

President Eisenhower's proposed agency would not deal with the disarmament problem, that his proposal was in fact not a disarmament proposal. This point has never been in dispute. As was made clear last December and many times since by United States' spokesmen, and again today by Ambassador Lodge, the President's proposal was, as I understood it, never conceived as a disarmament proposal. It was intended, as he said, to get international co-operation started in the field of peaceful uses without waiting any longer for agreement to be reached on a comprehensive disarmament programme.

International co-operation in this field without the Soviet Union would be a second best solution. But I do not see how the Soviet Union or anyone else can expect those of us who are now ready to co-operate internationally under the aegis of the United Nations to delay doing so indefinitely. A genuine attempt to secure Soviet participation has been made for the past nine months, so far without success. Does anyone seriously suggest that we must wait for the months to become years in the hope that the Soviet Union will change its mind? Is international co-operation in this field of such great promise to be delayed indefinitely? Surely that is not the wish of this Assembly. I urgently express the hope, having in mind the constructive activities of the representative of the U.S.S.R. in this Assembly, that he will find it possible to bring about clarifications in this matter which civilization demands.

Mr. Lodge and Sir Pierson Dixon have explained in some detail the type of agency we now hope to negotiate, if necessary without Soviet participation - but preferably with the full co-operation from the outset of the Soviet Union. I think it should now be clear that no attempt is being made to set up any kind of exclusive organization. As my two colleagues have stressed, we seek to set up an Agency in which all States will participate as members. If we had wanted to be exclusive, we would not have brought this subject to the United Nations, certainly not at this very early stage in the negotiations of the agency. We would not have proposed that the agency should be closely related to the U.N. - indeed, as much a part of the United Nations as are the Specialized Agencies. We would not have sought Soviet participation in the beginning and left the door open even after initial delays and discouragements. We could perfectly well have gone off into a corner and made our own arrangements privately for the most rapid exploitation of atomic resources we could jointly devise for our own benefit and I think it is to the great credit of the United States that this initiative has been taken. Indeed, from the rather narrow point of view of national interests, there would have been many attractions for some countries in doing that very thing. Those who suspect our motives might ask themselves why we did not, as a group, decide to continue the various forms of co-operation which have in the past few years been worked out directly among the eight countries at present negotiating.