

## DISARMAMENT

(Continued from P. 2)

wanting. The U.S.S.R. is on record with offers which should make such a programme possible. There is no question, therefore, as has been suggested in this debate, of the United States and the United Kingdom attempting to impose something by marshalling a majority vote of the Assembly. Given good will and good faith, there is no reason why there should be a single test explosion after October 31, ten days from now.

Whatever declarations we might extract from the Great Powers, I do not believe we can expect any of them to scrap completely and immediately their capacity to develop and test nuclear weapons, because it will take time to establish and prove the worth of an agreement. Whether we call it a cessation, a suspension, or a discontinuance of tests, the fact is that it will of necessity be tentative until all parties concerned are assured that the control system is operating effectively.

I realize that there are those who honestly doubt that the Western Powers are in earnest and that they are seeking to provide a means of escape from any agreement on discontinuance of nuclear tests. For my part, I can say that I am by no means certain of the good intentions of the U.S.S.R., but I am prepared to accept the declarations they have made before us and at Geneva, in spite of the attempts they have made here to cloud the issue. As for the United States and the United Kingdom, I know much more of their intentions. I am convinced of their determination to strive earnestly for a situation in which the cessation of tests will be achieved.

The stand of my own Government was put on record last April when the Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, stated in an address: "My hope is that the nations of the free world will announce in the immediate future their desire and willingness to discontinue nuclear tests, except for the application of known explosive techniques to peaceful purposes, provided that there is suitable international supervision."

In my country we do not make or possess nuclear weapons. Our considerable atomic energy industry is devoted to peaceful uses. It is tempting to make a virtue of this fact and commit thereby the all too common sin of those of us who are not great powers. Canada is linked for reasons of defence with those who do possess nuclear weapons, and we do not question their justification for doing so under present circumstances. All of us here would do more for the cause of genuine disarmament if we would recognize the terrible dilemma which faces the great powers today, and not treat their problems as if they were miasmas which could be exorcized by rhetoric.

Nothing I have said is intended to give the impression that we in Canada view the development of nuclear weapons with equanimity. I

think we should all be grateful to the distinguished Foreign Minister of Ireland for bringing to our attention, here and now, the danger involved in the spread of nuclear weapons. I share his grave anxiety at the uncontrollable anarchy which could result from the wide dissemination of these dangerous instruments. The main danger, as we see it, lies in an extension of the capability of making nuclear weapons, and I join heartily in Mr. Aiken's appeal to all those not now engaged in making nuclear weapons to refrain from doing so. The indiscriminate spread of nuclear weapons by transfer is something which we should also like to discourage. Nevertheless, to forbid absolutely their transfer, before relevant disarmament measures are agreed upon, might not contribute to the good cause which Mr. Aiken has in mind.

As I stated in the General Assembly, we are deeply concerned over the stalemate that has been reached in United Nations machinery to deal with disarmament. The Disarmament Commission has been rendered inoperable by the demand for "parity". Parity, it seems to me, is one of the most reactionary principles yet propounded in the United Nations and would quickly destroy our institutions if it were accepted. Any country, which has the best interests of the United Nations at heart, must struggle to maintain the necessary flexibility for movement and growth. It must frustrate efforts from all quarters to force member states into two or more camps. The principle of "parity" would freeze us into a strait-jacket of alignments, so rigid and so unnatural, that paralysis would quickly set in. I fully agree that the many various schools of thought in the Assembly should be represented, and I admit that the proportions in United Nations bodies dealing with disarmament and other subjects have not always been justifiable. It was for this reason that my Delegation last year took a lead in seeking a more equitable distribution of seats in the Disarmament Commission. We see no reason, however, why we should distort the world to suit the Soviet Union. Adjustment of the balance of interests is one thing, but this so-called "parity" is something quite different. For our part, we could not agree to the principle of "parity", whether it was put forward by the Soviet Union, or by any other great power.

It may be that the time has come for a new approach to the whole question of disarmament machinery in the United Nations. The Secretary-General, in his memorandum, has suggested the new responsibilities which will have to be accepted, if, as we trust, positive results are achieved in Geneva. We may be moving from a largely deliberative phase to a phase in which the United Nations will have administrative, along with deliberative, functions. If progress begets progress, then both aspects of our work may be much greater than anything