

overnight, or indeed over-year. And it is implementation that interests us - not mere paper undertakings. The time element is inherent in any policy that is intended to be realized in deeds rather than in words.

A further reason why progress by stages is, in my Delegation's view, an essential feature of any practicable programme, lies in our need to remove fear and suspicion by finding safeguards, in which we can each put our trust in each other. This concept makes it possible for us to make progress by a series of steps, each one of which singly involves a real, but nevertheless limited, liability or risk. While a certain degree of international faith will be essential in this, as in all other creative human acts, we need none of us be called upon to place too great confidence, at any one step, in the good faith of the other party. But as we advance step by step, the confidence of each of us in our agreed international procedures and safeguards, and simultaneously our confidence in each other, will grow and that is how we can get results and not merely resolutions.

For both these reasons, the principle of stages is, I think, unchallengeable if we are all seriously interested in achieving disarmament rather than in scoring points.

The opposite procedure which is advocated by the Soviet Union and friends is to accept at once categorical commitments without, presumably, any confidence in each other's good faith, and then later but only later to work out arrangements by which these commitments could be supervised and carried out internationally. And that is putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance. Not, Mr. Vishinsky, putting the cart before the buffalo, which is an expression I have never heard before in my country. In Canada our carts are usually pulled, not by buffalo or even bears, but by horses, but whatever animal we adopt I suggest that this procedure is putting the cart before the horse. Between the two procedures there can be no question as to which promises the better and more lasting results.

It is, of course, essential to this procedure by stages that the stages themselves should be carefully planned to provide at each step an equitable balance of risk and safeguards on both sides. At each step, both sides should make disclosures of real and equivalent value.

Once this realistic and essential principle is accepted, then the Soviet Delegation, if it is seriously interested in disarmament, but does not agree with the details of the stages which might be suggested by certain other powers, can make its own suggestions for appropriate, balanced and equivalent stages in our Disarmament Commission and these suggestions will, as they should, be given careful examination. On such details of stages, our Delegation's mind is not at all rigid. But agreement on the principle of stages, as on the necessity of watertight international inspection and controls is, I think, a basic test of our sincerity in this question of limitation of armaments and prohibition of some armaments.

It is because among other things these principles and this necessity are well and truly recognized in the