

resolution on disarmament. As a result, the United Nations, instead of devoting its energy to removing the causes of war, and promoting economic and social well-being, is now used all too much as an agency for gaining strength in the conflict which now rages, and in preparing for the far worse one that may come. In our debates and discussions, some delegations, notably the Cominform delegations, adopt the strategy, and even the vocabulary of conflict, and others feel it necessary to defend themselves against these tactics. Ideas and words are distorted as in war propaganda, and lose their meaning. Peace is used merely as a slogan to divide and disarm the enemy. The victims of aggression, as in Korea, are denounced as aggressors. Dangerous courses are advocated in the name of nationalism, of freedom, of international law, order and progress. In such an atmosphere, how can our United Nations grow stronger? How, in fact, can it survive?

There was a depressing example last Thursday of the depths to which the debates of the United Nations General Assembly can now descend. The United States Secretary of State, on behalf of the Three Powers, made a serious proposal - a constructive and helpful proposal - for the regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all forces and all armaments, and the prohibition of atomic weapons. The first essential step in this process was to set up an international agency to go into every country, including the U.S.A., and including the U.S.S.R., and secure complete information about every form of armed force and armament, including atom bombs.

What was Mr. Vishinsky's reply to this Three-Power disarmament proposal? He could hardly sleep, he said, it made him laugh so much; it was so funny. It makes one wonder whether this pathetic merriment does not conceal an uneasy conscience. When he stopped laughing, he produced a really, serious proposal of his own. Let me read you its first paragraph:-

"The General Assembly declares participation in the aggressive Atlantic bloc and the creation by certain States, and primarily by the United States, of military, naval and air bases on foreign territories, incompatible with membership of the United Nations."

It is obvious that the Soviet delegation doesn't expect to get much support for that. Even as propaganda it is not very impressive stuff. The whole world knows that the Atlantic Pact is a purely defensive arrangement, in strict accordance with Article 51 of the Charter. It will never become anything else. Mr. Eden in that great and moving speech reemphasized that fact, speaking for a country which did as much as any country to win the last war and is doing as much as any country to prevent the next one.

The U.S.S.R. proposal also calls for a general disarmament conference, beginning not later than June 1, 1952. Why wait until June? What is this Assembly? It is itself a disarmament conference with a concrete proposal now before it; one which causes Mr. Vishinsky only merriment.

Then, finally, the U.S.S.R. delegation produces again its Five-Power Peace Pact. But as Mr. Acheson said the other