

drafting amendments. He therefore had to reserve the position of the Canadian delegation on these two paragraphs. These essential Canadian amendments were, however, accepted unanimously by the sub-committee on December 12. The first was to add at the end of what became paragraph 4 of the final resolution a reference to the necessity of the international conventions providing not only for the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction but also for the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes. The second was a consequential amendment to what became paragraph 6 of the final resolution.

Canada also secured on December 12 the adoption by the sub-committee of the substance of its amendments to the first paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the drafting group. This first paragraph became paragraph 1 and 2 of the final resolution. The purpose of these amendments was to make clear that the action of the Assembly in adopting a resolution on disarmament was only the first of four stages in the process of disarmament. This would help to lessen the danger that the resolution would unintentionally mislead the public into believing that the task of disarmament was a simple one. Moreover it was desirable, in order to avoid unnecessary debate in the future over procedure, to state explicitly the nature of the third stage in the process of disarmament -- the submission of the disarmament plans formulated by the Security Council to all the Members of the U.N. for consideration at a special session of the General Assembly at which disarmament treaties or conventions would be adopted. The Canadian amendment to state explicitly the nature of this third stage was adopted by the sub-committee by a vote of ten to eight.

Another contribution made by Canada to the disarmament debate was over the vexed question of a great power veto over the imposition of sanctions. There was danger that the interjection of this question into the Assembly's discussion of the disarmament resolution might make the attainment of unanimous agreement impossible. The Canadian representative therefore urged, at a meeting of the Political Committee on December 4, that this question be approached realistically. If, under present conditions, "there came about a situation where it was felt that sanctions would have to be applied against one of the great powers, it would be a condition of imminent war whether the opposition of that power took the form of resistance or of the veto. The only way by which it could be overcome would be by the use of force and the use of force against a great power means war."

CANADA AND THE UNITED NATIONS 1948, pp. 48-50:

The Commission for Conventional Armaments was established by the Security Council in February, 1947 with the same membership as the Council. Canada therefore became a member of the Commission in January 1948 on assuming membership on the Security Council.

The first issue debated by this Commission was whether or not the question of the prohibition of atomic weapons should be considered together with the general reduction of armaments and armed forces, by the same body in drafting plans of disarmament. The Soviet Union wanted the two matters to be considered together. The majority of the other members of the Commission pointed out that the problems involved in the working out of a plan for the international control of atomic energy involved technical questions which were so essentially different from those relating to the question of disarmament and the so-called conventional weapons, that the work on the control of atomic energy should be left to the Atomic Energy Commission. In order