

And now we have reached the point - if not of no return, at least of no return to the possibility of accounting accurately for past production of nuclear weapons material, and of bringing it under international control.

However, I repeat that there has been some progress. On certain fundamentally important matters of principle the position of the major powers concerned is now less opposed. I have in mind, for example, the fact that the Soviet Government no longer calls for unconditional preliminary banning of nuclear weapons, but recognizes that measures of nuclear disarmament must be related to measures of conventional disarmament. There has also been a lessening of the differences of view as to the levels of forces of the great powers.

On the crucial matter of adequate and effective inspection and control of disarmament measures, the absolutely indispensable condition to an acceptable disarmament agreement, there has likewise been some progress. As a result of the discussions of the past year it is now, for the first time, possible to say that there is general agreement that the international control organization should have representatives established in the territory of the states concerned before disarmament actually begins, and that these control officials should remain in place throughout the duration of such disarmament agreement. In its latest proposals, the Soviet Delegation has also apparently accepted at least the principle of aerial inspection as one of the attributes of the control organization. While it is true that this reference to aerial inspection is by no means without limitations and conditions, we certainly welcome the fact that the Soviet Government has at least agreed, even if only in principle, to such inspection.

It is also my impression that in the last year or so there has been a growing realism in disarmament discussions. There has been considerably less tendency to advance proposals which, like the unconditional banning of the bomb, were recognized even by their advocates as quite unacceptable to other powers involved and were put forward for purposes which had little to do with disarmament or security. I think it is also increasingly recognized and accepted that disarmament measures must contribute to the security of the major powers concerned, and must not weaken the defensive position of one country relative to another. Governments must take very seriously their primary duty to defend their own people, and they must be convinced that disarmament measures are satisfactory from this point of view.

Turning now to the present discussion in the Political Committee, I should like first of all to welcome the moderately worded, businesslike and hopeful statement with which the distinguished representative of the United States opened the debate. I do not wish, at the present time, to go into the detail of the proposals of the United States, although I do wish to welcome this latest contribution to our negotiations.