

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.768
25 October 1955

ENGLISH

Tenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 25 October 1955, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Sir Leslie MUNRO

(New Zealand)

Peaceful uses of atomic energy [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.

A statement was made by:

Mr. Krishna Menon

(India)

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.768. 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: The Committee will recall that at our last meeting we agreed to adjourn until today. On Sunday afternoon I received a letter from the Indian delegation requesting that, on account of consultations which were being held and which, as I understood this morning were still going on, the meeting be held this afternoon. Accordingly, I called the meeting for this afternoon.

I wish now only to stress that the matter before us is very important. It is also important that consultations should be held if we are to reach agreement. On the other hand, time is passing and we have many other matters to which we must attend. I am sure that the representatives will bear in mind the importance of the time element.

The general debate will be concluded this afternoon after we have heard the statement of the representative of India. When the statement of the representative of India has been concluded, the Committee will proceed to discuss the resolutions which are now before us. At that time I shall make suggestions for the way in which I feel we should deal with those resolutions.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): On last Friday, under your wise guidance, the Committee agreed to adjourn this meeting until today. Then again on Sunday you agreed to call the meeting for this afternoon. During this time talks and consultations between the various parties and delegations concerned with the resolutions before the Assembly have been going on. They have been deeply involved in mutual discussions. This lapse of time has been necessary in order that the succeeding stage of the debate may be more fruitful than would otherwise be the case.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

As you have just mentioned, we are still at the stage of the general debate. It is only at the conclusion of the general debate that it will be possible for us to say with any finality what degree of agreement or difference exists among the delegations. However, I think it is appropriate -- and but fair to the Committee and to yourself -- that I should mention that so far as my delegation is concerned, we have entered into this debate and initiated such proceedings as we have with the outstanding desire that the Committee, and afterwards the plenary session, should pass one resolution unanimously. That is still our endeavour and our fervent hope. I think I am right in saying that, given the necessary time after the general debate, we may look forward to this prospect. If, in spite of all our endeavours, it is not possible to reach unanimity but only overwhelming agreement, then the Committee will understand that nations and Governments have basic conceptions on these matters which still remain to be bridged in certain aspects.

I would like to say that the talks which have taken place between the various delegations have been very frank and wholesome. I should mention that the sponsors of the first draft resolution and the Soviet Union have given us a great deal of their time. With your permission, I should like to leave this matter at this stage with one observation. In view of the continuation of these talks, my references to these resolutions will not go beyond principles and I will not seek to argue them. My delegation reserves its right to speak on the resolutions at the resolution stage. The way in which we address ourselves to that problem will very much depend to a great extent on what happens hereafter.

Last year -- about eleven months ago -- we debated this problem. Eleven months even before that, the initiative in regard to this matter contained in the address of the President of the United States to the General Assembly occurred. So, altogether, now we have spent twenty-two months in what may be called preliminary talks; and if I may say so with great respect, when we are trying to rush committees into great decisions it would be as well to look this historical fact in the face and sometimes to recall that we may make most progress by not hastening too quickly.

My Government takes no responsibility in the delay that has taken place in regard to the last eleven months; and I feel sure the United States delegation will not misunderstand our position but only regard it as part of our obligation to state the facts of this case. But since the conclusion of the debate last year -- when the Committee agreed that the negotiations concerning the international atomic agency should proceed, and that suggestions on these matters should be extended to the United States Government -- we have made some communications in order to obtain such information as we could, on 3 May of this year and, having heard no more about our resolution, on 8 August 1955.

I can well understand the position: that the sponsoring Government, or its representative, could not make any useful communication until various contacts that were necessary had been made. Subsequent to our communication of 8 August, to the Secretary-General, which no doubt was communicated to the Government concerned, there has been the circulation of suggested draft statutes of this agency, to which I shall refer later on.

The initiative to use the atom for peaceful purposes was first mentioned in the London meeting in 1945; and although the political conditions of the last ten years have resulted in the progress of atomic development more in the destructive or potentially destructive fields, nations and scientists have not forgotten its more useful value and what we -- in our faith, which we may not ever forswear -- must still believe will be the predominant and final uses of atomic power in the world. Much progress has been made, and my delegation takes heart in thinking that in all the changes and in the progress that has been made there has been not only technical advance, but also some advance in thought, some advance in the evaluation of ideas, in the relation of technical discoveries and in social advancement has also occurred.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Since the last debate we have made considerable advances; and the very fact that the resolution of last year, in both its aspects, was unanimous, has had an impact on the various countries and Governments participating.

Mr. Chairman, I feel sure you will agree with me in thinking that of the various subjects we debate here there is no item on which there is more desire to reach unanimity -- not unanimity of words, but unanimity of effort -- no subject in which we seek more common exploration and the juxtaposition of conflicting points of view for the purpose of debate, than the item on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

I want to repeat at this stage what I said on behalf of my delegation last year, namely that while the development of the peaceful use of atomic energy is an all-important and overwhelmingly arresting subject which is engaging the attention of this Committee and of all our Governments, we should not forget one fact, nor allow ourselves to think that the debate on this subject, or even the establishment of the agency or the large-scale development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy is by itself a solution to the problem of doing away with its destructive uses.

In other words, the problem of the prohibition of atomic weapons -- the prohibition of the new discoveries for building weapons of mass destruction or their use in warfare -- these are separate problems, though related; and where they are related their relation is of a rather ominous character.

I mention this because it would be a great mistake if we should allow our minds to follow the path of escapism and think that by building on one side we have dealt with the problems on the other.

But I have no desire, at this stage, to transgress from the procedural and debating limits set by the wording of this item and wander into the field of disarmament.

This item, as it is on the agenda, has what may be called three limbs. The first is the general heading, which deals with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The first sub-heading deals with the conference, and the second sub-heading with the proposed agency. My delegation will seek to follow the pattern that has been set by previous speakers, where their time has been spent, first of all, in announcing to the world the desire of their nation, and their hopes with regard to other nations -- that we may all proceed in a spirit of

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

constructive endeavour to establish the objective of using this new-found energy in the service of man. In other words, these speeches have been characterized by a proclamation of our willingness to co-operate, of our desire to attain objectives and, what is more, to attain them with speed. The second part of these speeches have been addressed to inform this Committee of the progress made within nations, and also to express the national concerns of people -- concerns in regard to what might happen to each national community if it were left behind, not in the race but in the endeavour for progress in the atomic field -- and also the hopes of these same nations.

In following that pattern, therefore, I would like first of all to say that my Government does not look -- and our country does not look -- upon this subject of atomic development and the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes merely as a technical problem, or, indeed, fundamentally and primarily as a technical problem. We have heard a great deal about various minerals, about various processes, about various new discoveries that are possible. But we feel it is necessary, in addressing ourselves to this subject, that we do not forget -- indeed, that we keep in the forefront of our minds -- that we are dealing with a problem of vast social and economic significance, a significance far vaster in magnitude, in intensity, in its amplitude and in the speed with which it will strike us than the invention of steam or the internal combustion engine, or all these other things that ushered into the world the Industrial Revolution and its economic and social consequences.

So, if we put forward ideas in our resolutions, or make the approach to this problem having in mind the economic impacts upon the vast millions of people -- particularly in our part of the world where more than half the population of the world lives -- or if we recall the historic circumstances which were visited upon us as a consequence of the industrial revolution; if we recall to our minds the lessons we had to learn from them, and the experiences we have to avoid, then I am sure the Committee will forgive us, because the approach we make to this problem is that we are at the dawn of a new era in our civilization, where our social values, our industrial techniques, our social purposes -- indeed, the quantity of leisure that will be available to mankind -- will make a great revolution in our civilization.

(Mr. Pastore, United States)

In considering this revision, I hope that the Committee will bear in mind that the new text represents a considerable change from the original resolution. We and our co-sponsors have, I believe, shown the greatest degree of flexibility, consistent with the need to maintain the support of Governments whose contributions to the atomic energy agency are essential to its success.

The new draft resolution provides a basis for speedy action within a framework that ensures that the final statute of the agency will reflect a practical balance of the interests and views of all States.

It has been the expressed intention of my Government to bring about, if possible, complete unanimity on the part of the Member nations on the item before us. It was indeed the hope of President Eisenhower, when he announced his plan for Atoms for Peace, that this idea should become a reality and should be a success. Otherwise the President of the United States would never have announced that idea to the United Nations. It is in this spirit, therefore, that we have made this further revision of our draft resolution.

We have always maintained that all of us who are interested in seeing the idea of an international agency come to life can adjust our differences and make proper adjustments so that the text will accurately reflect the consensus of views which merge from our debate. We therefore sincerely hope that this new revised draft resolution will enjoy unanimous support.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no other speakers on my list. As no other representative wishes to speak in the discussion on the resolutions this afternoon, the Committee will be adjourned until 10.30 tomorrow morning, and I trust that then as many speakers as possible will be ready to participate in the debate on the resolutions.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

(Mr. Pastore, United States)

Now I should like to refer briefly to Part A of the revised draft resolution.

We have revised paragraph 4 to recommend that the next technical conference be convened in "two to three years" time. This replaces our earlier language which reads "in about three years time". This change takes account of the views of a number of delegations, particularly the Soviet Union, that the interval of time before the next technical conference need not necessarily be as long as three years.

We have also added a new paragraph, number 2 in our revised text, which stresses an important result of the Geneva Conference, namely, that it facilitated the free flow of scientific information.

Two final changes in our draft resolution occur in the preamble, and take the form of two additional paragraphs. They are the second and sixth paragraphs of the preamble of the revised text.

The first of these new paragraphs reflects the interest of every member of this Committee that the utilization of atomic energy will be promoted to the end that it will serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind. You will all recognize that this language is taken from the text of the resolution adopted unanimously last year.

The second new paragraph which we are adding to our preamble expresses a similar thought in connexion with the activities of the proposed atomic agency. It reads as follows: "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." Safeguarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy will be, as we all recognize, a major technical responsibility of the proposed agency, and I believe the thought expressed in this paragraph has an entirely fitting place in our draft resolution.

This completes my brief description of what appears to be the more important changes in our resolution. In its revised form, this resolution, now sponsored by seventeen Governments, constitutes a major effort to ensure the speediest progress towards a goal which we all share, namely, establishing a sound basis for international co-operation for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and particularly the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency at the earliest possible date.

MW/ho

A/C.1/PV.768
64-65

(Mr. Pastore, United States)

A final change in part B involves the addition of an entirely new paragraph at the end of the draft resolution. This paragraph, which is number 6, requests the Governments concerned -- and here again we have in mind the group of twelve negotiating States -- to report to the General Assembly as appropriate. This would, quite naturally, be done in any event.

Now turning to the revised text of the draft resolution, I should like first of all to call the attention of the Committee to an entirely new paragraph which takes account of the new development which I have just described. I am referring to part B, paragraph 3 of the new text (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2), which welcomes the fact that invitations have been extended to the Governments of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the USSR to join with the present sponsoring Governments in their further negotiations on the draft statute.

As a result of the new expansion of the negotiating group of States, we have made a consequential change in the text of part B, paragraph 2. Representatives will recognize this as the language of part B, paragraph 3 of our earlier revised text (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.1). We have now deleted the word "the" before the phrase "Governments sponsoring the agency". Representatives will readily appreciate that this change is made in the expectation that the group of States committed to sponsoring the agency will have been considerably expanded between now and the time when the conference on the final text of the draft statute will be convened.

An additional consequential change appears in part B, paragraph 4, a paragraph which, in our former text, was number 2 of part B. In this revision we have substituted the phrase "Governments concerned" for the earlier wording "Governments sponsoring the agency". This change, I am sure, makes clear the intention of this Committee that the views expressed here on the agency, as well as those transmitted through direct Government channels, should be taken into account by all the Governments concerned.

In this same paragraph -- part B, paragraph 4 -- we have added, at the end of the earlier text, a new phrase: "bearing in mind the provisions of this resolution." The concluding phrase of this paragraph now reads: "... take all possible measures to establish the agency without delay bearing in mind the provisions of this resolution."

A third consequential change occurs in part B, paragraph 5, formerly part B, paragraph 4. Here we have substituted the phrase "Governments concerned" for the phrase "Governments sponsoring the agency". This change is identical with that of the change in part B, paragraph 4. We feel that the results of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Advisory Committee should be formally transmitted to all Governments in the new expanded negotiating group.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

The Soviet Union delegation is prepared to make every effort, together with other delegations, to work out agreed decisions on the problem under consideration.

Mr. PASTORE (United States of America): I should like to say just a few words about the new revised draft resolution which now stands in the name of the following co-sponsors: Australia, Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. I shall have to reserve the right, whenever my Government deems it appropriate, to comment at a later meeting on the remarks made this afternoon by the representatives of India and the Soviet Union. I think that, in that way, we shall better serve the convenience of the Committee.

We are happy that it has been possible to make additional revisions to our original text, and we trust that, in so doing, we have been able to give expression to the views of the largest majority of delegations. We believe that our new text accurately reflects the consensus of views which has emerged from our debate. We hope that it will enjoy the widest support.

Before I comment on the particular changes incorporated into our new text, I should like to call the attention of the Committee to a new development in the procedures for negotiating a draft statute for the proposed atomic agency.

Last Friday, 21 October, my Government issued invitations to the Governments of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, India and the Soviet Union to join the original eight negotiating States in their further negotiations on the draft statute for the proposed international atomic energy agency. Acceptance of these invitations on the part of those four Governments will constitute -- and I think that this is quite important -- an expansion of the negotiating group from eight to twelve States. It is hoped that the first meeting of this expanded group can be convened as early as December of this year.

My Government is pleased to be able to announce such an expansion, since we believe that the enlarged group will be representative of the widest range of views and thus will ensure a final agreement on the text of a statute which will be satisfactory to all.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

In this connexion we should note the positive significance of the Indian delegation's proposal to the effect that the General Assembly should declare its desire to promote vigorously the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only and for improving the living conditions of mankind.

The revised draft resolution submitted by a group of States today has this idea incorporated within it.

Referring to the question of the use of atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes, the delegation of the USSR deems it necessary to elucidate its position on this question in connexion with the speech of the representative of Colombia. The representative of Colombia alleged that the Soviet Union made the establishment of the agency on the peaceful uses of atomic energy conditional on the prohibition of the atomic weapon. Such an interpretation of the position of the Soviet Union is wrong.

The statement of the Soviet Union delegation, its draft resolution, as well as the comments on the draft statute of the agency, which the Soviet Union Government communicated to the United States Government, make it clear that 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 contribute in the highest degree to the broad development of international co-operation in furthering the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and would help to reduce international tension and to create an atmosphere of international confidence.

These are remarks which the Soviet Union delegation considered it essential to make at this stage of our work in connexion with the draft resolutions which have been submitted. Our debate tends to show that at the present time, given the will on the part of the States represented on this Committee, it is possible to draft such a resolution on the question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy as would be acceptable to all delegations. This would undoubtedly foster the development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

expressed that States wishing to become members of the agency might find themselves in a position where they would not be able to participate in drafting the agency's statute.

In this connexion, we should like to emphasize the importance of the Soviet Union proposal that a conference of experts designated by the governments of the States concerned should be convened for the joint consideration of questions relating to the drafting of the statute of the international agency on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Soviet Union delegation hopes that this proposal will meet with the support of other delegations.

The other day, a group of delegations submitted a revised draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.1), and, today, a second revision of the draft resolution has been placed before us. The draft resolution proposes that a conference of States should be convened for the development of the final text of the statute of the international agency on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Soviet Union delegation is studying this proposal very carefully.

The Soviet Union delegation has proposed that a periodical for atomic scientists on the peaceful uses of atomic energy should be established. This proposal has been supported by a number of delegations, in particular by the United States delegation. In our opinion, this should be appropriately reflected in the draft resolution which will finally be adopted.

In the course of the Committee's discussion, special attention was paid to the idea that genuinely broad and fruitful co-operation in the sphere of the peaceful uses of atomic energy would require that all atomic energy should be used for peaceful purposes only.

The Soviet Union draft resolution proposes that an appeal should be made to all States to continue their efforts to reach an agreement on the prohibition of atomic weapons, since that would contribute in the highest degree to the comprehensive development of international co-operation in furthering the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In the Soviet Union delegation's opinion, an appeal of this nature should be reflected in the Assembly's decision. There is no doubt **that the achievement of an agreed decision on this question would greatly contribute to the development of co-operation among the States.**

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

of those representatives who declared that the establishment of the agency as a specialized agency could not provide -- as one representative put it -- a panacea which would guarantee the agency's happy and harmonious existence.

Some representatives expressed the opinion that at the current session the General Assembly should not go into the details of the agency's statute, and, in particular, should not take up the task of defining the relationship between the agency and the United Nations at this state. The Soviet Union delegation agrees that the discussion at this session should be limited to an exchange of views on the principles on which this relationship should be based and that the detailed consideration and elaboration of appropriate provisions of the statute should be carried out at a later stage, in a manner to be agreed upon here. Taking into consideration the wishes expressed by a number of delegations, however, we think that it would be expedient even at this stage to provide in the Assembly resolution that the detailed elaboration of the provisions on the relationship between the agency and the United Nations should be based on a recognition of the principle that the international agency should be established within the framework of the United Nations and should have the closest relations with the United Nations.

As regards the membership of the international agency and its governing bodies, it may safely be stated that the majority of the delegations support the view that the agency should be organized on a broad basis and that not a single State should, on ideological or any other grounds, be denied co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We should also mention the unanimity on the point that no country or group of countries should have a monopolistic position in the agency and that all the bodies of the atomic energy agency should be organized with due account being taken of the interests of all States members of the agency. The suggestion that the governing bodies of the agency should include both States contributing atomic materials and States receiving assistance through the agency deserves our approval.

In the course of the debate on the international agency, particular attention was paid to the procedure for considering the agency's statute. Critical remarks were made, to the effect that the discussion of the statute was being held on a basis which could not be described as wide. Apprehension was

(Mr. Kuznetsov, USSR)

In his statement, the representative of Norway emphasized that:

"My delegation is...in a position to state now that Norway would favour the closest relationship between the agency and the United Nations".

(A/C.1/PV.761, page 29-30)

The representative of Sweden made the same kind of statement.

The Soviet Union delegation is of the opinion that the agency should be created within the framework of the United Nations and should submit reports on its activities to the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. One cannot fail to see that the closest relationship between the international agency and the United Nations is necessitated by important circumstances. All of us should take into account the fact that the proposed agency will deal with a new problem which is of immense importance in the progress of mankind. Here, we have primarily in view the close link existing between the production of atomic energy for peaceful uses and the production of atomic energy for military purposes. It is well known that the production of atomic energy for peaceful uses involves the accumulation of dangerous fissionable materials which may easily be diverted for military purposes. It is quite evident that, in the very course of the establishment of the agency, all the necessary precautions should be taken to prevent the utilization of fissile materials for non-peaceful purposes. Bearing this in mind, the USSR Government deems it necessary to provide in the statute for an appropriate control over the use of the materials received by the agency, lest those materials should be improperly diverted or misused.

I do not at this stage refer to other aspects of this important problem of the agency's relations with the United Nations, because I hope representatives are familiar with the aide-memoire which the USSR Government transmitted to the United States Government on 3 October and which, at our request, the United Nations Secretariat distributed to all delegations.

I merely wish to note that we cannot agree with an argument put forward by some delegations against the establishment of the agency within the framework of the United Nations; namely, the allegation that, owing to its close relationship with the United Nations, the agency would be involved in political controversies of the United Nations. In this respect, we share the view

delegations to the effect that scientific technical conferences should be convened both on general problems and on specific problems relating to the study and application of atomic energy. As is known, the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation suggests that conferences for the exchange of experiences in the application of atomic energy in various fields -- science, industry, agriculture, public health and so on -- should be convened periodically.

It is evident that the First Committee is in a position to adopt a unanimous decision on the convening of scientific technical conferences on problems related to the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. From the statements made in this Committee one can draw the conclusion that there is general agreement among us as to the continuation of the Advisory Committee set up at the ninth session of the General Assembly to assist the Secretary-General in convening the scientific conference at Geneva. As has already been noted in the course of the general discussion, this advisory committee should engage in the arrangement and conduct of scientific conferences, taking account of the wishes expressed in the First Committee to the effect that such conferences should be convened both on problems of a general character and on various specific problems related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

In the course of the debate questions relating to the establishment of an international agency on the peaceful uses of atomic energy were thoroughly discussed. In favouring the creation of such an agency, representatives gave special consideration to the question of the relationship between it and the United Nations. Many representatives spoke in favour of a closer relationship between the United Nations and the agency than the relationship between the specialized agencies and this Organization. For example, the representative of Indonesia said that the relationship of the agency to the United Nations should be as close as possible. "The international agency" -- the Indonesian representative pointed out -- "should, in fact, be an integral part of our Organization".

(A/C.1/PV.765, page 21)

The CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the point made by the representative of India.

I call now upon the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The First Committee, having completed its general debate on the question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, is about to begin the direct consideration of the various proposals. Delegations have shown great interest in the problem of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and in the great achievements that have been marked in this field. Many representatives have noted the vast strides made in the last decade in harnessing atomic energy for peaceful ends.

In the course of the general debate a number of delegations, including that of the Soviet Union, submitted draft resolutions on this question. Certain delegations, without submitting draft resolutions, have nevertheless made many constructive suggestions which also deserve the attention of the members of the Committee.

The proposals and recommendations placed before the Committee deal with many aspects of the development of international co-operation in the sphere of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Now that the Committee is proceeding to the discussion of the draft resolutions and the amendments thereto the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to make some comments on those draft resolutions.

All representatives who have spoken here have stressed the need for a wide international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and in this connexion they have made suggestions designed to promote the fullest and most comprehensive development of such co-operation. They have emphasized the great importance of the exchange of experience and of co-operation among the scientists and experts of various countries for the progress of atomic development. All representatives pointed out the great positive significance of the Geneva scientific technical conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and they have been unanimous in holding that the practice of convening such conferences should be continued. The Soviet delegation shares that view and, for its part, has submitted an appropriate proposal. We also agree with the opinion expressed by many

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes the general debate, and the Committee will now proceed to discuss the draft resolutions which are before it. It may assist the Committee if I enumerate them. First of all, we have the joint draft resolution set forth in document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2. With that we consider jointly the amendments proposed by India in document A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1. Secondly, there is a joint draft resolution sponsored by Burma, Egypt, India and other countries in document A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2. Thirdly, there is a joint draft resolution sponsored by Burma, Egypt, India and other countries in document A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2. Lastly, there is a draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in document A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1.

The Committee will, I know, appreciate the fact that we are now discussing the draft resolutions, that the general debate is over and that discussion will be confined, appropriately I think, to the details of the draft resolutions themselves. I trust that the Committee will assist me by not engaging in repetition which I feel is unnecessary, and that we shall proceed with the speed which is appropriate to this important matter.

Before I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who is the first speaker on my list, I call upon the representative of India who, I understand, wishes to raise a point of order.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that we have today received a revised version of document A/C.1/L.129, the original draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States, and I want to say that the amendments which we have submitted refer to revision 1 of that document. Revision 2 emerged in the Committee only just now, and therefore our amendments will not read properly and the Committee could not proceed to discuss them unless we had the opportunity to read them in conjunction with the new revised version of the original proposal. Some of these amendments will find their expression, either in substance or in form, in that revised version, and since our desire is to move closer and closer so that the amendments, in the final analysis, would disappear or find their embodiment in a main resolution, I would like you to take account of the fact that our amendments, as they stand at present, represent a stage prior to this meeting.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Therefore, I conclude these observations by once again pledging the endeavours of our delegation and of our Government to assist in reaching unanimous agreement on a resolution which will enable the world conference to meet and to receive the draft of a statute which will command wide acceptance in the world, a statute into which will have been placed the wisdom, the thoughts, the aspirations and the hopes of large numbers of people representing the diversities of our world.

It is a good thing that the world is diverse; otherwise, we would be very poor. That conference should not merely rubber-stamp, acclaim or proclaim them, but it should be a deliberative assembly, not a deliberative assembly which makes the statute but a deliberative assembly which gives value to the statute. That is what we are seeking.

I have no doubt that in the next day or two we shall be able to come before this Committee and once again tell an expectant world that the nations, in spite of their differences, are prepared to venture on this great experiment in a spirit of harmony and, if not necessarily in a spirit of agreement in every detail, with a commonness of objective in order that humanity may be served the better.

We should like to see this element of the establishment of atomic energy cover the whole field. Then our wisdom might enable us to see that no country, whether it be China or any other country which is standing outside, can be excluded, and it may enable us to benefit the whole of the world.

I am happy, therefore, to echo what has been said by the representative of the United States, that, "the United Nations, in this atomic age, is the one remaining hope where men of good will can meet in open forum ..." That is what we are asking for, the open forum, and we cannot merely make speeches about the open forum.

The Secretary-General, who has no particular role to speak on behalf of this Committee, stated last night, not to us but to the public of the world, that the question of atomic energy must be on a truly international basis. The world echoes that statement..

We cannot tell the world that it must be truly international and, at the same time, as I said in the general debate in the General Assembly, we cannot afford, in our modern world with all its potentialities of destruction, distrust and suspicions, to be torn between our dreams and our schemes. Our dream is one of a truly international agency.

"... the United Nations, in this atomic age, is the one remaining hope where men of good will can meet in open forum, honestly and frankly discuss their problems and make in good conscience the compromises which will lead to common understanding and bring peace to ourselves and to our children."

(A/C.1/PV.757, page 8)

My delegation does not look upon compromise as a sign of weakness. Compromise is the acceptance of the worth of the other fellow and the confidence in one's own judgment. It is only the weak man who is afraid of his position and who refuses to compromise.

At the same time, however, we have no desire to seek unanimity when it does not mean concensus of minds. Our friend and colleague, Mr. McIntosh, the representative of New Zealand, told us:

"Unanimity does not, of course, mean merely the agreement of a powerful few, although that agreement is, of course, essential. All legitimate interests and all honest views should be taken into account; but none, we trust, will be pressed beyond the possibility of agreement, and thus of the performance of our duty." (A/C.1/PV.762, page 47)

position where, shall we say, we have to look to a source which is beyond us for either enriched uranium, uranium rods, or anything of that kind, a situation in which the whole of our economy would become dependent.

Secondly, we do not want to find ourselves in the position where developments in this field or the use of other techniques, and so on, would be, to a certain extent, stifled by the existence of a monopoly.

Today, we are discussing this question not from the point of view of one country, but from the point of view of the world, in order to lay the foundations for an era which is to come. It is our responsibility to view the question in that way. We should learn from the experience of the disasters of the industrial revolution as well as from the experience of its great successes. Those disasters were the burdens which we have largely carried and from which we began to recover only in the second decade of this century. We have had thirty-five years of the beginnings of industrial apprenticeship. But fortunately for us, and thanks to the generosity that prevailed in the world, the spirit of liberalism abroad, the emancipation of countries in Asia and Africa, the founding of the United Nations and, what is more, the growth of countries which were formerly colonial countries into independent nations, have helped us to take today a new view of this question. It is for the application of **this** new view that my delegation appeals.

Therefore, I hope that the Committee will forgive me if I do not analyse these drafts clause by clause. It is my hope that, from the trend of the debate in the Committee, from the desire of the principal sponsors of the first draft resolution to find methods of co-operation, from the anxiety and from the overwhelming desire on the part of my delegation and our colleagues to meet them in every possible way provided that we can achieve results, we can get somewhere to save these principles for future discussions and that we are not simply being told, "you submit your ideas to us unilaterally". There must be multilateral discussion at some stage. It is our business to promote multilateral discussion. We should not put ourselves in the path of multilateral discussion. Multilateral discussion in this field will probably pave the way for multilateral discussion in other fields.

Mr. Nutting said to us: "In all these matters of international co-operation, the United Kingdom has a vital interest and part to play. The United Kingdom is a country which, more than most, must live by international trade and by providing international services on a massive scale." That is a statement of fact. "We in the United Kingdom have naturally sought always to expand our contacts in the field of atomic energy. We live, as I say, by the provision of international services." Now comes the significant phrase which I should like all my Asian and African friends to listen to. "For many years these services have included banking, insurance and shipping. Now we move to a new era which has appeared, that of international atomic co-operation." (A/C.1/PV.758, page 23-25)

International atomic co-operation, yes, but our countries are not moving into a field in which the monopoly of shipping, banking, insurance, or atomic pools, is going to be held by any country. It is our desire, and it should be the common endeavour of all of us, to see that the circumstances which came in the wake of the industrial revolution and the conditions that followed -- which are responsible for all the inequities and inequalities between nations and for the rule of one nation by another and for a number of the struggles in the world -- are not repeated. That is the purpose of the proposals which we have put forward, that is to say, to give some guidance to the General Assembly as to nature of the relations which should exist between the United Nations and the agency. We should endeavour to see that the preparatory work in this connexion is spread out in such a way that even at the formative stage the contributions of different parts of the world would come into it.

What I have said with regard to the development of atomic energy in my own country and the great scientific advances which have been achieved is not by any means a dissertation on atomic energy development in India. This may be taken in the context of the large number of scientists which our universities are turning out every year and the established policy of the Government of India that atomic energy shall not be used for anything but peaceful purposes. Furthermore, our facilities are available to those who want to come to our country. We welcome without any fear the kind of co-operation that has come to us from such countries as Canada, which we mentioned a while ago. But we do not want to be put into the

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

A few years ago no one knew that one of the great pioneers, Professor Einstein had given to the world the foundations of atomic science. But who is there to say that the uranium which is described in the Encyclopaedia Britannica as a worthless metal -- obviously the article will have to be rewritten -- will remain as valuable as it is today.

In connexion with the following quotation, we have to remember the significance which is not implied but is contained in it -- and I am sure that the representative of the United Kingdom, the Right Honourable Anthony Nutting, who is a good friend of mine, will not misunderstand me. I am advocating no motive and what is more I say that the motive is not the implication.

To start point-four programmes, special United Nations funds for economic development, to give aid -- bilateral and multilateral -- all wears rather thin when at the same time we do not take care to see to it that the new economic age is not based upon equality. It reminds me of a proverb in our part of the world where it is regarded as an act of religious something or other to make a present to a Brahman. It is equally regarded as a sin to kill a cow. Therefore, to kill a cow and make a pair of sandals to be given to a Brahman is not a good act at all. You only commit one sin in order to do something else. It is necessary that this attitude be understood.

We would not be a party to any organization that, not necessarily by design, but by implication, by the fact of economic consequences, will confine large areas of the world which are the producers of the raw materials and are at present backward in their economic development to return to that scale of the economic ladder. We do not want any economic ladders; we want a scheme of international co-operation. So long as there are underdeveloped, unhealthy, unadvanced, illiterate or other countries that cannot keep pace, as their standards of living are lower, we become the weak link in the chain of international progress. Therefore, this is also a problem of social and economic equity; it is a problem of the avoidance of international conflicts; it is the problem of the avoidance of requests for empires and for fields.

Mr. Bhabha, in speaking to this Committee the other day, said that the possession of uranium was not a criterion. He went on to express not only his own views but the views of our Government as well, and said that we are sacrificing a position which we ourselves have when we talk about the monopoly in these matters because the possession of raw materials today is not a criterion. For one thing, that position will not last and if it does last we must go back to what I said before: If we have plenty the only right it confers is to offer that plenty to somebody else. And what is more, those who have these raw materials today may not have them tomorrow.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

it says, then it means that those who are working on preparatory matters, those who are already working and are using governmental, diplomatic and other channels, who are using methods of persuasion, co-operation, conciliation and compromise, will produce, before the Assembly, the prolegomena that will become a statute. No statute can come before a body complete in its final form with the injunction that no one may touch it.

If there are good draughtsmen, if there has been sufficient prior consultation, if there is an assurance given to the people that it does not intend to persist in the tradition of haves and have-nots which is common among us, then it will be possible to do this.

It is my view that in the context of the atmosphere which prevails in this Committee, in the sincere desire that actuates the various views that have been put forward, we should be able to find a way of expressing this position because we have come very close to doing so.

I wish now to go back to what I said in the beginning. My Government does not approach this atomic problem as a mere technical revolution, as a matter for scientists or for Government departments or officials or even for this debate. We are going through a great revolution, and beginning a new epoch in human civilization. Do you, Mr. Chairman, think that countries like ours, which have emerged from a state of economic and political dependence, in the age when the world, as it was then known, was moving towards what is called the era of plenty, when the machine and tools of the United Kingdom and France and later of other Western countries -- when the energies of Western Europe -- were going to the rest of the world -- the machinery that was manufactured and the services -- when we found ourselves, as a great English statesman once said as merely the hewers of wood and the drawers of water -- would we want to repeat that position? If that position is to be repeated, we would have an economic context in which we would still have the haves and the have-nots which are the foundation of international conflict and war. We have an obligation, as Members of the United Nations who are pledged to rid the world and succeeding generations of the scourge of war, that no action of ours should lay the foundation for economic rivalry and conflict.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

economic, political, intellectual or scientific power, the only thing that is conferred upon them in virtue of their greater powers is the opportunity of greater service. Those who have more are to give more and not to take more. Therefore, any agency which emerges must be an agency that, by the text of its statutes, proclaims to the world that it is a good club to join. That is the situation. Therefore, let us make no mistake about it. Do not let the members of this Committee be persuaded again to retrace their steps on the decisions taken last year and add to their difficulties.

So far as improvement of the resolution is concerned, the very generous contribution made by the United States and its co-sponsors to put this matter in the hands of a world conference at a later stage is doubly welcome. But, it is necessary that, at that conference, there should be some knowledge of the amplitude of the functions to be performed. If there is going to be a conference to merely proclaim an agency, it must be a conference which establishes an agency. That does not mean that establishment can only be achieved by one set of procedures. There are diverse methods and procedures for establishment, but the essence of that establishment, in the process of the evolution of the agency, is that the largest measure of political, intellectual, moral and spiritual co-operation must emerge. This is what we must seek and that is why, in our amendments to the United States resolution, we have made some suggestions. I want to say that these are not like the laws which are unalterable. I would have used a proverb but I did not wish to offend my colleague -- who would not have been offended anyway. It is necessary, however, to bear this principle in mind.

Secondly, we stated last year -- and I am happy to say that both the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States, who were mainly responsible for piloting the resolution, stated over and over again -- something which has been restated by Senator Pastore in this Committee. It is that we shall never be faced, nor will the world conference, either by statement or by implication, be faced by a fait accompli. If this means what

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

It is important from our point of view -- and I am not, at the present moment, speaking to my amendment -- that this conference of Governments which is called the world conference must be a conference which will receive these drafts and have an opportunity to consider and approve them. In other words, they must seek in some form to establish the statutes and not remain merely a body of approval or ratification. We do not fear public discussion in this matter because the discussion is carried on by representatives of responsible Governments whose co-operation we are seeking.

Let us remember one thing. It may be possible, in one way or another, to obtain a majority decision in this Assembly or any other group. We have all been accustomed to public life in various forms and we know that there are ways and means, circumstances, considerations and so on, which bring about decisions of that character. But, when an agency exists in this world in a context which is not that of world government -- when this organization exists in the context of co-operation between sovereign nations whose positions lie according to their own procedures, their own parliaments and other constitutional organs -- it is necessary from the point of view of practical reality, in order that that agency may fulfil its purpose, that its constitution, its character, its background and everything that has been said in connexion with it -- every endeavour with which it is concerned -- should be of a nature that attracts loyalty. The thing must speak for itself.

A majority decision by this Assembly would not commit our Governments. Even if our Governments were to vote for such a resolution here, we would still have to go through the process of ratification according to our constitutional procedures. Therefore, it should not be forgotten that we have an audience -- a clientele, a constituency -- far outside the confines of this room. It goes beyond the strict confines of the Charter or provisions of the specialized agencies.

I beg everyone concerned to bear in mind that what we should be concerned about is not the victory of a resolution but the capacity to produce an organ which would be welcomed by everybody, which offers something to the people, which does not breathe a sense of exclusion and which does not create a system of castes among sovereign States. If there are States which have greater

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

This agency must be under the "aegis" of the United Nations. Of course, "aegis" is a little different from "framework", but it depends upon whether you put the frame from the top or whether it is lateral. At any rate, ^{Secretariat document} the/says that there are subsidiary organs of the United Nations and there are specialized agencies and that there are special bodies; and it goes on to point out how these relations can be established.

They are set out on page 10 of the document which was circulated last year, where it states:

"In the light of existing practices there are various methods which might be followed in negotiating and drafting a treaty establishing an international agency, whether that agency were to take the form of a specialized agency, or a 'special body'. The following basic methods will be considered:

"(a) drafting or approval of treaty by the General Assembly;"
(A/C.1/758, page 10).

Now we did not suggest that at any time.

"(b) drafting of treaty by inter-governmental conference called by the General Assembly (or by the Economic and Social Council); and

"(c) drafting of treaty by inter-governmental conference called by the sponsoring States without prior action by the United Nations." (Ibid).

In the intervening period from last year, in the context of the amended draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom, the United States and their colleagues, we have now very nearly reached the position set out in paragraph (c), that is "drafting of treaty by inter-governmental conference called by the sponsoring States without prior action by the United Nations". I am not at present going to debate this amended draft resolution in detail except to say that my delegation would consider, in the context of this Committee, that it would be a satisfactory result if the possibilities of setting out the relations between the United Nations and the agency provides for wide discussion somewhere else. Therefore, when the United States, in the amended draft resolution, proposes that there should be a world conference we not only welcome the idea but we think that this has met the position, in the present context, half way.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

detail, have merely stated that the relations between the agency and the United Nations must be of an integral character; that the General Assembly must be able to obtain its reports and the agency must be able to take back the proceedings of, and the discussions that take place in, the United Nations.

We were content to leave it there because that would have been a proclamation of the views of the Assembly in that it did not want to be at the distance of a foster-child and parent in this matter. I think, therefore, since this is going into the record, I would like to state what has already been stated, in another context through the appropriate channels, that the Government of India does not think that this important item of work which is concerned with a new era in our civilization should be anything but a unit connected integrally with the United Nations.

Again, since I am speaking for the record, I would like to say that it is not our intention to put forward such impractical suggestions as that the United Nations General Assembly could exercise the functions of a corporation or even of a parliament in the working of the agency. We not only believe but we think it is essential that the agency should be able to function from day to day to carry out its work, its control, its organization, its administration and everything else, as an autonomous body. But in so far as it is related to the United Nations, we think that the General Assembly is the appropriate body.

I do not want at this stage -- since it will come up in the discussions which take place during the next twelve months or the next six months or, if we are forced into it, at a later stage, which I hope will not be the case -- to argue and point out the various possibilities. Here may I say again, for the record, that the document produced by the Secretary-General's staff states that it is possible to have different types of agencies, and makes several suggestions in regard to this matter. In regard to the form and structure of the agency, it refers to the existing agencies within the framework of the United Nations. And here another point may be made: there is no reason for us to be so allergic to these words "within the framework of the United Nations", because they appear in regard to all the other agencies; they are all within the framework of the United Nations. They are included, in another form, in the statement made by the President of the United States to us when he said, as part of the principal observations he had to make, that

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

therefore assist the process of agreement on this matter if we left the character of this agency to further discussion outside the ambit of this Committee after the resolutions have been passed. To bring back the conception of the specialized agency is to put before us in this Committee a problem against which a large volume of opinion had been expressed, as Mr. Lodge said, last year.

But, if that is thought to be a purely negative attitude, my Government -- and I want to say this categorically here and now, because the revised draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom, the United States and others says that the proceedings of this committee will go into the hands of those who are to be the architects, or part-architects of this agency, which makes it necessary to speak for the record -- is opposed at present, and unless there are overwhelming considerations to the contrary, to establishing this agency as part of the Economic and Social Council as a specialized agency. We think its relations to the United Nations ought to be such that the General Assembly would receive its reports and the proceedings of the General Assembly would be communicated to it. We do not think that the relation between the General Assembly, or the United Nations as a whole, and this agency should be one of so remote a control as to come through the report of another of its organs. None of the arguments that have been adduced here -- the main one is that this should not be discussed with so many nations sitting around the table, -- is relevant. It is quite true that the Economic and Social Council consists of eighteen members, but those eighteen are elected by us on the basis of geographical and other representation. What is more, my Government cannot subscribe to the view that these matters -- which are matters which concern our sovereign Governments and for which we are responsible to our Parliaments and public opinion -- should be placed in a context in which there is some hostility to their public discussion.

We entirely subscribe to the view that the drafting of a statute by sixty or seventy people sitting round a table is a physical impossibility. We entirely subscribe to the view that, apart from the principles of the relations of an agency to the United Nations, an Assembly like this can do little. That is why our co-sponsors and ourselves, instead of labouring the point in any great

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

"What is now" -- that is, in the amended resolution -- "the second operative paragraph of section A has been amended to read:

'Suggests that, once the agency is established, it negotiate an appropriate form of agreement with the United Nations.'

"That paragraph brings us to one of the problems", he said, "that have received greatest attention during these debates:" -- and we all know that Mr. Lodge is a man of precise diction -- "the exact nature of the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. We" -- meaning the sponsors -- "had originally indicated that an appropriate form of agreement between the agency and the United Nations might be described as 'similar to those of the specialized agencies'. That language, as will be recalled, was in the original draft. We" -- again meaning the sponsors -- "had thought that these words were sufficiently flexible and that they would not prejudice the results of the negotiations to form the agency. But it became apparent during our discussion in this Committee that several delegations, including that of the Soviet Union, objected to this language. The change that we have now made eliminates the words 'similar to those of the specialized agencies'. Our reason for eliminating those words is to make it completely clear that the resolution will not prejudice the outcome of the negotiations to establish the agency. This change is acceptable to the interested delegations,..." (A/C.1/PV.722, pages 7 and 8)

This year, Senator Pastore, representative of the United States of America, also said:

"Of course, the final decision on the question of relationship does not rest with either the sponsoring Governments or the Secretary-General. It must be determined by the total membership of the agency, and the agreement on relationship which they propose must be approved by the General Assembly." (A/C.1/PV.765, page 11)

These are the words of the representative of the United States, which I am happy to quote.

Therefore, when we bring back the specialized agencies at this stage -- I repeat, at this stage -- of the debate, we are going back upon the decisions of last year; we are going back on the experience we can draw from the wisdom of the document which I have just quoted, which is now A/C.1/PV.758, and we would

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

When the resolution was introduced, both the United States and the United Kingdom particularly insisted upon the inclusion of the words "similar to those of the specialized agencies". The delegation of India moved the deletion of this phrase. We had considerable debate and, what is more, considerable conversation. The difference between a debate and a conversation appears to be that in one we try to reach agreement and in the other we proclaim our differences. What was the result? The result is set out in the statement made by distinguished representative of the United States of America, Mr. Cabot Lodge, on 18 November 1954.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

a success, to wishing it to go on, to requesting the relevant Committees of the United Nations to make the financial and other provisions for the furtherance of the work of the Advisory Committee, to retaining the Advisory Committee, and so on. Therefore, we would easily deal with that part unanimously. This does not mean that my delegation is at present persuaded that there are no ways of reconciling these two points of view. In fact, my delegation has -- and I say it with humility -- always believed that reconciliation is possible in all matters. The absence of reconciliation is a proclamation of the failure of human wisdom. We hope and we trust that we will find ways and means of arriving at unanimous resolutions on both these subjects and even on the point of whether the two separate issues are to be presented to the Committee as one or as two decisions. My delegation will not insist that a formal separation is necessary in order to maintain the substantial separation, but the substantial separation in so far as it is relevant to the progress of this work in the future is a matter on which the Committee will be commonly persuaded.

With regard to the agency, the resolution submitted by India and five other Governments contains some ideas which we think are basic. But because an idea is basic, that does not mean that it cannot find its place with other ideas that are basic. One of these basic ideas is that the relationship of the proposed agency, whenever it emerges, with the United Nations must be integral. In this connexion, I hope that the Chairman as well as the United Kingdom and United States delegations will forgive me if I refer for a moment to one aspect which I fear is controversial. As the Committee knows, I am an entirely non-controversial person, but if the topic is controversial, then I become part of the controversy.

It will be recalled that last year when this resolution was put forward the genius of the authors of the resolution introduced the words "similar to those of the specialized agencies". At that time the Secretary-General -- I hope not in a fit of absentmindedness -- told us that his establishment was making some research on this matter. We heard about it and asked whether it was really very secret or open to all. The Secretary-General, with his characteristic magnanimity and with his general desire, by force of habit, to produce more documents, provided us with what is called document A/2967. At our request this document has been circulated -- I hope at no further expense to the Secretariat.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

reserved to itself the right -- and I deliberately chose the words "reserves to itself the right" -- to raise this matter at any stage that may be appropriate. The appropriate moment has not yet arrived. Therefore it is not my desire at the present moment to go into the procedural aspects of this matter, but I am happy to see that the Committee as a whole is persuaded that whether these two aspects of the matter appear as two separate resolutions or not in form, in substance we must address ourselves to these matters separately in order to deal with them efficiently.

I am happy that the distinguished representative of Colombia, in his observations, has warmly supported this. He said:

"Perhaps we did not at first fully understand [the representative of India's] suggestion, because very often in the past we have discussed similar items together, but we feel that we should acknowledge today that this debate has proved that Mr. Menon was entirely right and that what we ought to do this year is to divide these two problems and to deal completely only with the aspect relating to the Geneva Conference [in one item], postponing the study of the setting up of an international agency." (A/C.1/PV.763, page 56)

We do not agree with him with regard to postponing the study of the setting up of an international agency, but we do agree with him necessarily in thinking that the decisions we are to make here, whatever their form, should be sufficiently self-contained as to enable them to be dealt with in the two fields of work that are open to us.

My delegation is happy to think also that with regard to the Conference itself the suggestion that has been put forward that the Advisory Committee should continue and that the Secretary-General should have the necessary assistance and machinery to carry it on has become generally accepted.

As I said, we reserve our position with regard to these resolutions and I have no desire to pursue the matter further. But the second resolution is more important. One of the reasons why we should keep the two resolutions separate is that there would be no argument with regard to the first. There would be no differences of opinion here with regard to welcoming the results of the Conference, to paying a tribute to those who were responsible for making it

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

So, while the Conference itself had nothing to do with the agency, was specifically stated to be of a technical character for savants in science -- there were only a few others for good measure -- there is very little doubt that this Conference has been a great landmark in the establishment of the atomic agency to be, which we all hope will come into being without delay.

This takes me to the last of the observations I have to make, and that is with regard to the agency itself. My Government not only shares the views of other Governments and delegations but supports with great enthusiasm and fervour the establishment of an international atomic energy agency. We expressed this last year and I hope I may say with humility that we made our own contribution to the reaching of unanimous decisions on this matter. As I have said, on 3 May and 8 August of this year we made requests to the Secretary-General which we hoped would assist in making progress in this field.

Reference has been made to a draft statute which has been circulated to Governments. My delegation proposes to refer to this draft statute only to the extent that it has been referred to and uncovered by its authors because the copy that I have -- the copy of the Government of India -- is marked "Confidential" on every paragraph. The fact that this statute has appeared in a local newspaper does not take away from us the sanctity of a confidential communication from another Government, and therefore we do not propose to discuss this statute in detail or to refer to any of its provisions except in so far as they have been referred to already by those who circulated it. But the fact that a draft statute has been circulated and that opinions have been asked for is a matter which we need no longer regard as confidential.

The Government of India has communicated to the Government of the United States its views on these matters. So far as we are concerned, there are two resolutions before the Assembly: one resolution dealing with the first part, namely, the Conference; and the other dealing with the agency. The Chairman may recall -- I made more than one intervention at the beginning of our discussion on this item -- that in the view of my delegation our debate deals with two separate items and therefore they should be treated separately, though observations may be made at the same time on both of them. He may recall that my delegation

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

level -- I think we would make considerable progress. Therefore, we should regard one of the greatest of the achievements of the Geneva Conference as contributing to human thinking and civilization, to human co-operation--this capacity not only of tolerance but of appreciation; and when we begin to offer and to receive appreciation that is merited for the work of different nations, we have then made a contribution which far exceeds the actual material advancement that is made in that field itself.

Finally, the great achievement of that Conference is something on which our Chairman of this Committee -- if he had, perhaps, been the Chairman of the Conference -- might regard as being out of order; that is, when we discussed this item last year, mainly on account of the insistence of those who sponsored the resolution, the item of the atomic agency was kept totally separate from the Conference. However, whether it was kept separate from the Conference merely on paper, or for the purpose of the record, no one can deny that one of the great contributions of this Conference has been made in giving fillip and a momentum to the work of the Agency itself; it has made patent the desire for its establishment.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

To this Conference, India contributed fourteen papers, nine of which were communicated orally. We are pleased to feel that they were of sufficient quality to permit this to be done.

Now, we come to the achievements of this Conference. My country feels that apart from all the material achievements and apart from all the knowledge which has been communicated, the Conference has been not only a great exercise in international co-operation, but also in contributing to that one great idea: namely, an open world. In lifting the veil of secrecy from atomic research and laying upon the table papers which, previously, were considered top secrets -- the revelation of the contents of which would have visited those responsible with severe punishments, if not charges of treason -- the result was that blueprints, material and information were exchanged; we believe that by this channel of information, this channel of international co-operation, where there is a great possibility of the meeting of minds, some remedy of the great sin--which humanity has committed against itself by imposing an embargo upon human knowledge quite contrary to the spirit of humanism altogether -- has been achieved in this field.

Reference has been made repeatedly to the spirit of co-operation that prevailed and in spite of the ideological differences of men and women who came there -- as a result of the differences in their backgrounds and civilizations -- their co-operation existed on a very large scale and, truly, in every sense it was an international conference.

Another of the great achievements of the Geneva Conference was the decision that emanated from itself, formal or otherwise, that its work should continue; that is to say, it set into motion a momentum -- a momentum which had life in itself and which did not necessarily require any push from outside. It was a momentum that was generated by knowledge, by the desire for endeavour and, what is more, by the men who contributed finding in each other the sense of fraternity and the sense of understanding.

It was also to be noted and placed on record that this Conference -- while scientists very properly vied with each other in what they had to tell each other and to tell the world as a whole -- was characterized by a spirit of recognition and merit and of generosity. If we could import some of this into the field of our political discussions -- whether at a high level or at a low

Now we come to the next item, which is the Conference at Geneva. It is the pleasant duty of my delegation to express the appreciation of our Government for the services that everyone has rendered in order to make this Conference a great success. Every delegation has spoken about the leadership of the Secretary-General and the co-ordination that he brought into this field, and of the Advisory Committee. We would like to mention, however, the names of Walter Whitman, the Secretary-General of the Conference, and of the Assistant Secretary-General, Mr. Vavilov, and also the twenty Secretaries who came from thirteen different countries -- again, another instance of international co-operation. We would also like to mention particularly the hard work of the members of the Secretariat, and, particularly, the members of the Geneva establishment for all their contributions in this direction.

We are happy to think that India was allowed to contribute to this Conference by providing its President. Once he became President, he belonged to the Conference and not to us and I am happy to feel that all delegations, and the world in general, has been good enough to accept his services and to acknowledge them. We in India are proud of our scientists, some of whom are no longer with us. Among them are three great pioneers, whom I take this specific occasion to mention: Dr. Bhatnagarand, who is one of our leading scientists who pioneered in the field of scientific enterprise and who is responsible, to a considerable extent, for laying the foundations of the Atomic Energy Commission; he is no longer with us. But the two others who were with him -- Dr. Bhabha and also the head of our National Physical Laboratory, Dr. Krishnan, are still among the great pioneers.

To Geneva, India sent eighteen scientists. I will not tax the patience of the Committee by reading out their names, except to say that they represented one each of the various divisions, such as physics, biology, engineering, nuclear physics, electronics, radio-chemistry, metallurgy and so forth -- in other words, eighteen of the various divisions concerned in this matter were represented. It is interesting to note that of the eighteen, the great majority are young men who have come up in the last seven or eight years. They have made a considerable contribution to Indian advancement and here, however, there was one name that stands out -- that is, Dr. Kanolkar who is the Director of Research at the Indian Cancer Research Centre and he was also the Chairman of the International Cancer Research Commission.

It is the intention of the Government of India, in co-operation with other countries, to set up one or more atomic power stations within the next five years. The Government of India has also decided to establish and has started work on its second fertilizer plant in the foothills of the Himalayas at a place called Bakra Nangal, where some of our great irrigation plants are located. This fertilizer plant will produce heavy water as a by-product. The plant will produce 70,000 tons of fixed nitrogen per annum in the shape of nitro-limestone and substantial quantities of heavy water annually.

In addition to this plant in Bakra Nangal two other fertilizer plants, possibly of the same size, are being built in other parts of India, and they will also produce heavy water.

What I have said here is enough for us to realize that nations -- not only the advanced industrial nations, but those of us who are the so-called under-developed countries -- are also making our contribution in the field of advances in atomic energy. There is one aspect, however, we want to mention in this matter to which my distinguished colleague from Canada has also referred. It is the policy and the intention of the Government of India that the facilities that are available either in our research stations or in our industrial establishments should be open to those others who are willing and able to come to India to make use of them, limited only by our own capacities of space and other facilities.

I would also like to mention that in addition to the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom, we have had co-operation in this field with Norway, Sweden, and some other countries. In the Institute of Fundamental Research and in our other scientific establishments, there are students from other parts of the world. It has also become part of the established practice in India that in addition to the international scientific conferences, in our large country with so many universities and scientific establishments, we have found it useful and expedient to have scientific conferences of our own in order to pool the experiences of our different scientists and to promote the desire and the pace of results.

Now that concludes the observations which I wished to make on the first limb of this item.

high-flux, high-power reactor, allows advanced experiments on the engineering aspects of atomic energy to be carried out. It is planned to start work on the foundations and the auxiliary installations of the second reactor early next year, in order that it can go into operation in 1957.

The United States of America -- with which we have, not a definite agreement, but co-operation -- has agreed to sell to India a definite quantity of heavy water necessary for this reactor. This, again, is another example of the friendly and real co-operation which exists between our country and the United States in the field of atomic energy, although there is no formal agreement.

staff of several hundred. The total staff of the Trombay establishment, therefore, comprises 1,400. Extensions to it are being built on a site of 800 acres of land, just outside the industrial centre of Bombay.

In the field of private industry, private enterprise is, very shortly, going to set up plants for the production of titanium and zirconium metal. Here, again, I should like to mention the achievements in the pioneering field by young scientists in India. A paper was communicated on this subject to the Geneva Conference by Dr. Prakash, one of our promising young men, on the new methods of purifying zirconium and preparing zirconium metal for use in reactors. These methods were reported to the Geneva Conference, and attracted considerable attention.

I come next to the question of reactors. The work on the building of the foundations for the first Indian reactor began early this year. We have not, however, waited for the completion of these buildings, and work is being carried on in temporary buildings at the present time; we are employing some 250 scientists and engineers on this work alone. I am happy to be able to inform this Committee that work on the construction of the first Indian reactor of the swimming-pool type has begun. And we are happy to say that, owing to the kind of co-operation that exists between our country and the United Kingdom, the fuel elements of this reactor will be supplied by the United Kingdom because we do not have a gaseous diffusion plant; but the other parts of this reactor will be built in India, and it will go into service in the **first half of 1956** -- probably by the end of April. This reactor will enable India to do experiments of a fundamental nature in physics, to produce isotopes, to train reactor engineers, to carry out further projects, and also to carry out research on shielding material. The reactor has been provided with special facilities to enable it to work at some ten times the usual flux for such reactors.

The largest of the undertakings in this field of reactors has come to us through the generosity and the co-operation of the Government of Canada -- this undertaking was referred to a few days ago by Mr. Paul Martin. The Government of India has decided to proceed with this project, which was offered to us by the Government of Canada, and to have a substantial part of the auxiliary equipment and the cooling system built by our own engineers of the atomic energy establishment. As Mr. Paul Martin said the other day, this NRX reactor, the

We turn now from material resources to that other resource without which no discovery and no endeavour can be successful, that is, men. One of the lessons we should have learned from the Industrial Revolution -- because the great industrial countries of that time were the pioneers in the Industrial Revolution -- is that the main export was not manufactured goods but rather that invisible export, services; unless we have **people** with technical skills, it will not be possible for us to advance. Our central institute of research is the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, which is supported by the Government, **and where** fundamental research in mathematics and nuclear science is carried out. This Institute, which is international in character in the sense that it has a large number of non-Indian students and research workers, and even non-Asian research workers, has 120 scientists, and it is planned to increase the strength of the establishment to 200 within the next two years. From this Institute have emerged several fundamental discoveries, of which I shall mention only one today: the discovery -- and this, again, was communicated in a paper -- of new elementary particles, or the establishment of new, hitherto unknown transformation processes which these particular particles undergo.

Work has been done recently on the detection of minute amounts of radioactive beryllium produced in the uppermost layers of the atmosphere by cosmic rays. The Committee may recall that, in the observations I made last year, I referred to the work on cosmic rays and the advances made, as it was the hope of our scientists at that time that one day it might be possible to split the atom by means of the cosmic ray. This discovery will enable us to obtain information of **great** value on the movement of minute particles in the atmosphere, information which is of value in studying the diffusion of radioactive material in the world. It will also provide us, in another field altogether, with methods of dating, of historical significance in geological work.

In order that research may go forward, the Government of India felt -- and we hope the Committee will agree, rightly so -- that the development of **further** research institutions was necessary. Therefore, in Trombay, outside of the city of Bombay, more laboratories with branches in physical, chemical, nucleo-chemical and metallurgical work have been established. They are all required for the development of atomic energy, and also for the erection of pilot engineering plants. This establishment in Trombay has 650 scientists, not to mention the supporting

Through these methods, which are no longer experimental, India has located deposits of uranium and thorium. The survey is at present small in relation to the vast area of India, but the successes that have already been established make us confident that many deposits remain to be discovered. But, taking into account only the known deposits having more than 0.1 per cent uranium, many thousands of tons of uranium have been located.

In regard to thorium, India is in a comparatively fortunate position. The monazite sands on the south-west coast of India, in Travencore and Cochin, are richer in thorium than the monazite sands in any other part of the world, and alone amount to some two million tons. In addition to these well-known deposits, during the last eighteen months the geological surveys have discovered other deposits of monazite, both on the north-west coast of India, and on the east, or Coromandel, coast. It should be mentioned that Indian monazite sands are remarkably rich in uranium ore, and contain no less than .04 per cent of uranium; they are therefore richer than the many uranium ores which are being worked in other parts of the world. I shall leave, for a moment, the reference to uranium deposits.

We come now to other methods for the extraction of uranium. Last year, we addressed ourselves to the use of copper ore in India for the extraction of uranium, **in order** to discover whether it could be worked economically. The Atomic Energy Commission constructed its own pilot plant, and they are now treating 200 tons of copper tailings per day in their own extraction plant, by processes worked out in the laboratory of the Atomic Energy Department. It is hoped that if this pilot plant is successful -- as we hope it will be -- by the end of next year it will be treating 1,000 tons of tailings per day.

With regard to the treatment of monazite itself, the **Government** of India has built a plant in the south of India for the treating of monazite sands, and it has been in operation for nearly a year. It treats several thousands of tons of monazite per annum. Another plant for carrying this process to a further state has been built outside the city of Bombay, and went into operation in July of this year. We take pride in stating that these plants have been built entirely by the Atomic Energy Department's own engineers, and their performance from the very beginning has been better than planned. This plant near Bombay can produce several hundred tons of pure thorium salt per annum, and a few tons of pure uranium. It is proposed shortly to add to these plants for producing thorium and uranium of atomic purity.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

as though we are pursuing this primarily or even substantially on a political basis but rather on a scientific, industrial and constructive basis. The Prime Minister is the head of this Ministry and is therefore the Minister for Atomic Energy.

The Department of Atomic Energy in India has its own geological survey with a staff of one hundred geologists and technicians whose time is exclusively devoted to the search for atomic minerals and this geological survey which formerly used the conventional methods of surveying the country with Geiger counters now has specially equipped vehicles with electronic instrumentation to make possible the survey of larger areas more expeditiously. Last year the Atomic Geological Survey of India made a further advance when they pressed into service helicopters and airplanes of the Indian Air Force and fitted them with scintillimeters for exploration. In addition to these conventional methods this geological survey has now developed a new method, devised by the staff of the Department of Atomic Energy, for locating surface deposits by studying radio-activity and the composition of the air. Particulars of this new method were communicated, in a paper, to the Geneva Conference last August and Dr. Bhabha informs us that it attracted considerable attention. It is of course possible for a country like India, with weather conditions which are comparatively stable-- and I assure you our sympathies go out to the United Kingdom in this matter-- where winds are regular over a large part of the country, to expect promising results.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

do not remember them with bitterness or with a sterile attitude of mind, but remember them in order that humanity may be saved from the consequences of this revolution in so far as its evil aspects are concerned, and turn it to more useful purposes.

It is also necessary for us to recall the conditions under which the masses of people in the industrial countries lived and worked at the beginning of the industrial revolution. In the great cotton areas of that time, babies of five and six and seven cleaned cotton in bathtubs. There were vast industrial abuses which were set right by the liberalism of those who were the pioneers of social revolution in those countries, as well as by the protests of the working classes. So, in this stage, when we are discussing these matters of resolutions and so on, I hope you will forgive me if I refer to two matters. First of all, in any arrangements that we make in the future, there must be equity as between nation and nation, and there must be equity as between the social groups inside a country. It is necessary for an atomic energy agency that is created hereafter to have in the forefront the idea of the protective conditions that those who work in the atomic field must have in view of the grave consequences and the ominous burdens they undertake.

I proceed to deal with the next aspect of this limb of the item to which I have referred already, following the example of other countries. In the observations I submitted to the Assembly last year on 17 November, which are to be found in document A/C.1/PV.720, at the 720th meeting of this Committee, I referred to the advances in the scientific field which had been made in India, beginning with the early part of the century. It is not my desire to go back over that ground again but to deal with only the atomic field. The Atomic Energy Commission was established in 1948 but on 3 August 1954 the Government of India created a separate Ministry of Atomic Energy with the full powers of other Ministries to pursue actively and energetically the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Now it is an article of faith with us and a practice from which we hope we shall never depart that the pursuit of knowledge in this field and all of our enterprises connected with it are restricted to peaceful uses. Dr. Bhabha, who presided over the Conference in Geneva, is the Secretary to the Government of India for this new department so that it is not

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

In the creative field -- since it is not appropriate for me to deal with the other aspects at this time and we hope we will have an opportunity when the Conference of the Foreign Ministers at Geneva is over to deal with them -- I should like to say at the present stage, even though that debate will take place later, that our position in regard to this matter in the field of disarmament remains unchanged as my delegation mentioned during the general debate, that is, that our country stands for the total prohibition of the use of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction. In the creative field, as I said a while ago, we see here the dawn of a new epoch of revolution, a revolution of vast economic and social consequences, and I think it is useful at this stage and relevant to what I shall say a little later, to recall a few facts in connexion with the previous age of the industrial revolution. That age saw the production of machine tools and all those things that make an industrial revolution possible by a few countries in the world. That age saw what in history has been called the dawn of the Napoleonic era, both of glory and of industrial advance. The West, mainly the countries of the United Kingdom and later of Western Europe, supplied to the world the machine tools, the engineers and the techniques. They drew raw materials from great parts of the world and, what is more, found in those parts of the world a market for their finished goods, thus dividing the world in the economic system, broadly speaking, into two camps -- those who manufactured from the raw materials, those who produced the raw materials and at the same time became, to a very considerable extent, the consumers. That period, and the period prior to that, saw great changes in agriculture in metropolitan countries which were industrial as well as in countries like ours, but even more in the unexplored areas of the world, which led to the establishment or rather to the creation of the institutions of forced labour and slavery and indentured labour in many parts of the world.

It also led not to the discovery of new land, which had already been done before, but to the sharing out of these unexplored parts of the world between the great Powers who were the pioneers in the industrial revolution, and those who came after them. These are historical facts which have a strong bearing upon the attitude that countries like ours have in their approach to the present problem. It is our view that we may not forget these experiences and yet we

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

This position -- the search for energy in this field -- has been forced upon us by two factors. First of all, the fact that human knowledge progresses by such impelling forces that humanity searches after new facts in the discovery of what we call the secrets of nature, which is another word for the comparative ignorance of mankind, and also because in the world today the standards of living are progressing and this increase in the standards of living bears a direct relation -- is in direct ratio -- to the consumption of energy in the world. We have been told by the President of the Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy that at the present rate of consumption, the available sources of energy would be used up in less than a century. We are also told that if all the nations of the world were to consume the quantity of energy that is now consumed by the most advanced industrial nation of the world -- the United States of America -- even the present atomic fuel would be exhausted within the next three and a half centuries. That is one set of facts.

The other set of facts is that -- strange as it may seem but as often happens in human affairs -- we have had to learn from the occurrence of calamity ways to turn that calamity to useful purposes. The dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and, what is more, all that has followed since as a result of the rivalry between the great, powerful nations in atomic armament on either side and the threat it holds out to the world, have created the urge to find more and more methods of exploiting and harnessing this energy. And not necessarily as a by-product but, due to the mentality of the scientists and others, and the large resources that have been thrown into this field by powerful Governments, the work in the field of the uses of atomic energy for war, or potentially war purposes, has also turned our attention to its development for peaceful purposes.

So far as our present endeavour is concerned, as I said a while ago, twenty-two months ago to be exact this matter was brought to our attention in its present form by the President of the United States. Since then we have been addressing ourselves to it, in its procedural, organizational and political aspects.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

We also recognize that any approach we make to this problem -- any endeavour we make in this field -- cannot be restricted to its national frontiers. This is so not only in the destructive field, where the possession of atomic destructive weapons -- either potentially destructive or actually so -- is of consequence to people who are far removed from it; and if the brief experience of the world in this field is of any value, probably more ominously of concern to those who are far away from it.