

Our joint resolution now provides for enlarging the Disarmament Commission by the addition of 14 member states, and provides further that for the first year, from January 1958 to January 1959, these 14 states shall be Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, India, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Poland, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. The resolution also requires the transmission to the Disarmament Commission of the records of the proceedings of the First Committee at which disarmament was discussed. . . .

In the various discussions which have taken place in recent days, many different ideas for solving this problem have been put forward, and we have always been prepared to consider any reasonable and constructive ideas on their merit. It is my firm conviction that the suggestion contained in the draft resolution now before us in the names of Canada, India, Japan, Paraguay, Sweden and Yugoslavia, represents a very well-balanced and thoroughly reasonable addition to the Disarmament Commission. We do not think that geography, and most certainly not ideology, is the main criterion for choosing these additional members. We feel that ability to make a constructive contribution to the disarmament negotiations should be the main concern. Nevertheless, the proposal which we now offer does give very fair weight to the principle of equitable distribution. It represents all the main geographical areas as well as other interests and groups with which we are concerned in U.N. matters. I feel that if this additional group of 14 members is honestly and fairly assessed, it will be found to be carefully and adequately balanced in its composition.

Our problem is not simply one of adjusting the machinery of U.N. disarmament bodies. If that were the only issue it would not have been necessary to deal with it by introducing at this late date a new proposal in the plenary session. Our problem is how to ensure that serious disarmament negotiations can go on in the future. Surely, the peoples of the world would not understand it if we ended this session of the General Assembly not only without agreement among all the major powers concerned on even a first step of disarmament, but also with a complete breakdown of the machinery for further discussions. This would be a completely backward step and would leave us worse off on this matter than before the Assembly began. Such a situation would be intolerable and would most certainly cause a great increase in fear, apprehension and tension throughout the entire world. I feel certain, Mr. Chairman, that this Assembly will not permit such a situation to arise without making a genuinely conciliatory move to do everything possible to provide a disarmament body acceptable to all of the major powers. It is my sincere and earnest belief that the proposal which Canada has the honour to co-sponsor does constitute just such a conciliatory move. I, therefore, strongly urge that our proposal be unanimously adopted by this Assembly.

I would hope that the broadly representative character of our present group of co-sponsors could be taken as some indication that our proposal will now have the Assembly's full support. The unanimous adoption of this proposal would at least open the door to further serious and constructive negotiations. It is hardly necessary for me to stress that we are still far from agreement on the desperately important matter of the actual substance of disarmament. Nevertheless, our resolution would keep alive the hope of all our peoples for a reduction of the crushing burden of armaments and a lessening of the danger of war, and all the horror and destruction which war would mean in this age of the hydrogen bomb.

I would like to close with an earnest appeal to all members of this Assembly to rally to the support of this resolution so that we can end our discussions on disarmament on a note of hope, however limited, and not give to the world a picture of division and frustration in this Assembly."

Although it had been hoped that it might be possible to obtain unanimous support for the 6-power resolution, the Soviet representative made it known that the Soviet Union would not participate in the Commission if it were expanded in this fashion. He argued in favour of the reintroduced Soviet proposal to replace the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee by a permanent disarmament commission composed of all members of the United Nations<sup>(34)</sup>. When put to a vote, this proposal was rejected by nine votes in

<sup>(34)</sup> See above, pages 13 and 20.