

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 771st
MEETING**

Thursday, 27 October 1955,
at 3 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 18:

Peaceful uses of atomic energy (*continued*):

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

Page

81

Chairman: Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand).

AGENDA ITEM 18

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

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

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that some conversations of importance were proceeding outside the Committee and suggested that, if there was no objection, the Committee should recess for a short while.

The meeting was suspended at 3.20 p.m. and resumed at 3.45 p.m.

2. Mr. MENON (India) stated that the delegation of India shared with other delegations the desire to bring the debate on the item before the Committee to a close as early as possible. It was necessary, however, to make certain observations for purposes of the record and in order to satisfy the obligations of the Indian delegation to the co-sponsors of its draft resolutions (A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2, and A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2).

3. Referring to section A of the Indian amendments (A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1), Mr. Menon said that the addition proposed by his delegation in paragraph 2 had been incorporated in the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) as operative paragraph 2 of part A, and therefore no vote on it was required. The amendment had been put forward because of the importance to civilization of the achievement of the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in dispelling secrecy in atomic matters.

4. Paragraph 3 of the amendments was to some extent covered by paragraph 6 of part A of the joint draft resolution and for that reason was withdrawn.

5. Paragraph 4 of the amendments had been included with the sole object of avoiding further limitation of the

functions of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee by specific references to consultations with the specialized agencies. The delegation of India had now no objection to leaving the matter as it stood and would therefore withdraw that amendment.

6. With the redrafting of the joint draft resolution, paragraph 5 of the Indian amendments had lost its relevance and was withdrawn.

7. Referring to part B of the joint draft resolution and to the relevant amendments submitted by India, Mr. Menon stated that he was grateful to the sponsors of the joint draft resolution for having accepted the two Indian amendments contained in paragraph 1 (a) and (d) of section B. In the view of the Indian delegation, while the peaceful uses and the war use of atomic energy were related, so far as the present discussion was concerned they were two separate propositions. The first two paragraphs of the preamble of the revised joint draft resolution, the second of which contained the words "will serve only the peaceful pursuits of mankind and ameliorate their living conditions", covered to a certain extent the omission from the draft resolution of a reference to atomic weapons. The first paragraph, as the representative of the United States had stated (770th meeting), was merely a reaffirmation of resolution 810 (IX).

8. Sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 1 of the Indian amendments were of a character to make the paper read well and could therefore be withdrawn.

9. Similarly, the Indian delegation now accepted the relevant phraseology of the joint draft resolution and would withdraw its amendment in paragraph 2.

10. With regard to paragraph 4 of its amendments, the substance of sub-paragraph (a) had been incorporated in the revised text of the joint draft resolution, while sub-paragraph (b) had been incorporated in somewhat different language. The Indian delegation had no objection to the phraseology used in the revised joint draft resolution.

11. Paragraph 6 of the Indian amendments had also been incorporated in the revised text of the joint draft resolution.

12. Returning to paragraph 3 of section B of the Indian amendments, Mr. Menon stated that the Indian delegation would have liked to embody that paragraph in the joint draft resolution as a suggestion by the General Assembly that the group of sponsoring countries be established on an expanded basis, while leaving the present sponsoring countries the freedom to negotiate with suitable countries concerning their joining the sponsoring group. Since, however, the revised joint draft resolution provided for further negotiations by sponsoring Governments, the Indian delegation accepted the wording of the revised draft resolution.

13. With regard to the nature of the proposed conference on the final text of the statute of the International

Atomic Energy Agency, Mr. Menon expressed the view that the conference must be a deliberative one, at which, through the process of negotiation, conciliation and consultation, a meeting of minds would result that would in turn bring about agreement likely to command world-wide acceptance of the draft statute of the Agency. The explanations that had been given with respect to the character of the conference on the final text of the statute had removed his doubts on that point, and the delegation of India was able to record its vote in favour of the revised joint draft resolution without requiring an alteration in its wording. While the wording of the joint draft resolution might still be liable to misinterpretation, the Indian delegation had no doubt that the words "final text" in paragraph 2 of part B of the joint draft resolution meant, in the first instance, that the text was final in relation to the negotiating group which would present it to the conference. Secondly, the words "final text" with regard to the conference meant the final text of the statute which would emerge from the conference.

14. The Indian delegation hoped that its interpretation of part B, paragraph 2, of the joint draft resolution would be confirmed as correct in the course of the debate by the representative of the United Kingdom, who had been the first among the sponsors to try to explain to it the meaning of that paragraph. However, whether that was done or not, the position of the Indian delegation was that, in view of the fact that the proceedings of the General Assembly on the subject would be transmitted to the bodies concerned in the future work of the International Atomic Energy Agency, it was now satisfied that it could accept the present wording of the joint draft resolution.

15. Turning to the draft resolution submitted by the USSR (A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1), Mr. Menon stated that, in the opinion of the Indian delegation, the substance of that draft was now incorporated for the major part in the revised joint draft resolution; it should thus be possible not to press it to the vote, but to let it stand on the record.

16. The Indian delegation reserved its position with regard to certain of the amendments submitted by the USSR (A/C.1/L.136), because it did not think they inhibited in any way the unanimity or the agreement that might be reached.

17. With regard to the amendments submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135), the delegation of India would also like to reserve its position.

18. Referring to the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2, and A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2, Mr. Menon stated that if, after consultation, the other sponsors of those draft resolutions were also satisfied that the revised joint draft resolution met the points they had in mind, he hoped they would be able to withdraw them.

19. As a result of its conversations with the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2), particularly the representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States, the delegation of India was now in a position to support the joint draft resolution. The consideration of the item before the Committee could be concluded with a proclamation, on the one hand, that the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency should go forward, that atomic energy should be used for peaceful purposes only and that the Agency's functions should not be diverted to any other purpose; and, on the other hand, that a wider degree of

work having the character of a prolegomenon should take place in time to come.

20. Finally, Mr. Menon emphasized his Government's view that there was need for a greater degree of concentration in the interval before the convening of the proposed conference, so that its work might be brought to a speedy conclusion. After referring to the alterations which had been accepted by the original sponsors of the draft resolution in a spirit of understanding, Mr. Menon commended the revised joint draft resolution to the unanimous support of the Committee.

21. The CHAIRMAN stated that, in the light of the statement made by the representative of India, and failing an indication to the contrary during the course of the debate, he would presume that the other representatives who, together with the representative of India, had sponsored the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2, and A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2, would withdraw their proposals and not ask for them to be put to the vote.

22. He called the attention of the Committee to the addition by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2 of the following as paragraph 7 of part B:

"Suggests that the International Atomic Energy Agency, when established, consider the desirability of arranging for an international periodical devoted to the peaceful uses of atomic energy."

23. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia) pointed out that, in the deliberations of the Committee, the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had done their utmost to meet, and to accommodate themselves to, the different views which had been expressed in the course of the debate. He shared the desire for unanimity, but the sponsors had gone as far in point of substance as was possible. He hoped that the joint draft resolution could be carried unanimously and that the nations which had put forward amendments thereto would see fit to withdraw them.

24. For the amendments submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135), Sir Percy expressed sympathy because, while in the United Nations the voice of the smaller nations might be heard, it was not sufficiently represented in some of the specialized agencies. He believed, however, that, although there were many nations which could contribute greatly to the work of the negotiating group, a stage had been reached when further expansion would only create new problems. For that reason he hoped that the representatives of Pakistan and the Philippines would not pursue their amendments any further. In that connexion, he remarked that such expressions as "the under-developed countries", "the haves" and "the have-nots" should be avoided in the United Nations because of their overtones and possibilities of misunderstanding. Each nation had something that other nations had not, and most nations were in some degree under-developed.

25. The amendments submitted by the USSR (A/C.1/L.136), Sir Percy stated, introduced matters of a very controversial nature which he hoped the majority of representatives would agree were not appropriate to inject into the debate.

26. With regard to the view taken by the representative of India concerning paragraph 2 of part B of the joint draft resolution, Sir Percy stated that it was clear that a final text must emerge as a result of the negotiating group's efforts to arrive at the highest common denominator of agreement in discussions with the various

nations seeking to join the International Atomic Energy Agency. Unsettled questions of detail and principle would be left to the proposed conference, which would have before it a draft which every nation, except in so far as it had voluntarily committed itself beforehand, would be at complete liberty to discuss. He hoped, however, that, by the time the conference was convened, a large measure of the work would have been done and agreed upon.

27. Although it was very proper for a representative on the Committee to express his views as to what interpretation was to be placed upon a particular clause of a draft resolution before the Committee, it was not the view of any delegation which prevailed; it must in the end be the meaning of the language which emerged from the resolution as finally adopted. Sir Percy stressed, however, that in the particular case before the Committee, the interpretation which had been placed upon the draft resolution by the representative of India agreed with his own.

28. Sir Percy suggested that, if the joint draft resolution sponsored by the eighteen Powers were adopted, it might not be necessary to proceed to consider the other substantive draft resolutions which were, in truth, alternatives.

29. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom) said that the statement of the representative of India voicing approval of the eighteen-Power draft resolution was an encouraging step on the road to unanimity. As the first of the sponsors to have spoken about the character of the conference referred to in paragraph 2 of part B of the draft resolution, he was happy to respond to the two questions addressed to him by the representative of India. In the light of his explanation of the intentions of the sponsors at the 769th meeting, he was sure that the representative of India would recognize that the answer to his questions was in the affirmative.

30. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) recalled that during the general debate (762nd meeting) his delegation had formulated certain reservations regarding the first draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.1/L.129). When those two delegations introduced the first revised draft of their proposal (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.1), his delegation was deeply impressed by the spirit of conciliation that had moved them to make far-reaching amendments in their draft. His delegation had realized that in the circumstances it could not expect more than a reasonable approximation to the views of others, and had agreed to become a co-sponsor. Subsequently, in the light of the amendments submitted by India (A/C.1/L.134/Rev.1) and the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.136), a third draft (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) was submitted. His delegation sincerely believed that the last product of the joint efforts of such a great number of delegations was the optimum that could be achieved in the way of incorporating into one single document as many as possible of the ideas held by the various groups. He would ask those of his fellow representatives who might wish to have some further alterations included to place the importance of a clear demonstration of universal solidarity in the present momentous matter above their desire for perfection.

31. He would agree with the representative of India that the present wording of paragraph 2 of part B of the eighteen-Power draft resolution might leave room for doubt on the question whether the conference would have the right to consider, discuss and propose amendments to the text placed before it. However, his dele-

gation was prepared to accept the explanations given by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada at the 769th and 770th meetings. It was relieved and gratified that the Indian delegation was also satisfied in this respect.

32. With regard to the first two amendments proposed by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.136), his delegation shared the view of the United Kingdom delegation that they would introduce an element of controversy which it had been decided to leave out of resolution 810(IX). As to the third Soviet amendment, his delegation considered that paragraph 5 of part B of the draft resolution ensured that the study of the relationship between the Agency and the United Nations would cover all its possible forms. His delegation would like to see a close relationship established and felt that the proposed study would provide the best basis for an informed discussion on the subject.

33. Although his delegation sympathized with the understandable desire of various groups of countries to participate in the negotiations, its realization of the necessity not to expand the negotiating group beyond reasonable limits compelled it to withhold its vote from the amendments proposed by Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135) and by Czechoslovakia (A/C.1/L.137).

34. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deemed it essential to offer some clarification of the amendments submitted by his delegation (A/C.1/L.136). In the opinion of his delegation, the general directive in its third proposed amendment, that to paragraph 5 of part B of the joint draft, on the nature of the relationship between the Agency and the United Nations, would facilitate and render more fruitful the work of the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General on that matter. The representative of the United States had (770th meeting) taken exception to that amendment on the ground that it would in some way commit the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to a particular point of view. However, the point of view would be that of the General Assembly and it was therefore important to accept it.

35. The majority of delegations had expressed their opinion that the relationship should be the closest possible, and no objections thereto had been put forward. It was therefore quite natural that clear instructions should be given to the Advisory Committee and to the Secretary-General so that they would be guided by the consensus of the representatives. The Secretary-General had stated (770th meeting) that he did not consider the question of the relationship an easy one and emphasized that he could not assume the task of interpreting the proposals of various delegations. The problem was of concern to the United Nations as a whole and could not be solved by the Secretary-General alone. The Secretary-General was entitled to expect the General Assembly to express its views. The position of the delegation of the Soviet Union on the interpretation of the phrase "within the framework of the United Nations" had been clearly set forth in its statement in the First Committee (768th meeting) and in the memorandum of the Government of the Soviet Union to the United States Government dated 3 October.

36. The representative of the United States had also opposed the second Soviet amendment, that the conference should include all States, on the ground that the question of participation in the conference had already been settled at the ninth session. That, however, was inaccurate since the General Assembly at that time had

only decided upon membership in the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. No decisions had been taken on the question of participation in future conferences. The Committee should take into account the changes in international life which had occurred since the ninth session and the new problems which would confront future scientific conferences. Account should also be taken of the position of a number of delegations that all States should have an opportunity to participate in the conference which would deal with the statute of the Agency, irrespective of their membership in any other international organization.

37. His delegation had proposed the publication of an international periodical on the peaceful uses of atomic energy but was prepared to accept the wording of paragraph 7 which had been added to the eighteen-Power draft resolution.

38. Mr. Hsioh-Ren WEI (China) said that the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) was on the whole satisfactory to his delegation. It welcomed particularly the explicit declaration of the sponsors regarding the conference on the statute of the Agency. The present version of paragraph 2 of part B was satisfactory to him. If there was any question, however, he would suggest the deletion of the words "the final text of" in that paragraph.

39. The responsibility of the General Assembly with respect to the Agency was to determine the proper relationship between the Agency and the United Nations. The position of his delegation on the question was the same as that stated in General Assembly resolution 810 (IX), namely, that once the Agency was established, it should negotiate an appropriate form of agreement with the United Nations. His delegation endorsed paragraph 5 of part B of the eighteen-Power draft resolution, but did not interpret it to mean that the conference on the statute alone would determine the relationship. For the present, therefore, his delegation would vote against any proposals attempting to determine the relationship. He would vote against the third amendment of the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.136) as prejudging and prejudicing the work of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee instead of facilitating it.

40. If the other sponsors of the draft resolution contained in documents A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2 did not withdraw it, he would have to vote against the operative paragraph 2.

41. With regard to the eighteen-Power draft resolution, he hoped that the word "scientific" could be deleted in paragraph 6 of part A. He had been the first to point out in the general debate (759th meeting) the importance of the social and economic aspects. A number of other representatives had expressed similar views. Although he did not insist that the second world conference must take up those aspects of atomic energy, he felt that the word "scientific" would limit the scope of both the world conference and all the technical conferences to be convened by the specialized agencies.

42. He was not sure that paragraph 3 of part B was really necessary. The General Assembly had not approved the original negotiating Powers. Moreover, the Soviet Union had always been considered one of the Governments concerned, and the conference to be convened on the statute would consist not only of the Members of the United Nations, but also those of the specialized agencies.

43. His Government fully supported the initiative of the United States in preparing a draft statute and the

procedure it had adopted. However, if the General Assembly was to express any opinion on the composition of the group of negotiating Powers which would prepare the draft statute, his delegation felt that both the "haves" and the "have-nots" should be duly represented. In that respect, his delegation had sympathy for the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135). If that and other amendments to paragraph 3 were withdrawn, his delegation was prepared to accept that paragraph in spite of the difficulty. Otherwise, he would seriously consider whether there was any necessity for it.

44. The purpose of the first two amendments of the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.136) was obvious. Similar proposals had been overwhelmingly rejected before. The evidence showed that the conference and the Agency could work out smoothly if unnecessary political complications were not introduced. The amendments should therefore be rejected.

45. He was glad that the sponsors had suggested a new paragraph regarding a periodical on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. As a scientist, he knew the difficulty of publishing such a periodical. He wished to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Secretariat had contributed much by the publication of bulletins on atomic terminology in different languages and the bibliography of material on the scientific and other aspects of atomic energy. He only regretted that the latter publication was very often out of date.

46. Mr. POLLERI CARRIO (Uruguay) felt that, although superhuman efforts had been made to harmonize the different points of view in order to achieve a unanimous agreement, there were still some secondary points that required comment. First, the two operative parts of the eighteen-Power draft resolution as constituted at present might, under certain circumstances, give rise to some difficulties. The fact that the Agency might be set up in the near future and that it might be possible to organize the conference referred to in part A, paragraph 4, in consultation with the Agency, could not be overlooked. Some additional effort should be made to contemplate that possibility and to provide for it. Secondly, it was provided in part B that the Assembly would welcome the intention of certain Governments without specifying which Governments were meant. That ambiguity should be removed in the final text, either by indicating which Governments were meant or in any way that might be satisfactory.

47. Mr. PASTORE (United States of America) wished to say, with regard to the views expressed at the 770th meeting by the representatives of the Philippines and Pakistan, that he could assure them and any others who might share their anxiety that the negotiating Governments would pay due regard to their views. The fact that the negotiating group had already been expanded showed that they desired to ensure that all points of view would be expressed in the group.

48. In conclusion, he reiterated his earlier expression of faith in the United Nations and expressed the wish to pay homage to the United Nations for the high quality of the debate in the proper spirit which had transpired on this very important item and the spirit in which it had been conducted.

49. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) found that, after the statement of the representative of the United States, it was quite unnecessary to make any further defence of the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135) or even to press them. He took that statement as a record of the intentions of the negotiating group and

regarded the purpose of the amendments as fulfilled. The purpose had not been to make a list of the members of the negotiating group, but to leave it to the good sense of the group to expand its membership as necessary. Since that assurance had been received, the delegations of the Philippines and Pakistan did not wish to press their amendments.¹ As already indicated, the Pakistan delegation would give full support to the eighteen-Power draft resolution.

50. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma), in taking the floor for the first time in the debate, wished to join in the general acclaim which had greeted the results of the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, and to offer his congratulations to all who had participated in and guided the Conference, particularly the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee and Mr. Bhabha. Since his delegation felt sure that the beneficial results of the Conference had by no means been confined to the purely technical field, his delegation gave its whole-hearted support in principle to part A of the eighteen-Power draft resolution. The only reservation it had on that part was with regard to paragraph 5. Believing that much was to be gained by giving the following conference a truly universal character by opening it to all States, it would support the Soviet Union amendment (A/C.1/L.136) to that paragraph.

51. On paragraph 2 of part B, his delegation had entertained serious doubts. Although it would have preferred the inclusion of the words "to decide" or "to determine" or "to establish" before the words "the final text", his delegation would not press the suggestion in view of the assurances given by several representatives. He wished, however, to make it perfectly clear that he would vote for that paragraph only on the understanding that the final text would in fact be decided, determined or established at the conference. Although he understood the purpose of the sponsors to be that as much as possible of the draft statute should be worked out through bilateral negotiations before the conference, that would not change the position that it was the conference which would decide the final text.

52. In connexion with paragraph 3 of part B, he recalled that he had appealed a year previously (723rd meeting) for Asian and Latin American representation in the negotiating group. He therefore welcomed the belated recognition of what he believed had been a serious misjudgement concerning the international character of the sponsoring group. Although even the expanded negotiating group was not entirely satisfactory, his delegation would accept it in the interests of obtaining unanimity.

53. The vast difference between the original draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129) and its second revision showed how far the original sponsors had moved to meet the point of view of other members of the Committee. Yet the difference was a disturbing indication of a wide gulf

¹ The amendments submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135) to the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) read as follows:

"1. After paragraph 3 of part B, add the following as paragraph 4:

"*Recommends* that the present sponsoring Governments also invite a few under-developed countries which may not at present have atomic materials and advanced scientific knowledge and equipment to participate with them in the aforesaid negotiations;"

"2. Renumber paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 as 5, 6 and 7, respectively."

between the major atomic Powers and the others, even though a unanimous resolution on the subject had been adopted the previous year. He could only trust that such fundamental differences had now been buried since the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy was one in which the closest co-operation among all nations on a basis of equality and mutual trust would best serve the interests of all.

54. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) said that the draft resolution to be adopted by the Committee was of vast significance since it would be the directive to the sponsoring Governments, the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General as to the direction in which the work with regard to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency should proceed. There were two outstanding issues which called for further efforts to reach an understanding: the relationship of the Agency with the United Nations and the membership in the Agency. Since the effectiveness of the Agency would be proportionate to the number of States comprising it, the laying down of conditions of admissibility to membership was undesirable. Universality should be the hallmark of the Agency, since its operations would impinge upon questions of vital importance in the development of all States and peoples. His delegation therefore supported the Soviet Union amendments (A/C.1/L.136) with regard to membership in the Agency and to participation in the second conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

55. Almost every representative who had spoken in the debate had voiced a desire for the closest possible connexion between the Agency and the United Nations. Discussion had revolved around the phrase "within the framework of the United Nations" in paragraph 3 of the Soviet amendments; its incorporation in the joint draft resolution was essential as reflecting the spirit of the entire debate.

56. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) stated, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2, that, after the vote on the eighteen-Power draft resolution—which they hoped would be unanimous—they would not press for a vote on their two draft resolutions.

57. The Yugoslav delegation regretted that there still existed three categories of States: Members of the United Nations, non-members of the United Nations but members of the specialized agencies, and non-members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies—a situation which it hoped would be remedied in the near future. The proposed International Atomic Energy Agency should be open to all States; any other decision would be open to the unintended interpretation that some States were to be excluded from membership in the specialized agencies. The Yugoslav delegation would vote in favour of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Soviet Union amendments (A/C.1/L.136). Indeed, the future conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy should be even broader in scope.

58. His delegation had always held the view that a close relationship should exist between the United Nations and the proposed Agency. It would favour the inclusion of that view in a resolution, but it had some difficulty in supporting the third Soviet Union amendment to include it in paragraph 5 of part B as part of a request to the Secretary-General. In the light of the explanation given by the latter, and of the context of the paragraph, his delegation would abstain from the vote on the third

Soviet amendment. He wished to make it clear that his delegation's support for the eighteen-Power draft resolution was not qualified by the fate of any amendment to it.

59. Before concluding, he wished to express his delegation's gratification that the noble words of the President of the United States (470th plenary meeting) had remained alive throughout all the difficulties of negotiation and debate. He wished to thank the representative of the United States and all others who had contributed to the improvement of the original draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.129.

60. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) recalled that, in connexion with paragraph 6 of part A of the eighteen-Power draft resolution, he had suggested (769th meeting) that it might be better directly to invite the specialized agencies to convene scientific-technical conferences rather than to invite them to consult with the Secretary-General. On behalf of his delegation and certain others which had requested him to speak for them, he would like it to be noted in the record of the meeting that they felt that the specialized agencies should consider that matter and should be asked to convene the technical conferences.

61. Secondly, with regard to paragraph 5 of part B, he felt that the results of the study by the Secretary-General should be transmitted not only to the Governments concerned, but to all Members of the United Nations so that they might consider them before the proposed conference. He would like to ask the Secretary-General whether the document resulting from the study would be distributed only to the Governments concerned or to all Member States.

62. The CHAIRMAN stated in regard to the first point made by the representative of Ecuador that his remarks would be on record in the verbatim records of the Committee. He called upon the Secretary-General for a statement in regard to the second point.

63. The SECRETARY-GENERAL stated that it was his understanding that a document prepared by him under a mandate from the General Assembly would automatically be an official United Nations document unless there was a special provision that it was to be something else. He did not regard the proposed mandate as containing such a qualification. The request to submit the document to the group of Governments concerned would be reflected in two ways: first, it would be addressed to the Governments concerned; secondly, it would be presented for debate and consideration within that group.

64. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) shared the hope and desire of the representative of Australia, who had appealed for unanimity and had asked for an end to the use of such terms as "under-developed" and "have-nots". However, the facts being what they were, the use of those terms could not be helped. He could not understand why no wording could be adopted to meet the demand of the representative of India for a legitimate explanation which could be accepted by everyone. The fact that four Powers had been invited to become sponsors before the matter came before the Committee lent support to the argument of the representative of India that it might be found that all questions had been settled before the proposed conference met. He would have liked to support the amendments of Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135) for the inclusion of several States from among the "have-nots". However, he appreciated the spirit shown by them in withdrawing the amendments out of a desire for unanimity.

65. Mr. MARTIN (Canada) was certain that it was a matter of great satisfaction to all delegations, and particularly to the representative of the Soviet Union, that the latter's proposal (A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1, para.6) for the establishment of an international periodical was to receive the consideration warranted by its importance.

66. The Committee had had time to study the Secretary-General's comments (770th meeting) on how he would be inclined to interpret the provision that the Agency should be established within the framework of the United Nations. It was not proper to try to pre-empt the results of the study which the Secretary-General would be asked to undertake. Having heard the Secretary-General's own interpretation, he would suggest that the Committee could reasonably leave it to Mr. Hammarskjöld to make the study without seeking further to qualify or modify that undertaking.

67. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Czechoslovakia whether he maintained his amendment since the amendments proposed by Pakistan and the Philippines had been withdrawn.

68. Mr. KAISR (Czechoslovakia) withdrew his amendment (A/C.1/L.137).²

69. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to proceed to the vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (A/C.1/L.129/Rev.2) and the amendments thereto.

70. He put to the vote the preamble of the draft resolution.

The preamble was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 1 to 4 of part A.

The paragraphs were adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

72. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first Soviet Union amendment (A/C.1/L.136), relating to paragraph 5 of part A.

The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.

73. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 5 of part A to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 6 and 7 of part A.

The paragraphs were adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 1 of part B to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

76. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second Soviet Union amendment (A/C.1/L.136), relating to paragraph 2 of part B.

² The Czechoslovakian amendment (A/C.1/L.137) to the amendments submitted by Pakistan and the Philippines (A/C.1/L.135) read as follows:

"In paragraph 1, after the words 'Recommends that the present sponsoring Governments also invite' insert the words 'some other countries including . . .'"

The amendment was rejected by 33 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.

77. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of part B.

The paragraph was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 3 and 4 of part B.

The paragraphs were adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third Soviet Union amendment (A/C.1/L.136), relating to paragraph 5 of part B.

The amendment was rejected by 40 votes to 11, with 8 abstentions.

80. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 5 of part B to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 6 and 7 of part B.

The paragraphs were adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

82. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.1/L.132/Rev.1) remained before the Committee.

84. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not press for a vote on its draft resolution, although some of its provisions had not been incorporated in the draft resolution adopted by the Committee. His delegation had voted in favour of the eighteen-Power draft resolution as a whole inasmuch as it contained no provisions unacceptable to his delegation. However, it adhered to the position set forth when it had submitted amendments to the eighteen-Power draft resolution.

85. His delegation considered that only the achievement of agreement on the prohibition of the atomic weapon would make it possible to utilize atomic energy entirely for peaceful purposes and to create proper conditions for fruitful international co-operation in that field. It also felt that participation in international scientific conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy and in the proposed Agency should be open to all States. Moreover, it firmly adhered to the view that the proposed Agency should be established within the framework of the United Nations.

86. Mr. MATES (Yugoslavia) wished to make it clear for the record that, having in mind rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the co-sponsors of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.130 and Add.1 and 2 and A/C.1/L.131 and Add.1 and 2 had intended not to press for a vote on those proposals after the result of

the vote on the eighteen-Power draft resolution. This was not the same thing as withdrawing the proposals.

87. Mr. QUIROGAGALDO (Bolivia) said that his delegation had been happy to vote in favour of the eighteen-Power draft resolution since it considered that that draft would apply President Eisenhower's generous suggestion. It had, however, supported the Soviet Union amendment to paragraph 5 of part B because, once the mystery surrounding nuclear discoveries had been removed, any discrimination as to participation in future conferences dealing with that important item should be avoided.

88. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) inquired whether explanations of vote could be offered at the following meeting.

89. The CHAIRMAN said he would prefer to have them at the current meeting and to complete the consideration of the item.

90. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) moved for adjournment.

91. The CHAIRMAN put the motion for adjournment to the vote.

The motion was rejected by 13 votes to 7, with 29 abstentions.

92. Mr. HANIFAH (Indonesia) stated that he would prefer to explain his vote the following morning.

93. Mr. ARENALES CATALAN (Guatemala) said that a question of courtesy on the part of the Committee was involved. The Committee could hear other explanations of vote at the meeting and permit the representative of Indonesia to explain his vote the following day, since it had not decided that explanations of vote must end at the current meeting.

94. Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) felt that the Committee should complete consideration of the item and further decide on the order of the items to be considered at later meetings. He suggested that it next consider item 3 of the Committee's agenda [59*], and then item 4 [19*]. Discussion of the priority of other items might be deferred.

95. After a procedural discussion in which the CHAIRMAN and Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador), Mr. BELLAUNDE (Peru) and Mr. MENON (India) took part, Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) explained that he had made no formal proposal.

96. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee was in favour of permitting representatives who desired to do so to make explanations of vote at the following meeting.

It was so decided.

97. In reply to an inquiry by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. URRUTIA (Colombia) stated that he would formally submit his suggestion regarding the order of discussion of agenda items at the next meeting after the explanations of vote had been completed.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.