



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XKVII)/OR.256

July 1984*

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

TWENTY-SEVENTH REGULAR SESSION: 10-14 OCTOBER 1983

RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Friday, 14 October 1983, at 3.40 p.m.

President: Mr. KEBLÚŠEK (Czechoslovakia)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
17	Examination of delegates' credentials	1 - 17
7	General debate and annual report for 1982 (resumed)	18 - 57
	- Draft resolution on "Protection of Nuclear Installations Devoted to Peaceful Purposes Against Armed Attacks"	18 - 39
	- Draft resolution on "South Africa's Nuclear Capabilities"	40 - 57
18	Election of Members to the Board of Governors	58 - 61
8	Consequences of the Israeli military attack on the Iraqi nuclear research reactor and the standing threat to repeat this attack for: (a) the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; and (b) the role and activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency	62 - 96
18	Election of Members to the Board of Governors (resumed)	97 - 113

*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 24 November 1983.

**/ GC(XKVII)/700.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XKVII)/INF/215/Rev.4.

84-1183

0023E

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Oral report by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the following items:	114 - 147
	Application for membership of the Agency (b) Chinese as a working language of the General Conference	
	The Agency's accounts for 1982	
	The Agency's budget for 1984	
-	Draft resolution on "The International Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material"	
	The financing of safeguards	
	Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1984	
	The financing of technical assistance	
	Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat	
	Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute	
	Review of the Agency's activities	
19	Appointment of the External Auditor	148 - 150
20	Elections to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	151 - 152
21	Report on voluntary contributions pledged to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for 1984	153 - 154
-	Closing of the session	155 - 178

**/ GC(XXVII)/700.

EXAMINATION OF DELEGATES' CREDENTIALS (GC(XXVII)/705)

1. The PRESIDENT recalled that on the previous day the General Committee had met as a credentials committee to consider the credentials of delegates as provided for under Rule 28 of the Conference's Rules of Procedure. The Committee's report was set out in document GC(XXVII)/705. Since the appearance of that report, the delegates of Peru and New Zealand had submitted credentials which satisfied the requirements of Rule 27. In addition, an official communication had been received concerning the status of the delegate of Bolivia. Furthermore, the delegate of Egypt had requested the addition of the following phrase at the end of paragraph 9 of document GC(XXVII)/705: "... and does not recognize Israel's annexation of Arab Jerusalem and the Golan Heights". Lastly, the name of Chile had been inadvertently omitted from the first list of Member States in the Spanish version of that document.

2. He then asked whether delegates wished to comment on the report and on the draft resolution contained in it.

3. Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia) said that the following Member States wished to express their reservations about the credentials of the Israeli delegation to the General Conference: Tunisia, Pakistan, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Lebanon, Kuwait, Jordan, Algeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Iraq, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Mali, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Cuba and Sudan.^{1/}

4. Those credentials had been issued from an Arab city which was under occupation. They had been issued by Israeli authorities which had occupied and annexed Arab territories in defiance of international law and the United Nations Charter. Since the Israeli authorities had no right to represent those occupied Arab territories, the credentials of the Israeli delegation were not in order.

5. Mr. AMROLLAHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) proposed that the credentials of the delegate of Israel be rejected owing to that country's violation of the Agency's Statute and its aggressive attitude towards all oppressed nations of the world.

^{1/} Indonesia subsequently associated itself with these reservations.

6. Mr. OFSTAD (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries - Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland - on a point of order under Rule 59 of the Rules of Procedure, moved that no action be taken on the proposal by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the effect that the credentials of the delegate of Israel be rejected. The motion of the Nordic countries related only to the specific proposal in question and not to other aspects of the General Committee's report on its examination of delegates' credentials. The Nordic countries were submitting the motion in the belief that it was vitally important for all Member States to be concerned about the future of the Agency and its work. The proposal to bar a Member State from the General Conference went against the principle of universality and was inspired by political considerations which had nothing to do with the criteria for acceptance of credentials laid down in the Statute.

7. The PRESIDENT said that, before calling for a vote on the motion by the delegate of Norway, he must remind the Conference of the provision of Rule 59 whereby, in addition to the proposer of the motion, two delegates might speak in favour of and two against the motion, after which it was to be immediately put to the vote. He asked whether any delegate wished to speak in favour of the motion.

8. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) wished to give his delegation's full support to the motion put by the delegate of Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries. He noted that at recent meetings of the United Nations General Assembly a challenge to the credentials of a State had been voted down under a rule similar to that being invoked by the delegate of Norway.

9. He urged the Conference to support the Norwegian motion, since the Iranian proposal aimed at rejecting Israel's credentials was also designed to strike at the heart of the Agency, where both its integrity and its very existence were concerned.

10. As the report of the General Committee made clear, the examination of credentials in international organizations was an essentially technical exercise designed to ensure that credentials were issued by the persons designated under the relevant rule, were submitted to the appropriate person and contained the name of the delegate of the Member State. The statement by the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran showed that his proposal that

Israel's credentials be rejected was based on purely political considerations, which had absolutely no bearing on the question of the propriety of those credentials, which had been issued by a Government recognized as legitimate by the vast majority of delegations. The Conference should thus refrain from demeaning itself by considering a proposal which was without justification and which, if approved, would constitute only the first step in a chain of events which would seriously damage the Agency and detract from the benefits which all Members derived from it. If the Israeli delegate's credentials were rejected, the United States delegation would withdraw from the Conference and United States participation in the work of the Agency would be suspended.

11. Mr. PECCI (Paraguay) supported the motion put by the delegate of Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries, since the matter under consideration was a purely procedural one.

12. The PRESIDENT said that, since no delegates had expressed the wish to speak against the Norwegian motion, he proposed to put it to the vote.

13. There were 52 votes in favour and 24 against, with 7 abstentions. The motion was adopted.

14. The PRESIDENT, having announced the result of the vote, asked the Conference whether it now wished to adopt the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee in paragraph 14 of document GC(XXVII)/705, note being taken of the reservations expressed by delegations, which would be fully reflected in the record.

15. It was so decided.

16. Mr. SHASH (Egypt) said that his delegation had supported the Norwegian motion and that that support was consistent with the Egyptian statement on Israel's credentials before the General Committee. The vote did not mean that there had been any change in his Government's position in relation to certain basic issues which had been raised in the Conference; on the contrary, it had been based purely on procedural considerations.

17. Mr. UMAR (Nigeria), observing that he was not speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that Nigeria had also voted in favour of the Norwegian motion on purely procedural grounds.

GENERAL DEBATE AND ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1982 (resumed)

Draft resolution on "Protection of Nuclear Installations Devoted to Peaceful Purposes Against Armed Attacks" (GC(XXVII)/701 and Add.1 and 2)

18. The PRESIDENT said that the Conference still had before it two draft resolutions, one of which was entitled "Protection of Nuclear Installations Devoted to Peaceful Purposes Against Armed Attacks" and was contained in document GC(XXVII)/701. It had been submitted jointly by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Mexico, Romania and Venezuela and was also being co-sponsored by the delegations of Ecuador, Panama and Peru.

19. Mr. CASTRO MADERO (Argentina) said that the draft resolution in document GC(XXVII)/701 was designed to meet a need which he believed was generally felt within the Agency, a need that had been demonstrated by an unfortunate event to which the attention of the Board and of the Conference had from time to time been drawn during the last two years. That need had also been clearly identified in the Director General's opening statement to the Conference.

20. He believed, therefore, that the large majority of delegations would wish the Conference to state clearly and unequivocally that, in future, armed attacks of any type against nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes should be expressly prohibited. Such a statement would be consistent with Article III of the Agency's Statute.

21. It seemed that if States were alerted to the realities confronting them there was still time to prevent a repetition of events of the type he had mentioned in any State, irrespective of its political system or its level of development in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The draft resolution now before the Conference in document GC(XXVII)/701, of which his Government was a co-author, was aimed at alerting States to that end.

22. He was well aware that it was not up to the Agency but to other international organizations - in particular the Committee on Disarmament, in Geneva - to consider the appeal which the Conference would be making. It was up to those bodies to consider what had been done so far and to decide on the methods, criteria and approaches for the preparation of legal instruments and other documents which would complement, supplement and improve on those

already in existence in accordance with the most suitable procedures. The aim must be to agree upon appropriate international legal arrangements which would lead to the prohibition of armed attacks on nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes. The topic was not a new one: it had been under consideration for some years in Geneva. The immediate purpose now was to give fresh impetus to the treatment of it.

23. In their draft resolution, the co-authors had tried to leave the greatest possible freedom to the competent bodies mentioned earlier. It was on those organizations that the complex and awesome technical task of responding to the Conference's appeal would fall. They would need plenty of latitude and time for the requisite negotiations, which, as Argentina was only too well aware, were not simple; there might be delays and even reverses. He was confident, however, that the Conference would be able to provide a real stimulus to that work through the draft resolution, which he hoped would be adopted by consensus. In doing that, the Conference would be marking a most important and ambitious step forward towards the maintenance of peace and the full achievement of the aims of the Agency.

24. Mr. UMAR (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that all members of the Group were able to approve the draft resolution without difficulty, and he hoped that the same support would be forthcoming from delegations not represented in the Group.

25. Mr. WILLIAMSON (United States of America) said that his Government appreciated the efforts the co-authors had devoted to the draft resolution; the United States welcomed a full discussion on the issue of limitations on attacks on nuclear facilities devoted exclusively to peaceful uses in an appropriate forum such as the Committee on Disarmament. The Agency was not, however, the appropriate forum, and it would be a mistake to prejudice the outcome of other discussions on the subject, in which the United States was an active participant. His delegation was therefore unable to support the draft resolution.

26. The PRESIDENT said he had received a request that the draft resolution set forth in document GC(XXVII)/701 be put to the vote. He therefore asked delegations to vote on the draft resolution by show of hands.

27. There were 69 votes in favour and 2 against, with 16 abstentions. The draft resolution was adopted.

28. Mr. HENDERSON (United Kingdom) wished to explain why his delegation had voted against the resolution. His delegation well understood, and to some extent shared, the motives of the co-authors of the resolution and had worked hard with them in search of a text on which consensus might have been achieved. It was, however, unable to support the text set out in document GC(XKVII)/701 because it contained formulations which were contrary to United Kingdom policy with regard both to the work of the Agency itself and to the issue of the protection of nuclear facilities from attack. Giving examples of the difficulties his delegation had perceived, he said that, first, it could not accept the use of the words "without obstacles" in paragraph (b), which did not appear to be consistent with the second sentence of Article II of the Statute; and, secondly, that paragraph (e) did not correctly describe the effect of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions. In any event, the Conference was not the appropriate forum for discussion of that topic.

29. Mr. NOE (Italy) said that the resolution in document GC(XKVII)/701 related to a problem that had long been the subject of discussions in other bodies, as had indeed been recognized in the resolution itself. Those discussions were still far from having led to a final consensus either on the objectives to be pursued or on the means and procedures with which to pursue them.

30. His delegation recognized the right of the Conference to express the hope that the problem of protecting peaceful nuclear facilities would be resolved satisfactorily and as soon as possible by the appropriate international bodies. It could not, however, subscribe to the view that the Conference should lay down - as the resolution in fact did - the procedure to be followed by those bodies and the methods which they were to use in negotiations when seeking a solution, since that would tend to prejudice the final result. For that reason, his delegation had found it necessary to abstain in the vote on the resolution.

31. Mr. MATSUMURA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted for the resolution in document GC(XKVII)/701 because it appreciated the spirit in which it had been submitted. Nonetheless, the Japanese Government believed that the types of nuclear installation to be covered, as well as the form of protection to be provided, were problems which should be discussed in detail by the Committee on Disarmament, in Geneva, where such matters had already been under discussion.

32. In fact, in September 1982 his Government had already proposed to the Committee on Disarmament a draft protocol whose provisions differed from those of Additional Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Convention. In accordance with that draft, attacks against nuclear installations for peaceful purposes would be comprehensively prohibited.

33. Mr. DARTOIS (Belgium) said that his country was sympathetic to the ideas behind the resolution in document GC(XXVII)/701 and had recognized in the Committee on Disarmament, in Geneva, that the protection of nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes against armed attack was an extremely important question. It was thus determined to find a solution in the appropriate bodies.

34. It was not, however, sufficient merely to state that certain nuclear installations other than power stations were to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Such exclusive use needed to be recognized in an international context, and Agency safeguards would be an appropriate means of providing the justification for such recognition. It was because of that lack of precision that his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the resolution.

35. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution in document GC(XXVII)/701 because it viewed that resolution as a general expression of the Conference's desire to see action taken internationally with a view to protecting nuclear installations devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes against armed attack. However, Australia fully recognized the competence of the Committee on Disarmament in that field and its vote on the resolution should not be seen as affecting in any way the Australian position on the negotiations under way in that body.

36. Mr. THABAULT (France) said that the Agency was not the appropriate forum for consideration of the matter to which the resolution in document GC(XXVII)/701 related. According to the final document of the first Special Session on Disarmament of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Committee on Disarmament, in Geneva, was the sole multilateral forum for negotiations on disarmament, and the problem with which the present resolution was concerned should accordingly be examined in the Committee on Disarmament.

37. The text of the resolution itself was defective in that it did not state the nature of the attacks envisaged; it did not lay down the scope of the measures recommended; and the definition of the facilities which were to be considered as being used for peaceful purposes gave rise to obvious problems.

38. France was, furthermore, opposed to a distinction being made which might lead to a pre-emptive attack on a facility being regarded as legitimate merely because the State which owned the facility had refused to place it under safeguards.

39. However, since his Government intended to continue negotiations on that important matter in other, more appropriate bodies and since it appreciated some of the intentions behind the resolution, his delegation had abstained in the vote.

Draft resolution on "South Africa's Nuclear Capabilities" (GC(XXVII)/702)

40. Mr. UMAR (Nigeria), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/702 on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the resolution was a moderate one which in essence demanded that South Africa submit all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency, and called on those Member States which had not yet done so to end all nuclear co-operation with the South African régime. He urged that it be adopted by consensus.

41. Mr. WILLIAMSON (United States of America) said that, although his delegation was concerned about the existence of unsafeguarded facilities in South Africa, it was opposed to the resolution because it called for severe restriction of the rights of a Member State. Such a restriction would constitute suspension of the privileges and rights of membership under Article XIX, which became applicable in cases where a Member had persistently violated the provisions of the Statute or any agreement entered into pursuant to it. South Africa had in fact not violated any such provision or agreement, nor had it failed to comply with its safeguards undertakings as set out in Article XII.C, and there were thus no legal grounds for its suspension. Although South Africa had not signed NPT, nor placed all its peaceful nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards, there were several non-nuclear-weapon States at present represented on the Board who were in the same position, and that was not regarded, in their case, as giving grounds for suspension.

42. Although his delegation found South Africa's apartheid policies repellent, to suspend South Africa would be a clear violation of the Agency's Statute. It would hamper the Agency in discharging its functions, and would strike at the principle of universality which was fundamental to the United Nations system, while doing nothing to eliminate apartheid. It was important to keep South Africa in the Agency precisely because it had a significant civil nuclear programme.

43. It had been argued that the IAEA, under its relationship agreement with the United Nations, was bound to implement resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. However, Article I of that agreement stated clearly that the Agency was an autonomous body and that its Members were bound solely by the provisions of its Statute. He considered that the Secretariat and the Board had acted properly in their handling of the relevant General Assembly resolutions. What was important was that the Agency should be enabled to continue to discharge its essentially technical task of increasing the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without unleashing the destructive potential of the atom.

44. Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, although the United States delegation claimed to be concerned with depoliticizing the IAEA, United States imperialism had in fact been using the Agency as a political tool for the past twenty-six years, and the United States delegation had begun to speak of "depoliticization" only after it had realized - at the Conference's previous session - that the Agency could no longer be used in that way. However, all were aware that the Agency, as an international technical community, was inevitably concerned also with political affairs. As far as the principle of universality was concerned, that principle would be better served, and the Agency would be healthier, if both South Africa and Israel were expelled from membership; their inhuman record undoubtedly warranted expulsion, and the Islamic Republic of Iran called upon the General Conference to remove those two cancer tumours from the Agency.

45. The PRESIDENT, noting that no other delegation had requested the floor, put the draft resolution set forth in document GC(XXVII)/702 to the vote.

46. There were 50 votes in favour and 6 against, with 19 abstentions. The draft resolution was adopted.

47. Mr. ALHOLM (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because he considered that operative paragraph 4 went beyond the scope of the tasks entrusted to the Agency within the United Nations system. The draft resolution also contained references to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly which the Nordic countries had not supported. He would nevertheless strongly urge that South Africa submit all its nuclear installations to IAEA safeguards.

48. Mr. HENDERSON (United Kingdom) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because both preambular paragraph (b) and operative paragraph 1 referred to General Assembly resolutions to which the United Kingdom was opposed. The Agency was under no obligation to implement resolutions of the General Assembly. The suspension of rights and privileges which the Board was being asked to consider under operative paragraph 4 of the resolution could only be put into effect under Article XIX of the Statute, following persistent violation of the Statute. Since South Africa had not committed any such violation, there was no need for the Board to consider the question.

49. His delegation's vote did not imply that there would be any change in the current United Kingdom policy of not co-operating with South Africa in its nuclear programme. His delegation supported operative paragraph 2, calling for safeguards on all nuclear facilities in that country.

50. Mr. NOE (Italy) said his delegation had abstained in the vote because the draft resolution was based on a number of United Nations resolutions which Italy was unable to support. Operative paragraph 4, in particular, ran counter to the principle of universality, which should always be adhered to by an organization such as the Agency. Despite his delegation's abstention he wished to reaffirm his whole-hearted condemnation of the policy of apartheid.

51. Mr. ZANGGER (Switzerland) said the resolution proposed restrictions which could constitute a de facto suspension of the privileges accorded by the Statute of the Agency to its Members. He had therefore voted against it, although Switzerland unreservedly condemned the doctrine and practice of apartheid, which was contrary to its own beliefs and practices as well as being contrary to recognized principles of international law.

52. Mr. MATSUMURA (Japan) said his delegation had abstained from voting because it considered the IAEA to be an international organization of a technical character, the aim of which was to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to ensure global non-proliferation. The principle of universality on which the Agency was based should therefore be protected, and infringement of that principle avoided.

53. His delegation nevertheless wished to urge South Africa to accede to NPT as early as possible, and to submit all its nuclear installations and facilities to Agency safeguards. The position of his Government remained unchanged, furthermore, in that it did not condone the racial policies of the South African Government.

54. Mr. SUAREZ de PUGA y VILLEGAS (Spain) said that, although Spain condemned the policy of apartheid, it had not previously supported resolutions adopted by international organizations requesting Member States to cease co-operation with the South African régime, because it believed that isolation tended to be counterproductive. His delegation also had reservations about the wisdom of preventing a country such as South Africa from participating in the technical work of the Agency.

55. Mr. CLADAKIS (Greece) said he could not support the draft resolution despite the fact that it contained a number of worthwhile elements. The last part of operative paragraph 4 could be interpreted as a challenge to the principle of universality of membership, which was the cornerstone of every organization in the United Nations system. However, he could readily have supported operative paragraph 2, which demanded that South Africa place all its nuclear installations and facilities under safeguards, and operative paragraph 3, which called for the ending of all transfer of fissionable material and technology to South Africa.

56. Mr. OTALORA (Colombia) wished to place on record his delegation's support for the important work done by the Agency, and its belief that the Agency should remain a technical organization which tolerated no political interference in its activities. His delegation had felt unable to support the draft resolution because it considered it political in character. He trusted that the organization's work would be able to go forward in a harmonious atmosphere, notably its technical assistance programme for the benefit of developing countries concerned in utilizing nuclear energy for peaceful

purposes under the Agency's safeguards system. Everything possible should be done to spare the Agency the kind of confrontation which regrettably so often darkened the international scene.

57. Mr. DARTOIS (Belgium) said his delegation had voted against the resolution because the request that South Africa be excluded from participating in the Agency's technical groups ran counter to the rights and privileges of Member States, and thus to the principle of universality that should govern international institutions. However, Belgium's condemnation of South Africa's apartheid policies remained unchanged.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXVII)/704)

58. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that 11 Members had to be elected to the Board from the geographical areas specified in paragraph 2 of document GC(XXVII)/704 to ensure that the Board would be constituted in accordance with Article VI.A of the Statute.

59. At the invitation of the President, a member of the Egyptian delegation and a member of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany acted as tellers.

60. A vote was taken by secret ballot to elect 11 Members of the Board of Governors.

61. The PRESIDENT said that the counting of votes would take some time and therefore suggested that the remaining business under item 18 be deferred until the tellers had reported to him.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE ISRAELI MILITARY ATTACK ON THE IRAQI NUCLEAR RESEARCH REACTOR AND THE STANDING THREAT TO REPEAT THIS ATTACK FOR: (a) THE DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY FOR PEACEFUL PURPOSES; AND (b) THE ROLE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (GC(XXVII)/703/Rev.2)

62. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the draft resolution submitted jointly by Algeria, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Zambia contained in document GC(XXVII)/703/Rev.2. There had already been extensive informal discussions on the text, which he hoped would help to expedite its further consideration.

63. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq), introducing the draft resolution, said inclusion of item 8 on the Conference's agenda did not, as had been alleged by

the representative of the Zionist entity, affect the role and activities of the Agency. On the contrary, it was Israel's unprecedented armed aggression against a safeguarded nuclear facility which had inflicted irreparable damage on the Agency and on its activities, and the Conference was in duty bound to investigate the consequences of that aggression.

64. The representative of the Zionist entity had claimed that Israel had no policy of attacking nuclear facilities. It was true that Israel had not explicitly declared such a policy, but it had repeatedly declared its readiness to ward off any possible threat to its security by preventing its enemies from developing nuclear weapons.

65. Since the debate in the General Conference the previous year on the subject of Israeli aggression, new evidence had come to light regarding Israel's nuclear capabilities. It had been learned that Israel had, in fact, had nuclear missiles ready for deployment since the late sixties, and had also been doing its utmost to prevent its Arab neighbours from developing their own nuclear capability.

66. Referring to the Agency's annual report for 1982 (GC(XXVII)/684), he pointed out that there were some glaring omissions in the section entitled "Matters of special interest to the Agency discussed by the General Assembly of the United Nations" (paragraphs 58 to 63 of the Introduction). That section should have referred specifically to General Assembly resolution 37/82, which demanded that Israel renounce possession of nuclear weapons, called upon all States to terminate nuclear collaboration with Israel, and condemned Israel's declared intention to repeat its armed attack against nuclear facilities. The report should also have referred to General Assembly resolution 37/19, which stated that Israel's threat to repeat such an armed attack constituted a serious threat to the role and activities of the IAEA. Those two resolutions formed the basis of the draft resolution he was now introducing.

67. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution called for action which was the very minimum that could be expected from the Agency in response to the criminal act committed by Israel. It had been claimed that that action amounted to suspension of membership, but in fact it had nothing to do with suspension, and was concerned purely with sanctions. It should be considered in the context of the set-back caused to Iraq's peaceful nuclear programme,

and also in the context of the damage done to the Agency's activities, by Israel's action. Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 should be seen in relation to General Assembly resolution 37/18, which called for consideration at the international level of legal measures to prohibit armed attacks against nuclear facilities.

68. He urged all delegations who were concerned about the future of the Agency and its credibility, and who favoured international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, to vote in favour of the draft resolution. His délégation requested a roll-call vote.

69. Mr. UMAR (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the States belonging to the Group of 77, said that the majority of those countries supported the draft resolution.

70. Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) recalled that his country's reaction to the violation of the Agency's Statute by the Zionist aggressor Israel was to suspend that country from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership. He regretted that, as a result of manipulation by the United States and because of Iraq's weak position, a brutal régime, guilty of aggression against Lebanon, and responsible for massacres at the Sabra and Shatila camps, continued to be a Member of an organization devoted to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. His country would bear no responsibility for any future aggressive acts of Israel as a Member of the Agency; rather, that responsibility should lie primarily on the United States and its allies. However, it was in a spirit of solidarity with the Group of 77 that the Islamic Republic of Iran was supporting the draft resolution.

71. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America), strongly opposing the draft resolution, observed that adoption of a resolution restricting Israel's rights and privileges of membership would seriously harm the Agency and its basic functions. The draft resolution represented a politically motivated attack on a Member State; it would damage the Agency's reputation as a technically competent organization and impair its credibility.

72. In spite of the Israeli Government's official declaration to the United Nations Secretary-General that it had no policy of attacking nuclear facilities, the draft resolution noted that the statement had not removed the

apprehensions of Member States. That was tantamount to the General Conference's acting as a tribunal to judge the official statement of a Member State. Such a course of action would compromise the Agency's reputation for objectivity and involve it in political controversies. The draft resolution involved the General Conference in decisions which lay outside its competence under Article V of the Statute.

73. While sympathetic to the need for an international convention prohibiting attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities, his Government considered that the Agency was not the appropriate forum. It might be recalled that the matter was being discussed by the United Nations Committee on Disarmament.

74. By calling for further consideration of the subject at the following session of the General Conference, the draft resolution was likely to initiate another year of harmful political controversy and to divert the Agency from its technical tasks, which were of vital interest to all Members.

75. Mr. EILAM (Israel) recalled that a sufficient number of responsible Member States had upheld the principle of universality by rejecting, at the twenty-sixth session of the General Conference, the politically motivated proposal of Iraq calling for suspension of Israel's rights and privileges as a Member of the Agency. The draft resolution now before the Conference did in effect discriminate against Israel. His Government wished to state categorically that it had no policy of attacking nuclear facilities and that it supported international efforts to arrive at an early arrangement with a view to prohibiting such attacks.

76. The draft resolution was based on extraneous political considerations outside the scope of the Conference's statutory mandate, and sought to introduce a further harmful element of politicization and discrimination. Urging all responsible delegations to reject the draft resolution, he emphasized that what was at stake was not only the quality and universality but the very future of the Agency as an international instrument and as a technical organization with a specific mission in the nuclear field.

77. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the statement of the United States delegate to the effect that Israel had no policy of systematically bombing nuclear facilities was meaningless: Israel itself had never previously claimed to have such a policy, yet it had bombed the Iraqi facility.

78. Nor could the Arab States accept the United States view that they were diverting the Agency from its technical tasks for political reasons. If they had had any such intention, they would have raised the issue of Israel in 1967 and again after the occupation of almost half of Lebanon. But aggression against a peaceful nuclear facility was not merely a political act, it was an attack directed at the very heart of the Agency and its safeguards system. It was precisely in defence of the Agency's reputation and the credibility of its safeguards that the matter had been raised.

79. The delegates who claimed to champion the principle of universality in the Agency's membership seemed to have a wrong understanding of that principle. The Arab States had always supported the right of any State to be a Member of the Agency and other United Nations organizations. They were not calling for Israel's expulsion but for sanctions. Any Member State which endangered mankind was subject to sanctions. Lastly, it was worth recalling that many of those States which were clamouring for universality had for long kept the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations.

80. Mr. AL-ZAHAWI (Iraq) said the United States delegate had alleged that the action which the General Conference was being asked to take against Israel was in violation of the Statute. The draft resolution submitted at the twenty-sixth session of the General Conference had sought Israel's suspension under Article XIX of the Statute, which provided for suspension of "a member which has persistently violated the provisions of the Statute". Israel had in fact violated Article IV.B by flouting the United Nations Charter and the Agency's Statute and also Article IV.C, which called for sovereign equality of all Members, by putting itself above the United Nations, the Agency, its safeguards system, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and so on. It was only in the face of the United States threat to destroy the Agency by withdrawing from it that Iraq was refraining from calling for Israel's expulsion. And it was worth recalling in that connection the statements made by various United States leaders expressing their apprehensions about the consequences of the Israeli attack against the Iraqi facility.

81. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that the delegate of Iraq had requested a roll-call vote on the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/703/Rev.2.

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

83. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Austria, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Holy See, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire.

84. There were 49 votes in favour and 24 against, with 17 abstentions. The draft resolution was adopted.

85. Mr. HENDERSON (United Kingdom) regretted that his delegation had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution because paragraph 3 amounted to discriminating against a Member State in violation of the principle of universality. Reiterating his Government's condemnation of the Israeli attack, he hoped that the Government of Israel would without delay take the action called for in operative paragraph 2.

86. Mr. VAN BARNEVELD KOOY (Netherlands) emphasized that his Government condemned the Israeli attack and would not like to see such acts repeated. It was in favour of an international agreement prohibiting attacks on safeguarded facilities containing significant amounts of nuclear material. Although the

Netherlands subscribed to much that the resolution contained, it was bound to oppose the resolution as a whole because it infringed the principle of universality of participation in international organizations. The lines of communication between States should be left open, and his country could not approve any action depriving a Member State of participation in activities normally associated with membership. Furthermore, the procedure was of doubtful constitutional validity.

87. In conclusion, he called upon Israel to state clearly that it had no intention of attacking safeguarded peaceful nuclear facilities.

88. Mr. ARZUBIAGA ROSPIGLIOSI (Peru) said that he had abstained from voting because the action called for in operative paragraph 3 was of a political nature; it lay outside the Agency's competence and affected the principle of universality, which Peru regarded as basic.

89. Nevertheless, he wished to reiterate his Government's strong condemnation of the Israeli attack against the Iraqi facility under Agency safeguards. His Government supported the call for an international agreement prohibiting military attacks against peaceful nuclear facilities. In that connection, he wished to reaffirm the right of developing countries to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

90. Mr. DIDIER (Brazil) said that, although his delegation had voted for the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/703/Rev.2, it would have been happier if a different wording had been used in operative paragraph 3.

91. Mr. MIYAZAWA (Japan) wished to explain why he had voted against the draft resolution.

92. The Agency was an organization of a technical nature. Its function was to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy throughout the world, while ensuring non-proliferation. The principle of universality must therefore be respected and any infringement of that principle avoided. He wished to stress that Japan had strongly condemned the Israeli attack on the Iraqi reactor and that its stand had not changed since June 1981. It once again urged the Government of Israel to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and accept Agency safeguards on all its nuclear facilities. In that connection, he reiterated Japan's basic position in support of an international convention prohibiting attacks against peaceful nuclear facilities.

93. Mr. CLADAKIS (Greece) said that his delegation might have been able to support the draft resolution had it not been for the fact that operative paragraph 3 could be interpreted, indirectly, as questioning the principle of universality. For that reason he had abstained in the voting. If a vote had been taken paragraph by paragraph, he would have voted for all but paragraph 3, on which he would have abstained.

94. Mr. LEVRERO PUIG (Uruguay) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it was political in nature. Uruguay had always maintained that the United Nations was the appropriate forum for the discussion of political issues.

95. Mr. PECCI (Paraguay) said that Israel's attack on the Iraqi reactor was a res judicata, having been dealt with on two occasions. The case could not be reopened, especially as the Israeli Government, in a letter to the United Nations Secretary-General (set forth in document GC(XXVII)/699), had declared that it had no policy of attacking nuclear facilities. Paraguay had therefore abstained in the vote. The General Conference was not the competent forum to judge Member States for political misdemeanours.

96. Mr. OTALORA (Colombia) recalled that his delegation had already condemned the Israeli act before the United Nations General Assembly. However, it considered the Agency to be a technical body, which meant that the General Conference was not competent to pass judgement on political matters. He had accordingly been unable to support the draft resolution.

The meeting was suspended at 6.55 p.m. and resumed at 8.45 p.m.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXVII)/704) (resumed)

97. The PRESIDENT informed the General Conference of the results of the voting:

98. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Latin America was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	39
<u>Valid votes:</u>	147
<u>Required majority:</u>	37

Votes obtained:

Chile	68
Cuba	79

99. Having obtained the required majority, Chile and Cuba were elected to the Board.

100. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Western Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	7
<u>Valid votes:</u>	177
<u>Required majority:</u>	45
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Austria	89
Italy	88

101. Having obtained the required majority, Austria and Italy were elected to the Board.

102. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Eastern Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	14
<u>Valid votes:</u>	172
<u>Required majority:</u>	44
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Hungary	84
Yugoslavia	88

103. Having obtained the required majority, Hungary and Yugoslavia were elected to the Board.

104. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Africa was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	13
<u>Valid votes:</u>	173
<u>Required majority:</u>	44

Votes obtained:

Nigeria	87
Tunisia	86

105. Having obtained the required majority, Nigeria and Tunisia were elected to the Board.

106. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Middle East and South Asia was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	14
<u>Valid votes:</u>	78
<u>Required majority:</u>	40
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Islamic Republic of Iran	2
Iraq	2
Syrian Arab Republic	74

107. Having obtained the required majority, the Syrian Arab Republic was elected to the Board.

108. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Far East was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	19
<u>Valid votes:</u>	66
<u>Required majority:</u>	34
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Mongolia	1
Philippines	65

109. Having obtained the required majority, the Philippines was elected to the Board.

110. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Middle East and South Asia or of South East Asia and the Pacific or of the Far East was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	12
<u>Valid votes:</u>	81
<u>Required majority:</u>	41

Votes obtained:

Islamic Republic of Iran	11
Iraq	58
Mongolia	1
Philippines	9
Syrian Arab Republic	2

111. Having obtained the required majority, Iraq was elected to the Board.

112. The PRESIDENT, after congratulating the 11 Members so elected, recalled that under Article VI.D of the Statute they would hold office from the end of the current session until the end of the twenty-ninth regular session of the General Conference, i.e. for a period of two years.

113. He thanked the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and Egypt, which had provided tellers, the two tellers themselves, and their Secretariat assistants.

ORAL REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

114. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, presented the Committee's report on items 5(b), 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 of the agenda, which had been referred to it for initial discussion.

115. The Committee of the Whole recommended that the General Conference adopt the following draft resolutions:

- The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/697 (item 5(b) - Chinese as a working language of the General Conference);
- The draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXVII)/685 (item 9 - The Agency's accounts for 1982).

116. With regard to item 10 (The Agency's budget for 1984), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt draft resolution A set out in document GC(XXVII)/686/Mod.1 and draft resolutions B and C set out in document GC(XXVII)/686, on the understanding that no part of the amount of \$85 000 allocated under the 1984 budget for a study on international plutonium storage would be spent before the Board of Governors had taken a decision on the matter in 1984.

117. Still on item 10 of the agenda, the Committee had studied the draft resolution entitled "The International Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material" contained in document GC(XXVII)/706, and a majority had been in favour of recommending the General Conference to adopt that draft resolution. The representatives of a number of countries, including the Islamic Republic of Iran, had not been able to support that recommendation and had expressed reservations regarding the draft resolution.

118. On item 11 (The financing of safeguards), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/687.

119. In deciding to make that recommendation, the Committee suggested that the Conference request the Board of Governors to initiate, immediately after the current session of the General Conference, consultations open to all interested Member States on the financing of safeguards after 1984.

120. With regard to item 12 (Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1984), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/691 with the annex reproduced in document GC(XXVII)/691/Mod.1.

121. However, in making that recommendation, the Committee suggested that the General Conference request the Board of Governors to investigate various ways of establishing the scale of assessment of Members' contributions and submit a report on the results of its work to the General Conference at its next regular session.

122. The representative of Brazil, while supporting the suggestion that the Board should undertake such a study, had objected in the Committee to the scale set forth in the annex to document GC(XXVII)/691/Mod.1.

123. With respect to item 13 (The financing of technical assistance), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/707.

124. As to item 14 (Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat), the Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/708.

125. During the Committee's examination of that item a large number of representatives of developing and industrialized countries, while insisting on the importance they attached to the provisions of Article VII.D of the Statute, had nonetheless expressed concern at the under-representation of their countries within the Secretariat.

126. In connection with that same item, France, together with Canada, Ivory Coast and Zaire, had submitted a draft resolution concerning the use of the Agency's working languages in the Secretariat. That draft resolution had been studied by an informal working group presided over by one of the Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, Mr. de Castro Neves (Brazil), who had indicated in his report to the Committee that the members of the working group had not been able to reach agreement on the draft resolution, but were agreed that France could, if it so desired, raise the questions forming the subject of that draft resolution in the Board of Governors. The Committee of the Whole had taken note of the agreement reached on that matter.

127. With regard to item 15 (Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute), the Committee recommended that the Conference adopt the draft resolution in document GC(XXVII)/709.

128. During the Committee's examination of that item the representatives of Egypt and the United Republic of Tanzania had urgently recommended that the General Conference request the Board of Governors to set up a working group to study the implementation of General Conference resolution GC(XXV)/RES/389. Another representative had suggested that the summary record of the Committee's deliberations on the matter be transmitted to the Board of Governors and that it be left to the Board to decide what action to take. The representative of the Soviet Union had stated that his country, together with several others, felt that the Board should decide for itself what procedure it wished to adopt in examining that issue. It had been agreed that the summary record of the Committee's deliberations should be transmitted to the Board for its information.

129. Finally, with respect to item 16 (Review of the Agency's activities), the Committee recommended that the Conference adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/710.

130. The PRESIDENT thanked the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and suggested that the draft resolutions relating to the items of the agenda that had been referred to the Committee could now be considered by the Conference with a view to their adoption.

131. It was so agreed.

Application for Membership of the Agency

(b) Chinese as a working language of the General Conference

132. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/697 was adopted.

The Agency's accounts for 1982

133. The draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXVII)/685 was adopted

The Agency's budget for 1984

134. Draft resolution A contained in document GC(XXVII)/686/Mod.1 and draft resolutions B and C contained in Annex VI to document GC(XXVII)/686 were adopted on the understanding that no part of the amount of \$85 000 allocated under the 1984 budget for a study on international plutonium storage would be spent before the Board of Governors had taken a decision on the matter in 1984.

135. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) said that there were two reasons why his country could not approve the budget for 1984 which had just been adopted. Firstly, that budget did not observe the constraint of zero growth which Belgium considered to be imperative for international organizations at a time when all countries were experiencing budgetary difficulties, some of them quite severe. Secondly, his Government considered that the safeguards budget showed unjustifiable growth. There could be no doubt about his Government's firm belief in the policy of non-proliferation, but at the same time it felt that safeguards policy should be reviewed. He hoped that account would be taken of his remarks when the 1985 budget was prepared.

Draft resolution on "The International Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material" (GC(XXVII)/706)

136. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/706 was adopted.

137. Mr. SINGH (India) said that his delegation had reservations regarding the resolution which had just been adopted. He recalled that during the deliberations of the Committee of the Whole it had been proposed that the resolution in question be approved by acclamation and that India had opposed

that proposal, not only because it had not signed the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material but also because the Convention contained elements which India considered discriminatory. The final sub-paragraph of its preamble, for example, would in the final analysis serve to place the nuclear-weapon States, as distinct from the non-nuclear-weapon States, beyond the scope of the Convention. Similarly, Article 2 of the Convention contained a number of provisions which India deemed unacceptable for the same reasons. Finally, he stressed that, while to date only 37 Member States had signed the Convention, 13 of them had expressed serious reservations about it.

The financing of safeguards

138. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/687 was adopted.

139. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would assume that the General Conference wished to request the Board to initiate, immediately after the current session of the Conference, consultations open to all interested Member States on the financing of safeguards after 1984.

140. It was so decided.

Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1984

141. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/691 and the annex reproduced in document GC(XXVII)/691/Mod.1 were adopted.

142. The PRESIDENT said that, in the absence of any objections, he would assume that the Conference wished to request the Board to investigate various ways of establishing the scale of assessment of Members' contributions and to submit a report on the results of its work to the General Conference at its next regular session.

143. It was so decided.

The financing of technical assistance

144. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/707 was adopted.

Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat

145. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXVII)/708 was adopted.

Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute

146. The draft resolution contained in document GC(KXVII)/709 was adopted.

Review of the Agency's activities

147. The draft resolution contained in document GC(KXVII)/710 was adopted.

APPOINTMENT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

148. The PRESIDENT recalled that an External Auditor had been appointed by the General Conference at its twenty-fifth regular session to audit the Agency's accounts for 1982 and 1983. The Conference now had to appoint an External Auditor to audit the Agency's accounts for 1984 and 1985. Since the Comptroller and Auditor General of Kenya had indicated his willingness to serve as External Auditor for a further period of two years, he (the President) proposed that the General Conference appoint him as External Auditor for 1984 and 1985.

149. The President's proposal was accepted.

150. The PRESIDENT thanked the Comptroller and Auditor General of Kenya for the work he had already done for the Agency.

ELECTIONS TO THE AGENCY'S STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE

151. The PRESIDENT recalled that the General Conference was at present represented on the Staff Pension Committee by two members - Mr. Aman (Indonesia) and Mr. Hofland (Netherlands) - and by Mr. Rybka (Hungary) and Mr. Ugalde Bilbao (Chile) as alternates. Since three of them were no longer able to serve on the Committee, he proposed that the General Conference elect Mr. Lozada (Philippines) and Mr. Ugalde Bilbao (Chile) as members and Mr. Dartois (Belgium) and Mr. Nitzsche (German Democratic Republic) as alternates.

152. Mr. Lozada (Philippines) and Mr. Ugalde Bilbao (Chile) were elected as members of the Agency's Staff Pension Committee and Mr. Dartois (Belgium) and Mr. Nitzsche (German Democratic Republic) as alternates.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED TO THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CO-OPERATION FUND FOR 1984 (GC(KXVII)/695/Rev.4)

153. The PRESIDENT said that document GC(KXVII)/695/Rev.4 contained information on the voluntary contributions for 1984 pledged by 10 p.m. on 13 October 1983. By that time the total amount of contributions pledged by the Agency's Member States had been US \$10 852 382. Since then Nigeria, Spain and Australia had announced pledges of \$42 750, \$30 000 and \$336 036, respectively. Thus, the aggregate amount so far pledged was \$11 261 168.

154. The pledges announced so far represented 50.5% of the target. Various delegations had indicated that, given the dates set for the adoption of their national budgets, their Governments could not announce their pledges until some time later. He appealed to those Member States which had not yet done so to pledge their voluntary contributions as soon as possible; that appeal was addressed in particular to those States which could easily afford their base rate share of the target recommended.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

155. Mr. MANOUAN (Ivory Coast), speaking on behalf of the African group, expressed admiration and appreciation to the President for the remarkable way in which he had guided the work of the Conference at its twenty-seventh session to a successful conclusion. He wished, through the President, to extend that tribute also to the other Members of the General Committee.

156. The twenty-seventh session of the General Conference had marked an historic turning-point in the Agency's endeavours to increase the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world.

157. The countries of the African continent, which stood in greater need of technology than others if they were to satisfy their legitimate aspirations for the well-being of their peoples, and which were accordingly firmly committed to the Agency's objectives, were delighted with the success of the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference, a success which was due not only to the President, but also to the work done and the spirit of co-operation shown by the various groups.

158. The African group was grateful for the support services provided by the Secretariat, which had done so much to facilitate the work of the Conference, and wished to thank the Austrian Government for its generous hospitality.

159. Mr. MOLITOR (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the Western Europe group, complimented the President on his diligence, shrewd judgement and competence, which, at all levels, had enabled the General Conference to complete its often difficult work successfully.

160. He also thanked the members of the General Committee and the Director General and his colleagues for the care they had taken in planning and preparing for the Conference, contributing thereby to the furtherance of international co-operation.

161. The Western Europe group was deeply appreciative of the traditional hospitality extended by the Austrian Government and people, to whom it wished to express its sincere gratitude.

162. Mr. SINGH (India), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Middle East and South Asia, commended the staff serving the General Conference, who, under the guidance of the Director General, had enabled its meetings to take place in a relaxed and business-like atmosphere.

163. A special tribute was due to the President, under whose outstanding guidance it had proved possible to avoid the tensions which had marked the previous session; that remarkable achievement was due, in particular, to the regular consultations held with the "friends of the President". His efforts in the direction of conciliation and compromise and his desire for consensus had enabled the Conference to avoid a number of errors made at previous sessions.

164. The Middle East and South Asia group considered that the General Conference had adopted three particularly important resolutions, namely those on the protection of nuclear installations devoted to peaceful purposes against armed attacks, the nuclear capabilities of South Africa and the consequences of the military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear research reactor. Thanks to the skill and conciliatory spirit shown by the Chairman of the Group of 77 and thanks also to the co-operation of other groups, the General Conference had been able to adopt all three resolutions by a majority of two thirds.

165. Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina), acting as spokesman for the Latin American group, congratulated the President, who, fulfilling the expectations of the delegations which had elected him, had guided the proceedings in a

quite remarkable way and had, in particular, succeeded in avoiding the various problems and obstacles which had arisen by seeking, wherever possible, common ground where agreement could be reached and hence effective decisions taken.

166. He also thanked the Director General and his colleagues and expressed his gratitude to the host country. He was convinced that the atmosphere and style at the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference would continue to prevail in the future for the greater good of the Agency's work.

167. Mr. MIYAZAWA (Japan), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Far East, joined the preceding speakers in complimenting the President on the skill and wisdom with which he had tackled a full and difficult agenda. A tribute was also due to Mr. Blix and his colleagues, whose work and commitment had contributed to the success of the session, and, finally, to the Austrian Government and the City of Vienna for their hospitality.

168. Mr. WILLIAMSON (United States of America), speaking on behalf of the North American region, wished to associate himself with the preceding speakers in paying tribute to the competent and efficient way in which the President had guided the work of the General Conference.

169. For the first time in the Agency's history, the President of the General Conference had also been the Chairman of the Board of Governors, and his exceptional wisdom, his talents and his devotion to the task had contributed in an unprecedented way to the success of the session.

170. Mr. CHUTHASMIT (Thailand), acting as spokesman for the region of South East Asia and the Pacific, complimented the President on his wisdom and good judgement, qualities which had won him the admiration of all. Thanks were due also to the Vice-President and to the other members of the General Committee, who had facilitated the Conference's work. He wished to mention, in particular, the contribution made by the countries of South East Asia through Mr. Singh of Malaysia, who had served as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

171. The Director General and his colleagues in the Secretariat also deserved special thanks for their efficient work.

172. In the course of its deliberations, the Conference had come up against differences of opinion, which was entirely to be expected. Nevertheless, the spirit of co-operation which had reigned, enabling acceptable solutions to be

found to problems shared by all participating countries, was a rare achievement; all delegations could be justifiably proud of the part they had played in the success of the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference.

173. Mr. PANDEV (Bulgaria) stated that his country and the entire region of Eastern Europe, for which he was speaking, wished to express their sincere gratitude to the President, whose tireless efforts and keen sense of diplomacy had justified the hopes of those who had elected him.

174. The wisdom and tolerance which he had displayed had greatly facilitated the work of the Conference, which he had successfully guided around various rocks and reefs, thus confirming the Agency's ability to foster both the development of co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the progress of the non-proliferation concept. Having also thanked the Director General and his colleagues, he wished the President every success in his future career.

175. Mr. UMAR (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, expressed satisfaction at the way in which the atmosphere of the current session of the Conference had compared with that of the previous year's session. He was deeply appreciative of the skill with which the President had guided the deliberations of the Conference and also thanked the General Committee and the "friends of the President" for their valuable collaboration. Having expressed his sincere gratitude to the Austrian Government and people, he thanked the delegates who had supported draft resolution GC(XXVII)/702 and also those who had abstained from voting on the matter. He had taken note of the reasons for which other delegates had opposed the resolution and wished to express his appreciation of the efforts made to reach a consensus. He concluded by thanking the Director General and his colleagues.

176. The PRESIDENT thanked the speakers for the kind words addressed to him and to his colleagues in the General Committee. It had been a privilege to serve as President of the General Conference at its twenty-seventh session, and through his election he felt that his country and his regional group had also been honoured. He would miss his work for the Agency, which had brought him great satisfaction, especially during the past two years. He thanked the Austrian authorities and the City of Vienna for their hospitality and also

paid tribute to the Director General for his advice and to the staff of the Secretariat for their assistance during his presidency.

177. In accordance with Article 48 of the Rules of Procedure, he invited the delegates to observe one minute of silence for prayer or meditation.

All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

178. The PRESIDENT declared the twenty-seventh session of the General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 10.5 p.m.