

own attitude, as I have said, was indicated long before this statement. Indeed I am confident that many other members of the Committee will share our view that we do not intend to be bludgeoned by the arbitrary Soviet attitude into jettisoning the machinery set up by the United Nations for dealing with disarmament. The unilateral Soviet pronouncement shows very little respect for the organs created by the United Nations General Assembly. No single great power has a right to take it on itself to disrupt United Nations bodies. As I have said earlier we also regard the Soviet proposal for an 82-member disarmament commission as destructive of any serious negotiation.

Nevertheless, I would urge members of this Committee to consider the importance of having further negotiations on disarmament among the major powers. Surely we should not end this Assembly without progress towards agreement between opposing views on the substance of disarmament, and even without any working machinery, acceptable to all the major powers, for carrying on the negotiations. However, if such a situation arose, heavy responsibility would attach to the arbitrary position adopted by the USSR.

Voting on the draft resolutions and amendments before the Committee took place on November 6. The twenty-four power draft resolution referred to above <sup>(18)</sup> was voted on first, and was adopted by fifty-seven votes in favour (including Canada), nine against (Soviet bloc), and fifteen abstentions. In its final form, the resolution <sup>(19)</sup> included, in addition to the six points noted above, three amendments proposed by India, by a group of Latin American states, and by Norway and Pakistan. The Indian amendment <sup>(20)</sup> inserted in the preamble a reference to General Assembly resolution 808 (IX) of November 4, 1954; the Latin American amendment <sup>(21)</sup> added an operative paragraph inviting the States concerned to consider the possibility of devoting additional resources to the improvement of living conditions from the funds made available by disarmament; the joint amendment of Norway and Pakistan included additional operative paragraphs according to which the Sub-Committee would establish a group or groups of technical experts to study inspection systems for disarmament measures which may be agreed in principle.

The Belgian resolution <sup>(22)</sup> described above was adopted by seventy votes in favour (including Canada), nine against (Soviet bloc) and two abstentions. The Belgian Delegation had previously accepted the inclusion of a Polish amendment <sup>(23)</sup> which made a slight alteration to the preamble of the resolution.

Of the remaining draft resolutions, four were not adopted, and four were not pressed to a vote. The Indian draft resolution on nuclear weapons tests <sup>(24)</sup>, the Japanese proposal on the same question <sup>(25)</sup>, the Soviet proposal for a temporary renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons <sup>(26)</sup>, and the Soviet draft resolution calling for the replacement of the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee by an 82-member disarmament commission <sup>(27)</sup> were all rejected. The other four draft resolutions noted above were not pressed to a vote.

<sup>(18)</sup> Page 15.

<sup>(19)</sup> UN Document A/C.2/L.179

<sup>(20)</sup> UN Document A/C.1/L.182

<sup>(21)</sup> UN Document A/C.1/L.184

<sup>(22)</sup> Final text in UN Doc. A/3630/Corr.1

<sup>(23)</sup> UN Document A/C.1/L.185

<sup>(24)</sup> See above, page 14. The vote on the resolution was 22 in favour, 32 against (including Canada), with 20 abstentions.

<sup>(25)</sup> Ibid, page 13. The vote on the resolution was 18 in favour, 32 against (including Canada), with 31 abstentions.

<sup>(26)</sup> Ibid, page 14. The vote on the resolution was 11 in favour, 45 against (including Canada), with 25 abstentions.

<sup>(27)</sup> Ibid, page 13. The vote on the resolution was 9 in favour (Soviet bloc), 51 against (including Canada), with 21 abstentions.