

its main drawback. As for the added provision for the reconvening of the Atomic Energy Commission, it did not allow of the reconsideration of the principal questions on which cleavages had arisen, and therefore was not even a palliative; it was empty phraseology, it was zero, it was nonsense. The only result to which it could lead was to cover up with the semblance of a decision the refusal to adopt any decision. It "put a tombstone" on the work of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Reverting to the substance of the majority proposals, Mr Vyshinsky elaborated his country's objections to the principle of international ownership of fissionable material. These objections were based firstly on legal grounds; the plan was "a clear formulation designed to deny the sovereignty of States." Secondly, there were economic objections; "the international control organ could very easily paralyse the development of many countries." Thirdly, there were strategic reasons why the Soviet Union could never accept the plan; its adoption "would impose upon the Soviet Union the necessity of indicating to the control organ the situation of its heavy industries, of its armaments industries, and of giving to the inspectors of the United Nations—and therefore to United States staff commanders—a complete map of military objectives within the Soviet Union." The alleged need for international ownership, which was thus clearly unacceptable, could and should be avoided by the establishment of a quota system for the equitable distribution among countries of raw materials and atomic fuel. Insufficient attention had been paid to this problem, the solution of which "would permit us to escape from the deadlock."

The *Indian* delegate (Mrs Pandit), in proposing that the majority proposals be approved "in substance" rather than in all details, said that India could not agree to international ownership of raw materials capable of generating atomic energy while other materials, such as oil, remained under private ownership without any international control. Full and free inspection together with control of production would provide adequate safeguards without international ownership of the actual raw materials.

Answers to the objections raised against the proposals for international ownership were given by the delegates of *Canada* (General McNaughton) and of the *United Kingdom* (Mr McNeil). It was true that the plan required the shedding of some sovereign rights, but that was the history and the business of international collaboration. "If we are going to shy at that," said Mr McNeil, "we might as well shut up shop." On the economic side, it was States like Canada and the United States which would have the most to contribute; they felt, nevertheless, that full benefits could only be obtained if development were organized on an international rather than a national basis. The question whether the proposed plan would result in a disadvantageous position for some