

appearance, this may sound reassuring, but in fact what does it mean? It means that an international body -- whose activities are not even outlined -- is to be established within the framework of the Security Council. That can only mean that the veto is to apply at some stage and can be used to prevent the inspection and enforcement that is so essential to a disarmament agreement. As has already been asked in this debate, what opportunity is there for inspection, for verification and for control? The Soviet proposals about international control over the implementation of measures of disarmament are, to say the least, ambiguous.

"In the view of the Canadian delegation, a system of international inspection is essential to any disarmament agreement. It is one thing for the Soviet Union to say that they will reduce by one-third their present land, naval and air forces, and even to say after a year has passed that the one-third reduction has been carried out, but it is quite another thing for the Soviet Union to tell us that they will welcome international observers before, during and after the reduction. There, I submit with deference, lies the weakness of the proposal. In the first case, the world has to accept the unsupported assurances of the Soviet Government. In the second case, the world can satisfy itself as to the manner in which disarmament is being carried out. This international inspection would, of course, apply to every country and there would be no invidious singling out of any one country for inspection. A constant scrutiny would be kept on the progress of disarmament measures.

OBSERVER TEAMS

"In the view of our delegation, there is nothing more important in this whole problem of international disarmament than the question of inspection, verification and control. The Soviet delegate has already been asked to declare unequivocally whether his country is prepared to open its doors and its borders to international observer teams. Such observer teams might establish both quantitatively and qualitatively the armed forces and armaments, both existing and potential, at the disposal of the Soviet Union in its own territories and the territories under its control, as well as in the territories of all other principal States. It strikes our delegation that an inspection of this nature is clearly a necessary prerequisite if a sound basis for progressive general disarmament is to be established. Following such an inspection a formula of disarmament must be found which would be related to the needs of international peace and security. The Canadian delegation will await with interest the Soviet delegate's reply to this question, already put and now repeated.

"Mr. Chairman, I have made it clear why this delegation considers that the Soviet

resolution, in spite of its appearance of simplicity, would actually set us back in the complicated task of securing disarmament. A decision has already been taken to disarm, in the General Assembly resolution of 1946, and adequate machinery has been established to carry out that purpose. All that is needed now is the willingness on the part of all nations to accept the principles and procedures for disarmament which are acceptable to the majority. We have before us this morning a resolution that has been circulated by the United Kingdom delegation. It makes the circumstances clear by referring to the Military Staff Committee and the Commission on Conventional Armaments and the Atomic Energy Commission Bodies which are already charged with the technical tasks of disarmament. It makes clear also that a majority of nations in those Bodies are willing to disarm on the basis of principles which will not endanger the lives and homes of their people.

"This resolution if adopted by the Assembly will demonstrate to the world that disarmament is possible, without threat or danger to any State, whether in the majority or minority in this debate, if the lines of approach, already laid down, are followed. The principles of this resolution are ones to which the Canadian delegation fully adheres, and we are prepared to continue our participation in efforts to put them into practice. The Canadian delegation hopes that the Committee will put before the Assembly a resolution in terms of the United Kingdom proposals."

MR. KING ORDERED TO REST: From London, England; it was announced on October 10 that the Prime Minister, Right Hon. W.L. Mackenzie King, had been ordered to take a complete rest, and, consequently, would not be able to attend the Prime Ministers' meetings.

In Ottawa, on October 11, the Prime Minister's office made the following statement:

"After consultation with his colleagues, the Acting Prime Minister, Mr. St. Laurent, has decided that he himself will attend the meetings of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, and that he expects to leave by air for London on Wednesday, October 13.

"During Mr. St. Laurent's absence, the Right Hon. C.D. Howe will be acting Prime Minister."

Mr. St. Laurent arrived in London Thursday.

His Majesty, the King, speaking to Dominion Prime Ministers at a private dinner Wednesday night at Buckingham Palace, said all regretted the absence of Mr. King, "whose unrivalled experience has always been of such value at the council table."

FARM MACHINERY SALES UP: Canadian farmers spent \$48,143,000 more last year on the purchase of new farm implements and machinery than they did in 1946.