

major agreements reached at the Conference at Geneva would have to be submitted to a wider conference of all militarily significant nations. This would be necessary if disarmament was to be "general" -- that is to say, if it was to apply to all nations in the world.

It is well known to all those who have any experience of disarmament discussions in the United Nations that, unless the viewpoints of the two super-powers -- that is, the United States and the Soviet Union -- are fairly close together in respect to any proposed measure, no positive results are to be expected from negotiations in any kind of forum. The Canadian delegation, therefore, feels that we shall be able to assess the usefulness of calling a world conference in the light of what degree of consensus of views we manage to obtain here in this Commission on the various measures we shall be discussing. For example, if no agreement has been reached on the approach to general and complete disarmament between the great powers at Geneva, with 17 nations participating, is there any likelihood that a forum with 120 nations well-known Soviet Union position that important agreement must be brought about by unanimity, and the refusal of the Soviet Union on numerous occasions to agree to proposals supported by large majorities in the United Nations which the Soviet Union thought were not right. In the matter of disarmament, agreement has to be reached by negotiation between the nations that possess the great armaments. World opinion, as expressed in this forum, undoubtedly has a great influence on the attitude of the heavily-armed countries, but experience up to now has shown that even resolutions supported by a large majority are not decisive in producing agreement on any particular measure.

I assume that considerations such as those which I have just outlined led the representative of India last Tuesday to say that he did not believe that the present was an appropriate time for a world conference. We fully agree with him that what we need first of all today with respect to disarmament is detailed discussions on the terms of a treaty based on the broad principles which have already been laid down.

The Canadian delegation is very reluctant to engage in controversy on matters which lie outside the subject for which we understood this Conference was called. We regret that the representative of the Soviet Union found it necessary to deliver such an intemperate and unfounded attack on the Federal Republic of Germany as he did at the seventy-second meeting. We have, unfortunately become accustomed in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee to this kind of tactic when the subject of non-dissemination is discussed, or rather when we tried to discuss it. Instead of a businesslike negotiation of a problem which is by no means insoluble, we get hysterical denunciations of a so-called German revanchism. This is in spite of the fact, many times stated in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee and elsewhere, that the highest authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany have repeatedly disclaimed any intention of becoming an independent nuclear power.

There are many statements which I could quote in this connection, but I shall cite only one, which in our view amply refutes the groundless charges we have heard. On 19 June 1964, Chancellor Erhard stated the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany as follows: