We were encouraged by the improved international atmosphere at that time. Meeting the wish of the Soviet Union for parity in the composition of the negotiating body seemed to ensure good opportunities for serious negotiation. Furthermore, we had before us the pattern and experience of the tripartite negotiations on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, which had been protracted and difficult but in which gradual progress had been made.

It seemed that the four-power agreement to establish the 10-Nation Committee had paved the way for a new and promising approach to disarmament. We saw in this approach an opportunity for the two sides, representing the most heavily-armed alliances in the world, to negotiate their differences bilaterally with a view to establishing a pattern for universal disarmament. It was assumed that any progress resulting from these negotiations would be reported to the United Nations and that, ultimately, the pattern developed between these alliances would form the basis for more extensive agreements and arrangements within the United Nations framework.

Hopes Shattered

Our hopes and desires in that regard were rudely shattered when, on June 27, the negotiations in the 10-Nation Committee were interrupted. It would be quite fruitless, and indeed contrary to my whole purpose, if I were to dwell upon the reasons for the interruption of those negotiations. They are dealt with, in any event, by the report to the Disarmament Commission by the five Western members of the 10-Nation Committee. I shall say only that, in the Canadian view, the negotiations need never have been broken off. I hope to demonstrate this during the course of my statement. My object in doing so is to support wholeheartedly the main purpose for which this meeting of the Disarmament Commission has been convened, that is, to bring about a resumption of the disarmament negotiations.

I do not wish to imply that the results obtained in the 10-Nation Committee were what they should have been. On the contrary, the Canadian Government believes that greater progress was possible and should have been made. In statements in Canada and elsewhere, I have made no secret of my view, that in some respects the pace and trend of events in the 10-Nation Committee was unsatisfactory. I do say, however, that the negotiations in the 10-Nation Committee did produce some drawing together of opposing positions and should have been pursued.

This was true at the time when the talks were interrupted. It was difficult to understand the logic of the action taken to discontinue the negotiations then, particularly as the failure of the Summit meeting had given the remaining East-West negotiations increased importance. However, despite