

and reporting on the implementation of the most important of these resolutions.

PROPOSAL IS WITHIN CHARTER

There remains the question: are we entitled to take action of the kind we contemplate? Is it legal and constitutional? Serious questions have been raised in this connection, and we should not dismiss them lightly. The only limitations which we face are the provisions of Articles 12 and 24. In our opinion and in spite of dogmatic but unsupported statements to the contrary, the U.S. proposal does not contravene either of these Articles. On the contrary, it falls within that provision of the Charter, Article 22, which provides for the establishment of subsidiary organs of the Assembly. Assertions, therefore, that in accepting the principle of the U.S. proposal we are breaking the Charter are without foundation. Their constant repetition does not make them more convincing. The intention at San Francisco was to provide in the Assembly an instrument with the necessary power and flexibility for the performance of the important duties assigned to it.

There are, of course, other ways within the Charter by which the General Assembly could fulfill the continuing responsibilities which we think it should discharge. The General Assembly might, by simple adjustments in the Rules of Procedure, be kept in session throughout the year, meeting as the occasion required. It would be possible also for us to depend on special sessions of the Assembly, and there is the third expedient of establishing a committee of the whole Assembly to meet between regular sessions. There are advantages and disadvantages to be found in each of these methods. We have been led to the conclusion, however, that an Interim Committee is the method best suited in the circumstances for developing the functions of the Assembly in the manner which we are contemplating.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED

The terms of reference to be given to such a committee must be studied carefully. We do not agree entirely with those which have been suggested in the United States resolution and for this reason have submitted (in Document A/C.1/217) certain amendments to that proposal. It seems to the Canadian Delegation that there are important functions which might be performed by an Interim Committee and which are not mentioned in the proposal before us. The United States delegate, himself, in introducing his proposal, referred to the important duties which an Interim Committee might perform in preparing the way for regular session of the General Assembly. He has not, however, made provision for performance of these duties in the resolution which he has presented. It seems to us also that the Interim Committee should consider the extent to which the more important resolutions of the General Assembly are being carried out. We realize that these resolutions are no more than recommendations to member nations. They are, however, expressions of

international opinion which must carry great weight. During the experimental year which is proposed, it is probable that the Interim Committee should consider the effect of only such important resolutions as are referred to it by this Assembly. The Committee itself might later consider whether, in the long run, it would be useful for the Assembly to have before it, when it meets, a report on the implementation of its resolutions.

There are also certain parts in the United States resolution which we think might be deleted. The Interim Committee will be both temporary and experimental in character, and we are not satisfied that at this stage it should be asked to assume the very general responsibilities which arise from Article 11 (1) and 13 (1) (B) of the Charter. The instrument which we are proposing to create may well prove so useful that we shall wish to extend its duties in this respect. At first, however, we should like to see excluded from its terms of reference the wide-ranging responsibilities which were suggested by these two Articles. The Canadian Delegation is, however, in full agreement with the idea that the terms of reference of the Committee should give it full authority to consider all matters in regard to peace and security which come within the competence of the General Assembly. For this reason we would favour a reference to Article 35 as well as to Article 14 in the terms of reference of the Committee.

Within the areas which I have suggested, we consider that the Interim Committee should be given clearly defined responsibilities. It should have the right to discuss fully any subject which comes on its agenda, to conduct investigations and to make reports and recommendations to the General Assembly, either in regular or special session. We do not think that it should have any other powers, nor do we consider that it should be established at this time for longer than an experimental period of one year. We agree with the United States proposal that it should be a committee of the whole Assembly.

NOT FOR PROPAGANDA

Before I conclude may I support the appeal, or was it a warning, made yesterday by the delegate from France: that this committee should not become a platform for the rehashing of political propaganda of the kind we are becoming all too familiar with in this Assembly. If the Interim Committee were to be used by certain delegations merely for the reading and distortion of press statements by and about individuals, well-known and obscure, or for the endless repetition of groundless assertions that certain individuals are war-mongers and certain peoples straining at the leash to overthrow their free and democratic systems of government, then the committee might become a liability rather than an asset and its discussions as intolerable as they have once or twice threatened to become in this committee.

Mr. Chairman, we are building in the United

Nations a structure for international co-operation which must endure. Our hopes depend upon its success. Its weakness lessens the security of each one of us. If the experiment which we are contemplating will have the effect of making the organization more effective, and that is our only purpose in supporting it, it will repay a thousandfold the effort which we shall expend upon it. The Canadian Delegation will gladly co-operate in making the experiment in the hope that the instrument we are creating may help speedily to remove the circumstances which make it necessary.

PEARSON TO BE CHAIRMAN OF SUB-COMMITTEE:

L.B. Pearson, Under Secretary of State for External Affairs and representative of Canada at the United Nations General Assembly, has been appointed chairman of a sub-Committee established to examine the U.S. proposal to create an Interim Committee of the General Assembly to deal with problems of peace and security which are not being solved elsewhere. Mr. Pearson was nominated by John Foster Dulles of the United States delegation. The work of the sub-Committee will be to examine the U.S. proposal and the amendments which have been submitted and to make recommendations to Committee 1 (Political and Security).

The sub-Committee consists of all authors of proposals and amendments on the matter. Membership is as follows: Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Canada, China, France, India, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom and United States.

PALESTINE MAJORITY REPORT TO BE STUDIED:

The majority report on Palestine as proposed by the United States and amended by Canada will be studied in detail by a sub-Committee to be set up for the purpose by the ad hoc Committee on Palestine. Asked in Committee whether Canada would be willing to withdraw its amendment, Mr. L.B. Pearson, Canadian representative on the ad hoc Committee, replied that Canada would prefer to retain its amendment which dealt with implementation.

After a lengthy debate the ad hoc Committee on Palestine agreed on October 21 to set up two other sub-Committees, one on conciliation and one to study and consolidate the various Arab proposals for an independent unitary Palestinian state.

ILSLEY CRITICIZES USSR RESOLUTION:

Speaking in Committee One (Political and Security) on October 23, Justice Minister Ilsley gave Canada's view of the USSR resolution now before the Assembly on "measures to be taken against war propaganda and the inciters of a new war." The resolution, he said, induced the suspicion that its authors were more interested in its propaganda value against certain countries and views than they were in stopping war-mongering. Charging that false and misleading statements

about Canada had appeared in the Soviet press and radio which built up enmity towards Canada in the minds of the Soviet people, he declared that that was war-mongering. He condemned "civil-war-mongering" which tries to create unrest leading to revolution and civil war, as perhaps the worst type of all.

At the end of his statement a Canadian resolution was submitted to amend the USSR proposal. This condemned all propaganda inciting to war or civil strife and urged members to promote friendly relations among nations.

Text of Mr. Ilesley's speech follows: One reason, though a comparatively unimportant one, why I have asked for permission to speak on the matter before us, arises out of a statement made by Mr. Gromyko in this Committee last Saturday. He asked why the Canadian delegate objected to having delegations to the United Nations carry on the struggle against war mongers and war propagandists. He apparently asked that question because he misinterpreted, no doubt purely accidentally, certain remarks made earlier by one representative that day. Mr. Gromyko said that we "had developed the thought in these remarks that we should not accuse anybody of war mongering and so forth and so on". Of course, as a reading of the Canadian statement would show, no such thought was developed, nor was it suggested that we should not discuss war mongering. What we said, in reference to the terms of reference of the proposed Interim Committee of the Assembly, and I quote from the text, was simply that "if the Interim Committee were to be used by certain delegations... for the endless repetition of groundless assertions that certain individuals are war mongers, then it might become a liability rather than an asset." That has nothing whatever to do with the suggestion that we should not discuss this resolution or any other resolution which concerns war mongering. I hope that Mr. Gromyko will interpret my intervention in this discussion as an indication that we do not object to such a discussion.

I must indicate at once, however, that I am unable to support the Soviet resolution before us, quite conscious of the fact that any statement of this kind leaves one open at once to the accusation of being in favour of war mongering and a friend of war mongers. In order to protect oneself as best one can from such an accusation and to justify a refusal to vote for this resolution, it is essential to look at it carefully, paragraph by paragraph.

The resolution of the delegation of the Soviet Union regarding measures to be taken against propaganda for a new war contains various ideas, some of which are of a highly contentious character both in form and in substance. These ideas have been crowded into the small space of a single resolution. In this resolution we are being asked to do two things. First, to declare that a certain type of propaganda amounts to a violation of the obligations we have assumed under the Charter.