

The Prime Minister of France introduced the suggestion that some of the savings resulting from disarmament measures could be used through an international economic organization to carry out a world-wide programme of assistance to under-developed countries. He envisaged that financial and budgetary controls could be provided in the general systems of control which had been planned as part of a disarmament programme.

In addition to the new proposals by the United States and France, a third Western proposal, introduced at Geneva by Prime Minister Eden, was intended as a practical experiment, particularly in the field of control and inspection.

The Soviet Union added little in Geneva to its proposals of May 10 submitted in the Disarmament Sub-committee. The Soviet Prime Minister reiterated at first his Government's suggestion for the withdrawal of foreign troops, the settlement of Far Eastern issues and the normalization of trade relations. Most of the proposals contained in the Soviet plan of May 10 were confirmed in Geneva either in Mr. Bulganin's opening statement or in the Disarmament Paper which he tabled on July 21.

These various proposals were received in the general atmosphere of confidence and optimism which had been generated by the meeting and it was a matter of great satisfaction to my Government, and I am sure to all of us, that there should have been unanimous agreement on the continuation of the Disarmament Sub-committee discussions on August 29 in New York. It is true that in Geneva, in spite of the friendliness of the discussions and the sincerity of those who had made proposals, there had been no real narrowing of the gap between the Western and the Soviet position. The Soviet Government did not clarify their position on the question of control and they did not then react to President Eisenhower's suggestion of a new approach to the problem.

The Sub-committee reconvened in New York on August 29 in accordance with the agreement reached at the Big Four Conference where it had been agreed that the representatives on the Sub-committee should "take into account in their work the views and the proposals advanced by the Heads of Government at this conference".

The Sub-committee discussions were not, frankly as fruitful as we had hoped. Attempts were made in the course of these discussions to seek clarification on a number of points and in particular on the essential question of control. As on previous occasions the Soviet representative failed to provide the required clarification of their May 10 proposals. I should like to digress here: I believe that in these matters of delicate negotiation, temper and manner mean a great deal. While I cannot feel very happy with the position taken by the Soviet Union, I cannot commend too highly the manner of Mr. Sobolev as a member of the Sub-Committee.

In the course of the meetings it emerged that given the scientific facts of the situation, while a comprehensive system of disarmament extending to nuclear weapons remained the goal there were immediate difficulties in plans calling for their elimination. The Sub-committee discussions pointed