

most of the members of this Committee who have spoken (this includes the representatives of the great nuclear powers) have expressed themselves in favour of the objective of the discontinuance, under sufficient control, of nuclear testing for weapons purposes. There are important differences as to timing and as to the relationship of test discontinuance to other aspects of disarmament. But agreement as to the acknowledged goal remains.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Delegation has no desire to foster an illusion of unity where none exists. On the contrary, we believe that a practical and realistic approach which faces all facts is the only one which offers any hope for progress towards disarmament. But we think that, if there is a measure of agreement as to our aims, this fact should find expression.

When we turn from words to deeds in this matter of test explosions, we are faced with an obscurity in the Soviet position which gives ground for real concern. One of the most promising auguries for the success of the forthcoming Geneva negotiations has been the willingness of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to suspend all test explosions for one year from October 31, the date from which these negotiations begin. When is the Soviet Union going to match this offer? For what purpose is the Soviet Government keeping us all in suspense while awaiting an answer to this question. The equivocal statement made by Mr. Zorin on this subject on October 10 can hardly be considered adequate. Members of the Committee may be more interested in this practical question than in score cards of past nuclear explosions.

So far, Mr. Chairman, I have been dealing with questions relating to nuclear testing, but although this subject has been in the fore-front of our discussions here, and although my Government attributes great importance to it, we must, I believe, all agree that it is not the heart of the matter.

Let me make our viewpoint clear. What we want is total disarmament as soon as possible. We do not like nuclear weapons and we want to rid the world of them. We do not, however, subscribe to the thesis that it is only nuclear warfare that is wicked, with the apparent conclusion that if we could get rid of it we could go back to nice clean wars like the last one. The existence of nuclear weapons in the first place was made necessary by the existence on a larger scale of conventional weapons of destruction. The refinement of nuclear weapons after the Second World War was made necessary by the accumulation and the threatening use of huge conventional armaments by the U.S.S.R. and its allies -- coupled, of course, with their own stockpiles of weapons and missiles. It is not stubbornness or malice which causes us to insist on the connection between nuclear and conventional disarmament. We cannot tackle one aspect of disarmament without tackling the other.

I am no more happy than other speakers that peace should be maintained by a balance of the forces of destruction. That is why Canada wants to move forward through stages of disarmament to healthier international relations. This is a hard world, however, and the transition from a balance of forces to something better is precarious. Those who insist on the immediate abolition of nuclear weapons without regard to any other factors, should ask themselves whether they are sure that the unhealthy balance of power which would result in the world would guarantee peace for any country. Would it, for instance, safeguard the countries on the expanding perimeter of the Communist empire? It has been with conventional forces and the threat of conventional forces that those countries have been threatened or subjugated in the past. We do not yet live in the ideal world of the philosophers and we dare not talk here as if we did.

Having insisted thus on the fundamental importance of balanced disarmament, I wish to make clear that Canada recognizes that we can proceed to our goal only by stages. We do not object to taking a first step, if that step is valuable in itself and equitable in effect. In particular, we strongly endorse the suspension of nuclear tests as an initial measure. We do so because we believe that suspension can soon become permanent cessation. Such a measure, we hope, would encourage greater mutual confidence. The essential control feature, although not an end in itself, could become a first great experiment in international scientific collaboration. It would point the way to a solution of the complex problems ahead in controlling more difficult aspects of disarmament -- because no progress in disarmament is possible without control. The establishment thus set up might also carry on positive scientific programmes in the spirit of the International Geophysical Year.

The immediate suspension of tests would have many desirable results. Nevertheless we should realize that serious risks are involved for those countries which have sought to turn their manpower to productive purposes and are forced to rely on modern arms for their security. The offer of the United States and the United Kingdom should not be underestimated. It is a daring step in a perilous international situation.

For our part, we have always pressed in this Assembly for the cessation of nuclear tests as urgently as possible. Those of us who are impatient, however, should all take stock of the extent to which the United States and the United Kingdom have changed, in the interest of reaching agreement with the Soviet Government, conditions considered only a few months ago as necessary accompaniments of the suspension of tests. No power can be expected to rush into moves of this kind without caution. If this programme is accepted by the U.S.S.R., it can lead us to the total cessation of tests, which we are all united in