

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

UNITED NATIONS
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT
DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS
Reference Library



GENERAL

A/AC.50/SR.2
12 March 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS COLLECTION

COMMITTEE OF TWELVE

(ESTABLISHED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 496 (V))

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SECOND MEETING

Held in Conference Room 5, Lake Success, Long Island,
on 2 March 1951, at 3.00 p.m.

Temporary Chairman:

Assistant Secretary-General

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Mr. SOARES | Brazil |
| Mr. RIDDELL | Canada |
| Dr. WEI | China |
| Dr. ALBONNOZ | Ecuador |
| Mr. LACOSTE | France |
| Mr. DAYAL | India |
| Dr. LUNS | Netherlands |
| Mr. KURAL | Turkey |
| Mr. MALIK | Union of Soviet Socialist Republics |
| Mr. COULSON | United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland |
| Mr. NASH | United States of America |
| Mr. NINCIC | Yugoslavia |
| <u>Dr. FREY</u> | Committee Secretary |
| Mr. VAUGHAN | Principal Director, Department of Conference and General Services |

Secretariat:

1. Consideration and adoption of the principles governing the chairmanship of the Committee and selection of the Chairman

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN said he would leave the adoption of the agenda to the Chairman. He recalled that, at the previous meeting, the principles to govern the chairmanship had not been settled, but proposals and suggestions had been made concerning systems of rotation and the possibility of a permanent chairman.

/Mr. COULSON

Mr. COULSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) observed that the first question was whether the chairmanship should rotate or there should be a fixed elected chairman. A case could be made for the latter; committees set up by the General Assembly usually appointed fixed officers; and the Committee had the defined task of reporting by a certain date and it might be well to have fixed officers to guide it. However, the Committee was not likely to be overworked. Some seemed to favour rotation and the United Kingdom delegation had no strong feelings. If rotation were decided upon, however, they should have a fixed rapporteur to furnish continuity, and the decision should not be regarded as a precedent for other General Assembly committees.

Dr. WEI (China) supported the principle of rotation. That system had been followed in the Atomic Energy Commission, the Commission for Conventional Armaments and the Six Power Consultations. The system of chairmanship of the Six Power Consultations was especially recommended for the Committee. They should decide on the principle of chairmanship and the term of office and deal with the matter of a rapporteur.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said his delegation did not feel strongly about the chairmanship. The Soviet Union proposal was that rotation should be followed and the first chairman should be drawn by lot. The possibility of a two week period had been mentioned. Mr. Nash suggested they might follow the example of the Six Power Consultations and rotate the chairmanship at each meeting. In the event of the adoption of such a plan, the appointment of a rapporteur would provide for continuity.

Dr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) supported the principle of rotation. It would allow the participation of a larger number in the chairmanship and was in accord with the spirit of the Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, which were relevant in view of the membership. Rather than draw lots they should start at the beginning of the alphabet.

/Mr. LACOSTE

Mr. LACOSTE (France) remarked that the duration of the Committee would be quite brief and its task limited. A permanent chairman might be desirable, but the principle of rotation could be followed, even changing at each meeting, if there were a fixed rapporteur to provide the important continuity. To this extent the question of a rapporteur was linked to the matter of chairmanship.

Mr. KURAL (Turkey) said his delegation agreed with the principle of rotating the chairmanship at each meeting, it being understood that continuity would be furnished by a fixed rapporteur.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his proposal had been that the term of office of the chairman should be a calendar month, and the possibility of a two week period had been suggested. The idea of rotating at each meeting would be acceptable. With regard to selecting the first chairman by lot, the objections raised overlooked the nature and duration of the Committee, which made that procedure appropriate. There seemed to be general agreement that the chairmanship should rotate, changing at each meeting, following the English alphabetical order and selecting the first incumbent by lot. If they could agree on that, they could go on to the matter of a rapporteur.

Mr. LACOSTE (France) said he did not favour the introduction of chance, but would accept the idea of drawing lots if the chairmanship changed at each meeting.

Mr. SOARES (Brazil) agreed to the rotation principle, but saw no reason to draw lots.

The proposal to rotate the chairmanship, each chairman to preside over one meeting was voted on by a show of hands. It was adopted unanimously.

/The proposal

The proposal to select the first chairman by lot was voted on by a show of hands. It was adopted by 7 votes in favour, 3 against, with 2 abstentions.

The United States of America having been selected by lot, Mr. Nash assumed the chair.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it would not be appropriate to have a permanent rapporteur. The Committee had begun by following the precedents of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments in the matter of chairmanship, and those bodies had no rapporteurs. Further, their report to the General Assembly need not be delivered orally, nor would there be a need for a rapporteur at that meeting. They could compile their report, as had been done in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments without rapporteurs, and address it to the Assembly. Alternately, the Committee might decide merely to forward the records of its meetings, as had been done by the Six Powers on the question of atomic energy, for the information of the Assembly. The Soviet Union delegation saw no need for a rapporteur. Indeed, there was no need to discuss the matter, as it was not on their agenda.

Dr. WEI (China) observed that the discussion was not out of order: they had not yet adopted the agenda. A rapporteur did not seem necessary. The Atomic Energy Commission, the Commission for Conventional Armaments and the Six Power Consultations had managed successfully without rapporteurs. Their work had gone forward in good order and had been well serviced by the Secretariat. The Committee could look forward to a similar prospect.

Intervening on a point of order, Mr. KURAL (Turkey) suggested that the consecutive interpretation be dispensed with during procedural debates. After a brief discussion on the desirability of consecutive interpretation in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. LACOSTE (France) joined, the suggestion was withdrawn.

Dr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said the question of a rapporteur could not be dropped. Some members had been in favour of a permanent chairman and had agreed to the principle of rotation only on the understanding that a rapporteur would furnish continuity.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that continuity would be ensured by the Committee and its members. If the views or position of any member was wrongly reflected in the report, that could readily be corrected. The task of a rapporteur would be a sinecure.

The proposal that there should be a fixed rapporteur was voted on by a show of hands. It was adopted by 9 votes in favour, 2 against, with 1 abstention.

The representative of Canada was nominated for the office of rapporteur by the representative of the United Kingdom, seconded by the representative of the Netherlands. There being no other nomination, the representative of Canada was declared appointed. The representative of the Soviet Union indicated that, if there had been a vote, he would have abstained.

2. Adoption of the provisional agenda

The provisional agenda was adopted without discussion.

3. Consideration of the question of rules of procedure of the Committee

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the basis of the rules of the Committee be the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. LACOSTE (France) suggested that they perhaps ought to follow the rules of the General Assembly.

Mr. COULSON (United Kingdom) said there were factors in favour of the General Assembly rules: the Committee had been established by the Assembly and would report to it. It was, in fact, a Committee of the Assembly, although its membership was similar to that of the Security Council and it dealt with matters concerning the Atomic Energy Commission.

/Mr. RIDDELL

Mr. RIDDELL (Canada) inquired whether there were technical considerations which might affect their decision.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Dr. FREY (Secretariat) stated that there was a considerable difference between the two sets of rules. Those of the General Assembly had been drawn up for a large body with sixty members; but they were followed also in small committees. The rules of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the Commission for Conventional Armaments, which were almost identical, were derived from the rules of the Security Council and might be considered better for a twelve Member group. However, there was no reason to expect difficulties from either set of rules.

Mr. RIDDELL (Canada) stated that, as there would be no apparent disadvantage, and as he was in favour of the standardization of rules, he would prefer the rules of the General Assembly.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that no faults in the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission had been pointed out. The Committee had been set up on the same principles -- the Security Council members and Canada -- so that the Commission's rules were particularly applicable. There were other specific reasons which could be given to support the contention.

Mr. LACOSTE (France) said committees normally followed the rules of the parent body and therefore they should adopt the rules of the General Assembly.

Dr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) supported the adoption of the rules of the General Assembly. Article 22 of the Charter and Rule 160 of the General Assembly indicated the relationship between the Assembly and its subsidiaries. Rule 160 said the Assembly rules should apply, although the subsidiary body could decide otherwise.

/Mr. MALIK

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the fact that they had already departed from the rules of the General Assembly in the matter of chairmanship, in which they had followed rather the principles of the Atomic Energy Commission. The latter had some useful rules, e.g., Rule 2 which provided that the Chairman should call a meeting at the request of any member -- a provision particularly needed in view of the chairmanship changing at each meeting. In other respects also the Atomic Energy Commission rules were more applicable and more appropriate than those of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN understood that it would be necessary to adapt either set of rules for the Committee, and that either could be adapted.

The proposal to adopt as a basis the Rules of Procedure of the Atomic Energy Commission was voted on by a show of hands. It was rejected by 5 votes against, 1 in favour, with 6 abstentions.

The proposal to adopt as a basis the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly was voted on by a show of hands. It was adopted by 6 votes in favour, 1 against, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN suggested they should consider the title of the Committee. The temporary name was somewhat unwieldy without being descriptive. Speaking as United States representative, he proposed the assumption of a title indicating their functions, such as "The Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments Co-ordinating Committee", to be known shortly as "The Co-ordinating Committee".

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the proposed title was unduly long and prejudged the results of the Committee, which was contrary to United Nations practice. Use of the word "co-ordinating" would seem to give the Committee powers to co-ordinate the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments but the General Assembly had given it no such powers. The Committee had been given the strictly technical task of considering and reporting on ways and means of co-ordination and their advisability. The Committee was the only one set up at the fifth session of the

General Assembly which had twelve members. In the last paragraph the resolution referred to it as a committee of twelve. They might call themselves "The Committee of Twelve" -- a title which would be objective, neutral and non-prejudicial, and better than a long and tendentious title.

Mr. RIDDELL (Canada) suggested that they might combine that idea with the temporary title and call themselves the "Committee of Twelve Established by General Assembly Resolution 496 (V)" and use as a short title "Committee of Twelve".

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as representative of the United States, withdrew his suggestion and endorsed the Soviet Union proposal as amended by Canada.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the opinion that "Committee of Twelve" would be a title sufficiently complete to identify the Committee.

Dr. WEI (China) supported the Canadian suggestion. The longer title would be used for their documentation and for specific identification. The question was related to their Rules of Procedure, and it was understood that the Secretariat would modify the General Assembly rules with regard to their title, system of chairmanship, methods of keeping records, etc. Dr. WEI hoped that they would receive a draft for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the Secretariat would circulate suggested changes in the General Assembly rules which would reflect their various decisions. Any objections to the changes would be discussed at the next meeting.

Mr. DAYAL (India) suggested that the phrase "Established by General Assembly Resolution 496 (V)" be added in parentheses after the title "Committee of Twelve" for documentation and similar purposes.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there were any objections to the Indian proposal. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that he would

/not object

not object but, if the matter had been voted upon, he would have abstained. The CHAIRMAN declared the adopted title to be "Committee of Twelve (Established by General Assembly Resolution 496 (V))."

Mr. IACOSTE (France) said that they would save much of the time of members of the Committee if they could meet in Manhattan. Further, if they were to follow the General Assembly rules they should use simultaneous interpretation. If they decided to meet in Manhattan, they should ask the Secretariat to effect the needed installations.

Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) stated that no conference rooms had yet been completed at the new Headquarters, but there was a room used by the Military Staff Committee which might be suitable. There was limited accommodation for the press and no room for the public. There were no facilities for simultaneous interpretation there, but arrangements could be made in about two weeks.

The CHAIRMAN observed that there were two questions: whether they wished to meet in Manhattan and whether they would request simultaneous interpretation there.

Dr. LUNS (Netherlands) said the great advantages of Manhattan might lead them to await the installation of simultaneous interpretation facilities.

It was agreed that the Committee should meet in Manhattan and that arrangements should be made for simultaneous interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN requested the Secretariat to advise the incoming Chairman as to when the accommodation would be ready for the next meeting. In view of the hour, he asked for opinions upon the advisability of beginning the following item on the agenda.

Mr. KURAL (Turkey) moved that the Committee adjourn the substantive discussion.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.