



International Atomic Energy Agency

General Conference

Distr.
GENERAL
GC(IV)/OR.37
7 December 1960
ENGLISH

FOURTH REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Wednesday, 21 September 1960, at 10.40 a.m.

President: Mr. NADJAKOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
6	Adoption of the agenda and allocation of items for initial discussion	1 - 3
5	Credentials of delegates to the fourth regular session: (b) Report of the Credentials Committee	4 - 60
8	The closing date for the session	61 - 62

* GC(IV)/130.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document
GC(IV)/INF/31/Rev.3.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS FOR INITIAL DISCUSSION
(GC(IV)/128)

1. The PRESIDENT invited the General Conference to examine the report submitted by the General Committee (GC(IV)/128), which recommended that the General Conference include in its agenda all the items on the provisional agenda, supplementary item A^{1/} - "The use of funds provided to defray the Agency's administrative and operational services costs in 1960 under the United Nations Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance" - and the item proposed by Poland concerning the matter of the grant of consultative status with the Agency to the World Federation of Trade Unions. The General Committee recommended that the latter item be discussed at a plenary meeting to be held on or after Wednesday, 28 September.
2. He proposed that the Conference accept the recommendations of the General Committee on the agenda and the allocation of items for initial discussion.
3. The agenda and the allocation of items for initial discussion were approved.

CREDENTIALS OF DELEGATES TO THE FOURTH REGULAR SESSION:

(b) REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (GC(IV)/129)

4. Mr. YEMISCIBASI (Turkey), Chairman of the Credentials Committee, associated himself with the congratulations expressed to the President and thanked the Conference for having elected Turkey to the Credentials Committee.
5. On behalf of the Committee he asked the General Conference to approve the Committee's report (GC(IV)/120) and the two draft resolutions appearing at the end of it.
6. Mr. EMELIANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was categorically opposed to recognition of the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, which claimed to represent the people of China, with its 600 million inhabitants, at the General Conference. The delegation of the Soviet Union considered that China could be represented only by persons nominated by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The Chiang

1/ GC(IV)/109/Add.1.

Kai-shek group had long been dissociated from the Chinese people; it was now living out its last days at Taiwan, protected by American bayonets and subsidized by the United States Government.

7. The Soviet Union delegation again drew the attention of the Conference to the completely abnormal, if not absurd, situation, as a result of which the great State of China was not represented in the Agency and played no part in the work of the General Conference. The absence of representatives of the People's Republic of China was prejudicial to the cause of international co-operation. The responsibility for that rested with the United States delegation, whose attitude showed clearly that the United States was pursuing a cold war policy and intended to subordinate the interests of the Agency to its own interests. The Soviet Union delegation proposed that the credentials of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique should not be recognized and that the draft resolution submitted by the Credentials Committee on that subject should be rejected.

8. The delegation of the Soviet Union also condemned the attitude adopted by the majority of the Credentials Committee with regard to the delegation of the People's Republic of Hungary. Hungary was a Member of the Agency and was meeting all its obligations under the Agency's Statute. Everyone knew that there was only one Hungarian Government and one Hungarian State. The credentials of the delegation of the People's Republic of Hungary had been issued by the Government of that country, in conformity with its Constitution and with the provisions of Rule 27 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The attempt of the United States delegation to question the credentials of the Hungarian delegation constituted an interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, which was a Member of the United Nations. It was perfectly clear that the United States delegation was seeking to intensify the cold war and complicate the work of the Conference. The position adopted by that delegation on whose proposal the Committee had taken no decision on the credentials of the Hungarian delegation, was absolutely illogical. The United States Government maintained diplomatic relations with the Government of the People's Republic of Hungary, had a legation in Hungary and, at the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, had voted for the admission of Hungary to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of

Outer Space. For those reasons, his delegation was categorically opposed to the action taken by the Committee in regard to the credentials of the Hungarian delegation and would vote against the draft resolution proposing that the report of the Committee be approved.

9. Mr. McCONE (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the report of the Credentials Committee and would vote in favor of the two draft resolutions recommended by the Committee.

10. The Soviet representative had opposed the Committee's action in regard to the questions of the representation of China and the credentials submitted on behalf of the delegates of Hungary, and in doing so had made a number of statements to which the United States strongly objected. Despite the provocation, the United States delegation would not, however, reply to those statements in kind nor engage in a debate on the substance of the political matters in question. Those issues were not new; the Agency was not the proper forum in which to discuss their substance. In addition, the United States delegation wished to avoid an acrimonious debate which would not enhance understanding or serve any useful purpose.

11. The United States delegation, like many others, had not come to the Conference to use the Agency as a propaganda platform, but to consider seriously ways and means of promoting the important work for which the Agency had the primary responsibility within the United Nations system.

12. The views of the United States on the substance of the question of the representation of China and Hungarian credentials had been made clear repeatedly in the political organs of the United Nations and other appropriate international forums. The United States Government would have further opportunity at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly to restate the facts underlying its strong opposition to the seating of Communist China in international organizations and to reiterate the reasons for its attitude on the matter of Hungarian credentials.

13. With regard to the representation of China, the resolution recommended by the Committee was in full conformity with the decisions taken on that matter by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The Agency and the specialized agencies had, in fact, always recognized that the questions involving the representation of Member States were the primary concern of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

14. As to the representation of Hungary, the action taken by the Credentials Committee was likewise in conformity with the practice consistently followed by the General Assembly ever since the tragic events in Hungary in 1956.

15. The United States delegate appealed to all delegations to make a determined effort to avoid debates on controversial issues which were not the concern of the Agency - which properly fell within the jurisdiction of, and were under active consideration in, other international forums. The problems to be solved to make the atom serve the peaceful purposes contemplated by the Statute of the Agency, and to achieve the goals established, were formidable. Their solution could only be delayed by confusing them with political issues.

16. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) protested against the pretensions of a group of persons who claimed to represent China, and regretted the absence of the only valid representatives of that country, namely those of the People's Republic of China. He also protested against the fact that the Committee had not recognized unreservedly the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

17. He wondered why the General Conference had set up a Credentials Committee if it was only to rubber-stamp a decision of the United Nations. By their vote, the majority of the Committee had not served the Agency's interests since they had in fact countenanced a maneuver that smacked of the cold war. The Polish delegation would vote against the Committee's report.

18. Mr. SEBES (Hungary) made the following statement:^{2/}

a. "As delegate of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic I protest most emphatically against paragraph 12 of the Credentials Committee's report proposing that the General Conference should once again take no decision regarding the credentials submitted by the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic.

b. "It is obvious to everyone that the proposal concerning the credentials of the delegate of Hungary is illegal and absurd. Hungary is a founder Member of the Agency and as such has participated actively in the Agency's work from the beginning. It takes part in sessions of the General Conference as well as in numerous seminars and meetings of experts organized by the Agency and endeavors to contribute towards the success of those activities. Under the Agency's auspices fellows proposed by the Hungarian Government have been

^{2/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 92(b) of the Rules of Procedure.

received in many countries including the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and even the United States of America. On its part Hungary has offered fellowships to the Agency, one of which has already been accepted by a candidate from another country. The relations maintained by Hungary with the Agency are thus effective and useful. It is therefore senseless, on the pretext of a discussion concerning credentials, to start a debate on a factitious question when the Conference ought to devote all its attention to matters concerning the Agency's work, such as the development of trade and scientific relations between countries and the industrial, agricultural and medical uses of radioisotopes.

c. "Delegations of countries seeking to question the credentials of the Hungarian delegation are fully aware that the international relations of the Hungarian People's Republic are developing satisfactorily in regard to the peaceful uses of atomic energy both within the framework of the Agency and in other spheres, as demonstrated by the Director General's visits to Hungary and my country's relations with both East and West.

d. "The fact that the Hungarian delegation's credentials have been contested obviously serves only to deflect the work of the Agency, which should primarily be of a technical and economic character, in a way that frustrates the successful accomplishment of its specific task so clearly defined in its Statute. Everyone realizes which are the countries to whose advantage such maneuvers redound.

e. "Concerning the representation of China, in the name of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, I most emphatically protest against acceptance of the credentials presented by the representative of the Taiwan clique. Credentials can only be submitted by duly authorized representatives of legitimate governments. In China there is only one legitimate government, the Government of the People's Republic. Accordingly, only the authorized delegate of that Government can be regarded as the lawful representative of China.

f. "We all know that the question we are really being asked to decide is not whether the General Conference should or should not endorse such credentials, but how long China is still to be deprived of its undoubted right to play its

proper part in the international organizations within the United Nations family. At present the place of the fifth great Power, recognized by the United Nations and hence by all international organizations, is being usurped by a clique; that diminishes respect for these organizations and stands in the way of the solution of world problems, including that of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the development of its applications. It is obvious that the Agency's objectives on a worldwide scale and true international co-operation can only be achieved with the participation of the People's Republic of China. Consequently I will vote against acceptance of the credentials presented by the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique."

19. Mr. NOVACU (Romania) noted from the Credentials Committee's report that the seat of the People's Republic of China was once again being occupied by private individuals representing no one but themselves. That anachronism reflected the attitude adopted by certain circles hostile to democracy and progress at a time when the People's Republic of China was continuously expanding its productive forces at an impressive pace and turning itself into a first-class industrial power.

20. The report of the Board for 1959-1960 stated that advantage must be taken of the Agency's worldwide membership by using it as a means of improving scientific contact between different countries. But it was difficult to see how the Agency could effectively discharge that function as long as it was deprived of the technical and scientific experience and the practical contribution of a country with a population of over 600 millions. The absence of China detracted from the Agency's authority and prestige. The only credentials his delegation could recognize were those emanating from the Government of the People's Republic of China.

21. Furthermore, his delegation opposed the Credentials Committee's proposal concerning the credentials of the Hungarian delegation which, being in order, were fully valid. The United States motion discriminated against Hungary and was wholly lacking in any legal basis since it concerned a country which maintained diplomatic and scientific relations with most Member States of the Agency, including the United States.

22. His delegation would vote against the Credentials Committee's report.

23. Mr. LALL (India) considered that, in paragraph 1 of the proposed draft resolution I, the Committee had gone beyond its terms of reference. The text derived from a similar resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, but whereas the Assembly had had before it requests and motions concerning the representation of China, nothing of the sort had happened in the General Conference. The proposed text, which was not in conformity with Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure, was therefore unacceptable.

24. His delegation would support draft resolution II although it was opposed to the recommendation in paragraph 12 of the report concerning the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

25. Mr. LEE (China) regretted that the Conference had had to listen once again to well-worn and false accusations against the Republic of China, which was a free country on whose territory there was not a single soldier belonging to an army of occupation. The United States had not sent an army to China to suppress the fight for freedom as others had done in Eastern Germany and Hungary. If the 600 million inhabitants of continental China had a free choice they would certainly not choose the Communist regime. That would also be true of the peoples of Eastern Europe. The delegation of the Republic of China thanked all the delegations who staunchly defended the cause of right and justice.

26. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) made the following statement:^{3/}

a. "The Czechoslovak delegation stated at the previous session of the General Conference as well as at the Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and considers it urgent to re-emphasize emphatically at the present juncture, that the Czechoslovak Government does not recognize as valid any signature appended to the Statute of the Agency in the name of China that has not been appended by the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China; likewise it does not recognize the validity of any credentials issued on behalf of China by persons other than the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China, which is the only legitimate Government of China.

^{3/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 92(b) of the Rules of Procedure.

b. "In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to express once again the deep regrets of the Czechoslovak Government that, as a result of the discriminatory policy pursued by some Western Powers, the People's Republic of China, whose population makes up a quarter of all humanity, has thus far been prevented from becoming a Member of the Agency. That policy, which has made itself felt also on other occasions, cannot under any circumstances further the interests of our organization. International co-operation within the framework of the Agency cannot but suffer from the fact that that great country has been deprived of the possibility of participating in the Agency's activities and that its place has been taken by the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, who represent nobody, and who maintain their existence only thanks to the military occupation of Taiwan by the United States armed forces.

c. "We therefore warmly support the motion tabled by the delegation of the USSR that the General Conference should declare the credentials of the so-called representative of China to be out of order and consequently exclude the name of China from the list of delegations which have submitted their credentials for the General Conference.

d. "With regard to paragraph 12 of the report of the Credentials Committee, the Czechoslovak delegation is obliged to express its fundamental objection to the effect of the voting in the Credentials Committee, which resulted in rejecting consideration of the credentials of the Hungarian People's Republic. The credentials of this delegation were issued by a Government elected legally and in accordance with the State Constitution. The unwillingness to consider the credentials of the Hungarian People's Republic represents, as was the case at the last session of the General Conference also, another attempt to discriminate against the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, with a view to frustrating its co-operation in the international field.

e. "The Czechoslovak delegation will therefore vote against the report of the Credentials Committee."

27. Mr. DIAH (Indonesia) said that he had studied the report of the Credentials Committee but could not support the Committee's draft resolution concerning the representation of China, as the Indonesian Government recognized only the Government of the People's Republic of China. In regard to the

credentials submitted by the Hungarian delegation, the Indonesian delegation was obliged to point out that those credentials were in conformity with the provisions of Rule 27 of the Rules of Procedure. Indonesia, like many States Members of the Agency, maintained diplomatic relations with the Hungarian Government, and the Indonesian delegation saw no logical reason why the validity of the credentials submitted by the Hungarian delegation should not be recognized.

28. Consequently, the Indonesian delegation could not support draft resolution I which the Credentials Committee recommended the Conference to adopt, but, subject to the reservations which he had mentioned, his delegation would vote for draft resolution II.

29. Mr. ZHMUDSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation protested most strongly against the recognition of the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek group. In the Agency the Government of China was judged on the basis of the negative attitude which the United States Government adopted towards the system of government instituted by the Chinese people; consequently that great country found itself deprived of the possibility of taking part in the Agency's work. It was time the Conference put an end to the practice of subordinating the activities of the Agency to the egotistical interests of certain States and did away with the anomalous position which had arisen in regard to the representation of China. His delegation considered that the legitimate representative of China in the Agency could only be a representative appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

30. The Ukrainian delegation protested most strongly against the doubts which a certain group of delegations were attempting to cast on the validity of the credentials of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic. Hungary was a Member of the Agency and had therefore an undeniable right to send its delegation to take part in the work of the Conference. The credentials of the Hungarian delegation had been submitted in accordance with the constitutional provisions of the State and they had been issued in entire conformity with the provisions of the Statute and of the Rules of Procedure. Consequently, any consideration of the political system in Hungary constituted an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of that State. For those reasons his delegation was unable to vote in favor of the report submitted by the Credentials Committee.

31. Mr. CONTRERAS (El Salvador) said that El Salvador maintained diplomatic relations with the Republic of China and for that reason his delegation was bound to recognize the validity of the credentials issued to the representatives of that country. His delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolutions submitted by the Credentials Committee.

32. Mr. GANEV (Bulgaria) stated that his delegation did not recognize any credentials submitted in the name of China other than those issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China. His delegation would continue to protest until the legitimate representatives of the Chinese people had taken their rightful place in the Agency. The question of the representation of the Chinese people in the Agency was an important one and had a direct bearing on the principle of the universality of the Agency. His delegation considered that the Chinese people should be represented by its real representatives.

33. In the interests of international co-operation his delegation protested most vigorously against the approval of the credentials of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique. His delegation was likewise opposed to the attitude adopted by the Credentials Committee in regard to the credentials of the Hungarian delegation; the delegations which had raised that matter were compromising the very principles on which the Agency worked.

34. His delegation accordingly protested most strongly against the report submitted by the Credentials Committee and would vote against the draft resolutions it contained.

35. Mr. KIM (Republic of Korea) regretted that certain delegations had felt it necessary to raise the question of the representation of China. The Conference was there to promote the peaceful use of atomic energy, and could have no place for propagandist political maneuvers. Was it to be tolerated that Communist China, which had attacked Korea and had been condemned as an aggressor by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and had never ceased to harbor evil designs against the Republic of Korea, should be allowed to become a member of an international organization like the Agency? The credentials of the Chinese delegation, which had been issued by the representatives of the only legitimate Government of China, were in complete conformity with the provisions of Rule 27 of the Rules of Procedure, and were therefore fully valid. Without wasting any more time on the question, the Conference should approve the conclusions of the Credentials Committee.

36. Mr. PAVLUCHENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that his delegation had stated on many occasions that only the representatives appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China could represent China in the Agency. In accordance with that view, Byelorussia had never recognized and did not recognize the validity of the signature which the Chiang Kai-shok group had appended to the Statute of the Agency.

37. During its eleven years of existence, the Chinese People's Republic had had enormous successes, political, economic and social, and had consistently followed a peaceful foreign policy. By depriving it of the right to take part in the work of the Agency, great harm was done to the Agency, and the opportunities for ensuring a broad international co-operation in the peaceful use of atomic energy were considerably restricted.

38. His delegation therefore unreservedly supported the Soviet Union proposal not to recognize as valid the credentials of the so-called Government of Chiang Kai-shok.

39. His delegation also protested strongly against the attempt to cast doubts on the credentials of the Hungarian delegation, which had been issued in accordance with the Constitution of the Hungarian People's Republic and with the provisions of the Rules of Procedure. The proposal to take no decision on the credentials of the Hungarian delegation, which had been imposed by the United States and was politically inspired, seriously obstructed the work of the present session of the General Conference and was intended to intensify the cold war.

40. The Credentials Committee's action was in flagrant contradiction with the Statute, Article IV of which provided that "The Agency is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members ...". His delegation was therefore strongly against approval of the Committee's report.

41. Mr. PHUONG (Viet-Nam) said he had carefully studied the report of the Credentials Committee. The problem of the representation of China must be considered from three viewpoints: legal, political and practical. From the legal viewpoint it was difficult to contest the validity of the credentials submitted in the name of the Republic of China, for the Conference only had to decide if those credentials were in conformity with the provisions of Rule 27 of its Rules of Procedure and it was clear beyond all dispute that they were.

From the political viewpoint it seemed uncertain whether the Conference was competent to take any decision. The Agency was a highly specialized organization, and if the discussions of the Conference were to be imbued with proper serenity, political questions should be left to such bodies as the United Nations General Assembly. Finally, with regard to the practical aspect, i.e. the contribution Member States could make to the Agency's work, there was no denying the progress which had been made in atomic energy thanks to the work of eminent scientists from the Republic of China.

42. For those reasons the Viet-Nam delegation approved the report of the Credentials Committee and would vote in favor of the two draft resolutions it recommended to the Conference for adoption.

43. Mr. BAUM (Yugoslavia) said he would not restate Yugoslavia's attitude to the question of the representation of China; it was already well known and had not changed. His delegation would vote against draft resolution I, submitted by the Credentials Committee. It would vote in favor of draft resolution II, although disagreeing with that part of the report which dealt with the credentials submitted on behalf of the delegates of Hungary and the decision taken in that regard by the Committee.

44. Mr. BOONWAAT (Burma) said he shared the Indonesian view on the credentials submitted by the delegation of China. In addition, his delegation could not recognize the validity of the credentials submitted by the delegations of Viet-Nam and Korea so long as the People's Republic of Viet-Nam and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were not also represented.

45. Mr. BINSON (Thailand) pointed out that, every time the Credentials Committee had had to deal with the problem of the credentials of the delegations of China and Hungary, it had taken a decision similar to that taken by the appropriate United Nations bodies. It therefore seemed reasonable for the Conference to approve the Committee's report. His delegation would vote for the two draft resolutions submitted by the Committee and hoped the discussion would soon end, so that the Conference could take up other items on its agenda.

46. Mr. SINACEUR (Morocco) pointed out that his Government maintained diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and therefore found it difficult to recognize any Chinese Government other than that of Peking. In

regard to paragraph 12 of the Credentials Committee's report, he thought the Committee should have adhered strictly to the provisions of Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure, which provided that it should "examine the credentials of all delegates and report thereon without delay to the General Conference". His delegation would vote against the first draft resolution submitted by the Credentials Committee, and could vote for the second only with the reservation he had made.

47. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said his delegation would vote against the first draft resolution, because his country maintained that the only legitimate government of China was that of the People's Republic of China; it would vote for the second draft resolution, but only on the understanding that its vote should not be interpreted as expressing doubts in regard to the validity of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation.

48. Mr. BUESO (Honduras) said he approved draft resolution I as a whole.

49. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to vote on draft resolution I in the report of the Credentials Committee.

50. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia) formally proposed that the two paragraphs of draft resolution I be put to the vote separately and asked that voting be by roll-call.

51. Mr. EMELYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) seconded the Czechoslovak proposal for a separate vote.

52. Mr. McCONE (United States of America) also supported the proposal.

53. A roll-call vote was taken on paragraph 1.

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

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, El Salvador, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Holy See, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Against: Poland, Romania, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Norway.

Abstaining: Pakistan, Switzerland, Tunisia, Ethiopia, Iceland, Israel.

54. Paragraph 1 was adopted by 32 votes to 21, with 6 abstentions.

55. A roll-call vote was taken on paragraph 2.

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

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Holy See, Honduras, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, El Salvador, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece.

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

Abstaining: Iceland, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland.

56. Paragraph 2 was adopted by 33 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.

57. A roll-call vote was taken on draft resolution I as a whole.

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

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Holy See, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Portugal.

Against: Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Norway, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Switzerland, Iceland, Israel, Pakistan.

58. Draft resolution I was adopted by 33 votes to 21, with 4 abstentions.

59. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to vote on draft resolution II.

60. Draft resolution II was adopted by 45 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

THE CLOSING DATE FOR THE SESSION

61. The PRESIDENT recalled that, under Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure, the General Conference on the recommendation of the General Committee should, at the beginning of each session, fix a closing date for the session. At its eighth meeting, on 20 September 1960, the General Committee had estimated that the general debate might conclude during the afternoon of Thursday, 22 September and the main committees begin work the following morning. The General Conference would then be able to resume plenary meetings in the middle of the following week. The General Committee accordingly recommended that the Conference provisionally fix Saturday, 1 October 1960, as the closing date for the session, on the understanding that the date could of course be altered if the Conference succeeded in completing its work earlier.

62. The recommendation of the General Committee was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.