

says his government for one would abide by it, even before it became legally binding, as I understand it, if others were to do likewise. But surely the whole problem, at least from our point of view, is how are we to know that atomic plants behind the iron curtain are not, during this period, increasing their stock piles?

May I suggest to the Soviet representative that our more immediate need, if we are to make any headway here, is for the Soviet representative to be prepared to discuss with us simultaneously both the question of prohibition and the question of inspection and control. So far, he and his colleagues have virtually refused to discuss anything except the declaration or prohibition. Until they are prepared to talk, about the practical arrangements envisaged under their control system, the work of the Disarmament Commission will continue to be deadlocked and sterile.

Even if we were to agree tomorrow on a political decision in principle to prohibit the atomic bomb when the control system covering the atomic and conventional fields was working, it would still take us a long time, with the best will in the world, to work out the details of an agreed control system. Why cannot we start this work now, and clear the ground as soon as possible of the very considerable amount of technical work that will in any case have to be done before disarmament could begin to become a fact?

I think I have said enough to show that the Soviet proposals need clarification, to say the least. There is ample opportunity for this to be done in the Disarmament Commission where we have a competent body already in existence. There is no dispute over its composition, or the time and place when it should meet. In view of the Soviet acceptance of the problem before the Disarmament Commission, as embodied in the second section of resolution 70<sup>4</sup> which I read at the beginning of my statement, we can say that there is in fact no fundamental difference of aim. And as it is the means that we must talk about in the Commission, it is in our view essential for the Soviet Government to refrain from merely reiterating its demand for some kind of general "declaration" and refusing even to discuss the ways and means of achieving the ends which all those who desire peace and hate war have in common.

As regards the Indian amendments my delegation is giving them its sympathetic consideration and may comment on them in greater detail at a later stage. I have only this to say at present. Before the Indian amendments were tabled my delegation came to the conclusion, in view of the eloquent statements of the distinguished representatives of the Netherlands, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru on Monday, supported by statements of the representatives of Argentine, Venezuela and Egypt today, that we would be well advised to leave the economic aspects of this debate to the Second Committee where they belong. This would mean withdrawing from our resolution the fourth paragraph of the preamble which was largely borrowed from a resolution of the Economic and Social Council. This paragraph was intended to have an appeal which it is clear from the debate it does not possess. So far as the Canadian Delegation is concerned, we should be glad to see this paragraph dropped.

-----