

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.769
26 October 1955
ENGLISH 49

Tenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 26 October 1955, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand)

Peaceful uses of atomic energy [13] (continued)

- (a) The 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.

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.769. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY [Agenda item 18] (continued)

- (a) THE 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

The CHAIRMAN: There seems to me no reason, if there are no further interventions this afternoon, why we should not proceed with the vote this afternoon on the various draft resolutions.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): By way of introduction to my remarks on the draft resolution, the second revised draft contained in document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2, which my delegation is co-sponsoring, it will not, I think, be inappropriate for me to say a few words about the debate which has preceded it.

There is no doubt to my mind that this has been one of the most stimulating and constructive debates which it has been my privilege to participate in at the United Nations. The tone of the many and varied speeches has been in keeping with the grandeur of the subject itself. We have heard a number of extremely valuable contributions, both of facts and of ideas. This in itself is an augury of the part which the United Nations will undoubtedly play in the future work of international co-operation in atomic energy. But more than this, in the give and take of negotiation and discussion, both in this room and in the many private talks which have been taking place outside it, we have, I believe, been acting in the true spirit of the United Nations.

It seems to me that the evolution of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.129, which in its second revision bears many marks of growth and change, shows how far the varied views expressed have been met since the first draft resolution was tabled three weeks ago. This, I feel, is an exemplar of how the principles of mutual accommodation and understanding can be translated into effective action. The result, I heartily trust, will be one resolution which we can confidently present to the General Assembly for unanimous approval.

(Sir Pierson Dixon,
United Kingdom)

After the lucid exposition yesterday by the representative of the United States, I need not dwell at length on the further changes we have introduced in the second revised draft resolution. These changes are designed to reflect the feelings expressed during the general debate and also those which have been discussed outside the Committee room. I would draw attention in particular to the additional second and sixth paragraphs of the preamble, which emphasize in words a cardinal point that of course is implicit in the whole thought of the resolution: the desire to promote the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Both these additions were made in response to views which have been expressed, in particular by the delegations of India and the Soviet Union. The most significant changes and additions will, however, be found in part B of the revised draft resolution, the part which deals with the agency.

In passing, I would like to draw attention to the fact that there are now six substantive paragraphs under this heading, whereas originally the draft resolution contained only one. Quantity as well as quality has been added to the resolution. The latest two additions will be found in paragraphs 3 and 6 of part B. Paragraph 3 registers the recent and important development which has led to the expansion from eight to twelve of the group of States negotiating the draft statute.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

I might point out in passing that the Governments concerned which are referred to in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of part B are of course the twelve Governments which will constitute the expanded negotiating group which has now been proposed as a result of the invitations extended to Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the Soviet Union. This enlarged group will, I believe, play a very important and constructive part in the further negotiations on the draft statute. It will be, so to speak, a steering or preparatory committee which, since it contains a wide spread of views, will be able to conduct the further negotiations and consultations with the seventy-two other Governments which we all hope will wish to become members of the future agency.

I listened with great attention to the eloquent speech of my colleague from India. I was gratified to hear him describe as generous the proposal of the Governments sponsoring this agency to hold a conference on the final text of the draft statute. He expressed concern, however, lest this conference should be no more than a rubber stamp on a document already finalized. May I assure him and any other representatives who may share his anxieties that it is not the intention of any of the sponsoring Governments -- and I know that I speak on their behalf -- that this conference, to be attended as we hope by the representatives of eighty-four States, should be called together merely to sign upon a dotted line and then disperse. We must all hope that the process of negotiation, conciliation and consultation on the draft statute, which will now be greatly assisted by the formation of the twelve-Power negotiating group, will result in a meeting of minds, that in its turn will result in agreement likely to command world-wide acceptance.

No one, I am sure, will wish to call together a conference of eighty-four States without having first established sufficient preparatory work to be confident of speedy agreement on a final text. The present wording in paragraph 2 of part B of our revised draft in no way contradicts this view. It has the virtue of being both practical and flexible. I therefore sincerely hope that in the light of this explanation the present wording of this paragraph will be acceptable.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

I was also encouraged, on listening to the speeches by the representative of the Soviet Union, to believe that we have now moved sufficiently close to the views of his Government as to facilitate the adoption of a unanimous resolution by the General Assembly. I hope, however, that he will not press for the inclusion of any wording which belongs more properly to the context of a disarmament debate rather than to the orbit of the peaceful uses of atomic energy with which we are dealing here. Vitally important as such questions are, we must keep the two subjects separate if we wish to make progress in our discussions upon them. Nevertheless, in attempting to meet the views of the Soviet delegation, we have now inserted two new paragraphs in the preamble of our second revised draft.

Another point raised by the Soviet representative was the danger of allowing any country or group of countries to enjoy a monopoly in the agency. I do not wish to discuss here the terms of the draft statute. Members of this Committee will, however, be familiar with it and will know that there is no reflection in that statute of any intention to create machinery which would give a group of States monopolistic rights in the operation of the agency. What the draft statute does do is to take account of the realities of the situation. These require some form of relationship between those who can contribute assistance and those who wish to receive it. It does no more than recognize existing economic realities. But no country or group of countries in the world today is economically independent. We are all, in varying degrees, interdependent one with another. The age of the "haves" and the "have-nots" in the old *sense* of the term has passed. We are governed today by a different and changing pattern of economic necessities.

The agency which my Government would like to see established would be a body fully reflecting the realities of this new atomic age, which is poles apart from the days of the nineteenth century industrial revolution.

I am confident that the long and interesting debate we have had and the fruitful negotiations that have taken place between several and composite groups of delegations will result in the adoption of a unanimous resolution by the General Assembly. If we can achieve this, then we shall be sending out from these halls a message of hope to the world and we will have made an auspicious contribution to the fashioning of a better age.

Mr. MARTIN (Canada): I fully agree with what Sir Pierson Dixon said at the opening of his remarks this morning that this has been an important and a constructive debate. There can be no doubt that the important procedures which have taken up our time during the past two weeks will have a very great significance, as Mr. Menon said yesterday, in the ultimate shaping of our world community. But I believe that a word of moderation should be expressed sometime during the course of this debate. Undoubtedly, the future possibilities of our present exercise is of fundamental significance. But we should not, it seems to me, expect too much from the agency in its infancy after its creation. Our world does not change overnight. This is not said in any way to depreciate the great potential significance of the agency in whose creation we are now assisting. I express this word of caution because in reading over the declarations made by a number of us, and particularly my own, I feel that we have given an indication of promise at the outset that cannot possibly be borne out. However, there can be no doubt of the significance of the work in which we are now engaged.

As Sir Pierson Dixon has said, this has been a very useful debate. It is encouraging that the United Nations should be engaged in matters of such great positive value in a discussion free from vituperation and characterized by objectivity, bent on trying to bring benefits to all mankind, an exercise in which tactical and other considerations have properly taken a subordinate place.

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

We have now had a very wide and representative discussion of the important subject matters covered by the item on "peaceful uses of atomic energy", and it seems to me now that we have reached the stage of considering various draft resolutions which have been submitted.

When I spoke in the general debate on this item on 11 October, my delegation had not yet associated itself as a co-sponsor with any of the draft resolutions which had so far appeared but, in common with a considerable number of other delegations, we eventually requested that we be listed as co-sponsor of a substantially revised version of the draft resolution originally tabled on 6 October by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States.

We refrained initially from offering ourselves as a co-sponsor of this draft resolution because, frankly, we felt that the resolution should reflect as completely as possible the views of the United Nations as a whole and we were confident that in the course of the debate useful and thoughtful suggestions would emerge which would be worthy of very careful consideration -- and our anticipations in this regard have not been found wanting. Our concern was and is to achieve unanimous support for a good and practicable resolution. This process takes time, as we have found out, but I can now warmly and unreservedly recommend to all members of the Committee the draft resolution of which my delegation has become a co-sponsor.

We have listened carefully to the many thoughtful and constructive statements made during the course of this debate. We noted with special attention the outstanding statements made yesterday by Mr. Menon, by the leader of the Soviet delegation, and by Senator Pastore on behalf of the United States delegation, in this particular matter. The ability to contribute to the best possible solution of the problems confronting us is certainly not a monopoly of any small group of countries. My delegation has profited greatly from the many suggestions put forward in this Committee, and I am certain that the same can be said of all the other delegations with which we are associated as co-sponsor of one of the draft resolutions before us.

The fact is that many delegations have played an important part in the process of working out a resolution which we hope can be supported unanimously; and I should like to observe that you, Mr. Chairman, have played a rather

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

considerable role in this matter. At this point, I should like to mention particularly the contribution made by the delegation of India. I do not wish to single out that country, as opposed to others, but I am more familiar with that country's contribution in the matter of compromise than I am with the contributions of other delegations which have undoubtedly played a great part. I know that the draft resolutions tabled by the Indian delegation as well as the list of suggested amendments have been examined with the greatest care and many of the sentences and paragraphs in the revised joint draft resolution of 25 October (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) will be recognized and identified by everyone interested in this discussion as taken directly from or embodying parts of the Indian proposals and amendments tabled in this Committee. I might mention as one or two examples of this the second and penultimate paragraphs of the preamble, the second operative paragraph of Part A and the final paragraph of Part B.

In this connexion, I know that careful attention has also been paid to the ~~proposals~~ and statements of the delegation of the USSR. I noted particularly the statement made yesterday by the distinguished Soviet representative as to the positive significance of the proposal that the General Assembly should declare its desire to promote energetically the use of atomic energy to the end that it will serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind and ameliorate their living conditions. As Mr. Kuznetsov remarked, this idea now appears as the second paragraph of the preamble of the joint resolution of 25 October.

The cumulative effect of debate, submission of alternative resolutions and of amendments, and of informal discussions among many delegations is clearly apparent now to anyone who compares the text of the present draft resolution, of which Canada is a co-sponsor (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2), with the text of the original draft (A/C.1/L.129).

Among the major alterations, all relating to the establishment of the international atomic energy agency, are the following:

1. The resolution now refers to a conference of all members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies to consider the final text of the statute of the international atomic energy agency. Substantial progress has been made already towards the establishment of this agency, and the draft statute has been

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

circulated to governments for their consideration and comment. We sincerely hope that much further progress will be made along these lines and that governments will not delay in forwarding their comments as requested. However, we are in agreement with the representative of the United Kingdom in also welcoming the intention now embodied in the draft resolution to launch the agency at an international conference which will be even wider in its membership than the present General Assembly and which will have the final say on the text of the statute of the new international agency.

Whatever may be the interpretation of this point in the resolution as revised which is now before the Committee, I cannot too strongly say that, as the United Kingdom representative has indicated, this conference is not intended to be ritualistic, assembled for the mere purpose of affording a formal act of approval of something previously conceived. It is intended to be a conference of States, and no gathering of States can be expected to take place for the mere purpose of carrying out a ritual. The only danger in this situation is that meanwhile advantage will not be taken of the opportunity of any advances giving indications of improvements which any individual State may think desirable. Advantage should be taken bilaterally, in the interval, of the opportunity to provide suggestions for improvements in the statute, so that, when the final document is considered, it will represent what most of us or all of us regard as the best conceivable instrument to launch into being, what could perhaps be almost the most significant act of the United Nations.

2. The resolution now requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, to study the question of the relationship of the international atomic energy agency to the United Nations and to transmit the results of this study to governments before the conference which I have mentioned is convened. We all know and welcome the intense interest of the Secretary-General in the development of international co-operation with respect to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Our draft resolution records the Assembly's appreciation of the Secretary-General's work in preparing and organizing the Conference on Atomic Energy held in Geneva. The question of the proper relationship of the new agency to the United Nations has naturally attracted a good deal of attention in this debate and has been thoughtfully analyzed by several delegations. I noted particularly what the Soviet delegation had to say by way of generalization on this point yesterday.

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

If I may do so without implying any lack of appreciation on the merits of other statements on this subject, I should like to single out the important statement made at our meeting on 18 October by Mr. Sandler, the representative of Sweden. I think that we have cause for satisfaction that the Secretary-General and his Advisory Committee are expressly requested in the present draft resolution, with which my delegation is associated, to study this question. I am sure that if this draft resolution is approved by the Assembly, we shall have no cause to regret having placed this heavy responsibility upon the shoulders of the Secretary-General.

The draft resolution now refers to the invitations which have been extended to the Governments of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the Soviet Union, to participate, as governments concerned, with the present sponsoring governments in negotiations on the draft statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I have become aware only this morning of the concern of the representative of Sweden for the phrase "governments concerned". I am sure, however, that this point can be satisfactorily resolved when its clear meaning is projected. In the sense which he has in mind, of course, all governments are concerned.

Coming back to those governments referred to in the expanded negotiating group, I very much hope that they will find it possible to join with the group of countries, of which my country has been one, in further negotiations which we trust will quickly lead to the establishment of this agency.

Another important addition to the draft is the recommendation that the governments concerned should take into account the views expressed on the agency during the present session of the General Assembly and that they should take all possible measures to establish the agency without delay, bearing in mind the provisions of the resolution.

The views expressed at this session of the General Assembly have already had a marked and proper influence on the drafting of the resolution of which I have been speaking. I can assure all members of this Committee that so far as my Government is concerned, the views expressed here on the draft statute will be given very careful and sympathetic consideration.

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

There are a number of other respects in which the original draft resolution of 6 October has been modified to meet various recommendations and suggestions, but I believe that I have said enough to show how genuine an effort has been made to produce a resolution which is responsive to the wishes and suggestions of this Committee. It is naturally our hope that all members of the Committee will be able to vote in favour of this revised draft resolution, but it is not merely a majority vote, even a large majority, which we should seek. We should seek nothing less than unanimity itself. This was the underlying emphasis in the speech made yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union. Last year, the first Assembly resolution carrying forward the proposal of the President of the United States was adopted unanimously, and I submit that we cannot this year be satisfied with less. At the last Assembly we adopted a resolution urging a resumption of the meetings of the Sub-Committee on disarmament. As I have just indicated, we approved unanimously the resolution proposed by the United States to establish procedures for the application of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Surely this year, after a year of intensive negotiation during which progress has been noted, we shall not let minor considerations hinder the great effect that would result from a unanimously adopted resolution on this question.

It has been suggested that for one reason or another dissatisfaction exists with regard to certain features of the draft resolution. My impression is that it cannot be seriously argued that those dissatisfactions involve matters of substance. We must take into account the great effect that would result on the world at the present time from a resolution which received the support of every member of this Committee.

After listening to the statements made in the debate yesterday by the representatives of India, the Soviet Union and the United States, and the statement made this morning by the representative of the United Kingdom, I am personally convinced that a unanimous resolution is attainable.

It is true that a certain price has to be paid for unanimity on a resolution of this type. But no delegation can expect to have every detail of its original proposals embodied in the final text. There are some things that we should like to have seen incorporated in this draft resolution which are not now contained

(Mr. Martin, Canada)

in it. In order to achieve the measure of support about which we have been speaking, we have not pushed those ideas forward.

A reasonable and a conciliatory attitude is essential in this connexion, and I should not like to end my remarks without paying my tribute to the original sponsors of this draft resolution, the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States. Since the dramatic proposal of the President of the United States, the United States Government has made continuous and strenuous efforts to get ahead with the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. But while the initiative has necessarily been largely in the hands of the United States, we can all, I suggest, note with appreciation the helpful and co-operative way in which the United States authorities have from the beginning sought to give full consideration to helpful and constructive proposals from whatever source.

A great responsibility has been placed upon the United Nations with respect to the peaceful uses of atomic energy and, after full and thoughtful consideration of all proposals, am I wrong in suggesting that it is our duty to report to the world in one unanimous voice on this question?

Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Ecuador did not participate in the general debate on this subject, a debate which began with the statement of the representative of the United States and ended with the statement of the representative of India. Detailed and interesting statements have been made on the advances which have been achieved in the field of atomic science and in relation to available equipment and trained personnel in the application of atomic energy for peaceful uses.

Almost all the statements made in the general debate referred specifically to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Statements were made on the report of the Secretary-General on the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, which was held at Geneva. Also discussed were the advances made so far in the peaceful uses of atomic energy on an international level.

(Mr. Trujillo, Ecuador)

No step in the scientific history of the world has been as important as the one taken by the United States in submitting to the General Assembly the question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This is much more important than any declaration bearing on the significance to man today of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the prohibition of the use of atomic weapons.

So far the Committee has received two draft resolutions and a series of amendments. We have the seventeen-Power joint draft resolution, which is the result of final negotiation on all the most important suggestions made in the course of the general debate. The second draft resolution before us is the Soviet Union draft. Then we have the Indian amendments, which are co-sponsored by certain other delegations. I should like briefly to analyse these proposals in order to explain the vote of my country.

I believe that the seventeen-Power joint draft resolution has a rather general scope and covers the greatest number of points that have been mentioned here. It appears to be the one which has the best chance of being adopted unanimously.

At the beginning of the debate we were extremely impressed by the proposal made by India with regard to the division of the item into two parts, one relating to the international conference and the other relating to an international atomic energy agency. We felt, as did the Indian delegation, that these might be discussed at different times, but in the course of the debate we have seen that it is much more logical to apply a general concept divided into two parts, A and B, a course which has been adopted in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2.

In its seven preambular paragraphs this document covers all the different aspects that have been made known to us in the Committee and all the different ideas that have led us to take part in this debate on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. From the very beginning this preamble raises the question of the desire that mankind should be enabled to make the fullest use of atomic energy for peaceful ends. We watched with great attention the proceedings of the Geneva Conference which permitted a closer interrelationship between the scientists of the world and the exchange of atomic information.

I was also impressed by the flexibility with which the co-sponsors of the draft resolution included, in the sixth paragraph of the preamble, the idea that has always been stressed by the Soviet Union, namely, the idea of a declaration of the prohibition of the use of atomic weapons. This would contribute to international co-operation because -- although we do not think that such a declaration is in place in this kind of draft resolution -- the paragraph in question says:

"Recognizing the necessity of ensuring that the facilities of the International Atomic Energy Agency and fissionable material which may be placed at its disposal are not used for, or diverted to, other than peaceful purposes".

Frankly, we feel that this declaration covers the positive aspects of the Soviet suggestion while leaving it to the statute of the agency itself to cover the other aspects of the problem, because when we consider that statute we shall have to take into account the functions of the agency and the way in which it can assure itself that fissionable material is not being diverted to other than peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Trujillo, Ecuador)

The seventh paragraph of the preamble is also extremely important in my view because it states that "continuing international co-operation is essential for further developing and expanding the peaceful uses of atomic energy". It has to be a continuing co-operation: it cannot be a sporadic co-operation.

After these general, preambular paragraphs, which I believe cover the original ideas expressed by almost all speakers, the co-sponsors divide their draft resolution into two parts, A and B. Part A refers in its first paragraph to the international conference and "expresses its satisfaction with the proceedings of the Technical Conference convened in accordance with resolution 810 (IX)" of the General Assembly, which facilitated the exchange of information on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This science, which had been enveloped in mystery, danger and fear, became part and parcel of the common knowledge of all men.

I should like to draw attention also to paragraph 4 of part A, which states:

"Recommends that a second international conference for the exchange of technical information regarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy should be held under the auspices of the United Nations in two to three years time".

May I remind the Committee that last year, when we were discussing the draft resolution that later became General Assembly resolution 810 (IX), part B, dealing with this very problem, the delegation of Ecuador suggested to the sponsors that they should use the words "periodical scientific or technical conferences to be held at intervals of either two or three years", thus stressing the idea that this exchange of ideas would be constant and that it would take place at certain intervals. That suggestion was not accepted last year, but I see that it now crops up in the present draft resolution. This is obviously due to the fact that the first atomic conference was such a success. When the second such conference is held it, too, will probably be a great success, and there will be a demand for the holding of a third conference, and so on.

I believe that in paragraph 5 of part A the most flexible possible position has been adopted, namely, that whereby it is left to the Secretary-General to determine, with the advice of the Advisory Committee, the appropriate time and place for the holding of the conference. Thus, in the interval between the adoption of the resolution and the calling of the conference the Secretary-General can decide where the conference is to be held.

With regard to paragraph 6 of part A, I would suggest to the co-sponsors a slightly modified text. As drafted, this paragraph reads:

"Invites the specialized agencies to consult with the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee with a view to ensuring proper co-ordination between the Conference referred to in paragraph A 4 of this resolution and such technical conferences as they or their affiliated non-governmental scientific organizations may convene on the more specialized aspects of the peaceful uses of atomic energy".

I feel that the draft resolution is not quite clear on this point, because it merely invites the specialized agencies to consult the Secretary-General but does not invite them to convoke specialized scientific conferences, which are very often as important as the international technical conferences. Therefore I would suggest that the wording be changed somewhat, to read along these lines:

"Invites the specialized agencies to convoke technical conferences on the more specialized aspects of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and to consult the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee with a view to ensuring proper co-ordination between the conference referred to in paragraph A 4 of this resolution and such technical conferences as they may convene".

In other words, what my delegation suggests is that we issue a direct invitation to the specialized agencies to convene more specialized conferences -- in the fields, for example, of agriculture, medicine, biology, and so on -- and not merely invite them to consult the Secretary-General on the subject of dates. In fact, what we are requesting is an inversion of the paragraph in question.

The last paragraph of part A, which refers to the continuing of the Advisory Committee, seems to be extremely useful. During the general debate my delegation was very much in agreement with this idea which had been mentioned in the Secretary-General's report.

To sum up, therefore, with the small change which I have suggested to paragraph 6, my delegation will vote in favour of this part of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Trujillo, Ecuador)

I turn now to part B of the draft resolution, concerning an international atomic energy agency.

My delegation feels that the question of the agency's draft statute is extremely important and that the statute should be circulated to governments. My Government is studying the statute and will submit its views thereon through the normal channels.

We agree to a great extent with the comments that have been made here on the composition of the agency. We think that it is a very good idea to invite all Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies to participate in a conference on the final text of the agency's statute. The original proposal on the drafting of the agency's statute and the composition of the agency did not appear to us to be entirely democratic. We feel that the procedure proposed in the revised draft resolution is much more appropriate. We wish to congratulate the delegations which had the mental agility to realize that the statute must be a product of the universal conscience and not an instrument imposed by the great Powers on the lesser Powers. We agree with the proposal that an international conference should be held to draft the final text of the statute and that the statute should be an international treaty.

Paragraph 3 of part B concerns invitations to the Governments of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to participate with the sponsoring Governments in negotiations on the draft statute of the international atomic energy agency. But Brazil is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution. I should therefore like to know why its name is included in this paragraph.

Paragraph 5 of part B requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee referred to in paragraph 7 of part A of the draft resolution, to study the question of the relationship of the international atomic energy agency to the United Nations and to transmit the results of their study to the Governments concerned before the conference referred to in paragraph 2 of part B of the draft resolution is convened. I believe that that drafting is very satisfactory. I am sure that the Soviet Union representative will have no objection to it, because the Soviet Union draft resolution contains a proposal that a conference of experts should undertake the kind of study to which reference is made here. I think that it is quite appropriate for the study to be carried

(Mr. Trujillo, Ecuador)

out by the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee. I do not, however, think that the results of the study should be transmitted only to the Governments concerned: I think that the results should be transmitted to all the Governments which will participate in the international conference, so that they may have time to study those results. I believe that among the documents to be transmitted to those Governments before the international conference is convened there should be included the comments which Governments have submitted either to the Secretary-General or to the United States Government and the results of the study carried out by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Advisory Committee.

If these suggestions were included in part B of the draft resolution, we should be prepared to vote in favour of that part, also.

I come now to the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1). I would draw attention to the fact that paragraph 6 of article 13 of the draft statute deals in a better way with the question of prohibiting the use of atomic weapons than does the Soviet Union draft resolution. In that paragraph of the draft statute, it is stated that the assistance provided by the agency should not be used to further the development of nuclear weapons. This a more positive statement than that contained in the Soviet Union draft resolution.

Paragraph 6 of the Soviet Union draft resolution reads:

"Considers that it would be useful to found an international periodical organ of atomic scientists, devoted to the problems connected with the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and requests the Secretary-General to arrange for the publication of this periodical in 1956".

We think that is a very interesting and important suggestion. Perhaps, however, it would not be a good idea to include such a proposal in a draft resolution, but, rather, in the draft statute. Paragraph 3 of article 2 A of the draft statute -- the article dealing with the functions of the agency -- reads :

"To foster the interchange of scientific and technical information and the development of standards in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy".

That would be the correct place for including this suggestion concerning an international periodical. We believe that such a periodical is absolutely necessary, so that scientists all over the world may learn of the latest discoveries in this field.

(Mr. Trujillo, Ecuador)

I should like to refer now to the amendments proposed by the representative of India. I believe that the most important amendment is contained in paragraph 3 of document A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1. Under that amendment, the following words would be added to paragraph 4 of part A of the seventeen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.1):

"and that seminars on the various aspects of the peaceful uses of atomic energy should be held as appropriate and that measures should be taken to encourage the dissemination of knowledge on the subject".

I think that the same comment as I made on the Soviet Union suggestion of a periodical could be made as regards this amendment. I think that the proposal for the holding of seminars should be included in paragraph 3 of article 2 A of the draft statute. I do not think that it should be included in a draft resolution.

Apart from the Soviet Union suggestion of a periodical and the Indian suggestion of seminars, the delegation of Ecuador will be very happy to vote in favour of all the ideas contained in these draft resolutions. We trust that it will be possible to adopt a unanimous resolution. All of humanity is awaiting such a resolution. We must set at rest the minds of the peoples of the world. This resolution must be much more than a verbal declaration, for all of us have by this time become quite accustomed to verbal declarations.

Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia): When I addressed this Committee last Friday during the general debate on this item, I pointed out that the debate so far had been marked by restraint and moderation and that the essence of the debate had been constructive. I would add today that even further efforts have been made since I spoke and that this debate on the peaceful uses of atomic energy has certainly become one of the most outstanding displays of co-operation ever witnessed in this Committee.

No immovable positions have been evident and there has been a process of development during the debate which I wish to emphasize and in connexion with which I should like to express the gratification of my delegation. We believe that it should become a general practice that, in the course of our debates, there should be a meeting of minds although it may mean, in some cases, the sacrifice of certain points of view to a compromise.

In my statement of 21 October I referred to the statements of Mr. Pastore of the United States and Mr. Nutting of the United Kingdom. I should like to mention now the statement made yesterday by Mr. Pastore and **those of** Sir Pierson Dixon of the United Kingdom yesterday and today which have, I think, been of great help in the further development of this debate on constructive lines.

I have also observed that my delegation was deeply impressed by the Chairman's appeal on 20 October for the necessity and desirability of unanimity in the Committee.

From my statement regarding the views of my delegation in general on the question under discussion it was obvious that we held views which were different from those presented in the original draft resolution by the United Kingdom and the United States. Our views can be summarised in three points: first, we believe that the General Assembly should consider the draft statute of the future international agency; secondly, it is our belief that the General Assembly should, as of now, express itself on some basic principles with regard to the relationship between the agency and the Assembly itself, thirdly, we believe that a committee of the Assembly should be established for the purpose of carrying out this task and for drafting the statute of the agency.

We still believe that the General Assembly would be well advised to agree to this position, but we cannot fail to notice the great progress in development on the part of those delegations which submitted the original draft resolution A/C.1/L.129, namely, the United Kingdom and the United States. **It must be observed** that serious efforts have been made to achieve unanimity in this Committee and, in this connexion, I should like to say that my delegation will spare no effort to make its contribution to the achievement of such unanimity.

(Mr. Mates, Yugoslavia)

We believe that the second revision of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) went very far in this direction and, reading through the paragraphs of this text, in **the interest** of reaching unanimity in this Committee, we find that we shall be able to vote in favour of every paragraph. This does not mean that we believe the draft resolution to be perfect nor that we would not wish to see any improvement in the text as it stands. In this connexion I should like to mention one point which, I think, is rather a question of clarification than of a substantial amendment -- I do not wish, of course, at this stage, to move any amendment. I am referring to the wording of paragraph 2, part B, which speaks about a conference. It says that the conference should be held "on the final text". I have been thinking very hard about these words and I do not doubt that there may have been reasons -- and there must have been reasons -- to select this particular wording. I must say, however, as a foreigner in any country where English is spoken, and after having studied very hard to acquire some moderate mastery of the language, that I have read better English in many places than this particular choice of words. Furthermore, it does not convey the idea very clearly. I believe that some change could be made in order to make the meaning clearer in the sense in which it has been interpreted by Sir Pierson Dixon this morning and by Mr. Pastore yesterday. Such modification would help us to go along with this paragraph as we can with all the other paragraphs of the draft resolution.

My delegation will keep its mind open regarding any amendments -- and I see that some have been submitted while I have been speaking -- but what is fundamental in the draft resolution and in the changes which have been introduced into it, we wish to welcome and to say that it is our desire to participate in a unanimous vote in this Committee. We hope that this paragraph 2 to which I have referred, as it does not introduce any idea different from what has been expressed by the two representatives who have spoken on behalf of the sponsors, will create no difficulty. I wish to make it quite clear that in supporting the draft resolution we do not change our views regarding what we believe would be best, but we do understand that others do not share our views. This, however,

is an indication of our effort to reach unanimity, as it has been the effort also of the sponsors of the draft resolutions, who may possibly believe that what they planned in the beginning was better than what they are now submitting. In this spirit we wish to be able to support this text fully.

Of course it is still possible to add to the text; there are many things which, in our view, it would be desirable to add, but I think that the position of my delegation, in the light of what I have just said, will be understood without any further clarification.

Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): At our meeting on 20 October the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, and at yesterday's meeting the representative of the USSR, when speaking about my last statement in the Committee, said that I had misinterpreted the meaning of the draft resolution of the Soviet Union inasmuch as the Soviet Union Government did not intend to suggest that the prohibition of the atomic weapon was to be considered as a preliminary condition for the establishment of the agency. But in the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union yesterday he said: "... the Soviet Union Government does not regard the prohibition of atomic weapons as a preliminary condition for establishing the agency. The Soviet Union, as it follows from our draft resolution, is of the opinion that the prohibition of the use and production of atomic weapons and their removal from national armaments would ... help to reduce international tension ...". (A/C.1/PV.768, page 61)

If this is the case, then I think that we all agree. The trouble is that the draft resolution of the Soviet Union did seem to ~~make~~ such prohibition a sort of prerequisite. If all that is indicated is a desire that agreement should be reached on the prohibition of the use of the atomic weapon, that has been said not once, but ten times, or fifty times.

(Mr. Urrutia, Colombia)

On the other hand, I think we all agree. The only thing we disagree on is the timeliness of such a statement. I think that such a statement should be left for the debates on disarmament or else for the debates on atomic weapons, or it could be left for inclusion in the draft statute itself. If in each resolution we refer to the previous resolutions of the General Assembly, then we shall never finish. It is true they are all linked together, but there is the question of order. What I do believe is that the inclusion of such a statement in this debate leads to confusion. I am sorry that I am to blame for having fallen into that confusion, but probably I am not alone in that. In order to avoid more general confusion and in order to avoid it being taken as a prerequisite, why not leave it for the other documents and postpone discussion of that question until we discuss disarmament. When disarmament is discussed, I shall be the first to accept or even to state that this observation is required, because it is a statement we made last year and the year before.

Having clarified that point, I should like to refer to the Indian amendments. I listened very carefully to the statement made yesterday by Mr. Menon, when he explained that the amendments that had been submitted by India referred to the first draft of document A/C.1/L.129 and had, therefore, to be considered as amendments to that draft. I am sure that when Mr. Menon speaks again he will change his amendments somewhat in order that they will apply to document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2. However, I do feel that some comments are called for.

For example, one of the most important of the Indian amendments states:

"Notes the impressive results achieved by the Conference in facilitating the free flow of scientific knowledge relating to the production and peaceful uses of atomic energy ..."

Well, that has already been included in the new draft resolution.

With regard to the amendments submitted by India to part B of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.129, I note the following. The delegation of India proposes the addition of this paragraph before operative paragraph 1:

"The General Assembly,

"Desiring to promote energetically the use of atomic energy to the end that it will serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind and ameliorate their living conditions,".

(Mr. Urrutia, Colombia)

I believe that has been perfectly clearly covered in paragraph 2 of the new draft resolution, since it states:

"Desiring to promote energetically the use of atomic energy to the end that it will serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind and ameliorate their living conditions."

This remark also applies to paragraph (d) of the Indian amendments, which states:

"Recognizing the necessity of ensuring that the agency and its facilities including fissionable material placed at its disposal are not used for or diverted to other purposes."

This is covered by the sixth paragraph of the preamble of A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2, which repeats practically word for word the Indian amendment.

With regard to the suggestion for increasing the number of countries negotiating on the draft statute, that is not only accepted, but an invitation to Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the USSR has been included.

The only difference which exists is the following. The Indian delegation proposes that these provisions be included in the operative part of the draft resolution, whereas the co-sponsors of the draft resolution have preferred to include these two paragraphs in the preamble. I have always considered, and I do not refer specifically to General Assembly resolutions, but to laws, regulations and ordinances, that the preamble should carry this kind of explanation. The preamble explains the reasons for the operative part of the draft resolution and the reasons a person, a parliament or a collective body may have for arriving at a conclusion are very diverse. If one tries to enumerate them, one is bound to forget a few, and if we want to give the reasons why each and every one of us supports this draft resolution, then we would never finish. We would have to start by saying:

"Considering the war is over,

"Considering the Charter has been signed,

"Considering we have had ten sessions of the General Assembly."

And we should have to add considerations running right through the alphabet. There could not possibly be any limitation to a preamble if one tried to explain motives. One would have to deny the existence of many others that may have

(Mr. Urrutia, Colombia)

weighed just as heavily in arriving at the conclusion, but of which one was not conscious at the time. Schopenhauer said that usually people are right when they affirm something and are wrong when they deny. Well, we do not have to affirm or deny anything here. I am sure that the delegations that have studied this proposal may very well agree with the representative of India that these two paragraphs should be taken from the preamble and put into the operative part of the draft resolution. I think the operative part is the important part, but I do not think that anyone will quibble about where this concept is included in the draft resolution. I do not think there is too subtle a distinction, and I certainly do not think that this should in any way be permitted to jeopardize the unanimity with which this resolution should be adopted.

A number of other amendments have been submitted. I will not say they are slight amendments, because I consider all amendments of importance, but I think the problems raised by them are less difficult of solution. Therefore, I think the conclusion we may arrive at is the following. If a general agreement has been arrived at on the substance, let us leave the secondary problems raised by these amendments, and the Committee can decide by a majority vote upon them, but under the condition that no matter what is the fate of these amendments, all delegations will vote in favour of the joint draft resolution on which we in general agree. That is the appeal which my delegation wishes to make to this Committee now.

74

Mr. de SOUZA GOMES (Brazil) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having called upon me to speak on a point of clarification. I should like to clarify a statement made by the representative of Ecuador. If I understood him correctly as regards paragraph 3 of part B of the joint draft resolution, Mr. Trujillo found it strange that Brazil, as a co-sponsor, deemed it fitting to invite itself to participate, together with the present sponsoring Governments, in negotiations on the draft statute for the international atomic energy agency. It is quite possible that the Spanish translation of document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2 has given this erroneous impression to the representative of Ecuador.

In reality, the invitation to take part in the negotiations for preparing a draft statute of the agency is also addressed to India, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, and this invitation was extended directly by the eight Powers which have heretofore engaged in negotiations for the drafting of this statute. What paragraph 3 of part B says is that the General Assembly:

"Further welcomes the extension of invitations to the Governments of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the USSR to participate as Governments concerned with the present sponsoring Governments in negotiations on the draft statute of the international atomic energy agency."

In other words, we welcome the extension of the ambit, of the venue, of the negotiations so as to facilitate the elaboration of a more equitable statute.

Brazil, which had not been heretofore one of the participating Powers, could not invite itself; of course it could not. It would be very difficult for it to do anything of the sort, and it is not doing so.

The CHAIRMAN: It appears that no other representative wishes to speak this morning. Before adjourning the meeting until 3 o'clock this afternoon, I desire to inform the Committee that Luxembourg has asked to be added as a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2. Luxembourg is added accordingly as a co-sponsor. I think there will be no need to reissue the document.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.