the Soviet Union, but because they fear aggression and wish to put collective force behind their will for peace in order to deter and prevent it; because negotiations for peace have a better change of succeeding if the parties, not accepting each other's views, respect at least each other's strength. Permanent peace can, of course, never be ensured by power alone; but power, on both sides, not merely on one, may give a breathing space in which to pause, reflect and improve relations. This course will be attacked as power politics, but power politics are often merely the politics of not being over-powered. So it is in this case.

"The Soviet resolution objects to this. It says disarm now, at once, by one-third. That point has already been suitably disposed of by previous speakers. I would merely ask one question. In any disarmament convention, would