

The revised resolution was designed to incorporate the suggestions of delegations which had been consulted by Canada and its co-sponsors, while at the same time retaining the basic emphasis on the importance of continuity in international discussions of disarmament which had been present in the original draft. To this end the resolution made provision for the Disarmament Commission to play an active part in bringing about the resumption of negotiations, and specifically set forth the Commission's important role in giving guidance to the negotiators once disarmament talks were resumed. In addition, it provided for the establishment of a sub-committee or sub-committees under the Commission that would permit the examination of certain aspects of disarmament to take place in smaller groups, suited to the consideration of the complex problems involved. Support for the Canadian resolution increased during the later weeks of the First Committee discussion of disarmament and the number of states co-sponsoring the proposal was raised to 19 before the end of the debate.

In addition to the Canadian proposal, 12 draft resolutions were submitted by various groups of co-sponsors on a wide range of subjects including disarmament, nuclear tests and related questions. After considerable discussion in the Committee, a procedural decision was eventually taken to vote on only three of the resolutions submitted, two of which dealt with the problem of nuclear tests and the third with the prevention of the further spread of nuclear weapons. It was decided to defer further consideration of the remaining ten resolutions until later.

The Canadian Delegation expressed firm opposition to this procedure on the grounds that it would not contribute to the solution of the disarmament problem and would result only in a further delay in realizing the goal sought by all members of the United Nations. Accordingly, the Delegation proposed that, in addition to the three resolutions already mentioned, there should also be a vote taken on the resolution submitted by Canada and its co-sponsors. In support of this position, the Canadian Representative argued that the proposal was the only one to provide for the establishment of United Nations machinery to carry forward the work begun at the General Assembly.

The Canadian Delegation then submitted a procedural motion proposing that the Canadian resolution be put to a vote. This motion failed to achieve majority support in the Committee when an amendment submitted by the Indian Delegation, the purpose of which was to place the Canadian resolution among those to be deferred for later consideration, was adopted by a vote of 29 in favour and 17 against, with 26 abstentions.

Although this procedural decision did not constitute a rejection of the Canadian resolution itself, it reflected an unwillingness on the part of a number of countries to take further action on disarmament at a time when not all the great powers were prepared to resume discussions of this subject. In the Canadian view this reluctance could only result in further postponing necessary action on disarmament. In expressing his regret at the failure of the Committee to take positive steps to bridge the gap in disarmament discussions that would now be brought about by the General Assembly recess, the Secretary of State for External Affairs spoke as follows in the House of Commons on December 20:

The unfortunate feature is that for the next two and a half or perhaps three months nothing will be done about disarmament. The