



International Atomic Energy Agency

General Conference

Distr.
GENERAL

GC(IV)/OR.47
5 January 1961
ENGLISH

FOURTH REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE FORTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Saturday, 1 October 1960, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. NADJAKOV (Bulgaria)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
25	The matter of the grant of consultative status with the Agency to the World Federation of Trade Unions	1 - 62
12	The development of nuclear power	63 - 64
5	Credentials of delegates to the fourth regular session: (b) Report of the Credentials Committee (continued from the 37th meeting)	65 - 66
27	Closing of the session	67 - 76

* GC(IV)/130.

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

THE MATTER OF THE GRANT OF CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE AGENCY TO THE WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS (GC(IV)/128, 133; GC(IV)/INF/29)

1. Mr. PETRZELKA (Czechoslovakia), introducing his delegation's draft resolution (GC(IV)/133), observed that the matter of the grant of consultative status to the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) was casting a shadow over the General Conference and some of its positive results. That was not the fault of the socialist or neutral States, but of the United States, whose attitude had been particularly discriminatory.
2. He recalled the Conference resolution of 8 October 1959^{1/}, recommending the Board to reconsider the question of granting consultative status to WFTU. The United States had exerted strong pressure to persuade a majority of the Board to reject WFTU's application; at the meeting held in June 1960, it had succeeded, and the Board had taken a negative decision. The only supporting argument the United States had advanced was that no new factor had arisen which would justify reversing the Board's first, negative decision. A majority of the Board had set a dangerous precedent, completely ignoring the Conference resolution and the fact that the Agency's highest authority had questioned the grounds for the previous decision, if not actually disapproving it.
3. With regard to the principles involved, there were three essential factors. First, WFTU satisfied all the conditions laid down in the Rules on the Consultative Status of Non-Governmental Organizations with the Agency^{2/}. It was an international non-governmental organization of world importance - the oldest and largest trade union federation - with over one hundred million members, spread throughout most of the countries represented at the Conference. In particular, it organized thousands of the workers, technicians and scientists of atomic industries in many countries. It had declared its willingness to support the Agency, whose objectives and functions it recognized, and take part in Agency activities. It had on many occasions shown its interest in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. For instance, it had sent a delegation to the first United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy held in Geneva in August 1955, and an observer to the Conference on the Statute of the Agency. On 17 December 1959 it had set up

^{1/} GC(III)/RES/47.

^{2/} GC(II)/RES/20, Annex.

a trade union committee of experts on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, mainly to study working conditions and health and safety problems; the committee's findings would doubtless be of considerable practical value to the Agency.

4. Secondly, as consultative status had been granted to two far less important trade union organizations, i.e. the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (IFCTU), the refusal to grant it to WFTU seemed all the more unjustified, and constituted flagrant discrimination not only against WFTU, but more specifically against thousands of trade union members working in atomic industries. The political climate of the Agency and its practical work must necessarily suffer as a result of such discrimination.

5. Thirdly, WFTU enjoyed consultative status with the United Nations and the main specialized agencies. Whenever it suited their convenience, certain Western Powers proclaimed that the Agency should follow the example of the other United Nations organizations, but it was otherwise in the case of WFTU. The United States delegate claimed that WFTU had changed in character since obtaining consultative status with the United Nations. That was not true: there had been no change in its principles, purposes or practical activities since its establishment in 1945. Nor could anyone deny the positive results of WFTU's co-operation with the organizations which had granted it consultative status.

6. For all those -- to him irrefutable -- reasons, he asked delegates to be objective and realistic and to respect the opinions of others, which was the very basis of international co-operation.

7. The Czechoslovak draft resolution reproduced almost word for word the resolution on WFTU adopted by the General Conference at its third regular session. The preamble reiterated the main pertinent facts; the operative part was based on the views expressed at the third regular session and recommended the Board, yet again, to reconsider its position.

8. The Conference could have been asked to take its own decision, but that would have meant amending the rules on the grant of consultative status. The Czechoslovak delegation had therefore opted for the alternative: a Conference

recommendation, inviting the Board to take a positive decision. That recommendation was in conformity with the provisions of Article V.D of the Statute. He felt sure that delegations which really wished to represent the interests of the working people in their own countries, and which had a sense of law and justice and did not want an unfortunate political atmosphere in the Agency, would support his delegation's draft resolution.

9. Mr. EMBLYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the grant of consultative status to WFTU was being considered by the Conference for a second time solely because of the discriminatory attitude adopted by the Board at the instigation of certain States. The Board had granted consultative status to 17 non-governmental organizations including ICFTU and IFCTU, neither of which could compare with WFTU in membership or international standing. The Soviet Union was opposed to discrimination in the Agency or in any other organization.

10. The Agency should be universal in character - that was why the Conference had drawn up the rules on the consultative status of non-governmental organizations with the Agency. WFTU had been one of the first to apply for consultative status. It had then 95 million workers in 48 countries; now it had over 100 million, in 70 countries, including some which had just become independent.

11. It was known that WFTU was much concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It had sent a delegation to the first Geneva conference and an observer to the Conference on the Statute of the Agency. At its twentieth session, in 1959, the Executive Committee had set up a trade union committee of experts to encourage and co-ordinate trade union activities connected with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. WFTU was prepared, through the Agency, to supply experts who could assist countries needing their particular qualifications, and could make a very appreciable contribution to the work of many of the Agency's scientific meetings.

12. In fact, however, certain delegates did not even ask whether WFTU satisfied the essential conditions for consultative status with the Agency but opposed its grant because in their eyes it was guilty of fighting for peace and for the banning of nuclear weapons. The best proof of that was the

statement made to the Board by the Governor from the United States in July 1959 when he had stated, without the slightest ambiguity, the reasons for which it would be inexpedient to grant consultative status to WFTU: it was campaigning against war and for the reduction of armaments, the banning of atomic weapons and the utilization of atomic energy for exclusively peaceful purposes.

13. Certain other delegations had claimed that the grant to WFTU of consultative status with the United Nations and certain specialized agencies did not constitute a precedent. But when it came to approving the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek clique, they referred to the United Nations and insisted vehemently that its example must be followed - an attitude that could only be considered, not logical, but cynical.

14. The United States' attitude was in the spirit of the cold war and dictated by certain circles in the United States which did not want any relaxation of international tension.

15. His delegation fully supported the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia with the object of settling at long last in a positive manner the question of granting consultative status with the Agency to WFTU. It only wished to repair the injustice which had been done to WFTU through the fault of the United States delegation. He hoped that the General Conference would show good sense and adopt the Czechoslovak draft resolution despite the efforts of the United States.

16. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America) said he would not reply to the accusations made against his Government; he would leave it to others to decide whether it was the United States which was responsible for continuing the cold war. Nor would he attempt to bring into true perspective the exaggerated claims that had been made on behalf of WFTU.

17. The usefulness, and indeed the only point, of granting consultative status to any non-governmental organization lay in its ability to present an independent point of view. As at present constituted, WFTU could not claim to be an independent international association of trade unions; it was an instrument of the foreign policy of the Government of one country which it served as a political propaganda machine. To be convinced of that fact it was only necessary to refer to the records of the discussions of the WFTU

General Council, which had met in Peking in June 1960. Those records were full of political invective against the United States Government and against the Governments of most States Members of the Agency. They contained inflammatory statements encouraging subversion and violence, which were contrary to the interests of the Agency, whose primary concern was the peaceful utilization of atomic energy. Several excerpts - which he quoted - from the records of the WFTU General Council illustrated these points. It was on that basis that the United States maintained that WFTU was not, under the Agency's rules, a legitimate non-governmental organization. Again, because of its subversive political activities in the territories of two Member States, WFTU had been asked to withdraw its headquarters, first from one and then from the other. A legitimate trade union association would not have been engaged in such improper activities.

18. The fact that WFTU had at one time been granted consultative status with the United Nations or with specialized agencies was irrelevant and should not affect the decision of the Conference in any way. That status had been granted at a time when many Governments were still inclined to give WFTU the benefit of the doubt in the matter of its standing as a legitimate labor organization. Its true character had meanwhile become clear.

19. It had been called illogical, discriminatory, and even a violation of the Statute to grant consultative status to other trade union organizations and deny it to WFTU. That argument was itself illogical: it was nowhere provided that consultative status must automatically be granted to all organizations which applied for it. The Statute merely stated - in Article XVI.A - that the Board, with the approval of the Conference, was authorized to establish an appropriate relationship with any organizations the work of which was related to that of the Agency. On the basis of those provisions, the Board and the Conference had jointly approved a set of rules to govern relations between the Agency and non-governmental organizations. Those rules provided that the Board should differentiate - or, if it were preferred, discriminate - between applicants to whom it would be in the interest of the Agency to grant consultative status and applicants whose admission would not serve the Agency's interest; they nowhere provided that if one organization satisfied the desired conditions the Board must automatically accord the same treatment to any other organization which claimed to represent similar interests.

20. He could not agree that the resolution adopted at the third regular session implied a criticism of the Board or a request that it go back on its decision of 1959. To be convinced that he was right it was only necessary to refer to the statements made at that time by the delegates of the United Kingdom, Canada, and Pakistan, and even by the delegate of the Soviet Union.

21. In conclusion, he reaffirmed his Government's position with regard to WFTU: it was an organization whose aims and purposes did not conform with the spirit, purposes and principles of the Agency; it was able neither to represent the interests of workers independently, nor to provide an independent, as distinct from a governmental, point of view; it would make no constructive contribution to the Agency's work. WFTU did not satisfy the conditions laid down in paragraph 2 of the rules on consultative status, and hence could not be granted that status.

22. The Board had twice rejected the application of WFTU by an overwhelming majority. It was a carefully considered and fully justified decision which the Conference should uphold by rejecting the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

23. Mr. NOVACU (Romania) observed that the Board had granted consultative status, without opposition, to 17 non-governmental organizations, two of which were trade union organizations. Only WFTU had been refused, and for obviously political reasons, although it was the largest world-wide organization of workers; the refusal was due to those who never ceased repeating that the Agency should be an exclusively technical organization.

24. When it suited them, the same delegations maintained that the Agency should follow the practice of the other United Nations organizations. Why not then follow the example of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) all of which had granted consultative status to WFTU?

25. The only valid criterion must be whether WFTU satisfied the conditions laid down in the rules on consultative status, in particular paragraph 2 thereof. By adopting Resolution GC(III)/RES/47, the General Conference had expressly recognized that "the World Federation of Trade Unions recognizes the objectives and functions of the International Atomic Energy Agency and declares its support for the practical work of the Agency". Moreover, the Executive Committee of WFTU had established a committee of experts to study health and safety problems affecting workers in atomic industry.

26. His delegation therefore unreservedly supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

27. Mr. PAVLUCHENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) reminded the Conference that WFTU represented 100 million trade unionists in 70 countries, working in the most diverse occupations including, in many countries, atomic energy industries.

28. Contrary to the spirit of the Conference resolution adopted at the third regular session, the majority of the Board - to keep in step with the United States which, for political and ideological reasons, was opposed to WFTU - had once again taken a discriminatory decision.

29. The United States' efforts to prove that the WFTU program was not in conformity with the aims and principles of the Agency could not be taken seriously. That program was, in fact, in full accord with the Agency's objectives and functions as laid down in its Statute. Moreover, WFTU supported Agency activities, not by empty words, but by practical action. In 1949, well before the Agency's establishment, the control of atomic energy in order to ensure its use for exclusively peaceful purposes had been an item in the WFTU program. At its fourth Congress, in 1956, WFTU had set up a committee of experts and workers qualified in radiation protection; in December 1959, at its twentieth session, the Executive Committee had decided to establish a trade union committee of experts on the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

30. Since the Agency had been set up WFTU, in official communications, had frequently expressed its desire to co-operate with a view to improving working and living conditions for workers; and likewise its desire to participate in the Agency's work and consult on questions affecting the working masses, especially those employed in atomic industry. Its co-operation would also be valuable because of the fact that no other trade union organization included so many scientific workers.

31. During the fifteen years it had existed, WFTU had received a wide measure of international recognition. It was a world organization which enjoyed consultative status with the United Nations, UNESCO, ILO and FAO. Why, then, could it not be granted consultative status with the Agency?

32. His delegation believed the Conference should, at the present session, take the decision proposed in the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

33. Mr. SEBES (Hungary) thought that the Board's refusal to grant consultative status to WFTU was contrary to the spirit of Resolution GC(III)/RES/47. In referring the question back, the Conference had obviously expected the Board to take an affirmative decision. The fact that it had not done so was mainly the fault of the Governor from the United States, though he would have found it very difficult to support his opposition by valid arguments.

34. Many United Nations organizations had to their own profit granted consultative status to WFTU. For example, at the forty-fourth International Labour Conference, the WFTU representative had played an active and constructive part in the discussions which led to the adoption of the proposed recommendations concerning the protection of workers against ionizing radiations. Why was the Agency reluctant to obtain similar co-operation?

35. It was stated in paragraph 2 of the Annex to the Board's report (GC(IV)/INF/29) that WFTU was "not, in fact, able to represent the interests of workers or to state an independent, as distinct from a governmental, point of view". How could it be claimed that an organization which grouped over 100 million trade unionists in 70 countries did not represent the interests of its members? The opposition to WFTU was really ideological. The Conference, however, should base its decisions on the Statute and any relevant Agency rules, not on the ideological positions of certain delegations. WFTU satisfied the prescribed conditions; the Conference should repair an injustice, and now at long last grant WFTU the status it applied for.

36. Mr. FURUUCHI (Japan) said his delegation's position on the matter under discussion had never changed. Did WFTU satisfy the criteria laid down by the Agency? In particular, were its aims and purposes in conformity with those of the Agency? After carefully weighing what had been said about the activities of WFTU, he was still satisfied that they did not. WFTU was a political organization dedicated to the infiltration of communist ideas into the free world, whereas the Agency's task was to promote the technical applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. His delegation therefore considered it would be neither right nor sensible to adopt the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

37. Mr. DOBREV (Bulgaria) said it was clear from the statements of the delegations which opposed the grant of consultative status to WFTU that their grounds were solely ideological and political since they had no real data to adduce. The fact that WFTU constantly campaigned for peace, for the cessation of nuclear weapons tests, for complete and universal disarmament and against colonialism and imperialism was no argument against granting it consultative status. Many delegations attending the Conference represented States which were working actively for peace and complete disarmament; but that certainly did not prevent them being active Members of the Agency.

38. The Bulgarian delegation appealed to the Conference to end the discrimination exercised against WFTU at the instigation of the Western Powers, in particular the United States; it would vote in favor of the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

39. Mr. ROCHANAPURANANDA (Thailand) thought that the Board must have had good reasons for twice refusing consultative status to WFTU. WFTU was not what it claimed to be and its aims were unrelated to those of the Agency. He would not prolong a discussion which should never have taken place and was only a pretext for making political propaganda. He would only remind the Conference that WFTU had attacked the United Nations a few years before for having gone to the help of Korea, and was still attacking it. His delegation would vote against the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

40. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said his delegation would vote against the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia. He regretted the differences of opinion that had arisen, but they were sincere and had their origins outside the Conference. The role of WFTU in the discussions at present dividing the communist countries from the Western democracies was so polemical and partial that it could not be regarded as a trade union organization independent of government control. At its congress in Peking in June 1960, WFTU had done nothing to dispel the impression that it was governed by factious political interests. Canada hoped to keep the Agency free from such disruptive influences; it seriously doubted the advisability of granting consultative status to WFTU, and was not prepared to support the application.

41. He challenged the interpretation some delegates had placed on Resolution GC(III)/RES/47. That resolution said exactly what it meant and no more; it did not indicate that the Board should reach any particular conclusion after its reconsideration of WFTU's application.

42. Mr. ZHMUDSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said his delegation unreservedly supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution. He had only one point to add to the arguments already advanced: it was of vital importance to millions of workers that the Agency should do everything in its power to raise their standards of living, promote scientific research and draw up regulations to protect the health of all whose work involved atomic energy. Those were the sectors which offered the best opportunities for technical co-operation between WFTU and the Agency.

43. The proposal of the United States and Canadian delegates not to grant consultative status to WFTU was wholly political in inspiration. Both those delegates showed excessive zeal in their defense of law and order, but their methods were unworthy, going so far as to violate the most elementary rules of propriety. Their advocacy of collaboration was all the more loud in order to conceal their intention of avoiding it in practice.

44. If the Agency was really to become a great international forum, its policy must be, not to discriminate, but to develop relations with all international organizations. His delegation sincerely hoped the question of granting consultative status to WFTU would be decided affirmatively.

45. Mr. McKNIGHT (Australia) deplored the present discussion, following as it did so many fruitful scientific and technical discussions. The application of WFTU was political in origin, since the organization had no real interest in the Agency's work. The fact that other international organizations had granted it consultative status was no argument why the Agency should do likewise: that had happened ten years ago, and the circumstances had changed. The decision taken at the third session to refer the matter back to the Board had been a procedural decision which in no way prejudged the principle involved. The Board's decision had again been negative and there the matter should rest. His delegation therefore opposed the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

46. Mr. WARDROP (United Kingdom) said his delegation was against granting consultative status to WFTU, not simply because of its communist ideology - whatever anxieties his delegation might feel regarding that ideology and the resultant policy - but rather because of its true nature and activities. WFTU was not a non-governmental organization; it was in reality a governmental organization under the orders of Soviet leaders whose avowed object was universal communism, and had its tactical role to play within their grand strategy. It was an instrument of political, social, industrial and psychological warfare, designed to infiltrate the non-communist world and undermine its foundations.

47. When WFTU had obtained consultative status with the United Nations and several specialized agencies, it had still had, at any rate on the surface, a universal character. It had brought independent trade unions together with those of communist allegiance, and who could tell what benefits such a body might have brought to mankind? But in 1949 the free trade unions, frustrated in their efforts to establish sincere collaboration without ulterior motives, had had no option but to withdraw and form their own association, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU).

48. The supporters of WFTU wished to give the impression that the refusal to admit that organization was due to some plot hatched by a reactionary capitalist clique. The reality was very different. British workers were free to express their opinions and to choose their own line of conduct. In 1958 a motion had been submitted to the Trade Union Congress calling for the resumption of contacts with WFTU; that motion had been rejected by a large majority; in 1959 a similar motion had been rejected by an overwhelming majority, and in 1960 no such motion had been submitted. In 1959 the spokesman of the Council of the Trade Union Congress had said in effect that the Council, though in no way engaged in an anti-communist campaign, was bound to recognize that WFTU, as an instrument of the Communist Party and Governments, had nothing in common with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which was an independent organization, responsible only to the unions. The United Kingdom delegation, though entitled to speak only for its own country, could not help feeling that that statement by the authorized representative of the British workers would be widely acclaimed throughout the world.

49. Without any desire to score debating points, still less to pass judgment on anyone's sincere beliefs, the United Kingdom delegation was therefore compelled by the facts of the case to vote against the grant of consultative status to WFTU.

50. Mr. SPANIDES (Greece) said that, after very carefully studying the Board's report on the application for consultative status submitted by WFTU, his delegation had decided to vote against the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

51. The attitude of his delegation was based on a number of considerations. In the first place, the reasons put forward by WFTU in support of its application had not convinced the Greek delegation of the justice of that application. It was clear from the letter addressed by WFTU to the Board that the ideas underlying it were contrary to those of the majority of States Members of the Agency, and that the participation of WFTU in the work of the Agency would be calculated to hinder it in the performance of its functions, the most important of which was to expedite the contribution of atomic energy to peace. To grant consultative status with the Agency to WFTU would be a political act which the majority of Member States could not accept. It was true that WFTU enjoyed consultative status with the United Nations and with several specialized agencies, but the United Nations was a universal organization, whereas the Agency, by its very nature, was restricted.

52. Another consideration which determined the attitude of the Greek delegation was a moral one. It could not be forgotten that WFTU had accused the United Nations forces fighting in Korea of resorting to bacteriological warfare - an accusation which had been fully disproved.

53. The Greek delegation regretted to note that each year the Conference wasted valuable time in a sterile political debate on the question under consideration. It could put its time to better use by tackling the great tasks before it.

54. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) said his delegation supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution all the more strongly because it had been instrumental in having the question of the grant of consultative status to WFTU placed on the agenda. To deny that status to the most important trade union organization in the world would be a shamefully discriminatory and

outrageously arbitrary measure, from which both the work and the reputation of the Agency would suffer. In the middle of the twentieth century, when the working class was advancing triumphantly, the Conference would be acting like the British House of Commons had done at the beginning of the nineteenth century, waiting till 1825 before it recognized the legal existence of the trade unions. The United Kingdom delegate had spoken of the freedom enjoyed by British workers, but it should not be forgotten that they had won that freedom by blood and tears.

55. He categorically denied the United States statement that WFTU was the instrument of a Government. On the other hand, the United States delegate should know that the French Government had recently had to take action against the European representative of the American Federation of Labor, whose activities were injuring French interests. For the benefit of what Government was he hatching plots in a foreign country?

56. The number of workers employed in atomic industry was continually increasing. A large proportion of those workers were affiliated to WFTU, and they should, in justice and equity, have a say in the preparation of Agency measures which would directly concern them.

57. The trade unions of many Member States were internationally represented by WFTU alone. Were they to be denied the right to make their voices heard in the Agency when they were so usefully collaborating with other international bodies - ILO in particular? That would be like going back to the practices of the Inquisition, whereas the Agency had been established to put the atom at the service of all mankind.

58. The workers of 70 countries were watching the Conference, and they would call the delegates of their respective Governments to account. He was a trade unionist himself, and was proud to belong to WFTU; he urged delegates to show understanding and to accord WFTU its statutory, legal and political right to consultative status with the Agency.

59. Mr. DIAH (Indonesia) recalled that during the general discussion his delegation had supported the principle of universality. If the Agency was to accomplish its allotted tasks, it must accept all offers of co-operation. WFTU enjoyed consultative status with the United Nations and with several

specialized agencies. It subscribed to the aims and purposes of the Agency, and had indicated its support for the Agency's practical work. Hence the Indonesian delegation saw no reason to reject WFTU's application for consultative status and would vote for the Czechoslovak draft resolution. It urged all delegations to put questions of prestige aside and to base their decision solely on practical considerations.

60. The PRESIDENT put the Czechoslovak draft resolution (GC(IV)/133) to the vote.

61. The draft resolution was rejected by 34 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions.

62. Mr. URANOVICZ (Hungary) deeply regretted the result of the vote just taken. He was glad to note, however, that the discussions had confirmed the bankruptcy of the arguments advanced by the United States delegate. Despite the rejection of its application, WFTU would continue its fight against monopolies and against the oppression of the working classes. The decision just taken by the Conference was not in the best interests of the Agency.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR POWER (GC(IV)/122, 123, 144)

63. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to examine item 12 of the agenda. The relevant report of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee (GC(IV)/144) contained a draft resolution which the Committee recommended to the General Conference for adoption.

64. The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

CREDENTIALS OF DELEGATES TO THE FOURTH REGULAR SESSION

(b) REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (GC(IV)/129, 150) (continued from the 37th meeting)

65. The PRESIDENT pointed out that the second report of the Credentials Committee (GC(IV)/150) was a simple statement of facts. The draft resolution which the Committee recommended to the Conference for adoption appeared on page 2 of the report. If there was no objection he would take the draft resolution as being adopted unanimously.

66. It was so decided.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

67. Mr. EMELYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Soviet Union, congratulated the President on the excellent manner in which he had conducted the discussions during the present session of the General Conference. Thanks to the President's personality, and to the grasp, tact and patience he had shown during the Conference, it had been possible to overcome many difficulties - sometimes major ones. On behalf of all the delegations mentioned he also thanked the Secretariat for providing the technical services essential to the work of the Conference.

68. Mr. NAKICENOVIC (Yugoslavia) congratulated the President on the constructive atmosphere he had succeeded in creating in the Conference. The program for 1961 showed that the Agency's approach was now more realistic, and the Yugoslav delegation hoped its work would be successful. For its part, Yugoslavia would continue to support the Agency in all activities relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

69. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden), on behalf of the delegations from Western Europe, and Mr. ROCHANAPURANANDA (Thailand), on behalf of the delegations from South-East Asia and the Far East, Mr. BREW (Ghana), on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Canada, Ceylon, India, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom, Mr. HINDAWI (Iraq), on behalf of the delegations of the Arab countries, and Mr. LUJAN (Venezuela), on behalf of the delegations of the Latin American countries and the United States, congratulated the President on the skill with which he had conducted discussions that had sometimes been difficult, and thanked him for having brought the work of the Conference to a successful conclusion. They also expressed their gratitude to the Vice-Presidents, the Director General and all members of the Secretariat who had contributed to the success of the session.

70. The PRESIDENT thanked the delegations, but stressed that the session could not have been brought to a successful conclusion if it had not been for the indefatigable efforts of the Director General, the members of the General Committee, the Secretariat and all Agency staff. He again thanked the Austrian Government and the Vienna Municipal Authorities for their co-operation

and generous hospitality, and expressed his gratitude to the representatives of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations and to the observers for non-governmental organizations; he hoped that the international organizations already granted consultative status by the Agency would soon be joined by others. He likewise offered his thanks to the representatives of the Press and other information media who had worked to keep the public informed of the progress of the work of the General Conference.

71. The Conference had disposed of all the items on its agenda. It had adopted some resolutions unanimously. Others, and in particular those dealing with controversial questions, had been adopted by simple majority, but it was precisely in regard to such questions that unanimity was especially desirable. The scientific and technical character of the Agency could not of course be neglected, but neither could the fact be ignored that fundamental discoveries in nuclear physics had not been utilized for the purposes scientists had had in making them, but exploited by certain political circles for destructive ends. As it was difficult to separate technical problems from political problems, scientists and politicians must co-operate. Insofar as the fourth session of the General Conference had resulted in a better understanding of the need for such co-operation on an international scale, it would have contributed to the subsequent development of the Agency as an inter-governmental organization responsible for creating a climate favorable to the peaceful development of atomic energy.

72. He hoped that the future work of the Board would be fruitful, and that delegates, on their return home, would spare no effort that might assist the Agency in the noble task of placing atomic energy at the exclusive service of human welfare and world peace.

73. He felt sure the Agency would overcome its present difficulties and that its future accomplishments would be even more satisfactory.

74. In accordance with Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure, he invited the delegates to observe one minute of silence dedicated to prayer or meditation.

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

76. The PRESIDENT then declared closed the fourth regular session of the General Conference.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.