

on the basic principles of general and complete disarmament the cause of disarmament will not be benefited by the resumption of negotiations. In our view, the purpose of the negotiations is, in the first place, to find a basis for agreement and then go on to develop that agreement. That is why it is so essential to focus attention on the central problem of restarting negotiations, whether or not agreement is reached here on basic principles.

I have often expressed my conviction that the way to disarmament lies through serious negotiation — that is, hard bargaining about concrete measures, pursued in good faith, with patience and determination until an agreement is reached. The most recent attempt to negotiate disarmament agreements was made, of course, in the Ten-Nation Committee. In renewed disarmament negotiations, surely it would be wiser to capitalize on and consolidate such progress as was made in the Ten-Nation Committee than to start from the beginning all over again. For its part, Canada is ready now, today, to resume the work which the Ten-Nation Committee began in Geneva, because, as the representatives know, we happen to be a member of that Committee.

Defence of Ten-Nation Committee

It can hardly be said seriously that the Ten-Nation Committee is not suited for hard bargaining. It embodies essentially a "two-sides" conception; it brings face to face the powers possessing the most powerful weapons and having the most experience in disarmament negotiations. Whatever the shortcomings of the negotiations, and I admit that there were shortcomings, they cannot be blamed on the negotiating forum.

Unfortunately, in the Ten-Nation Committee the two sides have tended to talk at cross-purposes. In an effort to avoid this, the Canadian representative in the Ten-Nation Committee made several suggestions for concentrating the discussion on substantive measures. One was that proposals of comparable significance from the plans of each side should be discussed in packages. That is, a proposal by the Soviet side should be considered in conjunction with the proposals from the Western side and an attempt made to reach agreement on those two proposals — one from each side. And we described this as discussing the problem in packages. This was not a proposal that we seek only partial disarmament, as some have argued, but rather what we believe is a practical approach to the negotiations — a practical way to start getting results.

A desire to ensure a business-like approach in the Committee was also the basis for my suggestions in the Disarmament Commission, which sat in this room two months ago, that the negotiating committee might benefit from having a neutral chairman. I have in mind a chairman known for his record of impartiality and for his experience in dealing with difficult discussions. The basis of selection would be personal qualities rather than nationality. He might be a national of one of the middle or smaller powers which have not been connected with current negotiations; for instance, I give as an example the chairman of the Disarmament