

point of view. This development represented the normal course of a negotiation. Yet it was just at the stage, when new proposals had been introduced by both sides, that the negotiations were broken off. In other words, the interruption took place at the least logical time.

PERSEVERANCE AND PATIENCE

"No matter how difficult the task of achieving agreement may appear or how slow the progress may seem, there can be no valid reason for not pursuing disarmament negotiations with perseverance and patience. Those countries that have been given and that have accepted the responsibility for negotiation -- and that of course includes Canada -- are bound to continue their search for agreement. World opinion expects no less of them, as we saw last year when the UN General Assembly unanimously pronounced that disarmament was the most important subject facing the world today. It is this expectation on the part of the world community that underlines the seriousness of the interruption in the work of the 10-Nation Committee just when it appeared that progress was being made....

"Perhaps the most important aspect of disarmament where more progress is called for is the question of nuclear carriers. The Soviet disarmament programme presented to the UN General Assembly on September 18, 1959, proposed that nuclear carriers should be abolished in the last stage of disarmament. However, in the revised Soviet programme of June 2, 1960, it is proposed that all nuclear carriers should be abolished in the first stage. Speakers for the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European delegations during the discussions following the presentation of the revised Soviet plan claimed that this alteration was made to accord with the wishes of the Western nations. In fact, the Soviet proposal in regard to the abolition of nuclear carriers went from one extreme of timing to the other, in the process over-shooting the target -- which they claimed they were aiming at -- of reaching accommodation with Western views on this vital area of disarmament.

"Perhaps it would be possible for the U.S.S.R. to modify its position again, placing it between these two extremes. The Western position also, as expressed in U.S.A. proposals of June 27, 1960, has been modified in the direction of specifying the complete eventual elimination of nuclear carriers and advancing the timing of the several stages in which this is to be accomplished.

"I have tried to give briefly, and in general terms, the position of the West and East in regard to the elimination of nuclear carriers. I think progress was made during the Geneva talks toward a common position, although the progress here was less than in other areas I have mentioned. There would seem

to be no compelling reason why, if negotiations were resumed, there should not be further progress and eventual arrival at an agreed position. The approach through balanced concessions could be applied to this area of disarmament -- that is, the elimination of nuclear carriers.

ARMS RACE PERIL

"It is of the most vital interest to all nations of the world, not only to nations that would be most directly affected if nuclear warfare breaks out. The reason is that it is in multiplying ICBMs, and perhaps other even more terrifying means of mass destruction, that the armaments race is concentrated. This arms race goes on right now. Every month that is allowed to elapse without its being checked adds to tension and suspicion, and makes eventual disarmament more difficult....

"It has not been my intention to review the whole course of the negotiations in the 10-Nation Committee. Nor have I sought to attach blame unduly to one side or the other for the failure to make the kind of progress I think the present world situation demands. But I do hope that all members of this Disarmament Commission will share my great concern about the fact that these most important negotiations have been interrupted and will give their full support to a clear recommendation calling for the early resumption of those negotiations.

"The Disarmament Commission is competent to exercise UN responsibility in this regard and to use its influence in the constructive sense I have suggested. I firmly believe that the Commission should neither hesitate nor equivocate in calling for resumed negotiations.

A NEUTRAL CHAIRMAN

"I have an additional suggestion to make, which may make it easier for both sides to resume negotiations. In my view the 10-Nation Committee might benefit from having a neutral Chairman, who could regularize the order of business, especially when the two sides were deadlocked in this regard. It might be difficult to reach agreement on the appointment of such a Chairman, but one possibility would be to have him designated by the Secretary-General in consultation with the powers concerned.

"Mr. Chairman, geographically Canada lies between the two leading nuclear powers -- the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. We are bound to suffer terribly in a nuclear war and we believe that many other nations would suffer as well, if not by direct destruction, then by the effects of fallout. If the nuclear powers were to engage in total war, they would probably destroy civilization -- let us face that fact, and I do not believe anybody can deny it -- and this destruction could result from a mistake or miscalculation as has been admitted by the two previous speakers.