

As Canadian representative on the Disarmament Commission, I announced the acceptance by the Government of Canada, as part of a general disarmament plan, of the ceiling which the tripartite proposals concerning the limitation and reduction of armed forces would impose on Canadian armed forces, i.e. either less than 1 per cent of population or less than current levels. I then welcomed, as I do now, the initiative of the Western powers in presenting to the Commission detailed constructive and forward-looking proposals, seriously presented as component elements in the comprehensive disarmament plan which it is their intention to develop if there seems any hope of the Soviet Union being interested in such a plan.

Although the Soviet representative on the Commission said on May 14 that his government was ready and anxious to give serious consideration to any proposals for the reduction of armed forces, he made it plain almost as soon as the Western proposals on this subject had been introduced in the Commission a few weeks later that his government would not consider them seriously. Since that time the Soviet Delegation has not only confirmed that they would not even take the tripartite proposals as a basis for discussion, but had failed to provide the Commission with equally specific alternative proposals of its own.

Finally ... I should like to refer briefly to what the Soviet representative said on the subject of bacteriological warfare. He tried to confuse the issue by asserting that the Disarmament Commission refused to give a hearing to Soviet proposals concerning the prohibition of bacteriological weapons. This is not what the Disarmament Commission did at all. I was Chairman of the Commission at that time and what I ruled out of order, as the records of the Disarmament Commission for March 28 last year show, was not any discussion of proposals for the prohibition of bacteriological or any other weapons. My ruling was simply - and I quote - "This is not the proper forum to consider or debate specific charges of bacteriological warfare". No attempt was made at any time to prevent any member of the Commission from making proposals to prohibit bacteriological or any other weapons but charges of a specific character are of course quite out of place under the terms of reference of the Disarmament Commission as established by the General Assembly in Paris last year.

When, as Canadian representative on the Disarmament Commission, I commented on the present report, while it was being considered in the Commission, I expressed my regret at the meagre results achieved by the Commission. A Canadian paper, the Telegraph Journal of Saint John, New Brunswick, commented editorially, on October 1 last, that, although "regret" is the language of diplomacy, "heartbreak" would have been a more appropriate term.

The heartbreak. ... is that although the Soviet Union say that they stand for peace, for disarmament, for the prohibition of the atomic bomb and bacteriological warfare, and at the same time they make it perfectly plain that they have no intention of making any of these things possible. Categorically and explicitly, we are in favour of the elimination and prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, including atomic and bacteriological weapons. We are in favour of a balanced reduction of armed forces, commencing with a reduction of the forces of the great powers to approximately 3,000,000 men on each side, as part of a