

then go on to develop that agreement. That is why it is so essential to focus attention on the central problem of re-starting negotiations, whether or not agreement is reached here on basic principles.

"I have often expressed my conviction that the way to disarmament lies through serious negotiation--that is, hard bargaining about concrete measures, pursued in good faith, with patience and determination until an agreement is reached. The most recent attempt to negotiate disarmament agreements was made, of course, in the Ten-Nation Committee. In renewed disarmament negotiations, surely it would be wiser to capitalize on and consolidate such progress as was made in the Ten-Nation Committee than to start from the beginning all over again. For its part, Canada is ready now, today, to resume the work which the Ten-Nation Committee began in Geneva, because, as the representatives know, we happen to be a member of that Committee.

DEFENCE OF TEN-NATION COMMITTEE

"It can hardly be said seriously that the Ten-Nation Committee is not suited for hard bargaining. It embodies essentially a two-sides concept; it brings face to face the powers possessing the most powerful weapons and having the most experience in disarmament negotiations. Whatever the shortcomings of the negotiations, and I admit that there were shortcomings, they cannot be blamed on the negotiating forum.

"Unfortunately, in the Ten-Nation Committee the two sides have tended to talk at cross-purposes. In an effort to avoid this, the Canadian representative in the Ten-Nation Committee made several suggestions for concentrating the discussion on substantive measures. One was that proposals of comparable significance from the plans of each side should be discussed in packages. That is, a proposal by the Soviet side should be considered in conjunction with the proposals from the Western side and an attempt be made to reach agreement on those two proposals--one from each side. And we described this as discussing the problem in packages. This was not a proposal that we seek only partial disarmament, as some have argued, but rather what we believe is a practical approach to the negotiations--a practical way to start getting results.

"A desire to ensure a business-like approach in the Committee was also the basis for my suggestion in the Disarmament Commission which sat in this room two months ago that the negotiating committee might benefit from having a neutral chairman. I have in mind a chairman known for his record of impartiality and for his experience in dealing with difficult discussions. The basis of selection would be personal qualities rather than nationality. He might be a national of one of the middle or smaller powers which have not been connected with current negotiations; for

instance, I give as an example the chairman of the Disarmament Commission, or it might be a citizen of a country which does not belong to the UN, such as Switzerland.

A NEUTRAL CHAIRMAN

"The neutral chairman would attend impartially to the procedures of the Committee and see that it had a regular order of business at each meeting. With such a chairman and procedure, the Committee would be spared, I am sure, the talking at cross-purposes. In short, this neutral chairman could assist in conducting a discussion on the complex maze of problems which comprise the disarmament question.

"For if we have learned anything at all during the protracted international discussion of disarmament, it is that the subject is complicated, and it grows more so with each passing week, month and year of weapons development. We need only remember the statements which have already been made in this discussion today to realize that fact. If we are ever to cope with the growing problem, we must make a start on actual measures, without detracting from the more comprehensive plans related to ultimate goals:

"The very complexity of the issues indicates one way to make progress, and that is, through technical studies. It is already common ground that many measures of disarmament and their verification will require joint technical studies before there can be agreement on and implementation of actual measures. And in this connection, I was somewhat surprised to hear the representative of the U.S.S.R. arguing so strongly this morning against technical studies. In a minute or two I hope to be able to show that his own side have expressed great interest and have actually carried out joint technical studies in the three-power committee at Geneva.

"It seems to my Government that a useful list of possibilities--which does not necessarily have to be treated as exhaustive--is to be found in the draft resolution on technical studies submitted by the United Kingdom in Document A/CI/1.251. This draft resolution, as I understand it, seeks to give expression to the important suggestion made by Prime Minister Macmillan in the general debate that many aspects of the disarmament question might usefully be approached from the scientific point of view. The Canadian Government favours this approach and believes it capable of extension, even beyond the limits which the United Kingdom may have envisaged for it.

"We see this as a procedure to expedite negotiations--not to delay them as some would suggest. The powers concerned should be willing to begin joint technical studies concerning the measures, at the earliest possible date, irrespective of any interruption in the political negotiations on disarmament. If it is agreed that studies are required in order to facilitate negotiations, why not undertake those studies at once?