

**INTERNATIONAL
ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY**

Distr.
GENERAL
GC(III)/OR.35
9 December 1959
ENGLISH

General Conference

THIRD REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Friday, 2 October 1959, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. FURUUCHI (Japan)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
10	General debate and report of the Board of Governors for the year 1958-59 (continued)	1 - 33
25	The question of granting consultative status with the Agency to the World Federation of Trade Unions	34 - 35
17	Scale of Members' contributions	36 - 40
13	The Agency's programme, budget and Working Capital Fund for 1960	41 - 48
14	Voluntary contributions to the General Fund in 1960	49 - 56
8	Report of the Credentials Committee (continued)	57 - 58
12	Assistance to less developed countries with the production of nuclear power	59 - 75
27	Closing of the session	76 - 90

* GC(III)/88/Rev.2.

N.B. The list of delegations attending the third regular session of the General Conference was issued as document GC(III)/INF/25/Rev.2.

GENERAL DEBATE AND REPORT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR THE YEAR 1958-59
(GC(III)/73, 89 and Add.1, 92/Rev.1. 107) (continued)

1. Mr. LOPEZ (Argentina) agreed with the views expressed at the thirty-fourth meeting by the Austrian delegate^{1/} and supported the motion submitted by Sweden (GC(III)/107). The Agency was a technical organization, and it was not therefore the business of the General Conference to consider political problems.
2. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia) said that the Czechoslovak draft resolution (GC(III)/89 and Add.1) and the Moroccan amendment (GC(III)/92/Rev.1) had the merit of reminding States Members of the Agency's main ideals. The military uses of atomic energy were not, of course, the Agency's concern, but it would render a great service to humanity by using its influence to divert the nuclear energy at present used for armaments into peaceful channels. The Indonesian delegation would support the Czechoslovak draft resolution, as amended with the author's approval,^{2/} since it had only the character of an appeal, an expression of hope.
3. He appreciated the efforts of the Austrian and Swedish delegates to reach a compromise,^{3/} but found it difficult to agree to referring to the Czechoslovak resolution as a substantive resolution.
4. Mr. ESCHAUZIER (Netherlands) agreed with the Austrian delegate's comments and supported the Swedish motion. The Netherlands was most anxious to see an agreement concluded to stop tests of all kinds of nuclear weapons and to set up a suitable international control system to implement such agreement. However, the Agency should not concern itself with the military uses of atomic energy. Furthermore, Article III.B.1 of the Statute recognized that responsibility for furthering the establishment of world-wide disarmament rested with the United Nations.
5. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) paid tribute to Czechoslovakia for the feelings expressed in the draft resolution, but doubted whether it was advisable for

^{1/} GC(III)/OR.34, paragraphs 8 and 9.

^{2/} Ibid, paragraph 6.

^{3/} Ibid, paragraphs 8 and 28.

the General Conference to consider an essentially political question. The General Conference might debate for years and years without ever achieving any positive results, since disarmament was a matter to be dealt with by the United Nations and not by the Agency. Consequently the Japanese delegation, like the Austrian delegation, would request the Czechoslovak delegate to withdraw the draft resolution. If that request was refused, he would support the Swedish motion.

6. Mr. LENDVAI (Hungary) said that the peoples of the world, who were following the General Conference's work with interest, not only entertained great hopes of what the peaceful utilization of atomic energy could mean in future years but were also somewhat afraid. That was particularly true in Hungary. No opportunity should therefore be missed of affirming that all the technical achievements which the scientists had bestowed on the peoples of the world must in fact be used solely for the well-being of mankind. And in that connexion, deeds spoke louder than words.

7. Experience had so far shown that the present international situation, which still made people afraid that the achievements of nuclear science and technology would be used against their interests, was a great stumbling-block to individual countries' own work on atomic energy as well as, on the international plane, to the exchange of information and to the Agency's activities.

8. It was incorrect to state, as some delegations had done, that the Agency was not entitled to submit recommendations to the United Nations on a matter which, it was said, came under that organization. The amended text of the Czechoslovak draft resolution removed any doubts on that point. It was most important to show the world yet again that the men responsible for international co-operation, and to a large extent for all that had been done on the international plane in the field of atomic energy, had resolutely decided to insist that atomic energy should never again be used for the wholesale destruction of human life and that they had again taken the chance offered them of restating their firm desire to see nuclear energy employed for peaceful purposes.

9. The Hungarian delegation therefore considered that the Czechoslovak draft resolution should be seriously considered and approved by the General Conference. The Hungarian delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

10. Mr. ARNOTT (Australia) said that the question raised by the Czechoslovak draft resolution should not be debated by the General Conference; he therefore associated himself with the proposals in the Swedish motion.

11. Mr. EL FASSI (Morocco) said that his country was at present the one most directly exposed to the harmful effects of radiation from the forthcoming atomic weapon tests. However, his delegation did not intend to submit a draft resolution on that subject, for it did not wish to delay the General Conference's work and it knew that the question of nuclear weapons tests and disarmament would be studied by the General Assembly of the United Nations, since the Moroccan request to place that question on the agenda of the General Assembly had received 42 votes.

12. However, since the question had been raised by the Czechoslovak delegate, the Moroccan delegation could not but support the Czechoslovak draft resolution. Of course, the question was one for the United Nations, but if the General Conference were now to reject the amended version of the Czechoslovak draft resolution, which was supported by other delegations, all peace- and freedom-loving countries might think that the General Conference had failed in its duty. The United Nations would deal with the political and diplomatic aspects of the question, but the Agency had the right to consider the technical aspects and to consider the effects of nuclear tests on human health and life.

13. The Moroccan delegation therefore hoped that the General Conference would approve the Czechoslovak draft resolution and the Moroccan amendment, the text of which had also been amended and now merely expressed a hope.

14. Mr. CASSILI (Italy), speaking under Rule 60 of the Rules of Procedure, moved the closure of the debate on the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia.

15. Mr. MELLER CONRAD (Poland) observed that the Czechoslovak draft resolution invited the three great atomic Powers to intensify their efforts for an early conclusion of an agreement on the suspension of the tests of all kinds of nuclear weapons; among those Powers, however, only the Soviet Union had expressed its point of view and unequivocally stated that it was ready to do all in its power to reach such an agreement.^{4/} Not only the General

^{4/} GC(III)/OR.27, paragraph 1.

Conference, but also the public, should have the opportunity of hearing the reply of the United States of America and the United Kingdom before the end of the debate. For that reason he formally opposed the closure of the debate.

16. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia), having received the President's permission to exercise his right of reply, said that he was unable to accept the arguments advanced by the delegate of Sweden. In his view, responsibility in the field of atomic energy was shared by the Agency and the United Nations. In the Relationship Agreement with the United Nations, Article I, paragraph 4, which defined the Agency's functions, repeated word for word the text of Article III.B.1 of the Statute, under which the Agency had to conduct its activities "in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations to promote peace and international co-operation", in other words in accordance with the principles and purposes set forth in Articles I and II of the United Nations Charter. Article III.B.1 of the Statute also laid down that the Agency should conduct its activities "in conformity with policies of the United Nations furthering the establishment of safeguarded world-wide disarmament". No one could therefore deny that the draft Czechoslovak resolution was in complete accordance with United Nations policy.

17. He wished to stress that under Article III.B.1 of the Statute it was laid down that in conducting its activities in conformity with United Nations policies the Agency must in the first place further "the establishment of safeguarded world-wide disarmament". Thus, if the Czechoslovak draft resolution were regarded as being political in character, the same would have to be said of the Agency's Statute.

18. Article XVI.B.2 of the Statute provided for "Consideration by the Agency of resolutions relating to it adopted by the General Assembly ... and the submission of reports, when requested, to the appropriate organ of the United Nations on the action taken by the Agency or by its members in accordance with this Statute as a result of such consideration." Thus the Agency should only submit a report to one of the United Nations organs when that organ explicitly requested it to do so. In other words, the Agency did not have to submit a report on the measures it had taken to implement United Nations resolutions and need only mention them in its annual report to the United Nations General

Assembly. That also implied that the Agency might take a decision without waiting for the initiative to come from the United Nations.

19. It was also indisputable that the Agency could consider items appearing on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. The Relationship Agreement with the United Nations recognized that the Agency was the body responsible, under the aegis of the United Nations, for international activities concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy, in accordance with its Statute. The Agreement also recognized, in Article I, paragraph 2, that the Agency "by virtue of its inter-governmental character and international responsibilities, will function under its Statute as an autonomous international organization in the working relationship with the United Nations". Thus, under Article I of the Agreement and Articles III and XVI of the Statute, the Agency was empowered to consider questions on the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. Article VIII, paragraph 2, of the Agreement went so far as to state that "The Agency may propose items for consideration by the United Nations".

20. It was thus clear that the Statute itself authorized the General Conference to consider and adopt the draft Czechoslovak resolution.

21. With regard to the procedural proposal submitted by Sweden, requesting the General Conference to decide that the Swedish motion should be put to the vote before the Czechoslovak draft resolution, he observed that its intention was undoubtedly to make use of the old familiar voting machine in order to shelve the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

22. The PRESIDENT put the motion for the closure of the debate to the vote.

23. The motion was adopted by 33 votes to 13 with 11 abstentions.

24. Mr. FONTAINE (France), invoking Rule 72 of the Rules of Procedure, asked that the votes on the proposals before the General Conference be taken by roll-call. His delegation would not take part in those votes for the following reasons: the question under discussion did not fall within the Agency's competence; moreover, according to his delegation's information, 65 atomic explosions had taken place since the foundation of the Agency, 26 of

them on Soviet territory, without giving rise to any comments comparable to those he had listened to during the present debate.

25. Mr. RAJAN (India) said that the Agency's object was to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy throughout the world and that it was perfectly within its rights in indicating the means which might facilitate the accomplishment of its task in that field.

26. The Indian delegation realized that the questions raised in the Czechoslovak draft resolution were being studied in other international organizations. Nevertheless, there was no question of giving directives to those organizations. The purpose of the draft resolution was simply to express a hope. Since the Swedish proposal would prevent the Agency from doing so, the Indian delegation would vote against it.

27. Mr. MAKINEN (Finland) made the following statement.^{5/}

"The Finnish delegation regrets the tone this debate has taken. Being firmly convinced that all Governments in the world are unanimous about the ultimate goal to be reached, namely the banning of nuclear weapons so that the resources of atomic energy can be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, the Finnish delegation believes that it should have been possible, once the question was raised in the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia, to request this important assembly to express the unanimous hope that an international agreement would be reached in the near future which would enable atomic energy to be utilized solely for peaceful purposes. Although it shares the opinion of those speakers who have said, during the debate, that the Agency should devote itself primarily to the practical activities - admirable and important as they are - assigned to it under its Statute, the Finnish delegation believes that the unanimous expression of such a hope would not have created a precedent by virtue of which the General Conference would be committed in future to considering questions whose solution does not depend on the Agency. For, seeing that the conclusion of the desired international agreement is primarily the responsibility of the United Nations, the General Conference would have no reason to resume discussion of the matter until the day such an agreement is signed: a day which will mark the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind.

"In view of the tone the debate has taken and in view of the regrettable political controversy which has characterized it, Finland, faithful to its spirit of neutrality, will abstain from participating in the votes which are about to be taken."

^{5/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 92(b) of the Rules of Procedure.

28. Mr. ZAMYATIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the vote on the proposals under consideration should be taken in the order of their submission, in other words that the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia should be voted on first.

29. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the procedural proposal submitted by Sweden (GC(III)/107, paragraph 2) to the effect that the General Conference should vote on the Swedish motion (GC(III)/107, paragraph 1) before voting on the Czechoslovak draft resolution (GC(III)/89).

30. At the request of Mr. Petrzelka (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. Fontaine (France), a roll-call vote was taken.

India, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vatican City, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras.

Against: India, Indonesia, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: Iraq, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Finland.

The procedural proposal submitted by Sweden was adopted by 40 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.

31. The PRESIDENT put the Swedish motion to the vote.

32. As requested by Mr. Fontaine (France), a roll-call vote was taken.

Canada, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vatican City, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil.

Against: Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

Abstaining: Finland.

The Swedish motion was carried by 41 votes to 17, with 1 abstention.

33. Mr. NOVACU (Romania) explained that he had voted against the Swedish motion because he was far from convinced by the arguments advanced in its favour. It had been said that the Agency was a technical organization which should not concern itself with political problems. Yet in speaking against the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia, the Canadian and Swedish delegates had themselves invoked political considerations, considerations which were contrary to the interests both of the Agency and of mankind as a whole.

THE QUESTION OF GRANTING CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE AGENCY TO THE WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS (GC(III)/94)

34. The PRESIDENT recalled that when the General Conference had included the item on its agenda^{6/}, it had decided to vote without discussion on the

6/ GC(III)/OR.31, paragraphs 12 - 15.

draft resolution contained in paragraph 6 of the USSR proposal (GC(III)/94), which recommended that the Board of Governors re-examine the question of granting consultative status with the Agency to the World Federation of Trade Unions.

35. The draft resolution was adopted by 23 votes to 11, with 17 abstentions.

SCALE OF MEMBERS' CONTRIBUTIONS (GC(III)/101)

36. Mr. ARNOTT (Australia), on behalf of the Rapporteur of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, introduced its report on agenda item 17 (GC(III)/101).

37. The PRESIDENT put to the vote draft resolutions A, B and C in the annex to the Committee's report.

38. Draft resolution A ("Revised scale of Members' contributions for 1959") was adopted by 52 votes to none.

39. Draft resolution B ("Scale of Members' contributions for 1960") was adopted by 52 votes to none.

40. Draft resolution C ("Guiding principles for the assessment of Members' contributions") was adopted by 51 votes to none.

THE AGENCY'S PROGRAMME, BUDGET AND WORKING CAPITAL FUND FOR 1960 (GC(III)/102)

41. Mr. ARNOTT (Australia), on behalf of the Rapporteur of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, introduced its report on agenda item 13 (GC(III)/102).

42. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolutions in Annexes I and II to the Committee's report.

43. Part I of draft resolution A was adopted by 45 votes to 9.

44. Part II of draft resolution A was adopted by 56 votes to none.

45. Draft resolution A ("Budgetary appropriations for the financial year 1960") as a whole was adopted by 47 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

46. Draft resolution B ("Use of the Working Capital Fund in 1960") was adopted by 55 votes to none.

47. Draft resolution C ("Establishment of a publications revolving fund") was adopted by 55 votes to none.

48. The draft resolution in Annex II ("Preparation by the Agency of manuals and codes of practice on health and safety") was adopted by 53 votes to none.

VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GENERAL FUND IN 1960 (GC(III)/103, 106)

49. The PRESIDENT informed the General Conference that since the report of the Committee for Pledges of Voluntary Contributions to the General Fund (GC(III)/103) had been drafted a number of delegations that had been unable to make pledges on behalf of their Governments in the Committee were now in a position to do so.

50. Mr. FONTES (Portugal) stated that his Government would make a contribution of US \$3 500 to the General Fund in 1960.

51. Mr. CHRISTENSEN (Denmark) said that the Danish Government, subject to the approval of the Finance Committee of Parliament, would contribute to the General Fund US \$8 400, which was equal to its contribution to the Agency's regular budget.

52. Mr. CARDONA (Mexico) stated that his Government would contribute in 1960 an amount of 62 000 freely convertible Mexican pesos (equal to US \$5 000).

53. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution in paragraph 5 of the Committee's report. The United Arab Republic had submitted an amendment (GC(III)/106) proposing the insertion of a new paragraph in the operative part of the text.

54. He invited the General Conference to vote first on the amendment, then on the draft resolution itself.

55. The United Arab Republic amendment was adopted by 52 votes to none.

56. The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 57 votes to none.

REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (GC(III)/104) (continued)^{7/}

57. The PRESIDENT invited the General Conference to take a decision on the draft resolution in paragraph 6 of the Committee's second report (GC(III)/104).

^{7/} GC(III)/OR.29, paragraphs 1 - 39.

The Committee had unanimously recommended the draft resolution to the General Conference for adoption.

58. The draft resolution was unanimously adopted.

ASSISTANCE TO LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES WITH THE PRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR POWER (GC(III)/105)

59. Mr. ARNOTT (Australia), on behalf of the Rapporteur of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, introduced its report on item 12 of the agenda (GC(III)/105).

60. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia) said that although as Chairman of the Committee he had approved the report, which was an objective account of the facts, he could not, as delegate of Tunisia, support the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom (paragraph 6) to the draft resolution submitted by Brazil, India, Indonesia, Pakistan and the United Arab Republic (paragraph 4), nor the amendment submitted orally by the delegate of Turkey to paragraph 3(c) of that draft resolution (paragraph 3).

61. The United Kingdom amendment was contrary to resolution GC(II)/RES/27 and would be likely to have the effect of discouraging countries such as Tunisia, which placed great hopes in the work undertaken by the Agency on the economic aspects of nuclear power. It would also be in the interests of countries with uranium stocks if the use of the latter as fuel for small reactors were developed, as that would be the sole way of keeping up the price of uranium, which was showing a tendency to collapse.

62. Although the Turkish amendment was based on a valid principle, its effect, by forcing collective action into a regional framework, would be likely to infringe Tunisia's freedom of action. In that connexion he hoped that the present framework would soon be expanded in order to allow better representation of African countries, with particular reference to the countries in that continent which were about to become independent.

63. He therefore requested that the words "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the Agency" in paragraph 3(d) of the operative part of the draft resolution recommended by the Committee (GC(III)/105, Annex) should be made the subject of a separate vote. It would

also be preferable if paragraph 5 retained the original text of the joint draft resolution (paragraph 4 of the Committee's report). His delegation requested a separate vote on that point also.

64. Mr. TACAR (Turkey) expressed his delegation's surprise and regret that a Member of the United Nations and of the Agency should request that a reference to the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the Agency be deleted from a draft resolution. Such a proposal was unacceptable to him.

65. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that he was sorry to introduce a discordant note at the present stage of the discussion. The fault did not lie either with the United Arab Republic or with Tunisia but solely with Turkey, which, in collusion with Israel, had, without a word of explanation, presented the Committee with an oral amendment although it had been agreed that all amendments should be submitted in writing. The object of the amendment, which added only a number of imprecise words, was no doubt perfectly clear to the delegations of Turkey and Israel but was of considerable obscurity to the delegation of the United Arab Republic. In any event, the amendment would be likely to create difficulties for Tunisia and other countries which undeniably formed part of the area of Africa and the Middle East and which, unlike certain other countries, were not in a position to claim that they belonged at one time to Europe, at another to the Middle East, whichever seemed convenient at the time.

66. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) agreed with the substance of the draft resolution as a whole. It was not desirable, however, for the General Conference to give the Board of Governors too many directives at the present stage, especially in a sphere where the Agency had practically no experience, such as assistance with the production of nuclear power. The Agency had not yet received a single request for such assistance and the time was still far distant when it would have to take a decision on the form in which assistance might be granted to a particular country or group of countries. He would accordingly prefer that paragraph 3(d) of the draft resolution be simply deleted. Canada was not certain what the United Arab Republic and Tunisia had in mind in proposing their amendment to that paragraph. In any event, it would be ready at the appropriate time to examine objectively and in all good faith any specific proposals for Agency assistance in that general field which might be put to the Board.

67. The Tunisian motion that certain words in paragraph 3(d) should be put to a separate vote represented a somewhat unusual procedure, particularly since the words in question aimed at conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the Agency. In those circumstances, he would wish to see the motion relate to the sub-paragraph as a whole.

68. With respect to paragraph 5, he saw no objection to putting the paragraph as a whole to a separate vote.

69. Mr. RAJAN (India) thought that the separate vote on paragraph 5 asked for by the Tunisian delegation related solely to the phrase: "and to consider the desirability of submitting to it annually thereafter", which was what had been added by the United Kingdom amendment.

70. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia), while not doubting Canada's goodwill, recalled that that country and some others had shown a marked lack of enthusiasm at the second regular session of the General Conference during the discussion that had led to the adoption of resolution GC(II)/RES/27.^{8/} The attitude of those countries had doubtless undergone some change since then. The Tunisian delegation would not press its motion for a separate vote on paragraph 5 if it could have satisfactory assurances from the countries in question.

71. The Turkish amendment to paragraph 3(d) was completely superfluous and, if inspired by political considerations, was not acceptable to the Tunisian delegation.

72. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Tunisian motion for a separate vote.

73. The motion was rejected by 25 votes to 15, with 16 abstentions.

74. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Committee, as set out in the annex to its report.

75. The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

8/ GC(II)/COM.1/OR.13, paragraphs 12 - 16.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

76. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of the Commonwealth countries, thanked the President for his distinguished conduct of the General Conference's debates. His wisdom, ability, courtesy and patience, added to the excellent arrangements made by the Director General and the Conference secretariat, had made it possible to surmount all the difficulties - at times quite substantial - and even to bring the session to a close a day earlier than expected.

77. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) expressed his pleasure at having been able to take part in the work of the General Conference, which had once more testified to the steady development of the Agency on which were centred the hopes of people throughout the world.

78. On behalf of the Latin American countries and of the United States of America, he congratulated the President and all who had seconded him in his task on the noteworthy work that had been accomplished. He also thanked the Austrian Government and the Municipality of Vienna for their hospitality.

79. Mr. REGALA (Philippines), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Far East and of South-East Asia, said he was glad to associate himself with the previous speakers' tributes to the President.

80. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said he had gladly agreed to be spokesman for Iraq, Tunisia and Morocco, in addition to his own country, in paying tribute to the work of the President. He also wished to thank the Secretary to the General Conference and all members of the Secretariat without distinction; there was often a danger that their devoted work, which was indispensable to the efficient functioning of the Conference, would pass unnoticed.

81. Mr. HAYMERLE (Austria) conveyed his country's thanks to the President for the personal contribution he had made to the success of the General Conference, as well as to the other officers, the members of the Main Committees and the Secretariat for the outstanding work they had done.

82. The Austrian Government was only too glad to be able to contribute in so far as it could to the achievement of the Agency's lofty objectives.

It was convinced that the sincere co-operation of all Member States would enable those objectives to be achieved for the greater good of mankind.

83. The PRESIDENT thanked the other officers and the Secretariat for their co-operation and advice, without which he could not have discharged his functions.

84. He availed himself of the opportunity to express his appreciation for the hospitality of the Austrian Government and of the Municipality of Vienna. He especially thanked the Chairmen of the Main Committees whose task had been particularly onerous. His sincere appreciation was also due to the representatives of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the intergovernmental organizations for their attendance, and to the non-governmental organizations which had sent observers. He paid a special tribute to the Director General and the Deputy Directors General, as well as to all members of the Secretariat, whose untiring efforts had often continued late into the night. Appreciation was due, too, to the representatives of the Press and Radio who had contributed to the Session's success by keeping the public informed of the progress made.

85. The third regular session of the General Conference had achieved its objectives. The budget and programme for the year 1960 had been approved, and the target set for voluntary contributions.

86. The session was unique in that the political discussions which had characterized the two preceding sessions had lost their vigour and edge. The Agency, as a scientific and technical body, could fulfil its functions better to the extent that politics were divorced from its activities and programmes. The solid progress made during the past year would inspire new hope among its Member States. They could look confidently to the future of the Agency when every effort would be made towards achieving the lofty ideals and principles embodied in the Statute.

87. As he had said in his opening statement, the age of the atom, enshrining the triumph of modern science and technology, demanded the broadest possible measure of co-operation among all nations, large and small; indeed, the future of mankind depended upon such co-operation. If the third session of the General Conference had succeeded in ensuring international co-operation of that kind in the sphere of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, it would go

down in the history of the Agency as the session which had opened a new era of peace, happiness and prosperity.

88. He invited the Conference to observe a minute of silence dedicated to prayer or meditation.

89. All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

90. .The PRESIDENT then declared closed the third regular session of the General Conference.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

