

Mr Connally hoped that, in the light of the recent statements by Marshal Stalin and Mr Molotov on the necessity of strict international control, including inspection, the Atomic Energy Commission could end its stalemate of recent months. It was not enough to outlaw the atomic bomb; the freedom to violate pledges could not remain in the hands of individual nations.

Moreover, the removal of the atomic bomb would not stop troops, aeroplanes, rockets, or any other kind of weapon. The question of the number and training of reserves also arose. The United States desired real disarmament, as was demonstrated by its rapid demobilization since the war. It would not, however, again make the mistake of disarming unilaterally. Disarmament must be international and multilateral in character and go hand in hand with collective security.

Finally, not only agreement in the Assembly on the guiding principles of disarmament, but a settlement of the major issues that remain between the Allies as a result of the war, was necessary to accomplish disarmament. Permanent peace must be based on mutual confidence arising from a settlement of these issues in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The representative of France (Mr Parodi) said that there were three indispensable needs. First, it must be recognized that disarmament is impossible without security organized along parallel lines. Secondly, security meant control of both information furnished and engagements undertaken. The character of modern war meant that this control of disarmament measures would compel inspection to an extent as yet undetermined in the domain of industry as well as possible inspection of inventions. Thirdly, all the various types of war potential, not only armaments but also industrial activities, should be taken into consideration. One step could be taken at a time without awaiting the result of the inevitably complex discussions needed to achieve a solution of the whole problem.

In this connection it would be appropriate for the Security Council to study preliminary measures to relieve current international tension. It would be paradoxical to plan for general disarmament at a time when, as at present, armies and bases were being maintained and scientific research for war pursued.

The representative of New Zealand (Mr J. V. Wilson) spoke in the debate first to emphasize, on behalf of the New Zealand Government, their desire for the successful outcome of the task on which the United Nations was now embarking; and, secondly, to comment on the relations between the proposed organ of control and the United Nations. He agreed that the proposed organ of control must be autonomous within its own sphere, free to proceed to measures of inspection, to the publishing of its findings, and to the execution of any other measures within its competence. It must not be merely advisory to the Security Council or so related to that body that its actions would be subject to review. Its freedom of action could be exercised effectively only if it