

I do not intend today to deal in any detail with the terms of the disarmament proposals that were put before the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission by the four Western powers, but I feel it well to refer for but a moment to the question of the suspension of tests of nuclear and atomic weapons.

The suspension as provided for in the Western proposals would be for a year, conditional on a convention on disarmament being entered into, and this would be renewable for a second year if satisfactory progress had been made towards a cessation of the production of nuclear weapons. But there are well-intentioned people—many people—who believe that a ban on atomic tests is a panacea for all the ills of mankind. In all the clamour there has been over this, some have lost sight of the fact that the suspension of tests is not going to stop the stock-piling of nuclear weapons or the atomic armaments race. The only way to do this is to divert fissionable material from the manufacture of weapons to peaceful uses, and the Western proposals very sensibly linked an agreement to do this with a continuation of the suspension of the tests.

While treating the suspension of nuclear tests as a matter for immediate action, the 11-point Western proposals made such suspension dependent on the establishment of nuclear watching posts in the territories agreed on of the United States, the United Kingdom, the U.S.S.R. and other countries. . . .

In addition to inspection, the other Western proposals also included in the first stage a limitation on the size of armed forces; a ban on the use of nuclear weapons except in the case of defence; and 'international supervision' to ensure that the production of fissionable materials should be for peaceful uses only.

We believe that these proposals are eminently fair and workable, but for some reason the U.S.S.R. has cavalierly and contemptuously refused to consider them seriously. Surely they must realize that in the climate of distrust and fear which exists paper declarations, however pious their purpose, are not acceptable and that a prerequisite to disarmament must be an adequate system of inspection and control. . . .

The Western nations have gone more than half-way on the subject of disarmament from the beginning of the meetings of the Sub-Committee. For some reason the Soviets have refused to give any ground and insist on its programme. And I say with all the sincerity that I can bring to my words that we in Canada, in the strategic position in which we are, are willing to go to the utmost limit of safety and survival to bring about disarmament. . . .

On September 30, the Disarmament Commission was convened to consider the fourth and fifth reports of its Sub-Committee. Two meetings were held, during which the representatives of each of the powers on the Commission (with the exception of the Philippines representative, who was chairman) spoke briefly on the progress of the recent Sub-Committee session, and on the various proposals which had been submitted to it. The Commission then decided, without objection, to take note of the fourth and fifth reports of its Sub-Committee, and to transmit them, together with relevant documents and the proceedings of the Commission, to the General Assembly and the Security Council. The statements of the majority of representatives again emphasized the very great need for agreement on measures to put a stop to the armaments race, and called upon the powers concerned to renew their efforts in this direction. In discussing the work of the Sub-Committee, the Canadian representative reviewed what he considered had been the most important developments during the preceding few months. In spite of the fact that agreement had not been reached, it was the Canadian view, he said, that the work of the Sub-Committee had not been in vain.

. . . on some important questions the gap between opposing positions has narrowed; and, on the whole, the work of the latest session of the Sub-Committee was conducted in a realistic way appropriate to negotiations which are expected to have early and practical results and are not merely propaganda exchanges. The Canadian Government regards as an unfortunate lapse from this standard of negotiation the hasty and rather scornful rejection by the Soviet representative of the working paper for partial measures of disarmament of August 29, of which Canada was one of the sponsors. We trust that,