

establishment of an effective system of control to ensure the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only and to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions.

As I have said this view is shared by ten out of the twelve nation members of the Commission. On the other hand, Mr. Gromyko, speaking for the U.S.S.R., expressed his continued opposition. He reiterated his view that no progress had been made because the report did not provide a solution for what he described as the urgent problem of prohibiting atomic weapons and particularly for the early destruction of the U.S. stocks of atomic bombs. He objected also to the ownership of fissionable material, and of plants for its processing and use, being vested in an international authority which he held to be both unnecessary and contrary to the principles of national sovereignty. He took similar objection to the proposals for the licensing of non-dangerous atomic energy activities which the majority of the Commission felt should be supervised by the Agency although their operation had been entrusted to a national authority.

Mr. Gromyko thought that some system of "quotas" would suffice, and he said that this proposal had not been sufficiently explored. The only point on which he seemed to have moved forward from the position which he took at the time of the First Report was in relation to inspection and control, which he now conceded must be international in scope and organization, with personnel who are international. However, it is thought that by international control and inspection the U.S.S.R. merely contemplates occasional or periodic inspection rather than the meticulous continuous process which the other members believe to be essential for security. There thus remains a very wide gap between the views of the U.S.S.R. supported by Poland and those of the rest of the Commission, but I do not think that we should be unduly cast down on that account, and we should certainly not underestimate the value and the significance of the progress which has been made.

When the Commission began its sessions in June of 1946, now some eighteen months ago, there was little to go on beyond a conviction that the dread potentialities of atomic war needed to be brought under effective international control. Since then the problem has been examined in its many intricacies and multitude of aspects. Gradually a consensus of opinion has formed and found expression until today ten nations out of twelve believe that they have found the right path forward. The circumstance that the other two nations on the Commission do not yet agree should not be regarded too seriously at this stage. As a matter of fact both these nations have made substantial contributions to the discussion. Certainly the representative of Poland has done so in a positive sense, and at the least the U.S.S.R. has formed an anvil on which the rest of us have had an opportunity to forge and hammer out the conclusions we have now reached.

Up to date we have been more anxious that the U.S.S.R. should continue to be represented in the discussions and less concerned that they would at once agree to the majority proposals. I think I can claim that we have felt so convinced of the necessity for proper control, and we are now so genuine in our belief as to how it must be brought about, that we feel that something of this sincerity must find its way through to the people of Russia. It is a fact that no people would benefit more than they would from what we have proposed and so both on the grounds of benefit from the peaceful application as well as of security, it is not too much to hope that eventually a way will be found to traverse the position of those who presently control the policy of the Soviet.