

of a pen or the passage of a resolution. But I am convinced that such an achievement is within our capacity and within our grasp.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I ask seriously this question. What is the alternative? Are we once again to end our discussions in deadlock? We should ask ourselves each of us, have we all really faced up to the meaning of this for the peoples of the world—for all mankind? Prime Minister Diefenbaker, in participating in the general debate, concluded his statement in the general debate with the heartfelt wish that this Assembly might become known in future years as the Disarmament Assembly. My final word is a plea directed primarily to the great powers, which must bear the main responsibilities, for at least a beginning in actual measures of disarmament. Canada has co-sponsored plans for partial disarmament but I repeat we do not regard them as necessarily the last word. Further negotiations in the interests of world peace is the bounden duty of all of us. At the beginning the experience gained and the confidence created by our first steps in disarmament—however limited—could lead us on towards our goal which is the elimination of nuclear weapons. The stake is the very survival of the human race.

Following the general debate, discussion of specific proposals began on October 31. A total of eight meetings was devoted to the consideration of the ten draft resolutions and amendments to them which were before the Committee.

When advocating the Soviet resolution calling for the establishment of a permanent disarmament commission composed of all members of the United Nations, the Soviet representative, Mr. Kuznetsov, stated that experience had shown that the Disarmament Commission and its Sub Committee "are unable to achieve any progress in the solution of the disarmament problem". The Soviet Union believed, he continued, that the question of disarmament "must be permanently under the supervision of all states of the world", and it was this belief that had motivated the submission of their proposal. Under conditions in which "all attempts to make use of the Disarmament Sub-Committee for productive work have been entirely exhausted", the Soviet Union could see no sense in further participation in its work, and would not take part in the deliberations of either the Commission or its Sub-Committee in their present composition.

Speaking shortly after Mr. Kuznetsov, the Canadian representative, Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, M.P., stated that the Canadian Delegation was "shocked and disappointed by this ultimatum from the USSR, in view of the manifest desire of this Committee to make progress on the great issue of disarmament". In a further intervention on November 6, Mr. Nesbitt elaborated the Canadian position on proposals to change the existing United Nations machinery for disarmament negotiations. The Canadian Delegation, he said, did not believe that

the size or composition of the Disarmament Commission and the Sub-Committee has been a major obstacle in the way of agreement. But, by the same token we do not believe that a matter of some alteration in United Nations disarmament bodies need inevitably be allowed to stand in the way of at least the opportunity for further negotiation.

The attitude of the Canadian Delegation on this matter is not something new. While we have, of course, taken into account all the views expressed in this Committee, our fundamental approach to a possible change in disarmament bodies was defined by Prime Minister Diefenbaker in his statement in the General Debate on September 23. He made it clear at that time that we were certainly not opposed in principle to associating other countries with these disarmament talks if there was any chance that this would improve the prospects of success. If, however, the very possibility of continuing the negotiations at all is now jeopardized, then a willingness to accept some reasonable adjustment is all the more essential.

Our Committee's assessment of the importance of suggested alterations of disarmament bodies cannot be unaffected by the Soviet statement of two days ago announcing refusal to serve on the Commission and Sub-Committee as now constituted. But our