

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**TENTH SESSION**  
**Official Records**



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 770th**  
**MEETING**

**Wednesday, 26 October 1955,**  
**at 3 p.m.**

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 18:	
Peaceful uses of atomic energy ( <i>continued</i> ):	
(a) International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy: report of the Secretary-General;	
(b) Progress in developing international co-operation for the peaceful uses of atomic energy: reports of Governments .....	73

**Chairman:** Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

**AGENDA ITEM 18**

**Peaceful uses of atomic energy (A/2967, A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2, A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.135, A/C.1/L.136, A/C.1/L.137) (*continued*):**

- (a) International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy: report of the Secretary-General;**
- (b) Progress in developing international co-operation for the peaceful uses of atomic energy: reports of Governments**

1. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) introduced the amendments (A/C.1/L.135) tabled by the Pakistan and Philippine delegations. The joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) was generally acceptable to his delegation, subject to those amendments and his remarks on them, and reservations with regard to Pakistan's position on the draft resolutions submitted by India and other countries (A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2, and A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2) and by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1).

2. It was his delegation's understanding during the previous session that the negotiations for setting up the International Atomic Energy Agency would be best conducted by and among the Powers who had the atomic materials and advanced scientific knowledge. Certain protection and secrecy had to be ensured for the negotiators. Inasmuch as the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva had made public what was considered to be mostly secret in the field, the delegation of Pakistan was happy to find in the Indian amendments (A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1), the suggestion that the group of sponsoring countries should be established on an expanded basis. The Pakistan delegation was also happy to note that it was the intention of the Governments sponsoring the Agency to call an international conference consisting of Member States and members of specialized agencies to discuss their comments before the statute of the Agency was made final for ratification.

3. The delegation of Pakistan proposed that the sponsoring group should, in determining the composition and functions of the Agency, include two or three countries which might not at present have the atomic materials or the scientific knowledge or equipment, but which, by the nature of their under-developed economy, could say in what manner and how best the functions of the Agency could be designed to assist in their development. Recalling the words of President Eisenhower (470th plenary meeting), he stated that the main emphasis of the plan was on the use of atomic energy for economic development. Although Pakistan approved the suggestion contained in paragraph 3 of part B in the amendments submitted by India (A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1), Pakistan's amendments were designed to make the suggested expansion equitable and realistic. His delegation was firmly of the view that without two or three under-developed countries, the negotiating group would be handicapped and its proposals would run the risk of misunderstanding and of an inadequate response from the under-developed countries.

4. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) observed that the most serious question before the Committee referred to paragraph 2 of part B of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2), which dealt with the conference to be held on the final text of the statute. The Peruvian delegation did not believe that the conference would be a rubber stamp, a mechanical body recording what had been done. There would have to be discussion on details, and points of view would be considered and weighed for inclusion in the final text. The conference would examine what had been done and if something was missing when that balance was struck, the conference would add it. If the conference was held in that sense, then it would indeed be a meeting on the final text, and that would be sufficient. But the conference would not be a power that would stop everything else. He would recoil from any suggestion that the conference should have the right to draw up a new statute and to re-do everything.

5. Mr. Belaúnde requested the representative of India to consider in that connexion the explanation given to him by the great Powers and by Peru, one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution. The Committee should not stop at a word when it knew perfectly well that behind that word there was an honest and sincere interpretation on the part of all.

6. With regard to the amendments submitted by the representatives of Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135), he was certain that Brazil and India would represent in the negotiating group not only their own interests but those of America and Asia respectively. Thus the Agency's governing body would take the under-developed countries into account. He suggested that the proposal submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines should be included as part of the record of the Committee's discussion and that the governing body

of the Agency should be requested to take it into account. Observing that such proposals might be convenient from the standpoint of drafting, he stated that the Committee had to avoid the danger that the debate would retard action.

7. Mr. LUNDE (Norway) believed that it would be possible through continued co-operation to arrive at decisions which would command the approval of all members of the Committee. His delegation hoped that the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2), which his delegation had co-sponsored, laid down the basis for a unanimous decision and established procedures sufficiently flexible to allow all the views expressed during the debate to be taken into consideration when the resolution was put into effect.

8. He wished to comment only on points to which the Norwegian delegation attached special importance. His delegation felt that its views regarding the establishment on a more permanent basis of United Nations machinery for dealing with problems connected with atomic energy had been largely met, so far as future international conferences on atomic energy were concerned, by the provisions included in part A of the joint draft resolution. Turning to part B of the joint draft resolution, Mr. Lunde stated that the adoption of the principle of holding a general conference to deal with the final text of the Agency's statute should put all participating States in a position to express their opinions before the Agency was established, and would also ensure that all States taking part in that conference would have full access to all relevant information before the conference was convened. In that respect, it would be of special interest if Governments would circulate to all other interested States, through the Secretary-General, texts of comments sent to the sponsoring States. The Norwegian delegation would take it for granted that the results of the study to be made by the Secretary-General of the Agency's relationship to the United Nations would be made available before the conference was convened. Such a procedure would be fully compatible with the text of the draft resolution.

9. Summing up his delegation's attitude, he stated that the draft resolution adequately met the three basic requirements which it regarded as essential. Those requirements were: first, that the Advisory Committee should be continued on a more permanent and expanded basis as a consultative body for the Secretary-General; secondly, that the great majority of States which were prospective participants in the Agency should be given the opportunity to consider and discuss actively and directly the Agency's draft statute before the text of the statute was finally elaborated; and thirdly, that the United Nations should, before the statute was finally elaborated, consider the question of working out the relationship between the Agency and the United Nations. The Norwegian delegation considered that the assignment to the Secretary-General of the task stipulated in the draft resolution would make it possible to have the interest of the United Nations adequately represented in that process.

10. Mr. MENON (India) said that, since the last of the amendments had been submitted only a short while before, his delegation, relying on rule 121 of the rules of procedure, would not expect the vote to be taken at the present meeting. Reserving his delegation's right to intervene at a later stage on the main aspects of the draft resolutions before the Committee, he addressed

himself to paragraph 2 of part B of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2). He did not propose at that stage to discuss his delegation's position with regard to its amendments (A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1) to the joint draft resolution, a number of which had been included in the latest revised text.

11. He recalled the phrase of paragraph 2 of part B which read "to participate in a conference on the final text". If the conference was to be on the final text, he said, the final text must precede the conference. He wished to ask the Committee to consider the absurdity of asking States to go to a conference on a final text in order to produce a final text. That was not just playing with words; it was something very fundamental. He feared that, under the instructions which he had at that time, it was not possible for the Indian delegation to vote for the text as it stood. He said that with deep regret because both sides had gone a long way to find common ground.

12. Referring to the statements concerning the concessions made by the original sponsors of the joint draft resolution for the purpose of unanimity, Mr. Menon observed that the Indian delegation had also made its contribution in the same interest. He recalled that, for the sake of unanimity and in order that the establishment of the Agency might proceed, India, relying on the good faith that existed on all sides, had accepted, in place of operative paragraph 1 of its draft resolution (A/C.1/L.131) that the Agency should be based upon the consensus of views, the position that the future conference and the preparatory committee should take into account what was said in the Assembly on the basis of documents to be transmitted to them. Operative paragraph 2 of its draft resolution, which spelled out the relationship of the proposed Agency to the United Nations, would go into the record rather than be a binding resolution. As to the third paragraph, on which there had been considerable difference of opinion, that would be covered by paragraph 3 of part B of the text of document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2.

13. Referring to other points in connexion with paragraph 2 of part B, he observed that the English equivalent for the Russian translation of the words "on the final text" was, he had been told, "for working out the final text". The Committee could not vote on two texts which meant two different things. The Indian delegation would accept either the Russian version or such phrases as "to establish the final text", "a conference on the draft text", "a conference on the draft of the final text", or "to consider and approve the statute". While the Indian delegation was prepared to accept the phrase "on the draft of the final text", it was not prepared to accept "on the final text". The substitutes he had suggested did not exclude mere ratification by the conference, but they included something more, and were more flexible than the original. Each one of the eighteen co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution had the responsibility to respond to the plea of common sense and of reason that he had made. The Indian delegation would agree to any words which would mean that the text before the conference would not be the statute. Acknowledging that it had been assured by the representatives of the United States and of the United Kingdom that there would be discussion at the conference, Mr. Menon suggested that it would be simpler to accept the suggestion of the delegation of India than to put such assurances in firm terms.

14. The Indian delegation would request the sponsors of other draft resolutions to appreciate the fact that the Indian delegation was prepared to accept any form of wording that would meet its point of view, and would, in order to make the resolution unanimous, refrain from pressing to the vote the very substantial matters in the three operative paragraphs of its draft resolution.

15. In conclusion, Mr. Menon reiterated that it was not possible for his delegation, as advised at that time and in those circumstances, to vote in favour of the words "on the final text" as they stood. Moreover, the Committee would have to decide which text it was voting on. He also warned his colleagues, particularly those who were not co-sponsors, to bear in mind the fact, which was no secret, that the text had been canvassed for during the whole of the preceding year and that if a certain number of nations, namely, the eight States, subscribed to and created the Agency, then it would be a matter of ratification for the others. Therefore, the final text might not be, in those circumstances, merely a matter of words but have a finality that went beyond words. He hoped that the Committee would be able to vote on a wording of the draft resolution that would commend itself to all.

16. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the point raised by the representative of India, noted that any question of the interpretation of the Russian text of the joint draft resolution would have to be settled by reference to the original English text. As for the question of voting, in his opinion rule 121 left the matter to the discretion of the Chairman, but he assured the representative of India that he would take the point into consideration at the appropriate time.

17. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) had not meant that the rules of procedure should be disregarded. Clearly, the amendments submitted that day could not be voted upon at once. Moreover, the delay called for by rule 121 would permit a last effort to bring about a harmony of views. He noted that two extreme interpretations of what the conference should do—namely, that it should merely decide on the final text of the statute or that it should have discretionary powers—had been dropped by all concerned.

18. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the USSR delegation had sought sincerely to work out, in co-operation with other delegations, a draft resolution reflecting the general desire of the peoples that international co-operation for the peaceful use of atomic energy should become a reality. That desire would best be reflected by a decision in accordance with the USSR proposal (A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1) that all States should continue their efforts to reach an agreement on the prohibition of atomic weapons. A decision of that nature would also most fully contribute to achieving the goal of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. It should be noted, however, that the United States and the United Kingdom had not agreed to incorporate that position in the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2.). The revised text did constitute an improvement in that it incorporated a provision expressing the desire of the General Assembly that the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only would be promoted energetically. That was insufficient, however, and his delegation was firmly convinced that only prohibition of the atomic weapon would achieve the end of ensuring the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

19. Two other points also had not been covered in the revised draft, and they formed the subject of USSR amendments (A/C.1/L.136). In connexion with two of those amendments, Mr. Kuznetsov recalled that a number of delegations had pointed out that the Agency should be organized on the broadest basis possible; and that no State should be denied for ideological reasons the opportunity to participate. All countries able and willing to participate should be allowed to do so. Many delegations had also urged that the Agency should have a close connexion with the United Nations. All mankind was concerned by the problem of ensuring the peaceful use of atomic energy, and there was a close link between such peaceful use and the use of atomic energy for war. That link accounted for the view of many delegations that it was necessary to institute appropriate international control over the Agency to ensure that the materials at its disposal would be used only for peaceful purposes. Since it was advisable that the revised joint draft resolution should give appropriate instructions to the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee, the third USSR amendment provided that the relationship between the United Nations and the Agency should be based on recognition of the principle that the Agency should be within the framework of the United Nations.

20. He shared the views of the representative of India on paragraph 2 of part B of the revised joint draft resolution. The participants in the conference should not be placed in the position of being presented with a complete text and of meeting only for the purpose of approving it. It should be stated clearly in the revised text that all would have an opportunity to present their views and to discuss the matter. He also shared the Indian representative's understanding of the Russian text of the revised joint draft resolution.

21. Mr. KIDRON (Israel) had grave reservations concerning the wording and implications of the first of the amendments submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135). It would tend to exclude one class of countries. If the amendment were accepted, the negotiating group would consist of three categories of States: there would be a category consisting of the great Powers in the field of atomic energy, which possessed the resources and capacity to furnish fissionable materials and technical assistance; another consisting of countries rich in raw materials; and the third, that listed in the amendment. The class of countries whose principal contribution was their scientific and technological capacity in the atomic field would be deliberately excluded.

22. The amendment also involved practical difficulties. It would have been difficult enough to negotiate an instrument so complicated as the draft statute with eight States; twelve was an even more unwieldy group. If the amendment were accepted, that number would be increased to fifteen or sixteen, and if some of the countries in the category he had mentioned were then also included to ensure representation of all interests, the figure would run to twenty or more. That would no longer be a negotiating group; it would be a limited conference, and the revised joint draft resolution already contained provisions concerning the conference. The text of the draft resolution, of which Israel was a co-sponsor, was the result of intensive work and of compromise. Although certain ambiguities might still be removed—and he reserved the right to revert to that point—it represented the highest common factor on the sub-

ject in the Committee at that time. He pointed out that the revised text of part B, dealing with the Agency, went a great deal further than the single paragraph in the original draft resolution. Reviewing the provisions of that part, he noted that the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada had assured the Committee that the conference would not be a rubber stamp or a "command performance". Much credit was due to the original sponsors of the joint draft resolution for the understanding and the flexibility which they had displayed. His delegation felt that the revised text could and should be adopted unanimously by the Committee in a spirit of tolerance, universality and goodwill.

23. Mr. MELAS (Greece) said that his delegation had witnessed with deep gratification the rapid progress made in the consideration of the all-important question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy since the declaration of the President of the United States in December 1953 (470th plenary meeting). In the momentous nuclear age, which could lead to the destruction of mankind or to the creation of new and vast possibilities for human life, it had become imperative to direct that new conquest to constructive purposes alone. Greece had welcomed the sequence of events leading up to the present debate, including resolution 810 (IX) adopted unanimously by the General Assembly, and the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, which was an important milestone in that quest.

24. The Committee had, after praiseworthy efforts to reconcile differences, reached the stage where it was dealing with comparatively minor divergencies. He hoped that they would be smoothed out so that unanimity could be achieved. In that connexion, he shared the Canadian representative's view (769th meeting) that unanimity was indeed indispensable. He welcomed the fact that, despite the emphasis it placed on prohibition of atomic weapons, the USSR had not made that ban a prerequisite to agreement. That question would of course find its proper place in the discussion on disarmament.

25. Referring to the statement made at the 768th meeting by the representative of India, Mr. Melas concurred with the view that there should be no distinction between "haves" and "have-nots". The question was of such vital importance to all mankind that there could be no question of monopoly by some countries. The resources required should be available to all.

26. The technical conferences referred to in paragraph 6 of part A of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) would be of great assistance in co-ordinating future developments in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and his delegation believed that the General Assembly should take a more specific part in the convening of such conferences. His delegation also considered it important that the results of the study provided for in paragraph 5 of part B should be transmitted to all participating Governments, not merely to the "Governments concerned". Moreover, it believed that broad powers should be left to the conference to decide the final form of the statute. His delegation was prepared to vote in favour of the revised joint draft resolution.

27. Mr. PASTORE (United States of America) said that his delegation felt unable to support the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135) and of Czechoslovakia (A/C.1/L.137). The present

group of negotiating States constituted an efficient mechanism for conducting the negotiations and was sufficiently representative to ensure the broadest possible basis. To expand that group would make it less effective. The fact that the Pakistan and Philippine amendments had been followed by that of Czechoslovakia made it clear that there was no telling where the process would stop. He reminded the Committee of the very great length to which the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had already gone to meet the points of view expressed in the debate. He believed that the present text merited the unanimous support of the General Assembly. To attempt to alter it might well defeat the result desired. He appealed to the representatives of Pakistan and the Philippines not to press their amendments.

28. Turning to the USSR amendments (A/C.1/L.136), he said that they would reopen an issue debated and settled at the previous session, when the USSR amendments (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1) concerning the basis of invitations had been rejected (725th meeting). The wording incorporated in paragraph 5 of part A was that of resolution 810 (IX). The United States would oppose the USSR amendments. As it had pointed out at the previous session (722nd meeting), the conference would be a technical one under the auspices of the United Nations system. In the interests of maintaining the very wide support which the joint text had obtained, he urged the Committee not to adopt any amendment along the lines of the USSR proposal. He also opposed the last of the USSR amendments, which attempted to prejudice the relationship between the Agency and the United Nations. It was not appropriate at the present time to decide what the relationship should be, and it was not wise to suggest to the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee that they should be bound in advance.

29. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia), reviewing the endeavours made to arrive at a unanimous resolution, said that the example of the Geneva Conference highlighted the important role of negotiation and agreement in international co-operation. A number of delegations had rightly emphasized the importance of unanimity. Moreover, the discussion showed that there was agreement on a number of important principles. All delegations had emphasized the importance of ensuring that atomic energy would be used for peaceful purposes only. Stress had also been put on the need to ensure that no other use was made of the material to be entrusted to the Agency. The revised text of the joint draft resolution represented an improvement over the original text in that respect.

30. Considerable attention had been given to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It was agreed that its establishment was urgent, but at the same time there were divergent views on certain important questions, particularly the principles which were to govern the organization and activity of the Agency. The cornerstone of that body would undoubtedly be its statute, and that was why the discussion had centred on the procedure for establishing the statute. He believed that progress had been made in that respect. His delegation was satisfied that the new wording of the joint draft resolution embodied the opinion that a conference of the States most directly concerned would contribute to the success of the negotiations. However, the Czechoslovakian delegation considered that some other countries should also participate in the negotia-

tions. It therefore supported the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines. It felt that the invitation should be extended not only to countries described in those amendments, but that the door should be left open for invitations to other countries whose participation seemed appropriate. It had submitted an amendment (A/C.1/L.137) in that sense to the amendments submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines. He hoped that the authors of the joint amendments would accept it.

31. The resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly would undoubtedly play an important role in the establishment of the Agency and in the determination of its structure. The Assembly should therefore take into account certain principles of fundamental importance for the further development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, namely, that no country, whether or not it was a Member of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies, should be denied participation in scientific conferences or in a conference to draft the statute. Secondly, the Agency should be within the framework of the United Nations. The close link between the peaceful use of atomic energy and the security of nations and international peace could not be disregarded. The relationship of the Agency should be determined in accordance with the provisions of the Charter as well as with the nature of its functions and responsibility. He therefore supported the USSR amendments (A/C.1/L.136) to the revised joint draft resolution.

32. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation did not find it possible to agree with the USSR amendments. The effect of the first two would be to introduce a highly controversial question which, it had already been decided, should not be considered at the tenth session of the General Assembly. Such a proposal was out of place in the present constructive debate. As for the third USSR amendment, the Committee had already heard complaints as to the lack of clarity and precision of the language used in the revised text, and he felt that the USSR proposal would lead to very considerable confusion if it were inserted. It was possible to argue for days on the precise interpretation to be placed on the word "framework". That would not assist the Secretary-General or the Advisory Committee in their study of the important question of the relationship between the United Nations and the Agency. Those who thought that some advice or guidance should be given to the Secretary-General could certainly expect him to bear in mind the aim of the amendment.

33. Turning to the amendments (A/C.1/L.135) submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines, he said that, while he was much in sympathy with the thought behind them, he did not see how the Committee could easily reach agreement on a list of under-developed countries, even if it were decided to add those countries to the list of sponsors. The Czechoslovakian amendment and the point made by the representative of Israel showed how controversial the matter was likely to be.

34. The negotiating group of twelve countries comprised a wide range of views. Moreover, the other seventy-two countries would have every opportunity for contact with one another and with the negotiating group. He pointed out that such a group must be compact; otherwise it would be in contradiction with the purpose for which it was created. He was sure that the interests of no State would be prejudiced in being represented by the twelve Governments in that group.

35. While he did not wish to stress the point, it must be clear that the original sponsors of the joint draft resolution had given much in the give-and-take admittedly necessary to achieve unanimity. There was very general agreement on the fundamental objectives of the joint draft, and he appealed to the representatives of Pakistan and the Philippines, in the interests of unanimity, not to press their amendments to a vote.

36. Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) said that while the text of the joint draft resolution, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, might not be perfect, he wished to assure the representative of India that his delegation shared that representative's interpretation of paragraph 2 of part B. It might be convenient to alter that paragraph, but the passage must be interpreted in the sense advocated by Mr. Menon.

37. His delegation might have been willing to support the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines under other circumstances, particularly since Mexico was not one of the sponsors of the Agency, but felt it inadvisable to introduce a vague and somewhat confusing element in a text arrived at after much effort. The sponsors would naturally heed the views of under-developed countries.

38. Mr. MARTIN (Canada) was sure that the debate clearly indicated that, in a matter of such importance, none would wish to rush. It would be wise to assess carefully the various points of view.

39. Like the representative of the United Kingdom, he felt very considerable sympathy for the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines. But the line had to be drawn somewhere. If the Committee were starting from the beginning, it might be otherwise, but the fact was that it had a specific proposal before it. Various countries, for example Sweden and Norway, had strong claims for a position on the negotiating group, but recognized the limitations which prevailed. Indeed, much forbearance was required of all in order to achieve what he considered most important, namely a unanimous resolution.

40. Noting that the Indian representative had once again called attention to the question of the character of the conference, Mr. Martin remarked that he thought that the statement of the United Kingdom representative at the previous meeting would have reassured Mr. Menon on that point. No one was indeed in a better position than the representative of the United Kingdom, who, he believed, had originated the idea of the conference, to give assurances concerning its intended character. As had been pointed out, it would be not only illogical but presumptuous that a conference of eighty-four nations should be called merely to carry out a formal act, without the quality of freedom of intervention characteristic of all normal conferences of civilized human beings. He wished to give further consideration to making sure that the wording of the revised joint draft was as he understood it and wanted it to be. His present view was that that wording was not inconsistent with what had been said about the character of the conference. In a matter of such importance, the sponsors wished to make sure that the wording was consistent with their intentions.

41. He had been impressed by the desire of the USSR representative to establish the new Agency under the best possible auspices. That representative must realize, however, that at least two of the USSR amendments could not be accepted. He urged that the USSR repre-

sentative give consideration to not pressing points which could not be accepted and which prevented the matter from obtaining the consideration it deserved. He found some difficulty in connexion with the last of the USSR amendments. The President of the United States, in his address to the General Assembly in 1953 (470th plenary meeting), had dealt with the relations of the Agency to the United Nations in the words "under the aegis of the United Nations". The Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs had repeatedly said that the Agency should have as close a connexion as possible with the United Nations. Canada, which had been one of the precursors of the idea of using the model of the specialized agencies, felt that to change the concept would be doing disservice to the work and processes all had in mind. He was sure, however, that all agreed that the relationship should be one which would enhance the prestige and effectiveness of the Agency. Indeed, he was not sure that the USSR formula "within the framework" differed from "under the aegis".

42. One of the USSR amendments concerned paragraph 5 of part B which, he realized, gave the Secretary-General a very important assignment. He had no doubt that the Secretary-General had given consideration to that very problem and a clarification by him of that point would be of great value.

43. In conclusion, he emphasized his confidence that it would be possible to arrive at a common text, not for the sake of expediency, but for the sake of what that potential organ could do for the world.

44. The SECRETARY-GENERAL noted that even an improvised answer to the question raised by the representative of Canada might be more helpful than a considered reply given later. It was obviously true that, as the representative of the United Kingdom had said, the interpretation of words like "within the framework of" could be argued for days. It was equally obvious that he could not try to interpret what special significance had been given to that phrase by those who had proposed or opposed its insertion. He could, however, indicate how he personally would interpret that phrase as part of the terms of reference for himself and the Advisory Committee.

45. In general terms there was agreement that the relationship of the Agency to the United Nations should be as close as possible, in conformity with their respective responsibilities. The phrase must mean that the Agency should be within the United Nations family, and not less close than a specialized agency co-operating with the United Nations in the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) and with the ACC Atomic Sub-Committee. He did not interpret the phrase as meaning that the Agency should necessarily be a specialized agency in the technical sense of the word—that is, a body reporting in accordance with the special procedure set up for the purpose—nor that it should be a division of the Organization proper. The Agency should not, in his view, be considered *a priori* as a part of the United Nations Organization, but it should definitely be part of the United Nations system working with the United Nations itself in such a way as to guarantee fruitful co-operation and a division of responsibilities. Whatever phrase was put into the draft resolution, such co-operation and division of responsibilities would certainly lead to a kind of link between the United Nations and the Agency which would

differ quite considerably in practice from the links with other specialized agencies.

46. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) reiterated his delegation's view that the statute of the Agency must reflect certain principles which would guarantee its character, proper functioning and participation in all fields of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. His delegation was glad to see that many of the views advanced in the debate had been taken into account by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution. He believed that all possibilities for compromise had not been exhausted, and joined those who appealed for further efforts to achieving unanimity.

47. The USSR amendments to the revised joint draft resolution reflected recognition of the importance of the Agency and of the desire for a common solution. They were worded in such a manner as to be easily acceptable by the sponsors. First of all, they would make membership open to all qualified under the terms of the statute and those terms should derive from what was required for the proper functioning of the Agency, without additional conditions. If universality was desirable in the United Nations, it was all the more so in an agency which covered such a specialized field and concerned every State and nation in the world.

48. He expressed surprise that there should be any opposition to the third USSR amendment, and particularly, that the United States should adopt such an intransigent position. As had been pointed out, the word "framework" was very indefinite. He believed that that was why it had been used. As the Secretary-General had just pointed out, it implied a wide range of relationships, from that of being directly subordinate to that of being connected by reporting. The terms "under the aegis" and "remain in relation with the United Nations" were fully covered, he thought, by the phrase used in the USSR amendment. The phrase gave a general direction without defining how the relationship should finally be declared, and left a good deal of room for interpretation. He expressed his conviction that when the representatives of Canada and the United States again reviewed the phrase, especially after the explanation given by the representative of the Soviet Union, they would have no hesitation in accepting it. Certainly, the General Assembly should not be afraid of including the Agency within the framework of the United Nations.

49. The opposition of the United States was the more surprising because it was based on conflicting arguments. On the one hand, the United States wanted limited membership, which it justified by reference to the United Nations, and then opposed having the Agency within the framework of the United Nations.

50. He hoped that a further effort would be made to include the amendments in the resolution, in one way or another. He also trusted that the point raised by the representative of India would be taken into consideration. It was not clear what the sentence concerning the tasks of the conference really meant. The fact that, not so long before, the Assembly had been faced with a conference concerning which it had simply been called upon to rubber-stamp a decision was all the more reason for caution and for removing ambiguous language that was unintentional on the part of the authors of the draft resolution.

51. The Polish delegation would also support the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines and of Czechoslovakia. It had already stressed the special in-



terest of the under-developed countries and the importance of avoiding any distinction in the appointment of the preparatory group. There was no need to fear the enlarging of the preparatory group which would be concerned with political and legal, as well as scientific, problems and in which even countries under-developed in the field of atomic energy or otherwise could play an important role. He believed that such increased participation would assist in the preparation of a better statute.

52. Mr. INGLES (Philippines) did not accept the view that, since the purpose of the Pakistan-Philippine amendments would undoubtedly be taken into account by the sponsoring Powers, further discussion would only delay the Committee's work. Only the previous day, the sponsoring Powers had announced the extension to four more countries of invitations to participate in the sponsoring group. Since the discussions of the sponsoring Powers were to take place in December, it was clear that it was not too late to invite others to participate.

53. Another argument was that a line must be drawn somewhere. But he failed to see how the addition of two or three countries could make the negotiating group less efficient or representative. On the contrary, the group would be more representative. Moreover, the figure of, say, fifteen was no more arbitrary than eight or twelve. He concurred in the view that it would be appropriate for under-developed countries to be represented on the governing body of the Agency. The United States had given assurances in that respect. The logical conclusion was that the sponsoring Governments, which consisted mainly of contributors at present, would find it useful to invite the under-developed countries.

54. It was generally realized that the needs of the contributing Powers must be taken into account. The needs

of the under-developed countries were also significant and should likewise be taken into consideration. According to the United States, the sponsoring Governments were to sift the suggestions and conduct the negotiations prior to submission of the draft to the conference. If the undertaking was to be really international, there was no ground for excluding the under-developed countries not presently possessing atomic material and knowledge. As had been pointed out, the Agency should be established on a universal and democratic basis. It also seemed to be agreed that it should represent the various interests and areas of the world. The representative of Israel had answered his own charge to the effect that the Pakistan-Philippine amendments were exclusive by saying that a number of countries whose contribution was of an intellectual character were already represented among the sponsors. Indeed, the joint draft resolution might more appropriately be regarded as exclusive and the Pakistan-Philippine amendments were designed to remedy that situation.

55. Referring to the text of the Czechoslovakian amendment, he pointed out that the purpose of the Pakistan-Philippine amendments was to include representation of under-developed countries. For its part, his delegation could not accept the Czechoslovakian amendment for fear of making the objective of its own amendment less clear.

56. The CHAIRMAN, reiterating his hope for unanimity, suggested that some representatives, on reflection, might decide that they had achieved their end in participating in the debate that afternoon. He pointed out that delays, by their very nature, sometimes endangered the achievement of unanimity.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.