



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Reference Library



GENERAL

A/AC.50/SR.6
29 August 1951

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

UN/DA COLLECTION

COMMITTEE OF TWELVE

(ESTABLISHED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 496 (V))

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

Hold at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 10 August 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Adoption of the agenda

Consideration of the resolution adopted by the 323rd plenary
meeting of the General Assembly, 13 December 1950 (496 (V))
(A/AC.50/1, A/AC.50/4)(continued)

Future work: exchange of views on the Committee's report to
the General Assembly

Chairman:

Mr. WEI

China

Mr. LUNS

Netherlands

<u>Members:</u>	Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES	Brazil
	Mr. GEORGE	Canada
	Mr. ALBORNOZ	Ecuador
	Mr. TINE	France
	Mr. DAYAL	India
	Mr. DEPINSU	Turkey
	Mr. TSARAPKIN	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>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. PROTITCH	Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Security Council Affairs
	Mr. FREY	Secretary of the Committee

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE 323rd PLENARY MEETING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 13 DECEMBER 1950 (496 (V)) (A/AC.50/1, A/AC.50/4)(continued)

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the United States draft resolution (A/AC.50/4).

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said that the draft resolution submitted by his delegation was both simple and concise and therefore did not call for a lengthy explanation.

As the Committee was aware, in resolution 496 (V) the General Assembly had given the Committee of Twelve a limited task: to consider ways and means whereby the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments might be co-ordinated and the advisability of their functions being merged and placed under a new and consolidated disarmament commission. The United States delegation in the general comments which it had submitted for the Committee's consideration (A/AC.50/1) had said that in its view the very useful work of the two present Commissions should be co-ordinated through the establishment of a single
/commission.

commission. That view, which had been favourably received by the majority of the members of the Committee, was reflected in the present draft resolution.

The draft did not go beyond the task entrusted to the Committee of Twelve. It proposed that the future commission should be established under and report to the Security Council, and that it should be known as the Commission for the Control of Armaments and Armed Forces, but it did not touch on the question of its terms of reference, leaving it to the General Assembly to decide that matter.

The United States delegation hoped that the Committee of Twelve would adopt the draft resolution and thus take a limited but important step forward in a field in which unfortunately it was not possible for the time being to achieve results that would correspond more closely to the hopes of the peoples of the world.

Furthermore, the United States delegation wished to suggest one change by way of clarification to avoid ambiguity and make clear that the new commission should be established by the General Assembly. That could be done by a simple amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution: inserting after "That" the words "it establish"; adding after "Armed Forces" the word "which"; and deleting "established".

The CHAIRMAN invited observations not only on the United States draft resolution but also on the question whether its adoption would enable the Committee to discharge fully all of the task required in General Assembly resolution 496 (V).

Mr. COULSON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was prepared to vote for the United States draft resolution with that amendment. By adopting the decision embodied in the draft resolution, the Committee of Twelve would discharge adequately the task which it had been given by the General Assembly.

Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia) explained that his delegation had not as yet received any instructions from its Government regarding the United States draft resolution. He would therefore have to confine himself to a few preliminary observations.

The Yugoslav delegation endorsed the central idea underlying the United States draft resolution, which constituted a broad and flexible approach to the /problem.

problem. It agreed with the United Kingdom representative that by adopting that resolution the Committee of Twelve would accomplish the task entrusted to it by the General Assembly. It felt, however, that the fourth paragraph of the preamble tended to prejudge the work of the future commission in the field of atomic energy. Hence, he feared that if the Committee decided to retain that paragraph, which did not seem indispensable in a draft resolution devoted essentially to procedural proposals, the Yugoslav delegation might be unable to give the United States proposal its unqualified support as it would have liked to do.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the matter could be settled in due course by a vote. He pointed out, however, that the paragraph referred to by the Yugoslav representative used the exact wording of the first paragraph of the preamble of General Assembly resolution 496 (V).

Mr. NASH (United States of America) confirmed the Chairman's statement. The United States delegation had been careful to adhere very closely to the text of the relevant General Assembly resolution.

Mr. TINE (France) also supported the United States draft resolution. The French delegation had already affirmed its full agreement on the question of principle and it accepted the method proposed in the draft resolution, on which it shared the view of the United Kingdom representative.

However, the French delegation would like the exact wording of the fifth paragraph of General Assembly resolution 496 (V) to be repeated in the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the United States draft resolution since, as had been pointed out, the original texts were identical.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the French text would be amended as requested.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands) recalled that his delegation, while entirely supporting part A, had expressed certain reservations regarding part B of the general views put forward by the United States (A/AC.50/1). Hence, it had been glad to see that the United States draft resolution was much more satisfactory in that it refrained from prejudging the questions of the membership, terms of reference and functions of the future commission. The Netherlands delegation would therefore unreservedly support the draft resolution.

Mr. GEORGE (Canada) also endorsed the United States draft resolution, both the intent and terms of which appeared to him entirely satisfactory. He thought it particularly appropriate that the substance of the matter was referred to in the preamble, thus adding to the flexibility of the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) recalled that his delegation had already signified its support of the proposal to co-ordinate the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments. Ecuador, although a small country with restricted military potentialities, understood the desire of the great Powers to seek all possible ways and means of preventing aggression and maintaining international peace and security.

It was to be hoped that the day would eventually dawn when every such problem would be settled by pacific means and all natural and technical resources, including atomic energy, could be devoted to economic and social advancement, a prerequisite for the maintenance of peace.

The Ecuadorian delegation wholeheartedly supported the United States draft resolution, as amended by its sponsor. The Committee, by adopting that text, would be fulfilling the task laid upon it by the General Assembly. It would be for the General Assembly to set up the proposed new commission and establish its terms of reference.

Mr. DERINSU (Turkey) recalled that his delegation had endorsed the general principles enunciated in the United States comments (A/AC.50/1). The draft resolution now before the Committee embodied in a general form the main ideas expressed in the document and the Turkish delegation therefore gave it warm support.

Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES (Brazil) remarked that his delegation had already, at the previous meeting, indicated its approval of the general principles put forward by the United States (A/AC.50/1). He regretted that he was not able immediately to give his unqualified endorsement to the United States draft resolution as he was awaiting instructions from his Government.

He expected to be able to vote for the draft resolution (A/AC.50/4) when the time came.

Mr. DAYAL (India) was in a similar position. He was not in a position to offer detailed comments on the draft resolution pending instructions, but he repeated the hope expressed by him at a previous meeting that the great powers would be prepared to accept the general proposition for the merging of the functions of the two commissions into a consolidated commission.

/The CHAIRMAN,

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of China, said that his delegation supported the United States draft resolution, as amended by its sponsor.

Speaking as Chairman he hoped that the draft resolution would receive unanimous support. He did not feel that he could put the draft resolution to the vote immediately, since several delegations were awaiting their Governments' instructions.

FUTURE WORK: DISCUSSION REGARDING THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to submit suggestions on the Committee's future work and its report.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, thought the time was approaching when the Committee would have to consider its draft report, more especially if no further draft resolutions were submitted. He proposed to draw up a comparatively short report, merely outlining the main discussions that had taken place and the decisions adopted; the general views submitted by the United States (A/AC.50/1) and the Secretariat monographs would be appended as annexes. He would welcome any suggestions on the subject.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) thought that the question of future work did not arise, since the Committee would have completed its task once it took its decision on the United States draft resolution.

He was in favour of appending document A/AC.50/1 and the Secretariat studies as annexes to the report, which according to the Rapporteur would be a very brief one. Those admirable studies would undoubtedly be much appreciated by the General Assembly and would enable it fully to grasp the position.

It would doubtless also be advisable for the list of resolutions concerning the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments to be annexed to the report for ready reference by the General Assembly.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands) thought that a valuable suggestion; the list would greatly facilitate the work of the new Commission, particularly at the outset.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN considered that the general views (A/AC.50/1) would be of assistance to the General Assembly in drawing up the new commission's terms of reference; the observations of members of the Committee on those views might also be included in the report.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, observed that that was, in fact, his intention.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished to set a date for the next meeting.

A brief exchange of views took place.

It was decided that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, 21 August 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.