

The representative of the Soviet Union emphasized the importance of the Soviet proposals of November 17, 1956. He also introduced three draft resolutions. The first proposed the immediate cessation of nuclear tests; the second called for the convening of a special session of the Assembly on the question of disarmament; and the third proposed the enlargement of the Disarmament Commission to include Egypt, India, Poland and a Latin American country and of the Sub-Committee to include India and Poland.

Canada, Japan and Norway co-sponsored a draft resolution which proposed that the Sub-Committee should give particular and urgent attention to the question of establishing, as a preliminary step, a system for the registration with the United Nations of nuclear test explosions. It further proposed that the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation should co-operate with the states concerned in the operation of such a system with a view to keeping the total actual and expected radiation in the world under constant observation.

### Canadian Statement

The Canadian position was presented by Mr. L. B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs and Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, in the Committee on January 21, in a statement reading in part as follows:

We are once again engaged in what must seem to many one of the most unrewarding activities of the United Nations, discussing ways and means of reducing arms in a climate of international fear, tension and insecurity. This climate is indeed, and the conditions which produced it, the main reason why, in spite of a rather bewildering array of proposals and counter-proposals, we are still far from our goal of agreement on the major steps of a substantial disarmament programme. I think, however, that we have made some progress to that goal. . . .

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. As Mr. Lodge pointed out, further details of these proposals will be developed in the sub-committee, and I would comment now that it seems to the