The Atomic Energy Commission therefore concludes that no useful purpose can be served by further discussions in the Atomic Energy Commission of those proposals which have already been considered and rejected by the appropriate organs of the United Nations. The Atomic Energy Commission reports to the Security Council and the General Assembly accordingly.

## JULY 29, 1949, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION RESOLUTION AEC/43

#### TO Syldandeconger on IMPASSE REACHED Serioblepto

(Adopted at 24th Meeting by a vote of 9 in favour (including Canada), 2 against (Ukrainian S.S.R. and Soviet Union), no abstentions)

### The Atomic Energy Commission

# evitablesorger and to duemature enjoyed and solve Soviet Soviet Republics at transferrence

That in accordance with the instructions in General Assembly resolution 191 (III) of 4 November 1948, the Atomic Energy Commission has surveyed its programme of work in order to determine whether further work would be practicable and useful;

That the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian SSR continue to reject the recommendations of the Commission approved by the General Assembly on 4 November 1948, including those forms of control contained in the plan approved by the General Assembly "as constituting the necessary basis for establishing an effective system of international control of atomic energy to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes and for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons in accordance with the terms of reference of the Atomic Energy Commission";

That the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian SSR continue to insist on the adoption of the draft resolution (A/C.1/310) proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and rejected by the General Assembly on 4 November 1948, to prepare immediately separate convention based on the proposals of the Soviet Union of June 1946 and June 1947, which provide among other things for national ownership of dangerous and explosive atomic materials, and for national ownership, operation and management of dangerous atomic facilities. This, in the opinion of the majority of the Commission, would not remove causes for suspicion, fear and distrust among nations, would render ineffective the prohibition of atomic weapons, and would continue dangerous national rivalries in the field of atomic energy;

#### Concludes:

That the impasse as analysed in the third report of the Atomic Energy Commission still exists; that these differences are irreconcilable at the Commission level, and that further discussion in the Atomic Energy Commission would tend to harden these differences and would serve no practicable or useful purpose until such time as the Sponsoring Powers have reported that there exists a basis for agreement.