

would be no danger of a local outbreak of fighting growing into a general conflagration. That is the nub of our problem for the future. If we do not begin to think about a longer term solution of this problem, we may miss the psychological moment when national governments may perhaps be prepared, under the impact of recent events, to commit themselves to such procedures in advance for the sake of increasing the collective authority of our organization.

Even while considering how we can best organize collective security through the United Nations within the limitations of our situation, we must not neglect, Mr. President, the parallel efforts which have to be made to reach solutions of the points of most acute friction and danger. We must not imagine, needless to say, that the creation of this or any other international force will solve the acute problems we face. Such a force is a most useful instrument for ensuring a negative kind of peace. But peace to be lasting must be positive.

As Israeli, French and United Kingdom forces are withdrawn in accordance with the General Assembly's cease-fire resolution, and as the United Nations Emergency Force is moved into the area, a momentum for peace is created which should not stop short of a political settlement of both the Palestine and Suez questions. A cease-fire is better than fighting; but it is precarious at best and must be used to begin work here and now on a political settlement which will provide an honourable and secure basis for the lasting peace of the area. This is not a settlement which can be imposed by the international force. It must be a settlement on which all interested parties agree. The Force is the instrument of the settlement, not its creator. An international force to hold the ring can be useful, and in the short term necessary; but it is no substitute for grappling with the more intractable political problems before the sense of urgency and danger has gone out of them, leaving the same old tinder exposed for the next explosion. The world, the United Nations, cannot afford another such explosion.

It might be asserted by some that in the present circumstances of increased international tension there is little point in expecting serious discussion of disarmament at this session of the General Assembly. While it is true that progress towards agreement on disarmament cannot be divorced from the international situation in general, nevertheless the need to make a start, however modest, towards disarmament grows steadily more urgent. The rate of scientific development, particularly in the field of nuclear and thermo-

nuclear armaments, and in the means of delivering them, and the growing realization of the terrible consequences of the use of such weapons compel us all to continue the effort to agree at least on the beginnings of a disarmament programme.

#### Soviet Proposals

Two weeks ago the U.S.S.R. made public proposals on disarmament and on methods of negotiation. This move was made in sinister circumstances indeed. It came at a time when almost all governments in the world were condemning Soviet savagery in Hungary. The Soviet Government statement was followed within a few hours by the cynical announcement of a large-scale nuclear explosion, and their proposals were also accompanied by boasts about the vast military might of the U.S.S.R. In such circumstances we must consider carefully how much credence we can put in the assertions of the same Soviet leaders of their peaceful intentions. As prudent men who have a responsibility to our several peoples we must make certain that our desire for peace does not expose those who have given us office to the same dark power of tyranny which stalks Eastern Europe.

Nevertheless the Canadian Government are prepared to show their faith in the United Nations by approaching these proposals of the U.S.S.R. for an examination of their merits as though they had been put forward in less equivocal circumstances.

Some of the proposals are quite familiar. Indeed the general framework appears to us to be the same as recent Soviet plans. The main new element is an apparent readiness to accept the principle of aerial inspection. If this acceptance proves to be real it will represent an advance which we could regard with satisfaction. It would be the one spark of hopefulness to come from Moscow in these gloomy weeks of crisis. But although the value of aerial inspection appears to be gaining acceptance among the Soviet leaders they seemingly have yet to grasp its principal merit. It would be an advantage if the secret manoeuvres of the Red Army could no longer be executed threateningly right on the borders of the Western world. But the greatest danger to mankind lies in the massive surprise assault with all the modern apparatus of mass destruction. The Soviet proposals still would afford no means of gaining assurance that forces of destruction were not being prepared in the vast regions of the Soviet Union.

Having said this, I would repeat that we are prepared to join in the examination of the Soviet proposals. It has always been our view that the United Nations offers the proper