

The Soviet resolution, because of its inadequacies and ambiguities, required amendment. Canada did not, however, consider it appropriate that a nation with a comparatively small population which had never had armed forces which might constitute a threat to the peace of the world should take the lead in putting forward the necessary amendments. Canada considered it more appropriate that that lead should be taken by the United States, both because it was one of the two most heavily armed powers, and because its interests were especially affected by what appeared to be the Soviet proposal that the atomic bomb should be abolished before measures were agreed upon to carry out other terms of reference of the Atomic Energy Commission.

However, since the proposals made in the Soviet resolution were of direct concern to all nations and not only to the most heavily armed, there was prepared in the Canadian delegation a "working paper" setting forth a tentative draft of a possible substitute for the Soviet resolution. This "working paper" of November 4 was prepared as a basis of discussion within the Canadian delegation and was also shown as a provisional and tentative draft to a few other delegations whose general approach to the problem was thought to be much the same as that of the Canadian delegation.

An interval of a month elapsed between the presentation of the Soviet proposal on October 29 and the opening of the debate on disarmament in the Political Committee on November 28. When that debate opened, the United States was not ready to introduce a substitute resolution. The Canadian substitute resolution which was a revision of the working paper of November 4 was therefore immediately introduced. Two days later the United States introduced its substitute resolution.

After devoting five meetings to a debate on disarmament (November 28, 29, 30, December 2 and 4), the Political Committee appointed a sub-committee of twenty states to study all the relevant resolutions submitted to the committee and to draft, if possible, a unanimously acceptable resolution. This sub-committee took as the basis of its discussion the United States resolution. After four open meetings (December 5, 6, 7 and 9) it appointed a drafting group consisting of the Chairman (M. Spaak of Belgium), the rapporteur (Mr. Clementis of Czechoslovakia), the five great powers, Canada and Egypt. The drafting group held three meetings (December 9, 10 and 11) and reported a provisional draft resolution back to the sub-committee on December 11. Two further meetings of the sub-committee were held (December 11 and 12), to discuss this draft resolution. Three Canadian amendments and one United States amendment to the report of the drafting group were accepted, a number of improvements were made in the language and structure of the resolution, and a draft resolution was adopted for presentation to the Political Committee. The Political Committee on December 13, after making a few minor drafting improvements, adopted unanimously and by acclamation the resolution submitted by the sub-committee; and this resolution was likewise adopted unanimously and by acclamation by the General Assembly on December 14.

The critical stage in the discussions was the period of December 9 to 12. At its meetings on December 9 and 10, the drafting group adopted paragraphs 2 and 3 of its draft resolution. The Canadian representative was unable to persuade the other members of the group that the amendments which he was putting forward to these two paragraphs were more than