

still using, Mr. Chairman, the outworn vocabulary of international rivalry in the age of intercontinental missiles and the beginning of ventures into outer space. Modern science requires us to achieve a solidarity of purpose as human beings in the great venture of exploring these new developments in science for the benefit of mankind.

The Soviet Union makes a simple appeal -- ban the use of nuclear weapons altogether, or for five years, and then eliminate them entirely, and I must confess, in common with many others throughout the world, that this proposition has an immediate attraction and appeal. An end to any possibility of the use of nuclear weapons is certainly our objective. Why then, it is fair to ask, can we not now accept this simple appeal? The answer is that a promise not to use nuclear weapons is good only until one nation decides to break it. There is at present no reliable means of ensuring the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

A disarmament agreement must be based on something more substantial than mere promises. All nations must know (and be able to rely on that knowledge) that other nations will not continue to keep and develop such weapons in spite of their pledged word to get rid of them. We must be convinced that no nation is planning or preparing the destruction or crippling of another, and each of the nations must, by its deeds and not by mere declarations, persuade the other nations of the world that its weapons will never be used except for defence. We must have mutual trust and confidence, but it must be based on the cold, hard terms of a binding agreement under which real safeguards have been established. If the nations of the world had the faith in one another on which moral obligations without such safeguards would have to depend, they would not now be caught in the dire armaments race.

Throughout the United Nations disarmament talks the U.S.S.R. has been notably reluctant to come to grips with the question of inspection. Instead, they have frequently accused other countries of using arguments of inspection as an excuse for avoiding disarmament. We were considerably encouraged by the fact that at least in principle the Soviet attitude on controls in the last year or so had improved considerably, and I believe this was a major factor in the hopes during the past year that at least a partial disarmament agreement might be soon achieved. It was, therefore, with deep dismay that we heard in the latest Soviet pronouncement the same old contemptuous reference to the guarantees of inspection and control which mark the difference between empty declarations and serious disarmament undertakings.

I know that the deep suspicions which divide the great nations today make any agreement on inspection and controls slow and difficult, but countries which are genuinely peaceful in