

of mass destruction, with their swift means of delivery, that had produced profound anxiety and increased tension in the world.

UN Responsibility

Thus, when representatives of the five Western members of the Committee met late in January 1960, in Washington to prepare Western disarmament proposals, the basis of the Canadian position was that serious negotiations should be entered upon as quickly as possible, including negotiations on the subject of nuclear disarmament, and that the principle of the ultimate responsibility of the United Nations for disarmament must be preserved throughout the process of negotiation. The preparatory talks in Washington lasted until the beginning of March. In the end, a plan emerged, which, in form and, to a considerable degree, in substance, was similar to the proposals Mr. Selwyn Lloyd had put before the General Assembly of the United Nations the day before Mr. Khrushchov launched his plan for "general and complete disarmament". Although the Canadian Government was not satisfied that the proposals in their final form had paid sufficient attention to the United Nations or the problems of nuclear disarmament, the Government accepted them as a satisfactory position for initial negotiating.

Stalemate

On March 15, the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee began its sessions in Geneva. These continued until April 28, when the Committee went into recess for the "summit" talks. The Soviet side pressed steadily for the adoption in principle of the plan which Mr. Khrushchov had put forward. The Western powers had their plan too, but they tried to bring the discussion down to specific measures. During the first six weeks of the negotiations the opposing sides stuck firmly to their positions. Discussion, therefore, became increasingly repetitious and progress practically ceased. Generally speaking, the Western side rejected the Khrushchov plan on the ground that its proposals were unrealistic and uncontrollable, while emphasizing that the West shared with the Soviet side the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The Eastern delegations, on the other hand, criticized the Western proposals on the ground that they did not involve *real* disarmament but were merely an attempt to impose "control over armaments". The fundamental difference was in no way resolved at the time of the recess. In addition there were other differences between the Eastern and Western countries on such questions as the level of conventional forces and armaments, the problem of controlling nuclear disarmament, the question of the best approach to the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space, the details of the international disarmament organization for which provision was made in both the Eastern and Western proposals, the questions whether it was possible to fix a time-table for the accomplishment of general and complete disarmament and whether there would be a need for improved machinery to maintain peace in a disarmed world.