

for negotiating rests on the nuclear Powers, other states also have a responsibility and have the deepest interest in assisting the negotiations. I have frequently expressed my conviction that the middle and small Powers, indeed all the non-nuclear Powers, must join together in mobilizing opinion in favour of early action on disarmament.

I have been speaking about the main considerations which prompted the co-sponsors to put forward these proposals. I now turn briefly to the proposals themselves, that is, to the operative part of the resolution.

In keeping with the general approach in the draft resolution which is to strengthen the United Nations influence on the course of disarmament negotiations, the first operative paragraph "reaffirms the continuing and ultimate responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament."

The second operative paragraph deals with the heart of the matter, the resumption of serious negotiations. This paragraph calls for every effort to be made to achieve a solution of disarmament problems by means of the earliest possible continuation of negotiations.

The paragraph takes no particular stand on what forum should be used for negotiation. On many occasions I have stressed my preference for a return to the Ten-Nation Committee because of its obvious advantages. The only criterion suggested in the resolution is that the negotiations should be resumed in a body agreeable to the negotiators, which in practical terms means the nuclear Powers must agree on the forum.

They are encouraged to consider, however, the appointment of one or more impartial officers to assist in the negotiations. In my statement on October 19 I explained the Canadian suggestion for an impartial Chairman and others in this debate have expressed themselves in a similar sense. Our own experience in the Ten-Nation Committee would lead us to believe that these suggestions merit careful consideration.