

questions in that general region of the world; as, indeed, was visualized in the Statement of Principles approved by the Political Committee on January 13, 1951, during the debates on Korean questions.

A settlement in Germany and Austria and elsewhere is also desirable.

I agree with Mr. Vishinsky that we should not delay the study and negotiation of disarmament agreements pending political settlements, but if international tension could be eased, effective disarmament would be made easier of achievement than it is otherwise likely to be.

The resolution of the Three Powers now before us provides, in the opinion of my delegation, a solid foundation for progress in this vitally important field. It is difficult to believe that any government represented at this Committee could validly object to its principles or to its purposes though there may be, of course, a legitimate difference of opinion over some of its details. By this resolution we accept principles which would govern, and set up machinery which would direct negotiations for the balanced reduction of arms and for the effective control and elimination of those instruments of mass destruction, particularly atomic weapons, which could destroy mankind. So my Delegation earnestly hopes, as, I am sure, other delegations do, that we will adopt the principles embodied in this resolution and that we will set up this new Disarmament Commission to begin its work at once, the work of implementing these principles. It is difficult to understand how any delegation can oppose such a step, which could, if it is accepted by all the great powers, lead to such far-reaching and beneficial results.

It is true that the good faith and sincerity of those who have put forward this resolution has been questioned. That is a depressing and discouraging fact. If, however, good faith in connection with a resolution of this kind is questioned, then, of course, surely it is arrant hypocrisy for those who do the questioning to argue that resolutions on the same subject, which depend for their results merely on unsupported declarations, could themselves have the slightest possible effect.

A U.S.S.R. resolution, which is also before the Committee, states that membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is incompatible with membership in the United Nations. Therefore, according to the authors of that resolution, those of us who are signatories to the North Atlantic Pact must be acting in bad faith, must be insincere in putting forward proposals for arms reduction here, especially at the very time when we are about to meet in Rome to discuss our own defence preparations.

Well since I happen to be at the present time the Chairman of the North Atlantic Council, I would like to clear up any confusion that may exist on this score. I speak, of course, only for my own Delegation, and not for my colleagues in NATO, but I am confident that the other members of the North Atlantic Organization will share my profound and sincere conviction that the effort we are making to build up our power for collective self-defence, and our effort, and our hope, to achieve agreement on effective disarmament through the United Nations, are not inconsistent, but are, indeed, complementary and essential parts of the same single policy designed to ensure peace and security for all.