

took decisions by a majority vote. To duplicate in the control organ the voting arrangements of the Council, would render the control organ impotent.

There seemed, however, to be a suggestion that the control organ should stand apart from the United Nations on a footing of complete equality and independence in relation to it. That was not the view of his delegation. On the contrary, there should be a close relationship—to be specified in the convention setting up the control organ—between the control organ and the Security Council. Likewise, the General Assembly would properly be concerned with the work of such an organ in so far as it related to the beneficial purposes to which atomic energy might be put. If in the future the Security Council should show itself capable of reaching positive decisions, the representative of New Zealand saw no reason of principle why its authority should necessarily be wholly excluded from the field of control of atomic energy or disarmament. The control experts, military and scientific, must have a wide field of independent action in which they would have not only the right, but the duty, of making decisions. But they would require the support, and perhaps the guidance, of those organs of the United Nations concerned with the general political interest of mankind.

Some concern was expressed in the debate that the Soviet Union seemed exclusively interested in the suppression of atomic weapons. The necessity of including also other weapons of mass destruction was emphasized, especially by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States. The representative of the Soviet Union sought to reassure them on this point.

The earlier stages of the debate were conducted in a somewhat sceptical atmosphere because it was felt that the phrase in the Soviet resolution “within the framework of the Security Council” implied that the veto would apply within the control organ itself. The following additional statement by Mr Molotov was therefore received with very great interest. To dispel any misunderstanding about the application of the unanimity rule, Mr Molotov stated that the Security Council would take a decision on the reduction of armaments, including the prohibition of atomic weapons and the creation of control commissions, only when there existed unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council. All its members were interested in achieving that unanimity. After the Security Council had taken its decision, the control commissions would work in conformity with the rules specified by the Security Council. The rule of unanimity in the Security Council had nothing to do with the work of the control commissions. Therefore, it was incorrect to say that a permanent member, with its “veto,” could prevent the implementation of a control system. Any attempt to prevent an inspection would constitute a violation of the Security Council’s decision.

This statement offered some hope that a sub-committee might be formed with a real prospect of drawing up an agreed resolution, and not,