

GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
MASTER FILE  
ASSEMBLEE GENERALE

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

FIRST COMMITTEE: SUB-COMMITTEE 3

SUMMARY RECORD OF SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Flushing, L.I., 12 December 1946 at 4:00 p.m.

## Present:

Chairman:	Mr. Spaak	(Belgium)
Rapporteur:	Mr. Clementis	(Czechoslovakia)
	Mr. Ferrer	(Argentina)
	Dr. Arce	(Argentina)
	Mr. Martin	(Australia)
	Mr. Harry	(Australia)
	Mr. Valle	(Brazil)
	Mr. Wilgress	(Canada)
	Mr. Hsu	(China)
	Mr. Soto-Del-Corral	(Colombia)
	Mr. Fawzi	(Egypt)
	Mr. Parodi	(France)
	Mr. Chagla	(India)
	Mr. Amador	(Mexico)
	Mr. van Blokland	(Netherlands)
	Mr. de Morgenstierne	(Norway)
	Mr. Winiewicz	(Poland)
	Mr. Zurayk	(Syria)
	Mr. Medved	(Ukrainian SSR)
	Mr. Vyshinsky	(USSR)
	Sir Hartley Shawcross	(United Kingdom)
	Mr. Connally	(United States)

DISCUSSION ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE RESOLUTION ON INFORMATION ON ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, REFERRED TO THE SUB-COMMITTEE AT THE FIFTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. (Document A/203)

Mr. VYSHINSKY (USSR) suggested that the Sub-Committee begin the discussion on document A/203/Add.1, the United Kingdom amendment to the resolution (A/203) on information on armed forces of the United Nations, and on the USSR amendment to this document presented by Mr. Molotov verbally at the Fifty-Fourth Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly.

Sir Hartley SHAWCROSS (UNITED KINGDOM) said he preferred to start the discussion on paragraph 3 of document A/254, a text of the resolution in

/which

which an attempt was made to include the United Kingdom and USSR amendment. He had made it clear in the General Assembly that his agreement to the USSR proposal to submit information on armaments as well as on armed forces was conditional on the establishment of an International Supervisory Commission. Since he would have to vote against the inclusion of armaments in the first paragraph of the resolution if the adoption of the Supervisory Commission in the third were uncertain, he suggested the discussion start on what was to him the vital third paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that document A/203/Add.1 had been withdrawn and replaced by document A/254.

Mr. VYSHINSKY stated that his delegation would be in a difficult position if document A/203/Add.1 were withdrawn, for the "gentlemen's agreement" in the Fifty-Fourth Plenary Session of the General Assembly depended on it. The USSR delegation had suggested the addition of armaments to the United Kingdom amendment (A/203/Add.1) calling for the verification of information on armed forces. On the basis of the United Kingdom acceptance of this USSR amendment, the USSR delegation had accepted, in principle, the establishment of the International Supervisory Commission in the United Kingdom additional proposal. The USSR amendment had been made to document A/203/Add.1. The new document (A/254) replacing A/203/Add.1 was completely different and if A/203/Add.1 were withdrawn he wished to be free to adopt a new attitude.

Sir Hartley SEAWCROSS declared that, as indicated on page 445 of Supplement A to Journal 57, the record of the Fifty-Fourth Plenary Meeting of the General Assembly, he had made an additional proposal defining specifically an International Supervisory Commission, the establishment of which was the condition of his accepting the USSR amendment to include information on armaments. Mr. Molotov had accepted this additional proposal in principle, and the General Assembly had referred it to the Sub-Committee together with document A/203.

/Document A/254

Document A/254 replacing A/203/Add.1 had been drafted by the United Kingdom delegation in order to facilitate the work of the Sub-Committee. It included the USSR amendment on armaments, and in paragraph 3, the identical language of the United Kingdom proposal introduced in the Assembly, with the addition of one sentence linking it to the draft resolution on disarmament accepted at the Sub-Committee's previous meeting.

He was prepared, however, to withdraw A/254 and base the discussion on what had been agreed in the Plenary Meeting of the Assembly, returning later to document A/203 to make any necessary changes.

Mr. VYSHINSKY observed that page 452 of the record of the Fifty-Fourth Plenary Session showed Sir Hartley had proposed referring document A/203 and A/203/Add.1 to the Sub-Committee. As indicated by Mr. Molotov's remarks on page 456, the USSR delegation would vote in favour of A/203/Add.1 on the condition that the USSR amendment to add 'armaments' were accepted. Subject to this addition, the USSR delegation also favoured in principle the second United Kingdom proposal.

The new document A/254 differed considerably from document A/203/Add.1 in the order for the submission of information since it called for information on armed forces immediately, but on armaments not until a month after the International Supervisory Commission had been established. The Security Council might never establish this Commission and there would then be no obligation to submit information on armaments. The General Assembly itself should decide this question. The new United Kingdom proposal made a clear distinction between armed forces and armaments such as atomic weapons, rockets, etc. and the USSR delegation must insist that information on both be submitted simultaneously. A/203/Add.1 had been clear on this point, and if the United Kingdom and the United States agreed to submit information on all armaments, the USSR was ready to accept the proposal. He therefore thought that discussion

/must

must be based on A/203/Add.1.

Mr. van BLOKLAND (NETHERLANDS) pointed out that the original USSR proposal under Article 43 of the Charter for information on armed forces of Members on non-enemy territories had grown by logical steps to include armed forces in ex-enemy states, armed forces at home, all armaments, and finally a system of control. The original purpose of the resolution in document A/203 was to speed the implementation of Article 43, but he doubted whether information on troops which dealt with totals not types would assist the Military Staff Committee in this regard. The idea of including armaments was good in principle but he also doubted whether the different information supplied by different states in accordance with this broad resolution would be of any assistance.

He therefore questioned the utility of this resolution. The implementation of Article 43 and the related question of troop withdrawal was laid down in paragraph 4 of the Resolution on Principles Governing the General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments adopted at the previous meeting. Either there must be a very detailed examination or the question should be abandoned and the Sub-Committee should limit itself to the resolution just adopted.

Mr. PARODI (FRANCE) observed that from the beginning of the discussion he had pointed out that balanced and progressive stages in disarmament were of fundamental importance. This balance must be maintained in each of the necessary stages. The original USSR proposal to report information on armed forces abroad, not including ex-enemy states, had not been balanced, and the inclusion of ex-enemy states, then of troops at home and finally the question of armaments, all in an attempt to reach a balance, had led to the present difficulty. Either the idea of a resolution in addition to that on disarmament should be given up, or, better, the Security Council might be recommended to seek information for the enforcement of that part of paragraph 4 of the disarmament resolution which called for the progressive and balanced withdrawal of troops abroad. Information on

/armed forces

armed forces abroad might be collected first, in which case only the first three points of the resolution in document A/203 would be retained.

Mr. CHAGLA (INDIA) recalled Sir Hartley Shawcross' statement that disarmament must be progressive and in gradual steps. Either the Sub-Committee could seek the largest common measure of agreement on this additional resolution or scrap it as an independent resolution because the disarmament resolution already covered the question. He did not think it was possible to achieve unanimity on this additional resolution and suggested the disarmament resolution, which had itself been a long step forward should be observed for a year or more. The Sub-Committee, therefore, should go to the General Assembly with only one resolution, "The Principles Governing the General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments," which could be accepted by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN associated himself with the remarks of the Representatives of the Netherlands, France and India. The resolution under discussion (A/203) had already been adopted by a large majority of the First Committee and had been referred by the Assembly to the Sub-Committee only to clarify the text as a result of many complicating amendments. He pointed out to the USSR representative that it was not practical to believe that the major states could give information on all their armaments by 15 December 1946 nor that the Security Council could set up a Supervisory Commission by 15 January 1947. The Atomic Energy Commission had been debating for months on the question of atomic weapons alone. He asked the representative of the United Kingdom if he really believed the Sub-Committee could agree in a few hours on even an interim International Supervisory Commission. The great powers would certainly not accept inspection unless they were sure it was carefully worked out.

In his opinion, neither the USSR or the United Kingdom amendment was practical and the only solution would seem to be to add a paragraph on information to the Resolution on the Principles Governing the General

/Regulation

Regulation and Reduction of Armaments. This resolution went even further than the original proposal of the USSR requiring information on troops, for it called for their withdrawal. It might be well to recommend the Security Council to report on information received in accordance with this resolution in order to make it clear that the resolution was being implemented. The important thing was the decisive step taken at the previous meeting in adopting the resolution on disarmament.

Mr. MAKIN (AUSTRALIA) pointed out that, whatever the circumstances, the United Kingdom and the USSR representatives had apparently misunderstood each other. He believed the Sub-Committee should adopt the course suggested by the representatives of the Netherlands, France, India and the Chairman.

Sir Hartley SEAWCROSS (UNITED KINGDOM) noted that he had been saying throughout that information such as required by the resolution in A/203 was almost valueless and of a transitory nature. He realized that at the Plenary Session there had been difficulties of confusion, tension, and interpretation but page 446 of the Journal Supplement showed that his second verbal amendment differed from A/203/Add.1, and that information on armaments was to be submitted only after the Supervisory Commission was established. His remarks recorded on pages 449 and 455 showed that there had been no change of attitude by the United Kingdom delegation. The only possible value of the resolution in document A/203 might be not in the actual information submitted, but as exhibiting the confidence among the Great Powers.

Mr. VYSHINSKY (USSR) denied Mr. Makin's suggestion that there had been misunderstanding. The USSR proposal was clear in asking that information on armed forces and armaments should be submitted simultaneously.

Sir Hartley's hurriedly submitted proposal had been only for a temporary Supervisory Commission and the USSR delegation made no objection. The USSR delegation would approve any date mutually acceptable for submission of information on armed forces and armaments but the main question was that armed forces and armaments were inseparable. Some delegations now thought

/there had

there had been too much haste and they could not accept the proposal. Mr. Molotov had made the position of the USSR delegation clear at the Plenary Session on the proposal to submit information on all armed forces and armaments, and the USSR delegation would like to hear the answer of the United Kingdom and the United States. There had been no change in the position of the USSR delegation, which insisted that the two aspects of the same question be treated together. Other delegations however had apparently changed their positions.

Mr. VYSHINSKY said he could not accept the suggestion advanced by some delegations of adding a new paragraph to the Resolution on Principles Governing the General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments, because he considered the resolution already complete, and additions might lead to dissension.

Mr. CONNALLY (UNITED STATES) thought the comprehensive resolution which had just been adopted fully met the need for disarmament and he would regret to see anything interfere with or impede this monumental achievement. The measures now being considered were temporary and the Security Council would call for all appropriate information when it took up the whole problem in the near future.

Sir Hartley SHAWCROSS (UNITED KINGDOM) wished to emphasize that his proposal did not depart from the principle of equity. He had agreed that information should be given on armaments and armed forces at the same time and had made it clear that the United Kingdom was prepared to give full information, but only after a system of international control had been established.

The CHAIRMAN appealed to the Sub-Committee to adopt the Indian proposal to decide that the resolution in document A/203 was covered by the resolution on disarmament. Unanimity, including the United Kingdom and the USSR, was necessary to avoid resuming the debates in the First Committee and General Assembly and the Indian proposal was logical, consistent and conciliatory.

/Mr. WINIEWICZ

Mr. WINIEWICZ (POLAND) pointed out that the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee were to conciliate the points of view expressed by various delegations on the resolution in document A/203. If this could not be accomplished, a statement such as that suggested by the representative of India could be adopted or the failure of reconciliation be reported to the Assembly. Personally, he favoured the latter course which he would put in a formal motion to the Sub-Committee.

Mr. VYSELSKY (USSR) observed that the original USSR proposal (document A/C.1/87) had been greatly changed and consequently he had voted in the First Committee against the resolution in document A/203. The Rules of Procedure must be followed and a decision should be taken on the question referred to the Sub-Committee from the General Assembly. The USSR delegation could not agree to the Indian proposal merely to secure unanimity and would therefore maintain its position.

The CHAIRMAN then suggested the text of a new resolution, referring to paragraph 4 of the Resolution on the Principles Governing the General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments and to replace document A/203. He added that in the absence of unanimity the Sub-Committee must proceed to a vote.

**DECISION:** After making several drafting changes, the Sub-Committee adopted the following resolution by 15 votes to 2 with 3 abstentions:

**THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**DESIROUS** of implementing, as soon as possible, the Resolution of December 1946 on the Principles Governing the Regulation and Reduction of Armaments,

**CALLS UPON** the Security Council to determine, as soon as possible, the information which the States Members should be called upon to furnish, in order to give effect to this Resolution.

It was agreed that Mr. Clementis would continue as Rapporteur for this resolution and explain to the First Committee the proceedings of the Sub-Committee in full.

The meeting rose at 8:10 p.m.

-----