

up its strength in support of, and in accordance with, the principles of the United Nations. However, building up of armed strength was not enough, Mr. Acheson said; no opportunity should be neglected to reduce the danger of war and to meet the economic and social needs of the peoples of the world. These aims could be fostered if the free nations could be relieved of some of the burden of armaments.

The Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, Mr. Pearson, in his address to the Assembly in the general debate, warned that it was necessary to take a realistic approach to the problems which the United Nations faces. He said in part:

The United Nations remains our last, best hope for peace. But the emphasis is shifting from *best* to *last*. We will have to stop that shift if our world organization is to survive as an effective instrument to maintain peace and promote security. . .

If we can reach that objective, the tragic split between the Great Powers which now weakens and endangers our world organization could be healed; the United Nations could grow in strength and prestige to a point where many of the items on this Assembly's agenda would be unthinkable. If however, that split persists and grows deeper and more dangerous, then the United Nations, as we know it now, as we formed it in San Francisco, may disappear. With that disappearance, if it ever took place, the risk of a war in which everything worth having would also disappear, would become immeasurably greater. To the prevention of that final catastrophe, my delegation hopes that this Assembly will be able to make an effective contribution. To that end, we pledge our own best effort.

Mr. Pearson emphasized the problems created for the constructive work of the United Nations by the existence of two blocs between which a chasm had been widened:

Many of the states between the two blocs are what we now describe as under-developed areas. They are receiving a measure, indeed an increasing measure, of technical assistance from the United Nations, and technical and economic aid from various agencies in the free world, including that from the Colombo Plan, an initiative of the Commonwealth of Nations, in which my country is proud to play a part.

If only the burden of defence programmes could be reduced, a much larger measure of such technical assistance and aid for capital development could and would flow in a far greater stream into the under-developed countries and territories.

The general debate was brought to a close by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, who asked that the United Nations continue with unflagging purpose the labour of constructing peace. He said that the general debate had reflected "the compelling desire of all peoples to extricate themselves from the morass of fear and danger in which they are now struggling". He outlined the three goals towards which members of the United Nations were striving; universal reduction of armaments, collective security and economic and social development. These, he said, were universal and had the universal support of the peoples of the world. Therefore they required the universal approach for which the United Nations stood. He closed his statement by asking that leaders of the delegations of member states take the opportunity which was presented to them at the time of the General Assembly to undertake direct, quiet, straightforward discussion amongst themselves.

The Disarmament Debate*

On November 7 in a radio broadcast President Truman stated that the United States was expecting to introduce in the General Assembly important new pro-

* The Canadian position on armament proposals was made in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, and Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L. B. Pearson. This statement appears in the Department's Statements and Speeches series as No. 51/47, and is obtainable on application to the Information Division, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa.