

So far, Mr. Chairman, I have been dealing with questions relating to nuclear testing, but although this subject has been in the forefront of our discussions here, and although my Government attributes great importance to it, we must, I believe, all agree that it is not the heart of the matter.

Let me make our viewpoint clear. What we want is total disarmament as soon as possible. We do not like nuclear weapons and we want to rid the world of them. We do not, however, subscribe to the thesis that it is only nuclear warfare that is wicked, with the apparent conclusion that if we could get rid of it we could go back to nice clean wars like the last one. The existence of nuclear weapons in the first place was made necessary by the existence on a larger scale of conventional weapons of destruction. The refinement of nuclear weapons after the Second World War was made necessary by the accumulation and the threatening use of huge conventional armaments by the U.S.S.R. and its allies -- coupled, of course, with their own stockpiles of weapons and missiles. It is not stubbornness or malevolence which causes us to insist on the connection between nuclear and conventional disarmament. We cannot tackle one aspect of disarmament without tackling the other.

I am no more happy than other speakers that peace should be maintained by a balance of the forces of destruction. That is why Canada wants to move forward through stages of disarmament to healthier international relations. This is a hard world, however, and the transition from a balance of forces to something better is precarious. Those who insist on the immediate abolition of nuclear weapons without regard to any other factors, should ask themselves whether they are sure that the unhealthy balance of power which would result in the world would guarantee peace for any country. Would it, for instance, safeguard the countries on the expanding perimeter of the Communist empire? It has been with conventional forces and the threat of conventional forces that those countries have been threatened or subjugated in the past. We do not yet live in the ideal world of the philosophers and we dare not talk here as if we did.

Having insisted thus on the fundamental importance of balanced disarmament, I wish to make clear that Canada recognizes that we can proceed to our goal only by stages. We do not object to taking a first step, if that step is valuable in itself and equitable in effect. In particular, we strongly endorse the suspension of nuclear tests as an initial measure. We do so because we believe that suspension can soon become permanent cessation. Such a measure, we hope, would encourage greater mutual confidence. The essential control feature, although not an end in itself,