

no matter how perfect on paper, could be put into effect. The armaments race - for that is obviously what it is - therefore continues, and with fighting actually going on in Korea there is always the appalling risk that a general conflagration might begin. The peace we have today is not the peace to which we pledged ourselves in the Charter - the peace of mutual co-operation and trust - but a peace based on fear.

As the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. St. Laurent, has said, our objective and the objective of those nations with whom we are most closely associated - is "to prevent a third world war, not to win one". We have already given our views during the debate on collective measures on the subject of collective security. The resources which the Canadian Government and people have reluctantly decided must be devoted to increasing our military strength are a sacrifice on our part to the cause of peace and freedom. Earnestly as our people desire disarmament, we realized that we should have to give up living in the illusion that we could negotiate from weakness and see what we could do in the future through negotiation: from strength. Our logic may not appeal to the Soviet representative, but it seems perfectly rational to me, bearing in mind always that our goal is negotiation and a peace based on confidence rather than military strength as an end in itself.

The strength which the free world has been building during the past four years, by sacrificing more pleasant and more productive things, does not constitute a threat to the Soviet Union and the countries associated with it, despite the bogies which they are continually raising about the "aggressive designs of the North Atlantic bloc." Whether or not we have reached that position of strength which we hoped would be sufficient to produce a change of policy on the part of the Soviet Union, we do not know. We can only continue our course steadfastly until we have some concrete evidence that serious negotiations are possible.

Unhappily, we have no such evidence from the work of the Disarmament Commission thus far. But we must not become discouraged and give up. This door to negotiations must not be closed, however depressing the record of the past year.

It may be, of course, that negotiations which could eventually lead to disarmament might begin over some quite different subject. Apart from Korea there are many other questions, on which the Soviet Union could demonstrate its desire to achieve an easing of tension. It could do so, to take a still simpler example, by refraining from its virulent "hate campaign" against the United States, of which the germ warfare charges are merely the crudest example.

Wherever the vicious circle of fear can be broken by any agreement no matter how tentative and small, the results may in time be felt in the Disarmament Commission. In the meanwhile it need not be wasting its time. It has before it a rather formidable technical task, which can be pursued usefully, although within limits, even in the present state of affairs. The ground can in other words be cleared of certain technical problems and the way prepared to hasten the conclusion of a Disarmament Agreement, perhaps by many months, as soon as the will to agree exists not merely on one side but on both. For in this field, as I have said, it takes two to make an agreement.