

What must be remembered by every thinking citizen of this troubled planet is that the tension existing today has been created by the Soviet Union which continues to add fuel to the flame. Not only has the Soviet Union created tension through its policies in international affairs, about which I shall have a word to say later on, but it has added to it by the efforts which it is making to create confusion and dissension within the borders of every liberty-loving and democratic State. If the leaders of the Soviet Union are sincere in their desire for a peaceful and happy world, we have a right to look to them for a moderation of the tension which they have been and are creating. It is because we see no signs of such moderation that we are in doubt as to Soviet motives in presenting the resolution which is now before us.

Let us turn now to an examination of the Soviet Resolution on Disarmament. We shall have to make our own examination of this resolution because Mr. Vishinsky in a long statement on Thursday last made practically no reference to the resolution itself. We heard a great deal about Mr. Spaak, we heard a great deal about Mr. Bevin, we even heard some historical records about the Disarmament Conference 20 years ago but nothing about the resolution.

How would the resolution, if adopted, add to our security? Why should we regard it as offering a solution to the complex and difficult problem of disarmament?

Questions like these which are normally answered by the sponsor of a resolution were left untouched. Now let me turn again to the resolution. On the question of reducing by one-third the force of the permanent members of the Security Council we have already heard cogent reasons from some of its permanent members as to the utter unsuitability of a mere proportional cut in armaments. There must clearly be qualitative as well as quantitative disarmament. In order to realize the emptiness of the Soviet suggestion that unless we approve their particular resolution we are opposed to disarmament, it is only necessary to turn to the resolution itself and to see what teeth it contains. By teeth I mean what measures of enforcement it provides. No agreement to disarm can be effective unless it provides a clear and workable system for bringing about disarmament and making sure beyond any doubt that the parties to the agreement are living up to their obligations. It is certainly regrettable that Soviet policies have brought the world to a point where we cannot be expected, in view of the secrecy which shrouds the Soviet Union, to accept vague assurances that this or any other measure of disarmament would actually be put into effect inside the borders of that State. That is why we are forced to the conclusion that, at all times, we must concentrate our attention upon measures of enforcement, inspection, verification and control. Canada, like most of the countries that fought together in the recent war, substantially reduced its own armaments and armed forces upon the conclusion of hostilities. We did this in the hope that we might be able to place reliance for our own security on the undertakings to which all members of the United Nations had pledged themselves under the Charter. We also hoped that we could rely on the machinery for the maintenance of international peace provided by the Charter.

No country, therefore, would welcome more sincerely than Canada any progress that can be made towards effective measures of general disarmament. Let there be no mistake about that. Canada warmly welcomes effective measures of general disarmament and that has been our consistent opinion. But we will not support measures of disarmament at the cost of insecurity for ourselves or at the cost of insecurity for other nations bent upon maintaining international peace and security on the basis of the

...../principles