

2

that its security was endangered;"

If the light of pure reason and the improvement in the international atmosphere in recent months are any guide, I see no reason why our resolution should not be adopted unanimously. That, together with the end of the fighting in Korea, would give the Disarmament Commission a propitious start on what I hope and believe will prove to be a new and productive phase of its work. But Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I was perplexed by some of the statements Mr. Vyshinsky made and by the terms of the resolution his delegation has tabled, for they seem to me to imply a position which would be retrogressive from the point of view of reaching agreement on the question which, as Mr. Vyshinsky said himself, is "the most important in the world".

Let us look for a moment at the relevant paragraphs of the Soviet resolution to be considered under the next item. It asks this Assembly to declare ".....atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction to be unconditionally prohibited". That is what the Soviet resolution proposes, "with the object of averting the threat of a new world war and strengthening the peace and security of nations". This declaration would be accompanied by an instruction of the Security Council - not the Disarmament Commission - "to take immediate steps to prepare and implement an international agreement which will ensure the establishment of strict international control over observance of this prohibition". In discussing the Disarmament Commission's report Mr. Vyshinsky went further and said that the Assembly could not expect results from the Disarmament Commission until its terms of reference were changed. He wanted us to instruct the Disarmament Commission to reach agreed decisions concerning both prohibition of atomic weapons and control over this prohibition, and to report for the consideration of the next session of the General Assembly.

Now let us look at this proposition and examine it in the light of what Mr. Vyshinsky has told us about the "declaration" or "decision" which Soviet representatives have been urging the Assembly or the Disarmament Commission to take for several years. What would it mean?

It would mean, as I understand it, that if we were to declare now at this Assembly the unconditional prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and other types of weapons of mass destruction as the Soviet resolution asks us to do, then and only then would the Soviet representative on the Disarmament Commission be prepared to discuss with us the practical arrangements which would be necessary if we were to have an agreed system of safeguards through international inspection and control. Mr. Vyshinsky in the Assembly and Mr. Malik in the Disarmament Commission have made a great play of the so-called Soviet "concession" of simultaneity - that is their proposal that the prohibition of atomic weapons would come into effect legally only with the entry into operation of the control system. In the meantime, Mr. Vyshinsky has told us that declaration such as he now proposes we subscribe to would have what he calls "moral and political significance". He