

substantial progress towards the conclusion of the special agreements with individual Members which would make armed forces and other facilities available to the Security Council. We therefore urged that the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee go ahead with all possible speed in the work of negotiating these military agreements and of organizing economic and military sanctions. It appeared to us it would be in the interests of all members to see the Security Council equipped and ready to enforce decisions for the maintenance of peace and also to see serious consideration given to the reduction of national armaments.

Immediately following that speech Mr. Molotov of the Soviet delegation put before the assembly a resolution on disarmament. In our opinion that resolution proposed by the Soviet delegation did not go far enough. It was vague as to the methods of implementing the recommendation of the assembly that progress be made towards disarmament. It did not point the way to practical steps, and it was in certain respects ambiguous.

We therefore prepared within the delegation a counter-proposal which you will find in the report, and when the debate opened—

*By Mr. Marquis:*

Q. Which page, please?—A. The first draft of the counter-proposal we prepared is on page 169 of the report. The text of the proposal as actually presented is on the following page. I think it is relevant to the question which Mr. Graydon has raised that in the statement made by the Canadian representative in presenting that Canadian resolution on disarmament—you will find it on page 183—we stated:

We believe that the United Nations will make progress in disarmament only if all the Members of the United Nations agree to practical measures which will convince their peoples that their nation can be secure through reliance upon means other than large national armaments.

That is exactly what Mr. Graydon has said, and that is the position we took. We asked how this could be done.

First . . . by working towards a system of world security which will offer protection at least as effective to the Members of the United Nations as their own national forces. Secondly, by developing such international safeguards as will give assurance to any nation that does disarm that it will not be suddenly attacked and struck down by another nation that may have evaded or violated its promises to disarm.

The debate went on for a very long time in the assembly committee, in a subcommittee, and in a drafting committee of the subcommittee. Throughout that debate we endeavoured to put forward our point of view on this question with, I think, some considerable measure of success. The resolution as ultimately adopted by the assembly does accord with the general proposition which Mr. Graydon has put forward in his question this morning. You will find the resolution of the assembly on pages 173 to 175.

*By Mr. Hackett:*

Q. It was unanimous?—A. It was passed unanimously. For example, it linked up in paragraph 7 of the resolution the problem of security with that of disarmament, and it therefore recommends that the Security Council should accelerate the placing of armed forces at its disposal. It links up very definitely the whole question of safeguards by recommending the creation of an international system of control and inspection. The great advance in the assembly was that Mr. Molotov did agree to the establishment of an effective international system of control and inspection.