



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 67:	
International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy: report of the United States of America (<i>concluded</i>)	381

Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEM 67

International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy: report of the United States of America (A/2734, A/2738, A/C.1/758, A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.107, A/C.1/L.108) (*concluded*)

Mr. MENON (India) wished to revert to the second of the three aspects of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) — the establishment of the agency — which he had been discussing at the close of the previous meeting. The purpose of his delegation's amendments (A/C.1/L.107) was to ensure an exchange of ideas and real discussion between the Governments participating in the establishment of the agency and other Members of the United Nations in order to avoid a situation in which ideas would flow in one direction only. There was therefore no question of upsetting the procedure proposed in the draft resolution, as the United States and United Kingdom representatives appeared to believe, but merely of preventing certain Governments from being confronted with a *fait accompli* or, at best, from being given an opportunity merely of saying "yes" or "no". The only argument that had been found for the rejection of those amendments was that their adoption would create difficulties or cause delay. He would not, however, argue the point further, since the sponsors of the draft resolution had said that they would take into account the objections raised in the course of the debate, as well as the desire expressed by the representative of Ecuador (723rd meeting) that no Government should be treated as a poor relation.

Turning to the third aspect of the joint draft resolution—the agency's relationship with the United Nations—Mr. Menon said that it had been dealt with, to some extent, in one of the Soviet amendments (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1) to which the Indian delegation had no objection in principle. It felt, however, that that aspect of the question had been adequately covered by the changes it had suggested in the wording of paragraph 1 of section A of the original draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105). India had suggested the deletion from that paragraph of the reference to the specialized agencies, and the addition of the words "in accordance with the Charter". The paragraph would then have read:

"Suggests that, once the agency is established, it negotiate an appropriate form of agreement with the United Nations, in accordance with the Charter". Mr. Menon noted with approval that the sponsors had accepted the suggested deletion; as for the suggested addition, which they had not accepted, he agreed that it would have made little difference to the text, since an agreement with the United Nations must be in accordance with the Charter.

3. Mr. Menon wished to clarify his country's position on the question of the agency's relations with the General Assembly and the Security Council. India considered that the agency's relationship to the United Nations would be governed by Article 7, paragraph 2, of the Charter, and its responsibility to the General Assembly, the Security Council or any other organ would be governed by the general law of the United Nations. It would be contrary to the established practice of granting autonomy to the specialized agencies, to lay down in advance the details of the new agency's relations with specific United Nations organs. The question of the veto and of Security Council control did not, therefore, arise at the present time. If, however, in connexion with the agency, a situation arose which might lead to friction in the world or which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, or if a matter arose which the General Assembly, under its over-all powers of discussion, should debate, the appropriate United Nations organs should normally consider it.

4. With regard to the establishment of the agency, Mr. Menon said that it would undoubtedly have been difficult to explain to the parliaments of some of the countries concerned why great parts of Central America, South America, Asia and Europe were not to be represented in the negotiations preceding the establishment of the agency. It was, however, clear from the explanations given by the sponsors of the draft resolution that they intended to take account of the views of the representatives of those areas. The declarations made to that effect must, therefore, be regarded as constituting a formal undertaking.

5. Mr. Menon wished, next, to state his delegation's attitude towards the various amendments before the Committee.

6. In the first place, the Indian delegation naturally supported the ideas contained in its own amendments (A/C.1/L.107). It had offered those amendments out of a sense of duty, and neither disapproval nor any false construction that might be placed upon its intentions would cause it to change its position. There were two other sets of amendments before the Committee, those of the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1) and those of Lebanon (A/C.1/L.108). India was in general agreement with those amendments, which the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) would undoubtedly take into account. Since, however, India had decided not to press for

a vote on its own amendments, it did not feel it could advocate the adoption of those of other delegations; it would accordingly abstain in a vote on the Soviet and Lebanese amendments, while voting for the draft resolution as a whole. The most important thing was to attain unanimity, and votes on points which had not been accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution would impede the attainment of that objective.

7. Mr. Menon observed that the most influential delegations were understandably prone to take an initially hostile attitude to suggestions made to them. It would perhaps be recalled in that connexion, that the Indian proposal (A/C.1/L.74) for the establishment of a sub-committee of the Disarmament Commission had not at first been welcomed; ultimately, however, the idea had gained wide acceptance, resulting in the adoption of resolution 715 (VIII).

8. In the interests of securing unanimity and of endorsing the initiative taken by the President of the United States, and with the full knowledge that the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom would do all they could to take the views expressed during the discussions into account, the Indian delegation had decided not to ask for a vote on its own amendments.

9. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) thanked the representative of India for his understanding attitude. In accordance with his desire, and also with the desire expressed by the representative of Ecuador, the sponsors of the draft resolution would especially bear in mind the suggestions made during the debate. In particular, the representative of Lebanon could rest assured that, once it had been established, the agency would take the results of the technical conference into account. But as the date on which the agency would be set up was as yet unknown, it would not be desirable to amend the text of the draft resolution to cover that point. Moreover, having decided not to make further changes in the text, the sponsors of the draft resolution did not feel able to make an exception.

10. Before discussing the proposals submitted to the Committee, Mr. Lodge wished to express his delegation's appreciation of the endorsement given to the "atoms for peace" proposal by the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Mendès-France, on the previous day (498th plenary meeting). All the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) shared the French Prime Minister's hope that the plan would be adopted unanimously.

11. The sponsors had considered the reference to the specialized agencies, in paragraph 1 of section A of the original draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105), sufficiently flexible not to prejudge the results of the negotiations for the establishment of the agency. In view of the objections raised, however, in particular by the Soviet Union, it had been decided to delete it. The paragraph, thus amended, was now paragraph 2 of section A of the revised text (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1). The Soviet delegation was now proposing an amendment (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1) to that paragraph, to the effect that the agency should be responsible to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

12. The sponsors of the draft resolution were strongly opposed to that amendment. Having agreed not to prejudge the negotiations by specifying the relationship between the agency and the United Nations, they could hardly accept a formula which would make the agency

responsible to the General Assembly or the Security Council. That relationship could be worked out later. Moreover, the amendment, if accepted, would probably doom the negotiations to failure because of the strong opposition which existed in many quarters to the idea of tying the agency to the Security Council and thus shackling it with the veto. Mr. Lodge wished to make it clear that in taking that stand the sponsors were not denying the obvious truth that the Security Council had primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and that the General Assembly also had responsibilities in that field. If a situation arose in connexion with the peaceful uses of atomic energy which endangered international peace and security, any State would have the right to raise the question in either body.

13. In conclusion, Mr. Lodge wished to raise a point relating to the Russian translation of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1). The word "energetically" ("*avec ardeur*" in the French text), in the second paragraph of the preamble, had been translated into Russian by a word conveying the literal meaning of "by all means". It must be understood that the correct meaning was the one conveyed by the English and French texts, which were the original versions of the draft.

14. Mr. Hsioh-Ren WEI (China) recalled that, during the general debate (713th meeting), he had expressed his support of President Eisenhower's proposal. Explanations had since been given on the objectives of the plan and on the procedure for establishing the agency, with particular reference to the representation of States without atomic resources on the board of governors of the agency. On the basis of those explanations, section A of the joint draft resolution was acceptable to his delegation.

15. Turning to section B, Mr. Wei regretted that his country was not included in the advisory committee provided for in paragraph 5; as a permanent member of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the Disarmament Commission, his delegation had followed the developments achieved in the field of atomic energy and Chinese scientists were doing work which would enable them to contribute to the preparations for the conference. However, the Chinese delegation did not intend to be influenced by its feelings in that respect.

16. The Lebanese amendments (A/C.1/L.108) were simple and reasonable. It was obvious that the agency, if it was established by that time, ought to be represented at the conference. The sponsors of the draft resolution, however, had that in mind, since they had wished the agency to have the status of a specialized agency. Mr. Wei therefore hoped that the representative of Lebanon would not press for a vote on his amendments.

17. The representative of India had stated that while he would not press for a vote on his amendment (A/C.1/L.107), neither would he withdraw them. Mr. Wei therefore wished to state his delegation's position on those amendments. The first Indian amendment imposed an unnecessary limitation by referring only to Member States that were "able and willing" to participate in the agency. The statement made at the beginning of the debate by the representative of Canada (707th meeting), tracing the stages of the negotiations, had been much more inclusive. Moreover, the procedure outlined by the representatives of the United States and

Canada made the second Indian amendment unnecessary. The Chinese delegation believed that all States should participate in the negotiations as sovereign States.

18. As to the question raised by the first Soviet amendment (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1), Mr. Wei agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution that it should be left to future negotiations. It would not be right to make the agency responsible to the Security Council when it would have no control over large quantities of fissionable materials, including the stockpiles of the USSR. The other countries for that matter, were no less concerned than the Soviet Union about the increasing stockpiles of fissionable materials; but it was for the USSR to accept the necessary measures of control. It should be borne in mind that some of the materials allocated to the agency would not be suitable for making atomic weapons; as for the others, safeguards would have to be taken, unless it was possible to build reactors that could be used only for peaceful purposes. The Chinese delegation would vote against the USSR amendments.

19. The Chinese delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution as a whole.

20. Mr. MAZA (Chile) said that great interest had been shown in atomic developments by scientific circles in his country. Several years previously, uranium deposits had been discovered in the Norte Chico area. The cost of processing the ore had certainly seemed too high, but the creation of the agency would enable Chile to continue prospecting and thus contribute to the pool of fissionable materials; that would be made easier by the fact that a law of February 1952 had made uranium one of the essential raw materials subject to State control.

21. Mr. Maza then quoted from a book by Mr. Yrarrázaval Concha, former Chilean Minister of Foreign Affairs, called *El Hemisferio Postergado* ("The Neglected Hemisphere"), in which it was stated that Latin America possessed great resources of fissionable materials and that the world was on the eve of developments that would be decisive for the production of energy from atomic materials. Mr. Maza was therefore glad to see that a Latin-American country, Brazil, had been included in the membership of the advisory committee provided for in section B, paragraph 5, of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1).

22. Mr. Maza observed that the current session differed from previous ones in the number of agreements reached on important points. Thus, the members of the Second Committee had at last agreed on the establishment of a fund to assist under-industrialized countries, and in the First Committee agreement had been reached on methods that might really lead to disarmament. Countries like the USSR had unexpectedly taken part in unanimous decisions.

23. The representative of Chile stated that his country, which regarded the atom as a new source of hope for all the peoples of the world, would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution.

24. Mr. MOCH (France) said his delegation appreciated the kind words that had been spoken concerning his speech in which the French Prime Minister, Mr. Mendès-France, had expressed feelings of all Frenchmen.

25. In view of the desirability of an early and unanimous vote, thanks were due to the Indian delegation for agreeing to withdraw its amendments (A/C.1/L.107). Where a draft incorporated all the points on which a body had been able to agree, further discussion was fruitless.

26. He wished to speak of the technical aspect of the first of the Soviet amendments (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1), which the United States representative had examined from an administrative point of view, and which provided that the agency should be responsible to the General Assembly and the Security Council. While the problems of disarmament and the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful ends should not be confused, they were related. The Soviet amendment reflected the idea that had led the Soviet delegation to press for the insertion of the word "only" in the second paragraph of the preamble, before the words "the peaceful pursuits of mankind". In an *aide-mémoire* of 27 April 1954 (A/2738, communication No. 9), Mr. Molotov had pointed out that "the peaceful application of atomic energy is connected with the possibility of simultaneous production of atomic materials utilized for the manufacture of the atomic weapon". Nevertheless, Mr. Moch believed that to eliminate all provisions permitting the production of by-products that could be used for military purposes might be tantamount to renouncing the most fruitful applications of atomic energy. It should be noted that the United States Government had already sought to allay the fears of the Soviet Union by stating, in its memorandum of 9 July 1954 (A/2738, communication No. 11), that "ways can be devised to safeguard against diversion of materials from power-producing reactors".

27. Mr. Moch asked the Soviet representative to withdraw his amendment, and he wished, in that connexion, to make four observations.

28. First, if a State possessing fissionable materials kept them instead of handing them over to the agency, it could use them for building up its military potential, in the same way as a recipient State. The former danger, however, was more grave than the latter, since the State in question would be industrially and technologically more powerful.

29. Secondly, with regard to the danger that a transfer of fissionable material might increase the military potential of another country, Mr. Moch again drew attention to the fact that the United States Government had already mentioned the technical possibility of preventing such diversion. Besides, there was little cause to suspect the donor country, which could simply have kept its own fissionable materials; and as for the recipient country, how could an inadequately equipped State carry out the intricate processes of transforming atomic by-products into explosive materials? In any case, how could that State carry out the necessary purifying operations clandestinely, once an international control system had been established?

30. Thirdly, referring to the generous offers which had been made to the proposed agency, Mr. Moch recalled that the representative of the United States had said (717th meeting) that the 100 kilogrammes of fissionable materials promised by his country would serve to activate the research reactors of which he had spoken previously (707th meeting); those small reactors, he had said, would produce isotopes, make possible an increase in research and afford a training

ground for technicians. Thus an increase in the quantity of fissionable materials produced by research reactors scattered in various parts of the world need cause no apprehensions from a military point of view.

31. Fourthly, the potential danger would not arise until much later, when the agency had distributed large quantities of fissionable materials to States having a greater number of technicians at their disposal. It should be noted, however, on the one hand, that in the case of certain reactors the amount of fissionable material increased slowly and, on the other hand, that the necessary precautions would be better known as time went on. Powerful reactors, of course, would have to be controlled: that was a matter which the Disarmament Commission would have to discuss.

32. It could therefore be said that, during the stage of research reactors, no new danger would threaten the world, and that there was ample time to give full satisfaction to the Soviet Union concern that atomic energy should serve "only" the peaceful pursuits of mankind.

33. In conclusion, Mr. Moch stressed the importance of a discussion which, like the debate on disarmament, bore on the future of humanity itself. He hoped that the USSR delegation would realize that the danger it feared was imaginary and that it would agree to withdraw its amendment or at least to join in making the vote of the First Committee unanimous.

34. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that his delegation would vote for the seven-Power draft resolution. As to the proposed amendments, although he was favourably impressed by the Indian suggestions, he felt that the Indian representative was wise to withdraw his amendments. The explanations given by the co-sponsors of the draft resolution were such as to allay the very legitimate fears of the Indian delegation.

35. Mr. Belaúnde hoped that the representative of Lebanon, too, would find it possible to withdraw his amendments in view of the United States representative's explanations.

36. Peru would vote against the amendments proposed by the USSR delegation (A/C.1/L.106/Rev1). With regard to the first of those amendments, Mr. Belaúnde believed that if the matter was considered from a legal point of view, instead of from a practical point of view, as the representative of France had just considered it, it could be said that it was wise to postpone any decision on the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. The time had not yet come to settle the question: moreover, if a problem threatened the maintenance of peace, the United Nations, and not only the Security Council, would have to deal with it, so that the United Nations would not be paralysed by the use of the veto. Consequently, the first USSR amendment was unnecessary if it meant that the United Nations must intervene if the occasion arose. And, if it meant subordinating the agency to the Security Council or even the General Assembly, the Peruvian delegation was bound to oppose it.

37. Peru would also vote against the second amendment proposed by the USSR delegation. While it was true that a large attendance was most desirable at a conference sponsored by the United Nations, the matter would give rise to some delicate questions relating to the recognition of uncertain entities, and that might complicate and interfere with the progress of the deliberations.

38. Finally, Mr. Belaúnde said that he had been authorized by his Government to state that his country had just undertaken an active programme of prospecting for and producing uranium ore and that, under that programme, Peru would contribute uranium ore to the international agency which was to be set up to develop peaceful uses of atomic energy.

39. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom), speaking as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution, thanked the Government of Peru for its intention, just announced by its representative, to contribute in kind to the success of the agency.

40. He deeply appreciated the statement of the Indian representative that he did not intend to press for a vote on his amendments. He might rest assured that in no circumstances would there be any *fait accompli*. As to the question of the initial membership of the agency, it was in no way prejudiced by the fact that only seven Powers had sponsored the draft resolution and were at present negotiating for the agency's establishment.

41. With respect to the Soviet amendments, the Committee would recall that in the light of suggestions submitted privately by the Soviet delegation, the co-sponsors of the draft resolution had revised the original wording of section A, paragraph 2, by deleting any reference to the specialized agencies. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation had considered it necessary to propose an amendment to that paragraph. The action was the more regrettable as it had seemed that agreement had been reached on the fact that it would be a mistake to specify, at that stage, the agency's relationship to any United Nations organ. Moreover, the summary of the constitutional aspects of the question, prepared by the Secretariat, (A/C.1/758) showed that the problem was more complicated than many had at first realized. No one was in a position to say at present exactly what form the relationship should take, since there was no precedent for the agency in the history of the United Nations. It would therefore, be ill-advised to adopt a formula which decided the question in advance.

42. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution had made many concessions for the sake of achieving unanimity, and they hoped that the Soviet Union, in its turn, would not insist on its amendment and would support the revised draft.

43. Sheikh JABBAR (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation fully supported the measures proposed in the joint draft resolution. Although for the present Saudi Arabia regarded the establishment of the agency from the viewpoint of a beneficiary, it hoped in the long run to become an active partner. It was in that spirit that his delegation would endorse the seven-Power draft.

44. The Saudi Arabian delegation felt that to adopt the Soviet amendments now might prove an obstacle to the success of that noble enterprise. It would therefore abstain from the vote on those amendments.

45. With regard to the Lebanese amendments, Sheikh Jabbar said that they would definitely improve the draft resolution, and his delegation would give them its full support if they were put to the vote.

46. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1) to paragraph 2 of section A of the draft resolution was not aimed at prejudging the question of the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. All that the USSR wanted was that the

General Assembly should place on record the fact that it deemed the agency to be responsible to the General Assembly, and to the Security Council in the cases provided for under the Charter. It would thus be made clear that the agency was not to be patterned after the existing specialized agencies. The nature of the agency's activities, and the problems confronting it, were very different from those of the specialized agencies, and its relationship to the United Nations must also, therefore, be different from theirs.

7. The representative of France had said that there was at present no problem relating to the agency which would in any way affect the maintenance of international peace, and he had concluded that no problem would at present arise in respect of which the Security Council would hear the primary responsibility. For those reasons, he had opposed the Soviet amendment.

8. But the fact that no such problem existed at present should not obscure another fact, which was that the agency would be established for a long period of time. The representative of France had not denied the fact that big reactors, used for the production of electric power, might also produce explosive material. He had indeed confirmed the fact that a dangerous situation might arise once fissionable materials were produced which could be used for the production of atomic weapons as well as for peaceful purposes. That aspect of the problem should not be forgotten. It was true that the United States Government had indicated in its memorandum of 9 July 1954 (A/2738, communication No. 11) that ways could be devised to safeguard against diversion of fissionable materials for military purposes. So far, however, that point had not been clarified.

9. The Soviet Union was therefore justified in contending that the question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy could not be considered separately from the problem of the use of atomic energy for military purposes. That was why the Soviet delegation had proposed an amendment concerning the relationship between the future agency and the United Nations. The United States representative had termed the amendment unacceptable, although he had not denied that, following the establishment of the agency, situations might arise which would endanger international peace and security. He had said that should that occur the provisions of the Charter would be applied. The Soviet delegation wanted provision to be made in the draft resolution for the very eventuality referred to by Mr. Lodge; it wanted the inclusion of a clause to the effect that such situations should come under the Security Council's jurisdiction.

10. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) said that the purpose of the second amendment proposed by his delegation (A/C.1/L.108) was simply to ensure that the Secretary-General should not be prevented, for some purely technical reason, from extending an invitation to the agency—should the latter have already been established—when invitations to the international conference were sent out. The amendment was thus merely an interpretation of the present text of section B, paragraph 7, of the revised draft resolution. If the Secretary-General felt that the misgivings of the Lebanese delegation were unfounded, the delegation was prepared to withdraw that amendment.

11. The purpose of the first Lebanese amendment was not to resolve a technical difficulty but to emphasize a

a principle. The Lebanese delegation was not animated by mistrust of the States participating in the establishment of the agency in suggesting that the Secretary-General should be invited to communicate to those States or to the agency, if it had at that time been established, the results of the work of the conference to be convened; its aim, in submitting that amendment, was to ensure that a link was established between the agency and the United Nations from the moment of the adoption of the joint draft resolution.

52. If the Secretary-General was not invited to communicate the results of the work of the conference to the States participating in the establishment of the agency or to the agency itself, if it had been established by that time, those States would not be morally bound to take into account the views and opinions expressed during the conference.

53. However, if the United States representative would agree that the statement he had made on that specific point could be interpreted as a moral commitment that the States participating in the establishment of the agency would take into account the conclusions and results of the work of the conference, the Lebanese delegation would not press for a vote on that amendment.

54. The SECRETARY-GENERAL stated, in reply to the Lebanese representative's question, that, unless the sponsors of the draft resolution placed a different interpretation of the matter, he would feel free, under section B, paragraph 7, of the draft resolution, to invite the agency to participate in the conference if the agency was already established at that time. However, he would not send that invitation without prior consultation with the advisory committee provided for in the same draft resolution.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the United States representative had not asked to speak, it could be assumed that he accepted the interpretation which the Lebanese representative had placed upon his statement. That being so, the Lebanese amendments (A/C.1/L.108) might be deemed to have been withdrawn.

56. Mr. PROTITCH (Secretary of the Committee) read a statement by the Secretary-General concerning the estimate of expenditures provided for under rules 154 and 155 of the rules of procedure. As the place, size and duration of the conference were not yet known, no estimate of the cost of the conference could be made. Accordingly, the Secretary-General would propose, when the matter was referred to the Fifth Committee, that the necessary expenses should be met under the resolution of unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

57. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to proceed to the vote on the revised draft resolution submitted by Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) and the amendments thereto.

58. He put to the vote the four paragraphs of the general preamble.

The paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the two paragraphs of the preamble and paragraph 1 of the operative part of section A.

The paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

60. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first Soviet amendment (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1), relating to paragraph 2 of section A.

The amendment was rejected by 43 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 2 of section A to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 55 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 3 and 4 of section A and paragraphs 1 and 2 of section B.

The paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

63. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second Soviet amendment (A/C.1/L.106/Rev.1), relating to paragraph 3 of section B.

The amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 of section B.

The paragraph was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

65. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of section B.

The paragraphs were adopted unanimously.

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

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

67. Mr. ALBERTSSON (Iceland) congratulated the sponsors of the draft resolution and the members of the Committee on the decision just taken. The initiative which had been taken might well mark the beginning of a new and glorious epoch of technical advancement and progress in the development of human relations.

68. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) said that although he regretted that the sponsors of the draft resolution had felt unable to accept his delegation's suggestions, the unanimous adoption of that draft afforded grounds for hope for the entire world.

69. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) thanked representatives for the courtesy they had displayed towards him during the discussions on the question. The high level of the debate had been a credit to the Governments represented. It was certain that whenever Member States adopted a unanimous decision, they were fulfilling an essential objective of the United Nations. In the difficult case in question, such a decision probably marked the start of what President Eisenhower had referred to (470th plenary meeting) as a new approach to the problems which had to be solved if the world was to shake off the inertia imposed by fear and make progress towards peace.

70. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that his delegation had submitted two amendments of essential importance. The first had recommended the establishment of an international agency which would be responsible to the General Assembly and, in cases provided for in the Charter, to the Security Council. The second had stressed the need to

invite to the international conference not only States Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, but also all other States which expressed their desire to attend. He regretted that those amendments had not been adopted. There were certain other serious defects in the joint draft resolution, such as the limit on the number of States participating in the international Agency and the conference, and the desire to make of the agency a kind of specialized agency rather than a United Nations organ. The fact that, according to the sponsors of the text, the agreement between the agency and the United Nations would be concluded after the setting up of the agency, on the basis of Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter, as well as the actual statements of the sponsors, showed how restricted would be the group of States taking part in the establishment of the international agency. Section B, paragraph 3, in its turn, limited the number of States participating in the international conference. Moreover, the tendency, still implicit in the draft resolution, to create the international agency on the model of the specialized agencies, represented a serious defect which the Soviet suggestions had been designed to eliminate.

71. The vote of the USSR delegation in support of the draft resolution signified its fidelity to the principle which it had always defended of international co-operation for the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. That did not mean, however, that the Soviet Union approved of those provisions in the draft resolution which restricted or hindered international co-operation in that important field. The Soviet delegation believed that a number of questions connected with international co-operation in that field would have to be further discussed during the negotiations which would take place among the States concerned.

72. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) said that his delegation, desirous of ensuring unanimity, had abstained from voting on the Soviet amendment concerning section B, paragraph 3, of the draft resolution although it believed that participation at the proposed conference and in the agency should not be restricted by any considerations of a social, religious, ideological or political nature.

73. Mr. KREMER (Luxembourg) was gratified to note the unanimity with which the seven-Power draft resolution had been adopted. The Luxembourg delegation had felt that the best contribution it could make to the realization of such a great concept was to give its unqualified support to that auspicious proposal.

74. Luxembourg, which was an industrial country with a high consumption of coal and no other substantial source of power, was particularly apprehensive of the time when the output of its mines might fail and was therefore very interested in new sources of power.

75. The Luxembourg delegation had noted with satisfaction the generous offer made by the United States and United Kingdom representatives, which would enable foreign scientists to attend courses of advanced study.

76. With regard to the first amendment proposed by the USSR delegation, Mr. Kremer said that his delegation had been unable to vote in favour of it, because in its view, it would be somewhat illogical expressly to include the Security Council as an essential element in an undertaking of an exclusively peaceful nature.

Section A, paragraph 2, of the draft resolution should suffice as a guarantee of compliance with the Charter provisions in that respect.

77. With regard to the second Soviet amendment, the Luxembourg delegation had felt obliged to oppose it because it might have made the organization of the conference more difficult by introducing factors which the sponsors of the draft resolution considered out of place.

78. Mr. MENON (India) said that, in voting for the draft resolution which the Committee had just adopted, his delegation had recorded its vote not merely for a text but also for a great idea, the component elements

of which were the principles and purposes of the United Nations, the initiative of the President of the United States and the discussion which had taken place.

79. He wished to stress that the observations which he had made concerning the proposal did not in any way signify any mental reservation on the part of the Indian delegation; they had merely been an attempt at understanding the position of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Those remarks were not in any way intended to diminish the Indian delegation's support for the text.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.