

However, as the debate developed it became evident that a considerable number of delegations, while not subscribing to the view that the Commission should ride over the Soviet on the clauses of the Treaty, nevertheless felt that it would be well for the world if the Atomic Energy Commission remained in session so as to keep the whole of this dangerous situation under constant review. It was thought that if this were done the Commission might even be able to make progress on some aspects of its technical work.

The Canadian Delegation and those who had joined in the sponsorship of our resolution, particularly the United States and France, were happy to accede to this somewhat more hopeful view of the possibilities of progress and we therefore modified our proposal so as to provide that the Commission would resume its meetings and "proceed to the further study of such of the subjects remaining in its programme of work as it considers to be practicable and useful."

In this form the resolution went to a plenary session of the General Assembly where it received forty votes in favour to six against. Those against included the Soviet and Soviet satellites only. The twelve nations unaccounted for or abstaining include a number who have not yet made up their minds on this complex and difficult subject. A few made reservations because of special interest in uranium and thorium ores and unfortunately a number were absent because the vote came earlier than had been expected. Altogether it is thought that in one form or another some forty-six nations expressed in Paris their acceptance, at least in principle, of the majority proposals.

Thus I can say that the novel and far reaching project for the international control of atomic energy which has been evolved by the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission has met with acceptance by the great majority of the nations and we can feel therefore that this project commends itself to the conscience of the world.

This is most important for the future because it is the assurance which we sought when we took this great question to the General Assembly in Paris. We have been given it in generous measure and even the Soviet must now realize that they stand almost in isolation in their failure to accept the new conceptions of international organization which seem to us to be an inescapable condition for the survival of civilization in this atomic age.

We may hope that by continued, patient and persistent efforts in the Commission and through the meetings of the "six" sponsors to be held later in the year, we will yet be able to carry conviction to the peoples of the Soviet. There is a little time left which can safely be given to this process of education and persuasion and we must use it to the best advantage.

The first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission subsequent to the Sessions of the General Assembly in Paris was held at Lake Success on Friday, 18 February, 1949 under the chairmanship of the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. It resulted in the acceptance of a Canadian proposal designed to facilitate the further work of the Commission and the preparation for the meetings of the "six" sponsors to be held later on in the year. These matters will now proceed in the Commission and in its various Committees and Sub-committees with the objective of developing reports there which might be presented to the Fourth Session of the General Assembly which meets in New York in September next.

The next meeting of the Atomic Energy Commission was held on 25 February 1949 and at it the Soviet representative re-submitted the proposal which the Soviet had made at the General Assembly for the preparation of "a draft convention for the prohibition of atomic weapons and a draft convention for the control of atomic energy, proceeding from the principle that both conventions must be concluded and put into effect simultaneously."