

radio broadcasts of other nations.

It is perhaps significant that the governments where this situation of freedom exists and which are represented in the United Nations Commission for Conventional Armaments have all approved the working paper submitted on the initiative of the Government of France, which provided for the submission by each nation of information in this field and for the necessary surveys and checks to substantiate such information put forward by themselves and by other countries. The Soviet Union and Ukrainian representatives in this Commission have opposed this proposal for substantiation of information. And that is disturbing, if not, perhaps, surprising. These representatives have denounced the plan for such surveys and substantiation as a scheme to make of the United Nations a branch of what is called an "Anglo-American Intelligence Service". As recently as October 11 in this Council, the representative of the Ukrainian S.S.R. repeated these baseless charges. If this attitude persists, it is difficult for us to see what progress can be made in the limitation and reduction of armaments.

This Soviet Union opposition to the plan for surveys adopted by the Commission in response to the instruction of the General Assembly is justified by an insistence on what is, in our view, an outmoded and old-fashioned concept of unrestricted national sovereignty which would make international progress in this field of disarmament and, indeed, in other fields practically impossible.

So far as the Canadian Government is concerned, we favour the fullest possible interchange of information on armaments and verification of such information. Our French colleague has submitted an alternative proposal to the Soviet Union resolution, and this provides for such verification. I hope that our Soviet Union colleague can prove the sincerity of his resolution by supporting this alternative and by agreeing that any information which his Government may give in this field shall be subjected, like that given by other governments, to impartial international investigation.

Turning now for a moment to the question of information on atomic weapons, it is our opinion that what we need here is a free pooling of substantiated information and, indeed, of facilities and activities in this vitally important field as part of, and this, I think, is essential, a co-operative international effort to control nuclear forces and ensure their use for peaceful purposes alone and to ensure also the effective prohibition of atomic weapons and their elimination from national armaments.

It is a fact, borne out through years of intensive study in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and elsewhere, that effective verification of the amount of nuclear materials in being or in production, and the effective prevention of clandestine diversion to secretly stocked weapon can be accomplished, in the present state of our technical knowledge, only through international management and operation of plants handling dangerous quantities of atomic materials and through inspection of other phases such as mining and milling.

My government has long been prepared, and is now prepared, to accept the degree of international co-operation and the necessary limitations on national sovereignty which world security in this field requires. That being our view, we will not be in a position to support any effort to mislead the world on this important matter by pretending that in default of such controls, humanity need not fear the use of atomic weapons if, in fact, that is not the case. But we will certainly support every genuine and effective proposal to remove that fear.

I do not suggest that the Security Council can settle or even adequately consider this complicated question of the control of atomic energy in this discussion. The General Assembly has referred consideration of this question to the Atomic Energy Commission and has asked the six permanent