

United Nations

Nations Unies

UNRESTRICTED

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLEE
GENERALE

A/C.1/A.III/SR 5
11 October 1948

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Dual distribution

Third Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

SUB COMMITTEE A III

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Palais de Chaillot, Paris,
on Monday 11 October 1948 at 3.0 p.m.

CONTENTS:

Continuation of the discussion on the Canadian draft resolution
(Doc. A/C.1/308)

<u>Chairman:</u>	Sir B. N. RAU	India
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. R. SANDLER	Sweden

Any corrections of this record should be submitted in writing, in either of the working languages (English or French) and within two working days, to Mr. E. Delavenay, Director, Official Records Division, Room 3015, Palais de Chaillot. Corrections should be accompanied by or incorporated in a letter, on headed notepaper bearing the appropriate symbol number and enclosed in an envelope marked "Urgent". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily by the services concerned if delegations will be good enough also to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.

RECEIVED

OCT 27 1948

UNITED NATIONS
ARCHIVES

The amendment to the Canadian draft resolution submitted by the representative of Ecuador at the previous meeting was circulated as document A/C.1/A.III/3.

Mr. OSBORN (United States) expressed his approval of the amendment and proposed that in paragraph 9 of the Canadian draft resolution the words "... and recognizing the grave dangers to international peace ..." be omitted since they were superfluous.

In paragraph 10 he proposed to insert "six" before the word "sponsors" in the first line and, in the third line, to insert the words "meet together and" for the words "to consult".

General McNAUGHTON (Canada) accepted the amendments proposed by both representatives and said that he would delete the entire last phrase of paragraph 9.

He also accepted a proposal of the representative of Sweden to delete the words "following this session" in the third line of paragraph 10 and insert "not later than" before the words "the next regular session" in the last line. The purpose of that amendment was to provide a precise time limit for the consultations of the Sponsoring Powers.

Mr. Couve de MURVILLE (France) asked that paragraphs 9 and 10 be considered separately and that paragraph 9 be submitted to a vote before paragraph 10 was discussed.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) could not accept the amendment submitted by Ecuador because it contained a reference to the third report of the Atomic Energy Commission which confirms in veiled form the findings and recommendations of that report. Moreover, he did not consider that the other minor amendments which have been submitted in any way affect the substance of the Canadian resolution, and therefore were unacceptable.

Mr. De SOUZA GOMES (Brazil) and Mr. Couve de Murville (France) drew attention to an error in the French translation of paragraph 10.

Mr. VITERI-LAFRONTIE (Ecuador) replying to the representative of the USSR, explained that his amendment crittied anything which might be interpreted as an approval or condemnation of the Third Report of the Atomic Energy Commission. It was for that very reason that he had
/substituted

substituted the word "impasse" for the original reference to an "analysis of the situation". However, if the reference to the Third Report was unacceptable to the USSR delegation, then it could be deleted and the sense of the amendment would be unchanged.

General McNAUGHTON (Canada) urged that the mention of the Third Report be allowed to remain since it was the only such reference and he considered it necessary to draw the attention of the Assembly to a document which represented the work of the Commission over a long period and which should be read by every Member of the Assembly.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) appreciated efforts made by the representative of Ecuador to find a way towards an agreement, yet the statement made by the representative of Canada proved that the amendment could not be accepted by his delegation. However, even if it were made to read as the representative of Ecuador had suggested it would be unacceptable as it appeared as a part of the Canadian resolution which the USSR rejected on the ground that it approved the findings and recommendations of reports of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The CHAIRMAN stated that, if paragraph 9 had not been controversial, he would have submitted it to a vote. However, in view of the objections which had been raised, he proposed to pass on to paragraph 10.

Speaking as representative of India, he drew attention to the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission had been given power to arrive at decisions by a simple majority of its members. In fact, the First and Second Reports of the Commission had not been adopted by unanimous decision and there was nothing to prevent the Commission from continuing its work whether it reached unanimous decision or not. Apparently it was because the disagreement had assumed very serious proportions that the Commission had thought it necessary to suspend its work until it received a directive from the General Assembly or until the Sponsoring Powers found by prior consultation that changed conditions made it possible for agreement to be reached.

He believed that, as a result of the discussion which had taken place in the First Committee and perhaps in the Sub-committee, the minority had mitigated its opposition to some degree and he did not see why the Commission should not now resume its work and bring it to

/a conclusion

a conclusion.

Turning to the Third Report of the Commission, he noted that on page 17 it was stated in the majority plan that a Treaty for the control of atomic energy should prohibit the manufacture and possession of atomic weapons, provide for the proper use of nuclear fuel and for putting the international system of control into effect by agreed stages. All that had already been accepted in the proposal which the Sub-Committee had adopted on 9 October for submission to the General Assembly. Moreover, Sir Benegal Rau interpreted the USSR resolution as agreeing that the stages of implementation should be synchronized. Consequently, he believed that the area of disagreement had diminished and he thought that when a treaty had been finally drafted, the area of disagreement might be still further reduced and a plan might become practical politics.

Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) said that the crux of the problem before the Sub-Committee was to devise a means to ensure that the Atomic Energy Commission's work could be satisfactorily resumed. Personally, he preferred the proposal of New Zealand which the Canadian representative had accepted as the best method because the question would be dealt with on the highest political level and he considered that discussion between governments was more likely to bear fruit than discussion in a committee or a Commission, since whatever the competence of that body might be, it would be still essentially a technical body. He did not believe that the proposal of the Indian delegation was the best designed to solve the problem since he thought that the Indian delegation was rather too optimistic when it stated that there were indications that the situation which had led to the suspension of the Commission's work no longer existed. While it was true that the USSR proposal had eliminated one of the most contentious points of disagreement, yet there were other questions which had not yet been resolved such as the question of stages in the implementation of a treaty and the management of the international controlling body. For his part, Mr. Couve de Murville was not as optimistic as the representative of India.

Mr. OSBORN (United States) questioned the premises on which the Indian proposal was based. He believed that the experience of the Commission had shown that if the work were continued, the areas of disagreement might be widened rather than reduced because each side would be obliged to take more rigidly divergent positions on an increasing range of subjects and ultimate agreement would be made more difficult. He recalled that during the preparation of the First and

/Second

Second Reports of the Atomic Energy Commission it had been hoped that further work would bring the views of the majority and the minority more closely together. However, during the preparation on the Third Report, it was found that, as the debate continued, the differences of opinion between the representative of the USSR and the representatives of the other nations became greater and not less. Finally, when the question of staffing of the organization came under discussion; the USSR delegation made it very clear that the differences would only be accentuated if the majority forced the adoption of its views on that subject. Mr. Osborn believed that all the representatives on that Commission would agree that, if the work were continued on a majority basis, the areas of disagreement would increase.

However, the United States was very anxious to obtain international agreement on the control of atomic energy and it believed that, from a long range point of view, the proposal contained in paragraph 10 of the Canadian draft resolution offered the best basis for ultimate solution.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that after carefully considering the proposal of the representative of India, the Soviet delegation had come to the conclusion that it flowed from paragraph 8 which had been adopted by majority decision and which provided for the approval of findings and recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission Reports. Since the Soviet delegation voted against approval of those findings it could not agree with the provision included in the Indian resolution that there were indications that the situation which had led to the cessation of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission no longer existed. On the contrary, the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom still maintained their position in respect of the prohibition of atomic weapons and refused to agree to the two simultaneous conventions concerning control and prohibition. He felt, therefore, that the adoption of the Indian proposal as part of a resolution approving the Atomic Energy Commission's Report would only induce the United States and the majority of the Commission to maintain more stubbornly the position which it had adopted and would reduce the possibility of compromise. The Indian proposal did not include the provisions of the USSR draft resolution which was most calculated to solve the problem of atomic energy. The USSR draft resolution provided for the continuation of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission along the lines set out in the resolutions of the General Assembly.

/Turning

Turning to the statement of the representative of France, Mr. Malik denied that the USSR delegation had made no further steps towards conciliation beyond its proposal regarding inspection. Moreover, the representative of France had failed to mention that the United States delegation and its supporters in the Atomic Energy Commission had made no conciliatory offers at all. Consequently, he could not agree with the representative of France that it was for the USSR delegation to take steps towards a compromise while others, particularly the delegation of the United States stubbornly maintained their position. Under such circumstances, he thought that agreement would be rather difficult.

Furthermore, Mr. Malik did not agree with the representative of the United States who had tried to prove that the representative of India was wrong in stating that acceptance of the majority plan by the General Assembly would increase and not diminish the existing area of disagreement. There was certainly no doubt that if the majority plan was adopted, the United States delegation would become even less willing to compromise.

The United States representative had spoken of long term and short term policies but there was only one possible approach and that was the prohibition of atomic weapons and the application of all efforts to ensure that atomic energy was used for peaceful purposes only.

Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) explained to the representative of the USSR that he did not consider that it was for the USSR only to make concessions nor should he be understood to have said that the USSR delegation had not made one step towards conciliation since its proposals in respect of inspection. The USSR proposal for two conventions to be concluded and put into effect simultaneously constituted a valuable contribution but it did not settle the other fundamental question relating to the stages by which control should be established and the manner in which control would be effected.

Mr. MILES (United Kingdom) expressed the hope that the rapporteur would explain in his report to the First Committee how the conciliatory moves initiated by various delegations had been rejected by the USSR.

The representative of the USSR had stated that the work of the Atomic Energy Commission could not advance if the principles contained in the majority plan were adopted; he had also insisted that the work of the Commission must continue. However, since the Sub Committee had

/agreed

agreed to a recommendation endorsing the majority proposals, would it not be unduly ignoring the USSR position to agree upon a resolution declaring that the Commission should continue its work? Mr. Miles thought that that might be provoking to the USSR and would make a rapprochement more difficult. Such a rapprochement would be difficult enough under any circumstances but it would certainly be more difficult if the majority proposals were elaborated and crystallized into specific drafts of a treaty. That was why the United Kingdom favoured a serious effort on the part of the six Sponsoring Powers to consult together in order to find a basis upon which the work of the Commission could be continued. Mr. Miles said that he was prepared to vote in favour of the New Zealand proposal whenever it was submitted to a vote.

The representative of the United Kingdom asked for a statement of the views of the USSR delegation with regard to the substance of paragraph 10 of the Canadian draft resolution as it had been amended. He hoped that the latter might be willing, failing everything else, to agree to some consultation between the Sponsoring Powers.

Mr. de Souza GOMES (Brazil) said that, after hearing previous speakers, he was reluctant to support the proposal of the representative of India since it was clear that disagreement still existed on several points and he did not think it would be wise to ask the Commission to resume its work without providing a basis for such resumption. He also expressed support for the proposal contained in paragraph 10 of the Canadian draft resolution.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replying to the representative of the United Kingdom, said that he would insist on the inclusion in the Rapporteur's report of a reference to the proposal of the representative of India and of the fact that it had not found support from the representative of the United Kingdom, and of the United States.

For its part, the USSR delegation had considered that resolution with all due seriousness and only after that it was obliged to reject the Indian proposal because it could not agree that the differences had been resolved since the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States still maintained their positions in refusing to agree to simultaneous conventions for the prohibition and control of atomic weapons.

With regard to paragraph 10 of the Canadian draft resolution, Mr. Malik reiterated the statement which he had made at the previous meeting that, while providing for consultation between the Sponsoring
/Powers,

Powers, paragraph 10 nonetheless failed to pave the way towards a solution which would enable the work of the Atomic Energy Commission to continue. That was why the USSR delegation objected to that proposal and had submitted its own resolution favouring the continuation of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Referring to the statement of the French representative, Mr. Malik restated his view that the stages provided for in the General Assembly's resolution related solely to the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and not to a system of control. That could be seen in the resolution of 24 January 1946 and the theory of stages in respect of control had merely been invented in order to justify the position of the United Kingdom and the United States and to relegate the prohibition of atomic weapons to an indeterminate and far-off future.

Replying to a suggestion from the CHAIRMAN that the meeting should adjourn, General McNAUGHTON (Canada) stressed the urgency of work of the Sub-Committee which was required to present its report to the First Committee the next day.

Mr. OSBORN (United States) reminded the Chairman of an earlier statement that it might be necessary to hold evening meetings. He asked for the views of other members of the Committee in that respect.

Mr. VITERI-LAFRONTIE (Ecuador) thought that the Sub-Committee should have time to consider the statements which had been made and he proposed that, at the next meeting, a vote should be taken on paragraph 9 of the Canadian proposal and on the principle for consultations among the Sponsoring Powers contained in paragraph 10. Subsequently, the Commission should consider all the various proposals which had been presented.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the long work which had been carried out without satisfactory results by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Sub-Committee should be prepared to prolong its discussion until the problem had been fully examined.

Mr. OSBORN (United States) asked that the Canadian draft resolution be submitted in its revised form at the next meeting.

Mr. COUVE de MURVILLE (France) asked that a revision be made of the French translation of the Canadian draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.