

4. On March 24th a telegram was sent to the Dominions Office stating that the draft armistice terms submitted separately to the European Advisory Commission by the Governments of the U.K., U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. were being studied in Ottawa. The telegram went on that we wished to draw attention at that time only to one point which was described as follows:

The Soviet proposal is for signature by representatives of the Supreme Commands of the Soviet Union, United Kingdom and United States, called "The Representatives of the Supreme Command of the Allies", and it provides for three signatories. The United States Government propose signature by the Supreme Commander, Allied Expeditionary Forces, and the Commander in Chief of the Forces of the U.S.S.R. "acting by authority of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and in the interests of the United Nations."

|| It seems to us essential that the armistice should
|| be signed on behalf of all the United Nations or at the very
|| least on behalf of all those with forces actively engaged
|| against Germany. Neither of these proposals meets this
|| condition. The United Kingdom proposal for signature "on
|| behalf of the United Nations, duly authorized to that effect"
|| would be quite acceptable to us.

The Dominions Office replied to this comment as follows on April 4th:

Your views as to desirability of signature "on behalf of United Nations" entirely accord with our own and with line which United Kingdom representative on European Advisory Commission had been instructed to take. This point has, however, not yet been discussed in Commission.

5. We heard no more of this matter until despatch D.75 of June 9th arrived. In the memorandum enclosed with this despatch it is stated (paragraph 5) "that the U.K. representative made strong efforts to secure the agreement of the U.S. and Soviet representatives to the use of the term "on behalf of", but the United States representative firmly resisted this alteration on the ground that the term "on behalf of" could not be properly adopted unless all the United Nations were consulted on the detailed terms and authorized signature on their behalf". The U.K. representative finally reluctantly acquiesced in the use of the term "in the interests of".