



International Atomic Energy Agency

General Conference

Distr.
GENERAL
GC(IV)/OR.46
4 January 1961
ENGLISH

FOURTH REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE FORTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Saturday, 1 October 1960, at 10.45 a.m.

President: Mr. NADJAKOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Welcome to a new Member (Colombia)	1 - 2
7	Applications for membership of the Agency (continued from the 43rd meeting)	3 - 8
10	General debate and report of the Board of Governors for 1959-60 (continued from the 45th meeting)	9 - 43

* GC(IV)/130.

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

WELCOME TO A NEW MEMBER (COLOMBIA)

1. The PRESIDENT announced that on 30 September 1960 Colombia had deposited an instrument of ratification of the Statute with the depositary Government and had consequently become the seventy-third Member of the Agency on that date. He welcomed the representative of Colombia, who was now present for the first time as the delegate of his country.

2. Mr. MARULANDA (Colombia) thanked the President and the General Conference for the welcome extended to his country and to himself personally. In ratifying the Statute, Colombia fully realized the responsibilities it was undertaking and hoped to be able to give satisfactory proof of its goodwill and faith in the Agency by participating whole-heartedly in the latter's activities over the coming years.

APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE AGENCY (GC(IV)/146, 147) (continued from the 43rd meeting)

3. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to consider two new applications for membership, those of Senegal and Mali (GC(IV)/146 and 147).

4. Mr. FONTAINE (France) pointed out that during the past year the Government at Dakar had been kept in touch with the Secretariat's work by the French delegation. In the firm belief that Senegal would make a valuable contribution to the Agency's work, the French Government strongly supported its admission.

5. He also urged the Conference to grant the application of Mali which, a few hours after its admission to the United Nations, had sent a telegram requesting that it be admitted to membership of the Agency.

6. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America), Mr. EMELIANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. MITRA (India), Mr. da COSTA (Portugal), Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia) and Mr. BREW (Ghana) associated themselves with the delegate of France in warmly supporting the applications of Senegal and Mali for Agency membership.

7. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to vote on the two draft resolutions submitted by the Board recommending the approval of Senegal and Mali for membership of the Agency.

8. The two draft resolutions were unanimously adopted.

GENERAL DEBATE AND REPORT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR 1959-60 (GC(IV)/126 and Corr.1, 131, 148, 149/Rev.2) (continued from the 45th meeting)

9. The PRESIDENT recalled the decision at the 42nd plenary meeting to discuss the Polish draft resolution covering the participation of the Agency in international efforts to secure the prohibition of nuclear weapons (GC(IV)/131) at a plenary meeting without reference to any committee^{1/}. Since then, a motion and procedural proposal relating to the Polish draft resolution had been submitted jointly by Canada, France, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States (GC(IV)/148). Both documents were now open for discussion.

10. Mr. DIMITRIU (Romania) said Romania believed that the Agency, under Articles II and III.B.1 of the Statute, was not only fully authorized, but actually required to participate in international efforts to secure the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and that it would be failing in its duty if it did not do so.

11. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) said he had no wish to pursue the history of the negotiations for an agreement on the suspension of weapons tests, which were, in fact, much more complicated than had appeared from what had been said by the delegate of the Soviet Union^{2/}. Essential to any agreement on weapons tests and disarmament was the belief of all parties that it could be fully implemented. That belief could only be founded on a rational conviction that each party was fully prepared to discharge the obligations it undertook. That conviction could in turn be founded only on the acceptance by all parties of effective controls and inspection.

12. As the British Prime Minister had said two days earlier to the United Nations General Assembly, the United Kingdom would gladly allow any form of inspection and control that was accepted by the Soviet Union; the sacrifice of some sovereign rights was a small price to pay for peace. But words alone would not ensure peace. Disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, and the suspension of nuclear weapons tests were under discussion in other

^{1/} GC(IV)/OR.42, paragraphs 36 and 37.

^{2/} GC(IV)/OR.45, paragraphs 26 - 30.

bodies specially set up for the purpose. With all due respect to the intelligence and knowledge of the delegates present, they involved problems which were outside the competence of the Conference.

13. His delegation did not believe the negotiations on the suspension of tests or weapons tests had failed or were likely to fail. The discussions in Geneva had been resumed and the British representative had just made an important compromise proposal designed to overcome a major difference between the parties. It would be neither wise nor diplomatic for the General Conference to adopt a draft resolution exhorting those taking part in the Geneva discussions to greater efforts.

14. He therefore believed the Conference should proceed as it had done at the previous session, and for that reason had joined with the delegations of Canada, France, Italy and the United States in submitting the motion and procedural proposal now before the Conference.

15. Mr. LEE (China) said there could be no doubt that the United Nations was the only international body which could attempt to deal with disarmament; hence, the question could not legitimately be considered as coming within the Agency's terms of reference or properly be the subject of a General Conference resolution.

16. Mr. GANEV (Bulgaria) recalled that his delegation had already expressed its views on disarmament during the general debate^{3/}. The Polish draft resolution did not suggest that the Conference could decide the discontinuance of nuclear weapon testing, but merely that it should join with others in demanding that nuclear weapons should be banned - a matter in regard to which the Agency could not remain indifferent.

17. It was obviously difficult for the United States and the other States sponsoring the motion and procedural proposal to take an open stand against the desire of all mankind that nuclear tests should be outlawed; that was why they were proposing on procedural grounds that the Polish draft resolution should not be considered.

^{3/} GC(IV)/OR.41, paragraph 42.

18. His delegation considered the Conference could and should take an affirmative decision on the Polish draft resolution: the vote should be on the substance of the question, i.e. for or against a ban on nuclear tests.

19. Mr. FURUUCHI (Japan) strongly opposed any proposal that the Agency should engage in purely political activities, however meritorious they might be in themselves. Only by remaining aloof from such questions could it hope to achieve the praiseworthy aims embodied in its Statute.

20. Mr. NAKICENOVIC (Yugoslavia) regretted the controversy which had arisen. It had been said that the Agency was a technical organization, not competent to deal with political matters. The distinction seemed illogical. The Agency's special responsibilities and the body of specialized knowledge it represented involved a clear duty to speak out. The safeguards policy adopted properly reflected an acknowledgement of that duty and formed a very useful precedent for the present case. The Agency was the organization best placed to emphasize the vast possibilities for developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy that would be released by disarmament; in any event, it should leave nothing undone that might contribute to world peace. For those reasons, his delegation could not support the joint motion and procedural proposal.

21. Mr. DIAH (Indonesia) said that as nuclear bomb tests had been carried out not very far from Indonesia, his country had a special interest in the present discussion. The Polish draft resolution was fully in accordance with the spirit of Article III.B.1 of the Statute and with the resolution recently submitted to the United Nations General Assembly by President Sukarno, Mr. Nehru and others. His delegation would vote against the motion and procedural proposal and in favor of the Polish draft resolution.

22. Mr. LENDVAI (Hungary) said that several speakers had put forward excellent reasons why the Agency should make itself heard on the question of discontinuing nuclear weapons tests. The Indian delegate, among others, had clearly demonstrated the competence of the General Conference, under the Agency's terms of reference, to adopt a resolution in the terms proposed by Poland^{4/}. The Hungarian Government believed that the question was one that

^{4/} GC(IV)/OR.45, paragraphs 52 - 56.

fundamentally affected the Agency's ability to carry out its obligations under the Statute, since the very existence of nuclear weapons tests constituted a grave obstacle to the success of the Agency's work.

23. He fully supported the Bulgarian delegate's comment that the attempts made to shelter behind objections of form showed that various delegations did not agree with the substance of the proposal; in other words, they wished to leave the way open for continued atomic bomb tests.

24. The confidence referred to by the United Kingdom delegate could only be attained by stages, but several delegations were refusing even the first step towards creating that confidence. The attitude Member States adopted towards the Polish proposal was the touchstone of their sincerity on the question of nuclear weapons tests. For its part, the Hungarian delegation strongly supported the Polish draft resolution and equally strongly opposed the joint motion and procedural proposal.

25. Baron van LYNDEN (Netherlands) proposed that, in accordance with Rule 77 of the Rules of Procedure, a vote should be taken on the motion and procedural proposal before the Polish draft resolution was voted upon.

26. Article III.B.1 of the Statute had been quoted more than once and, in his opinion, wrongly interpreted. Everyone agreed that the prohibition of atomic weapons would release vast resources for the peaceful exploitation of atomic energy, but the problems involved were political ones and should accordingly be dealt with by the United Nations itself.

27. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) observed that all delegations agreed on the desirability of putting an end to nuclear weapons tests. The only real argument put forward against the Polish draft resolution was that its subject matter was outside the Agency's terms of reference. He thought that argument had already been successfully demolished by the delegate of India.

28. It had been suggested that the draft resolution had been introduced for propaganda purposes. He thought no apology was necessary for propaganda in the cause of world peace and appealed to the sponsors of the motion and procedural proposal to withdraw them and support the Polish draft resolution.

29. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to vote separately, by roll-call, first on the procedural proposal and then on the motion set forth in document GC(IV)/148.

30. A roll-call vote was taken on the procedural proposal.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil.

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

Abstaining: Ethiopia, Tunisia, Ceylon.

31. The procedural proposal was adopted by 42 votes to 16, with 3 abstentions.

32. A roll-call vote was taken on the motion.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey.

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

Abstaining: Ceylon, Ethiopia, Tunisia.

33. The motion was adopted by 41 votes to 16, with 3 abstentions.

34. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said that, notwithstanding the terms of the motion which had just been adopted, he wished the Polish draft resolution to be put to the vote.

35. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) moved, under the terms of Rule 77 of the Rules of Procedure, that no vote be taken on the Polish draft resolution.

36. After a procedural discussion, the PRESIDENT put the Canadian motion to the vote.

37. The Canadian motion was adopted by 39 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.

38. The PRESIDENT said that, under the terms of Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure, he proposed to permit consideration of the draft resolution submitted jointly by Ethiopia, Ghana, Iraq, Morocco, Tunisia, the Union of South Africa and the United Arab Republic concerning equitable representation of the "Africa and Middle East" area on the Board of Governors (GC(IV)/149/Rev.2).

39. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia) said that the substance of the proposal was not new; it attempted to crystallize discussions which had been going on for a long time in the Board. The representation of Africa and the Middle East on the Board had been inadequate from the outset and with the admission of new African States to membership of the Agency it had become even more so. There were now 14 States from that area in the Agency, but apart from the Union of South Africa - which was nominated as a producer of source materials - only one of them was represented on the Board. In his view, two further seats should be provided.

40. He recalled that, at the Conference on the Statute, the Tunisian delegation had drawn attention to the inadequacy of African representation on the Board and the United States delegate had urged that no action should be taken until more African States had been admitted to the Agency. That had now taken place, and there was support in many quarters for removing the existing injustice and granting Africa the representation to which it was entitled.

41. Mr. SINACEUR (Morocco) called on delegates to indicate by a unanimous vote that they wished the Board to give full consideration to the matter.

42. The joint draft resolution (GC(IV)/149/Rev.2) was unanimously adopted.

43. Mr. SINACEUR (Morocco), on behalf of the sponsors, thanked the Conference for its unanimous vote.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

