

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Well I don't think we can publish any more than this until General MacArthur says he is ready. He has asked us not to publish details and my Government at any rate has no desire to go against that. But we think, in view of the public criticism of the Far Eastern Commission for not making decisions on any of these things, that we should let them know that some decision has been made.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: I don't deny the fact that it is some step forward.

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: I think the position at the present is either to get this or we get nothing. I think it is better than nothing.

GEN. MCCOY: I notice it has been a matter of considerable discussion in the Council of Japan.

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Yes, the economic situation.

MR. SEN: Is the object of this to allay public criticism in countries outside of Japan or Japan itself?

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Chiefly outside Japan.

MR. SEN: I am inclined to agree with the Soviet Representative that this last sentence, that the details of the decision will not be made public until a later date, might lead to unnecessary speculation and offset the advantage of the first sentence.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: I am not quite sure about speculation. I just wanted to put this question.

GEN. MCCOY: The United States is ready to go with Major Plimsoll on this, but I really don't think it helps much myself, and I think it will be what is desired at least partly by the Reparations Committee, for publication as soon as practical, ~~as~~ and that will no doubt be done as the Supreme Commander, with the advice of the Commission, there works it out and is able to announce without the embarrassment that might come while he's in the midst of this survey and consideration. However, I'm willing to hear the remarks on the subject.

MR. NAGGIAR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to be informed of the reason why the Supreme Commander wishes to postpone publication of the decision. As far as I understand, I am not sure, there seems to be some danger, which I can't see, of letting known our decision.

GEN. MCCOY: My remembrance is that in the consideration of the publication of our back papers is generally that an exception was made by the Supreme Commander for procedural reasons or for political reasons, I don't remember which, but I can make inquiry and see if I can enlighten you.

MR. NAGGIAR: Yes, because this policy decision is one of the most important we have been able to adopt and it is true that there has been some criticism of our failure, if I may use this word, but I consider that the Far Eastern Commission, compared with all the international commission, has done well. We have very many difficulties but we have been able to maintain a very friendly atmosphere ~~was~~ here and we have been able to agree, I think, unanimously to adopt a very technical paper and very difficult paper on capacity levels for Japan, a very important paper, and when we see in other parts of the world the Allies are not able to agree on a question of this nature, I think that it will be very important to let the public know that here we have been able to agree on this very difficult, technical question. Of course, there may be some embarrassment for the Supreme Commander in publicity being given to this decision, but I think it would not be fair either to the public, either to the Japanese people, either to the Far Eastern Commission, to postpone indefinitely or, I don't know, a long time the publication of our decision.

GEN. MCCOY: Well I feel that way about it in general, but I'm also sympathetic with the man on the spot. I find that while I am holding your position in general on the broad question, I am constantly aware of the reluctance of General MacArthur to publish

it at a particular time that might seem reasonable over here and over there consistently, with his policy of open covenants openly arrived at, that he selects the time when he thinks it will be to the advantage of the authority there. And in this last paper where he agreed to publication of the other papers it was not due to his objecting to publication of anything, but he wants to be the judge of the time, best time to do it, and there I think that as a rule we have accepted his opinion on that and in general I would like to continue to do it and I think the Commission would too. But I am also sympathetic and I think this is a very important paper that shows that we can cooperate on very difficult questions, where our interests are very deeply and properly involved. And I feel like you, that I would like to have the Commission have the credit, not only for itself but also for the effect on the public.

MR. NAGGIAR: Mr. Chairman, it's not only a question of credit for the Far Eastern Commission. It's a problem of the whole international atmosphere in the world. And I may say I am very anxious to give some fair play to international bodies when once in a while they agree on something because if we go along like that in the world at large, I can see no hope for the ~~far~~ future. So this time I hope that no delay will be found for the publication of our very important paper on Japan. The local necessity of administration in Japan we have to take care of and General MacArthur is the only one that can give us guidance on this point. But there is a broader view of the matter on a whole problem on an international plan. I think that we may give not only credit to the Far Eastern Commission as such but also ^{to} the fact that an international body has been able to agree.

GEN. MCCOY: I am informed that General MacArthur has stated to our Government not any objection to the publication but to doing it now while he's in the process of designating the factories, and

has not completed it, and that he will have no objection to the publication as soon as he's completed the designation.

MR. NAGGIAR: Is there any hope for that being done soon as far as you know?

GEN. MCCOY: I am informed that here we do not know when that designation will be completed, but that that was his broad statement apparently, that he did not want it published until he had completed the designation under the policy paper. In view of this discussion, Major Plimsoll, what is your wish now?

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: I don't think we can do anything until we know what our Soviet colleague's views are. He hasn't got his instructions yet.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Mr. Chairman, if the opinion of the Commission is that this short statement is useful, I think that it is worthwhile to postpone the consideration until I receive my instructions and then when the instructions of my Government are available we can discuss it again. There is no harm postponing the consideration. But if the majority of the Commission is of the opinion that this is not necessary, then of course instructions will not be necessary. As I got it some members still want--

DR. KOO: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word. I think on the whole it would seem to me perhaps more advisable to postpone the release, any kind of release until we are able to publish the whole paper. It is quite understandable that premature publication of this paper might inconvenience the Supreme Commander, especially since he is actually engaged in the process of selecting plants and factories for removal. It would inconvenience him because he might be flooded with claims in an amount on the part of Japanese industrialists which would only complicate his work. Since he's already in the process of doing so, I believe, and I hope that it will not be very long before that phase of his work might be completed, it will be better for us to wait until we are in a position to publish the whole paper.

To merely give a sort of preliminary release to the effect that we have taken a decision yet we are not in a position to give out the decision, as some of my colleagues already have stated, might unnecessarily sort of stir up ~~curiosity~~ curiosity and whet the appetite for speculation which would not be helpful either to the Commission or to the work of SCAP. So, on the whole, if I understood my Soviet colleague, I am inclined to share his view that it would be much better not to say anything now but to wait for the opportune moment, which I hope will not be too far off, for publishing the whole paper.

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Mr. Chairman, I think this is the sort of a matter in which there should be at any rate a substantial agreement in the Commission, and the Chinese Government is apparently opposed to publication. The Soviet Government at least is not enthusiastic about it, and in that event I will be prepared to withdraw this proposal. I think it does complicate things in our relations with the press and our own nationals, when they ask us what the Commission is doing in economic matters, we have got to remain silent and we can't even say we have designated certain industries and go into any further details. In view of the fact that there is certainly no unanimity in the Commission on the matter, I will be prepared to withdraw it.

GEN. MCCOY: All right. I think the discussion has brought out the real picture. I think that ^{if} General MacArthur were here himself he couldn't have expressed it better than the Chinese Ambassador. So that, with your approval, we will postpone action and possibly this discussion may be helpful to the men in SCAP.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted two words to say. In order to avoid misunderstanding, of course, I still am doubtful whether such a partial statement could serve very useful purposes. But my objection is based not only on that fact that it cannot serve useful purposes but that, of course, fully appreciating all angles of this question and all possible

complications after the release of this paper I still think that a full release of this paper will be best. I would like to make it quite clear. My opinion is that the paper will be not only completely unharful but will be very well if we release the whole paper. Coming back to this particular question, Mr. Chairman, this short release, upon which I can't say the opinion of my Government, it might well be negative or positive, so in view of this, of course, I am not prepared today to say my final opinion. Maybe if other members do not object it would be very useful to postpone it and take it up again at the next meeting.

GEN. MCCOY: And your wish is that the paper should remain on the agenda?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, sir.

GEN. MCCOY: Is that agreeable to all concerned?

MR. NAGGIAR: What paper?

GEN. MCCOY: The paper or the motion--

MR. NAGGIAR: Not the motion of Major Plimsoll. It was withdrawn.

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: I am prepared ~~to~~ to withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SEN: The question of publication will remain on the agenda?

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: I withdraw my paper.

MR. NAGGIAR: Then what kind of paper will remain on the agenda?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: You cannot do that, Major.

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Why not?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will not obstruct this, but if the Australian representative would leave this matter on the agenda for one week, personally, I would like to at least know the opinion of my Government and dispose of it at the next meeting.

MR. SEN: This question can be brought up at a later stage when we are in a position to take a ~~final~~ decision on this.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: I am in this position, Mr. Chairman. I made some recommendations and I got it from the previous meeting that everybody was willing--I wasn't willing to approve this paper last

meeting and everybody was willing, and I so informed the Government. Now we are ready so quick to withdraw everything. Just keep it on the agenda another week until I have the opinion of my Government and then dispose of it. I am not proposing anything.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, could I suggest that the present paper or the present motion be withdrawn and when Admiral Ramishvili has a suggestion to make, if he wishes to make one, he can present it at the next meeting.

GEN. MCCOY: Yes. Of course this can be brought up at any time by you.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, sir. My reluctance to withdraw this paper now does not necessarily mean that I don't agree with the opinions presented here. I just wanted to have the opportunity to present the opinion of my Government. Are you willing to withdraw your withdrawal, Major? Just to allow me to state my final opinion?

GEN. MCCOY: Why couldn't you let the paper be withdrawn and then when the time comes make a point of the matter in a form that will bring it up for discussion and action or just for discussion?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Well this would take place by the next meeting, Mr. Chairman.

GEN. MCCOY: Well it will be perfectly easy to make a ruling in accordance with the procedure of the Commission, but before I do that I will consult my experts.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, I am not insisting; I am just asking. Is it all right to give me the opportunity to report to the Commission the opinion of my Government without any commitments. It is quite clear that no use will be served in keeping it on the agenda if everybody expresses the opinion/^{to}withdraw it, except just to give me the opportunity to report the opinion of my Government.

GEN. MCCOY: Well, suppose to keep the record straight Major Plimself withdraws his motion and I make a statement that the subject of publication of this will be kept on the agenda until you receive

instructions?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Oh, so this is a particular motion? But the subject will be on the agenda?

GEN. MCCOY: Yes.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: All right.

GEN. MCCOY: Is there any objection to that?

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: No, that is all right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SEN: In other words, your motion remains on the agenda?

You are not withdrawing--

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Well I did, but it has come back again. It's like the ebb and flow of the tide.

GEN. MCCOY: I will keep on the agenda then the subject of the publication of the paper at the pleasure of the Commission.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes.

MR. SEN: Not the motion of Major Plimsoll?

GEN. MCCOY: No, not the motion. My statement is it. If there is no objection that will be done.

**ITEM 5 - SOURCES OF JAPANESE IMPORTS (FEC-060/11; FEC-060 series)
DESTINATION OF JAPANESE EXPORTS (FEC-032/21; FEC-032 series)**

GEN. MCCOY: A number of paper that I will not read the numbers. They are before you. The Steering Committee on the 8th of April agreed to forward these proposed policy decisions to the Commission. The Soviet position is reserved in the absence of the inclusion of the phrase: "and are not in conflict with the interests of other countries, members of the Far Eastern Commission" at the end of the first sentence in paragraph 3 of FEC-060/11, and at the end of the penultimate sentence in paragraph 3 of FEC-032/21. That is, the end of the penultimate sentence in paragraph 3 of FEC-032/21. That still remains your position, does it?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, sir. I would ask your permission to postpone it. I am not ready.

GEN. MCCOY: The item is postponed if there is no objection.

ITEM 6 - ADVANCE TRANSFERS OF JAPANESE REPARATIONS (FEC-201/1)

GEN. MCCOY: FEC-201/1 was first considered by the Commission on the 3rd of April and has been retained on the agenda.

At the last meeting the Soviet Representative asked for a ruling on the question of whether one member of the Commission could demand a vote on a paper listed on the Commission's agenda. Is that correct?

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, sir.

GEN. MCCOY: I give a little preamble to that to refresh your memory as it involves several points that haven't been thoroughly thrashed out at times and hasn't been necessary heretofore, apparently, as the informal way of the Chairman conducting the Commission has been acceptable and seemed best for our broad effort to cooperate on some very complicated problems.

In the attempt, after months of effort on the part of my Government, to cut the Gordian knot of this agreement, my Government took the responsibility, under the Terms of Reference, of issuing an emergency directive on this subject. However, the paper itself which had been put before the Commission, that is, in the sense of being referred in a routine way to the Committee, was brought before the Commission as a matter of courtesy in the sense of feeling that the Commission itself, as sitting in bane, had not had an opportunity to discuss it around the table, so that the Chairman introduced the paper, not for action but purely for discussion, and we have had that very decidedly and in a very enlightening way, I think, that has enabled us to have the opinions well expressed by all representatives. It now seems to be a matter of parliamentary procedure which the Chairman holds as follows and presents his ruling in the matter:

First, from a parliamentary point of view a request for a vote on a proposal is a request that debate on some specific proposal or motion before the house should cease and that the house should proceed immediately to vote upon this proposal. In parliamentary

language this request is commonly known as a motion for the previous question.

Secondly, standard parliamentary practice is set forth in the Roberts Rules of Order as well as the precedents of this Commission support the ruling that a motion for the previous question must be seconded before it can be voted upon. In the absence of a second a motion fails.

Thirdly, before a motion for the previous question being properly made, however, there must be before the assembly some specific motion upon which debate is to cease and upon which a vote must be taken.

Fourthly, it is the opinion of the Chair that no motion with respect to FEC-201/1, Advance Transfers of Japanese Reparations, is before this Commission. The paper in question is on the Commission agenda, as its cover page indicates, without recommendation. The precedents of this Commission have been that before any policy proposal can be adopted a motion must be made and seconded in its behalf.

Fifthly, in the absence of any motion with respect to FEC-201/1 it is the ruling of the Chair that a request for a vote on FEC-201/1 is out of order.

Admiral, I will pass this on. That is the only copy I happen to have and you can read it at your leisure. Does anybody else wish to look over that ruling of the Chair?

I might say that I have taken interest to follow the question through both from the point of view of the Admiral, representing the Soviets, and others as expressed, and the Secretariat has made wide inquiry as to such procedure, including the procedure of our House of Representatives, and I have consulted our legal advisers and all concerned, so that I feel I'm on sound ground in making the ruling.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, against not voting on this paper. I never had any objection about that. My objection is the withdrawal of this paper. It is quite clear--if

the members of the Commission do not want to vote for it, of course I could not insist on that. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Committee No. 1 met with some difficulties in discussing this question. Now, it seems to me, it is clear to me, that after the decision was not reached on this question, and in the meantime came the United States directive, which document shall we discuss? If you look in the Terms of Reference: "The United States Government may issue interim directives to the Supreme Commander, pending action by the Commission, whenever urgent matters arise..." So I interpret, and I think that everybody should interpret so because there is no other way to interpret it, that "pending action" means, first, that the action of the Far Eastern Commission, of this body, must continue and the subject of the discussion must be the policy decision of the Far Eastern Commission and not there, it is not said there, that issuance of the directive stops immediately the discussion of a Commission document and we have passed the interim directive. Quite to the contrary. This phrase says that "pending action", so it is understood that, after the issuance of the interim directive, the discussion of the matter, substance, continues, and when it is finished, of course the United States Government will look then whether its directive corresponds to the Far Eastern Commission's decision or not. This is my opinion and I believe that I am not mistaken in this. So the United States directive, not only in view of this paragraph but also in general sense, cannot be the subject of discussion of the Far Eastern Commission. This is a directive of one particular government. Well, I never would be willing, for instance, to submit any directive of my Government for discussion of an international body. This sounds like a very harsh way to discuss and to treat a government, even from this point of view. But in Committee No. 1 we met with rather a different opinion, that the members of the Committee want to discuss the United States directive and we feel that we cannot take part in such a dis-

cussion. The discussion is criticizing. Why shall we discuss the directive? The directive was drafted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the governmental agencies, and every word is signed by the government, and now we tinker with the directive and change it? It is no way to do. We should continue with the subject until we reach an agreement and then it will be--this is my opinion--up to the United States Government, which is the implementing government, to look into the decision and see whether this directive corresponds or not. And when we come to this question, Mr. Chairman, that we have on our agenda, substance of the interim directive, we have to dispose of the substance some way, and until we dispose of it we cannot get to the discussion of the directive because it is none of our business to discuss the directive.

MAJOR PLIMSOLL: Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that has come before the Reparations Committee on two occasions in the last week and the Reparations Committee has discussed it now for more than two and a half hours and reached no conclusion. I don't think it matters very much the distinction the Admiral chooses to make. There are two alternatives--either we discuss the interim directive itself, and I think the Terms of Reference of the Commission clearly give the Commission power to do so if it wishes--it says one of the functions of the Commission is to review directives issued to General MacArthur. That is one alternative which is being presented most strongly by the French Government. The other alternative is the one put forward by the Soviet Government, which is to discuss the policy paper which was before the Commission before the interim directive was issued--discuss that and make any amendments, adopt it in the Commission, and then let the United States Government amend its interim directive accordingly or issue a new directive. Now my own view is, it doesn't matter which we adopt. I think they will both get us to exactly the same place. And I think that, in view of the strong stand

which the Soviet Government took on the matter, most of Committee No. 1 were prepared to follow the same line, that is, to discuss the policy paper which was before the Commission before the interim directive was issued. But the French Government takes the opposite view. I don't know how strongly.

COL. POWLES: Mr. Chairman, might I mention that as far as the interim directive is concerned it seems to me fairly clear from the Terms of Reference that it doesn't come before the Commission for a discussion or a review until a request that that should be done is made formally by a member. The Terms of Reference say, to review, on the request of any member, a directive issued by the United States Government, and so forth, and as far as I am aware there has been no formal request to that effect as yet made, though I would feel that the directive, although it is before us for information, is not before us for discussion and review.

MR. NAGGIAR: Mr. Chairman, I may say that the Soviet Delegate's point of view and that just expressed very clearly by our colleague from New Zealand both seem to be well founded. I think we may take the stand that the technical review of any directive issued by the Supreme Commander could be reviewed only on the formal request of any member, but the words "formal request", of course, are not in the Terms of Reference. They just say "on the request", the request to be made verbally or in any other way. Or we may accept the Soviet point of view that the interim directive being taken by the United States Government pending the action by the Commission, the action by the Commission is pending, so it is still before the Commission. I am not able to decide on the terms of our statutes which interpretation is the best. But I think it is a legal point of view to be examined and see what is the best action to be taken. It's true that the words "pending action", as I understand it, mean that action is still pending, so there is some action--

ADM. RAMISHVILI: that must be completed.

MR. NAGGIAR: Yes. And at the same time we see here that "Section II, Functions, The Functions of the Far Eastern Commission shall be: 2. To review, on the request of any member..." so it means, according to our colleague from New Zealand, that there must be a request for the review of the directive, and what form the request must take now I don't know. Is it a verbal request or a written request, I don't know.

GEN. MCCOY: We will declare a recess for consideration of this matter.

(The meeting recessed at 11:45 A.M.)

(The meeting reconvened at 12:00 N.)

GEN. MCCOY: The session is reopened.

MR. SEN: Mr. Chairman, can I ask for clarification of one point which has arisen out of the discussions. Is it the view of the United States Government that if a different decision is taken by the Far Eastern Commission regarding the advance transfers that decision will not be allowed to affect the implementation of the interim directive?

GEN. MCCOY: Well I haven't made that statement or considered it. That would, I think, be covered in general by my present statement. I will have that in mind.

In reference to Item 6 and the valuable discussion we had on the paper that has brought out some important points, in view of all of them and of the fact that no member of the Commission has requested the United States interim directive be reviewed by the Commission, I assume that it is the wish of the Commission to refer FEC-201/1, the Advance Transfers of Japanese Reparations, to Committee No. 1 for its further consideration, and if there is no objection that will be done.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my position quite clear, at least to try to make it quite clear, because it is a

very important decision. We started the discussion of the Far Eastern Commission paper on advance transfers here in the Far Eastern Commission. Later on came the directive of the United States Government according to the Terms of Reference. Now, the Terms of Reference say that, pending the action of the Far Eastern Commission, which I interpret that the already started action must continue because the priority--I believe it is so and I believe everybody shares my view--the priority between the two papers, the paper of one particular government and the paper being discussed by the eleven members of the Far Eastern Commission, the latter has some priority of course. Now, so far as the request is concerned, the request of some government to discuss the United States directive, my conviction is, Mr. Chairman, even if somebody brings such request it would not be quite proper because we already have the Far Eastern Commission's paper and the consideration of the very same paper would mean the consideration of the United States Government paper, and by bringing here the request of some government to discuss the United States directive, it cannot preclude the discussion of the Far Eastern Commission's document on this same subject because, I repeat, it is quite natural that discussion of the Far Eastern Commission document is the review, in no indited way of course, of the United States directive. So far as your proposal is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am against it, but I wouldn't object if it would be brought up in a discussion at the next meeting. I am not quite ready to express my opinion on that question though the opinion is the paper must remain here. I am quite ready to hear this question at the next meeting. We are all tired here now of course.

GEN. MCCOY: I take it then you object to my statement and my ruling,

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I object and I ask you not

to vote this since I object and if you wish to bring this at the next meeting--

GEN. MCCOY: I take it then you wish it postponed until the next meeting, this ruling that I made as Chairman.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Not because I don't have any opinion on it right now. It might somehow be changed at the next meeting, but the opinion is quite clear that I am against referring this paper to the committee. But I am quite willing, if you are willing, to wait for one week to discuss this question at the next meeting. But for the time being my opinion, of course, is--I am not exactly asking for postponement because the position is quite clear now. But I am quite willing to discuss this question again at the next meeting of referring this question to the committee.

GEN. MCCOY: Well the Chair takes the point of view he makes a ruling, if there is no objection. And I take it you make an objection.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Yes, I object, Mr. Chairman.

GEN. MCCOY: The paper will remain on the agenda and be postponed for further discussion at the next meeting.

The Secretary General calls my attention to the answer to your question by referring to paragraph 2 on page 12 under Section II. It reads: "If the Commission decides that any directive or action reviewed in accordance with Article II-A-2 should be modified, its decision shall be regarded as a policy decision.

MR. SEN: The point was probably in advance of time--what the view of the United States Government was on this particular question.

GEN. MCCOY: Yes. Well, I would assume it would be as stated here.

MR. SEN: Because, if the view of the United States was that it would allow its interim directive to be reviewed, then the other questions would be simple. Somebody could move a request that the

interim directive be reviewed or under the other section the Far Eastern Commission could go on considering the original paper, as suggested by the Soviet member. The crucial point seems to be the attitude which the United States would take on this particular point.

GEN. MCCOY: One more point for consideration.

~~XXXX~~

ITEM 7 - REPORT ON JAPANESE EXTERNAL ASSETS (FEC-072)

GEN. MCCOY: This paper has been continued on the agenda, its consideration pending the outcome of reparations negotiations.

ITEM 8 - THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION (FEC-105/2, SC-049/2, FEC-224)

GEN. MCCOY: FEC-105/2 has been retained on the agenda for further consideration together with other similar proposals which may be submitted by representatives. FEC-224, a letter to the Chairman of the Commission from the Assistant Secretary of State relative to liaison with the Supreme Commander, was submitted by the Chairman on the 17th of April.

ITEM 9 - OTHER BUSINESS

MR. NAGGIAR: Mr. Chairman, in spite of the remark just made by our friend from the Soviet Union that we are all tired, I just have one word to say for information. It's a question related to disarmament of Japan. I have read in the paper, the New York Times and the Washington Post of the 12th of April, some information about the dividing of a certain number of Japanese destroyers and combat surface vessels, which are to be available for division between the United States, China, the United Kingdom, and Soviet Russia. The paper said that there has been an announcement by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, on the matter.

The problem of disarmament of Japan has been discussed in the Committee on Disarmament and it is still pending in the Steering Committee. Some reference appeared in the paper--it seems to me wrong, but I may be mistaken--to the Moscow Conference of October 1943. I suppose this should be December 1945; I am not sure. But, in any case I would like very much, if it is possible, if the United States delegation could have some information on this question for the Commission, either at the next meeting or later if you wish more time. And then we would know on what basis the division has been made, whether it is by an interim directive of the United States Government or by any other means, so that the other sleeping branch of our activity, the disarmament of Japan, could perhaps be revived, if possible, and the work go on.

GEN. MCCOY: Apparently there was such a statement by the Assistant Secretary of State. This is the official statement and it may answer your question.

(General McCoy then handed Mr. Naggiar a copy of the official State Department press release, No. 316 of 11 April 1947, covering the matter.)

MR. NAGGIAR: But isn't this the statement given to the press?

What I am suggesting is information being brought to the Commission, and the reference to the Moscow Declaration of October 30, 1943. If I am not mistaken the Soviet Union was not at war with Japan at that time. How could they divide Japanese vessels between the four of them at that time? Perhaps Admiral Ramishvili could give us some information on that.

GEN. MCCOY: I think that might be the subject of diplomatic representation rather than Commission--

MR. NAGGIAR: But the problem of disarmament of Japan is in the Commission.

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Mr. Chairman, I am quite deaf. Just what is this that the U.S.S.R. was not at war with Japan?

GEN. MCCOY: The French Ambassador was querying the United States Government on some statements in the newspaper and apparently based on an official statement of the Assistant Secretary, and that's the statement that was made.

(Gen. McCoy then handed the copy of the official State Department press release, No. 316 of 11 April 1947, to Admiral Ramishvili.)

ADM. RAMISHVILI: Well I would not take your time, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I will read it later.

GEN. MCCOY: (To Mr. Naggiar) I take it your query is a request for information?

MR. NAGGIAR: If possible. If the United States Government thinks it is possible to have some kind of information brought to the Commission, which is entitled to discuss the problem of disarmament of Japan. Of course the problem of the disarmament of Japan may include division amongst some of the Powers of the vessels of Japan. But, at the same time of the disposal of the vessel, disarmament of the vessel, division, is a very complicated matter. Some part of it may be more or less excluded from the discussion of the Commission and be maintained on a diplomatic plan, but it seems to me very

difficult that the Commission is not informed of what has been done on this subject. But, of course, the United States Government may have a different view. It's just a request for information.

GEN. MCCOY: Yes. That will be taken up with the State Department at your request.

Is there any other business? There seems to be none.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 12:15 P.M.)