



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE



GC(XXIX)/758
23 September 1985

GENERAL Distr.
Original: ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth regular session
Item 9 of the provisional agenda
(GC(XXIX)/746)

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

Report by the Board of Governors and the Director General

At its 641th meeting, on 19 September 1985, the Board of Governors decided to transmit the material in the Annexes hereto to the General Conference as the report from the Board and the Director General submitted in response to the request made last year by the Conference in operative paragraph 8 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423.

1147Y

85-4414

ANNEX 1

The International Atomic Energy Agency and South Africa
General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423

1. In resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 (see Attachment 1) the General Conference made a number of requests to the Board of Governors and the Director General:

- (a) In operative paragraph 2, it demanded once again "that South Africa submit immediately all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency" and requested the Director General "to continue taking the necessary measures in that connection";
- (b) In operative paragraph 5, it requested the Board of Governors and the Director General to contribute to the implementation of the United Nations General Assembly resolutions referred to in the preamble "in what relates to the Agency and especially the request to the Agency to refrain from extending, directly or indirectly, to South Africa any facilities which may assist it in its nuclear plans";
- (c) In operative paragraph 6, it further requested the Board of Governors and the Director General "to follow closely the activities of South Africa and its evolution in the nuclear field and to report to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session";
- (d) In operative paragraph 7, it requested the Board of Governors "to make recommendations to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session on appropriate action to be taken in accordance with the Statute if by that session South Africa has not complied with this resolution";

- (e) In operative paragraph 8, it requested the Board of Governors and the Director General "to report on the implementation of this resolution to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session"; and
- (f) In operative paragraph 9, it requested the Director General "to bring this resolution to the attention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations".

2. At its 39th regular session, in resolution 39/50.A, the Assembly expressed "its grave concern at the acquisition of nuclear weapons capability by the racist regime of South Africa" and declared that "such acquisition constitutes a threat to peace and security in Africa while posing a danger to all mankind". Also, it condemned collusion between certain States and South Africa in the nuclear field and called upon all other States to refrain from supplying South Africa, directly or indirectly, with installations which might enable it to produce nuclear materials, reactors or military equipment.

3. In resolution 39/72.A, the Assembly again requested the Agency "to refrain from extending to South Africa any facilities which may assist it in its nuclear plans".

4. In resolutions 39/61.A and B, the Assembly again demanded "that South Africa submit forthwith all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency".

5. On 26 July 1985, the United Nations Security Council adopted resolution 569 (1985), in which - inter alia - it urged "States Members of the Organization to adopt measures against the Republic of South Africa", including the prohibition of all new contracts in the nuclear field.

Action taken by the Director General

6. The Director General has taken the following action pursuant to resolution GC (XXVIII)/RES/423:^{1/}

- (a) Pursuant to operative paragraph 9, the Director General brought the resolution to the attention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in a letter dated 12 October 1984. Also, he notified the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid.
- (b) Pursuant to operative paragraph 2, the Director General wrote to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of South Africa in December 1984, informing him of the resolution and repeating the Secretariat's readiness to conclude the safeguards agreements and arrangements necessary for bringing all of South Africa's nuclear facilities under safeguards. He wrote again, in similar terms, in July 1985, following the meetings of the Board in June 1985. So far, no reply has been received to the Director General's letters.
- (c) Pursuant to a request made by the Board on 20 February 1985, the Director General prepared a written report on "South Africa's nuclear capabilities" which was submitted to the Board in June 1985 (in document GOV/INF/478) and has now been updated in the present document.

7. At the request of the Department of Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations and of the Organization of African Unity, the Secretariat made available to them in June 1985 the information contained in document GOV/INF/478.

^{1/} See GOV/OR. 631, paras 14 and 15.

UNIDIR

8. In resolution 38/181.A the General Assembly requested the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) to "provide data on the continued development of South Africa's nuclear capability". The Agency assisted UNIDIR in the preparation of the report which it submitted for the 39th regular session of the General Assembly.^{2/}

9. In resolution 39/61.B, the General Assembly, after taking note of General Conference resolution GC (XXVIII)/RES/423 and of the UNIDIR report, requested the Disarmament Commission "to consider as a matter of priority South Africa's nuclear capability during its 1985 session, taking into account, inter alia, the findings of the report", and requested the Secretary-General "to follow very closely South Africa's evolution in the nuclear field and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its fortieth session".

10. The Secretary-General, in a report to the General Assembly made pursuant to that request,^{3/} stated that "he has received no new information in this regard and, consequently, has nothing to add to his report on the subject to the Assembly at its thirty-ninth session (A/39/466)."

Safeguards at semi-commercial enrichment plant

11. The Board and the General Conference were informed in September 1984 (see document GC (XXVIII)/724) of developments in discussions concerning the application of safeguards to South Africa's semi-commercial enrichment plant at Valindaba, and the Director General has reported to the Board on further developments as follows:

- (a) The Secretariat communicated to South Africa on 24 September 1984 a revised draft safeguards agreement;
- (b) South Africa communicated to the Agency on 8 January 1985 the first version of the Design Information Questionnaire;

^{2/} United Nations document A/39/470.

^{3/} United Nations document A/40/510.

- (c) Discussions took place with South African representatives in February 1985, at which time it was agreed that negotiation of the safeguards agreement and negotiation of the subsidiary arrangements would proceed in parallel, that priority would be given to examination of the design information and of technical questions arising from it, and that South Africa would provide further information concerning the design and operation of the plant prior to further technical discussions in May 1985. This was done;
- (d) At a meeting with South Africa on 28 and 29 May 1985, the further technical information provided in connection with the plant and its enrichment process was discussed. The Agency gave detailed explanations of its safeguards requirements, and the application of safeguards at the plant was further discussed. The South African representatives proposed that the next round of technical discussions take place in South Africa in August 1985.

12. Agency representatives visited South Africa from 26 to 30 August 1985 and had meetings with the Atomic Energy Corporation of South Africa. They received additional design information and there were technical discussions relating to this information. In order to facilitate the working out of an appropriate safeguards approach, the Agency representatives were shown over the semi-commercial enrichment plant except for the cascade area. The Agency is now preparing the safeguards approach, and the Agency's proposals will be sent to South Africa as soon as possible with a view to early discussion.

13. During their visit to South Africa, the Agency representatives also visited the Koeberg nuclear power plant near Cape Town and the hot cell facility at Valindaba (see paragraph 27).

Supply of yellow cake

14. In February 1985, the Director General informed the Board that, in line with its announcement of 31 January 1984, South Africa had notified the Agency in November 1984 of an intended export of 1500 tonnes of uranium yellow cake to a non-nuclear-weapon State party to NPT. The notification was sent in order that the relevant safeguards might be applied to the material, and the Agency took due note of it. The Agency has since been informed by South Africa that the export has not yet taken place.

Status of the Agency's relations with South Africa

Membership

15. South Africa became a member of the Agency in June 1957. It was a member of the Board of Governors until June 1977, when the Board decided that Egypt should be designated -- in place of South Africa -- as the most advanced Member State for the area of Africa under Article VI.A.1 of the Statute.

16. South Africa's current base rate of assessment is 0.40%. As reported in the Agency's accounts for 1984 (GC(XXIX)/749), South Africa's outstanding contributions to the Regular Budget amounted to US\$ 930 898 as at 31 December 1984. South Africa's assessed contribution for 1985, US\$ 238 101, is also outstanding. South Africa recently made a payment to the Agency of US\$ 450 000, so that, with the application of the cash surplus shares to which South Africa thereby became eligible, the total amount of South Africa's outstanding contributions has been reduced by US\$ 544 752.

17. Until 1978, South Africa made voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund in accordance with its base rate of assessment. In 1979 it contributed in accordance with its base rate for 1978. Since 1979 it has not made any voluntary contributions.

General Conference

18. The credentials of the South African delegate to the 1979 regular session of the General Conference were rejected. The rejection applied to that session only, but South Africa has not since sought to attend a General Conference session.

Committee on Assurances of Supply

19. The Board of Governors decided in September 1981 that South Africa should not participate further in the meetings and work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply (CAS).

Participation of South Africa in Agency activities

20. As stated in sub-paragraph 1(b) above, in operative paragraph 5 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 the General Conference referred to the United Nations General Assembly's request to the Agency "to refrain from extending, directly or indirectly, to South Africa any facilities which may assist it in its nuclear plans".

21. South Africa is not in receipt of any technical assistance from the Agency, and at present the Agency has no research contracts with any institutes in South Africa.

22. As stated in document GOV/INF/459, South Africa, as a member of the Agency, has the right under the Statute to participate in activities open to all Member States, including attendance at meetings, except where a Policy-making Organ has explicitly determined otherwise -- as in the case of the Board's decision in September 1981 regarding CAS (see paragraph 19 above). From time to time, South Africa attends meetings of which, like other Member States, it receives notice.

Nuclear resources and activities

23. A summary of South Africa's nuclear resources and activities is contained in Attachment 2. The text of a news release, issued on 27 February 1985 by the Atomic Energy Corporation of South Africa, concerning the construction and commissioning of the semi-commercial enrichment plant at Valindaba is contained in Attachment 3; it confirms information, already communicated to the Agency and to the Board, that the plant is expected to be commissioned and to go into operation in 1987.

Safeguards

SAFARI research reactor

24. The Agency has been applying safeguards to the SAFARI research reactor since 1967 under a safeguards agreement between the Agency, the United States of America and South Africa (INFCIRC/98).

Koeberg nuclear power plant

25. Safeguards at the Koeberg nuclear power plant are applied under a safeguards agreement between the Agency, France and South Africa (INFCIRC/244). The co-operation agreement between France and South Africa specifically provides that the reprocessing of the fuel and the storage of the derived plutonium must take place outside South Africa, in locations mutually agreed upon by both countries and under Agency safeguards.

Semi-commercial enrichment plant

26. The latest position as regards the safeguards discussions on South Africa's semi-commercial enrichment plant is described in paragraphs 11, 12 and 13.

Other facilities

27. None of the facilities listed in Attachment 2 except the SAFARI research reactor and the Koeberg nuclear power plant are at present under safeguards. However, uranium enriched in the pilot plant at Valindaba and fuel fabricated for the SAFARI and Koeberg reactors would come under safeguards upon being introduced into the reactors and would remain under safeguards thereafter. That is to say, safeguards would continue to be applied to irradiated fuel from these reactors sent for post-irradiation examination at the hot cell facility which is being constructed (see paragraph 6 of Attachment 2). Design information on the hot cell facility has been submitted by South Africa to the Agency and reviewed by the Department of Safeguards.

ANNEX 1

ATTACHMENT 1

Twenty-eighth regular session

Agenda item 9

(GC(XXVIII)/730)

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

Resolution adopted during the 266th plenary meeting on 28 September 1984

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES

The General Conference,

- (a) Having considered the Annual Report of the Agency for 1983 (GC(XXVIII)/713), in particular paragraphs 42 and 311, and the report of the Board of Governors and the Director General on South Africa's nuclear capabilities (GC(XXVIII)/724),
- (b) Recalling United Nations General Assembly resolution 38/181 A/B on implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the nuclear capability of South Africa, General Assembly resolution 38/39 A on the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa and resolution 38/36 A on the situation in Namibia resulting from the illegal occupation of the Territory by South Africa,
- (c) Recalling resolution 38/39 F of the United Nations General Assembly on relations between Israel and South Africa, particularly in the nuclear field,
- (d) Recalling also resolution 38/39 G of the United Nations General Assembly on military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa,
- (e) Alarmed that South Africa's unsafeguarded nuclear facilities enable it to acquire the capability of producing usable material for nuclear weapons,
- (f) Stressing that acquisition by the racist régime of South Africa of nuclear armament capacity endangers the security of the African States and increases the risk of nuclear-weapons proliferation,
- (g) Bearing in mind South Africa's acquisition of nuclear capabilities through the illegal acquisition of Namibian uranium, and
- (h) Noting with grave concern the negative reaction of South Africa towards the implementation of General Conference resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/408,

1. Takes note of United Nations General Assembly resolutions 38/181 A/B, 38/39 A, F and G and 38/36 A and of General Conference document GC(XXVIII)/724;
2. Demands once again that South Africa submit immediately all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency and requests the Director General to continue taking the necessary measures in that connection;
3. Calls upon those Member States of the Agency which have not done so yet to end all nuclear co-operation with the South African régime and, in particular, to terminate all transfers to South Africa of fissionable material and technology which could be used for developing the capability of producing nuclear arms and to reconsider their purchases of uranium from South Africa;
4. Calls upon those Member States which have not done so yet to stop all purchases of Namibian uranium;
5. Requests the Board of Governors and the Director General to contribute to the implementation of the above-mentioned United Nations General Assembly resolutions in what relates to the Agency and especially the request to the Agency to refrain from extending, directly or indirectly, to South Africa any facilities which may assist it in its nuclear plans;
6. Further requests the Board of Governors and the Director General to follow closely the activities of South Africa and its evolution in the nuclear field and to report to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session;
7. Requests the Board of Governors to make recommendations to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session on appropriate action to be taken in accordance with the Statute if by that session South Africa has not complied with this resolution;
8. Requests the Board of Governors and the Director General to report on the implementation of this resolution to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session; and
9. Requests the Director General to bring this resolution to the attention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ANNEX 1
ATTACHMENT 2

South Africa: Nuclear resources and activities

Uranium resources

1. South Africa's uranium resources as at 1 January 1983 are reported to be:^{1/}

Reasonably Assured Resources Recoverable at up to US \$ 80/kg U	US \$ 80-130/kg U
191 000 tonnes U	122 000 tonnes U

Estimated Additional Resources Recoverable at up to US \$ 80/kg U	US \$ 80-130/kg U
99 000 tonnes U	48 000 tonnes U

Uranium production

2. Since 1980 South African uranium production has been running at about 6000 tonnes a year.

Uranium enrichment

3. A pilot uranium enrichment plant has been in operation at Valindaba since 1977. This plant enriches uranium to 45% for the fuel for the SAFARI research reactor.

4. A semi-commercial enrichment plant with an estimated capacity of about 300 tonnes separative work units (SWU)/year is under construction.

^{1/} Uranium Resources, Production and Demand, joint report of the Agency and NEA, December 1983.

Fuel fabrication

5. A fuel fabrication plant producing fuel for the SAFARI reactor is in operation. There have also been reports of an experimental line for the fabrication of fuel elements for the Koeberg power plant.

Research

6. The National Nuclear Research Centre at Pelindaba, the main governmental research establishment, undertakes research on mineral prospecting and mining, mineral exploitation, reactor and reactor fuel development, radiation and health physics, metallurgy, reactor safety and operation, applications of radioisotopes in medicine, agriculture and industry, and nuclear physics. The Centre contains the 20-MW (thermal) SAFARI research reactor, which was supplied by the United States and went into operation in 1965. In 1975 the United States ceased to supply fuel for the reactor and South Africa is manufacturing the fuel itself (see paragraph 5 above). A hot cell facility is being constructed at the Centre, primarily for the purpose of post-irradiation examination of fuel and materials irradiated in the Koeberg and SAFARI reactors.

Koeberg nuclear power plant

7. The Koeberg nuclear power plant comprises two 900-MW (electric) pressurized-water reactors supplied by France. Both reactors are now operational.

Radioactive waste disposal and spent fuel storage facility

8. A radioactive waste disposal facility which is intended to be used also as a site for the interim storage of spent fuel elements is under construction near Vaalputs (600 km north of Cape Town).

ANNEX 1
ATTACHMENT 3

TEXT OF NEWS RELEASE ISSUED BY
THE ATOMIC ENERGY CORPORATION OF SOUTH AFRICA

PRODUCTION OF ENRICHED URANIUM AT VALINDABA

PRETORIA -- The erection of a uranium enrichment plant at Valindaba to provide South Africa's enriched uranium needs is progressing according to programme and the plant should come into operation in approximately two years, says Dr. J.W.L. De Villiers, Executive Chairman of the Atomic Energy Corporation of South Africa.

Dr. De Villiers commented on news reports of the past weekend referring to the enrichment of uranium at Valindaba and international fuel purchases by ESCOM for the Koeberg nuclear power station.

Dr. De Villiers said that the then Minister of Mines had announced on 13 February 1978 that a project would be initiated for the commercial production of enriched uranium in view of the progress made with the pilot plant and that the envisaged plant would be able to provide the country's needs.

"The erection of such a production plant is obviously a complex venture and a definite commissioning date could not be specified. However, as progress was made with the project, it became clear that the production of enriched uranium for nuclear power production would become a reality in the second half of the eighties. The erection of the plant is progressing according to plan and it should be commissioned in approximately two years' time", Dr. De Villiers said.

The final cost of the project will only be known once the plant is in production. It has been designed for a production of 300 tswu per year, enough to supply South Africa's domestic demand. The production plant at Valindaba will utilize locally produced feed material.

As the Koeberg nuclear power station commenced with electricity production in 1984, it was necessary to negotiate the supply of fuel with international suppliers for the period when locally enriched uranium would not be available, Dr. De Villiers said. As a result, ESCOM would have to rely on overseas suppliers of enriched uranium until such time as the Valindaba plant could supply sufficient material.

A N N E X 2

Summary record of the discussion on the item "South Africa's nuclear capabilities" at meeting of the Board of Governors held in February, June and September 1985

RECORD OF THE 631st MEETING OF THE BOARD (held on 19 February 1985)

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

14. Referring to contacts with South Africa concerning safeguards, and to the implementation of General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, he said that, if the Board so agreed, he would at a later stage submit a written report to the Board to assist it in formulating its own report to the General Conference. For the time being he could add to the information contained in document GOV/INF/459, by pointing out that, after adoption of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, he had brought the resolution to the attention of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid. The 39th session of the United Nations General Assembly had also discussed the matter and had adopted resolutions 39/61 and 39/72 which, among other things, demanded again that South Africa should submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards and requested the Agency to refrain from extending any facilities to South Africa which could help it further its nuclear plans. Those resolutions were treated in more detail in document GOV/INF/469.

15. As for safeguards, he had again drawn the attention of the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs to General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, repeating the Secretariat's readiness to conclude the necessary agreements to place under safeguards all nuclear facilities of that country. Moreover, the Secretariat had pursued with South Africa the question of safeguarding the latter's semi-commercial enrichment plant. As had been foreseen in document GOV/INF/459, the Secretariat had sent to South Africa a revised draft safeguards agreement on 24 September 1984, and South Africa had provided the Secretariat with design information on the plant on 8 January 1985. Further meetings on the safeguarding of that plant had been held on 14 and 15 February, when both the revised draft safeguards agreement

and the design information provided by South Africa had been discussed. It had been agreed that negotiation of the safeguards agreement and the subsidiary arrangements would proceed in parallel so that technical issues relating to the safeguards approach and arrangements at the plant could be identified and clarified before the draft safeguards agreement was submitted to the Board. Since South Africa had confirmed that the plant was scheduled to go into operation in 1987, priority was being accorded to examination of the design information and technical questions relevant to the application of safeguards. The Secretariat had requested further information which South Africa expected to provide within the next two months so that further discussions at the technical level could be held in May 1985.

16. Furthermore, in connection with the announcement about uranium exports of 31 January 1984, South Africa had notified the Agency of one such intended export to a non-nuclear-weapon State requesting the Agency to note that information for the purpose of applying the relevant safeguards to that material. The intended recipient was a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) with which a safeguards agreement pursuant to INFCIRC/153 was in force. The Agency had duly noted the information.

17. Lastly, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) had the preceding autumn, completed its report on South Africa's nuclear capabilities, with the preparation of which the Secretariat had been associated, and had submitted it to the General Assembly. In its resolution 39/61 the General Assembly had taken note of that report and had requested the Disarmament Commission to consider South Africa's nuclear capabilities as a matter of priority during its 1985 session and the Secretary-General to follow nuclear developments in South Africa and to report thereon to the Assembly at its 40th session.

RECORD OF THE 633rd MEETING (held on 20 February 1985)

(a) SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES (GC(XXVIII)/RES/423)

56. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Board of the Director General's statement at the beginning of the current session, in which he had reported on his discussions with the South African authorities since the General Conference's adoption of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 and had stated that he would report further on the matter to the Board in June.

57. Mr. ADEBARI (Nigeria) said that Nigeria was greatly concerned by South Africa's nuclear capabilities and asked whether the Director General would be in a position to make a definite and positive statement on the subject by the time the Board met in June. If such assurances were in fact forthcoming, one could take that to mean that the Director General would have been able to complete negotiations before then - possibly not later than the month of May.

58. The DIRECTOR GENERAL said that he would be making a full written report in June.

59. The CHAIRMAN took it that the Board wished the Director General to intensify his efforts, as requested by the General Conference, to ensure the speedy implementation by South Africa of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, and to provide a further report on the matter in time for the Board's meetings in June, on which occasion the Board would examine the matter in the light of that further report and could also consider the nature of its own report for submission to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth regular session.

60. It was so decided.

RECORD OF THE 635TH MEETING OF THE BOARD (held on 11 June 1985)

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

34. In compliance with resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, adopted in 1984, in which the General Conference had demanded that "South Africa submit immediately all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency" and requested the Director General "to continue taking the necessary measures in that connection", he had again addressed a letter concerning the negotiation of full-scope safeguards to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of South Africa, but he had received no reply. Despite the continuing lack of progress in connection with full-scope safeguards, new substantive discussions had been held on the question of safeguards to be applied to the South African semi-commercial enrichment plant. Those discussions, which had involved a further exchange of technical information, had taken place in Vienna on 28 and 29 May. It had been proposed that the next round of technical discussions, together with a visit to the plant, should take place in South Africa in August 1985.

RECORD OF THE 639TH MEETING (held on 13 June 1985)

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES (GC(XXVIII)/RES/423; GOV/INF/478)

138. Mr. OKEKE (Nigeria) said that his delegation appreciated the efforts made by the Director General to implement operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 and commended the Secretariat on document GOV/INF/478, which was in fact not very different from document GOV/INF/454 submitted to the Board in June 1984. The Director General had made reasonable efforts to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to him personally and was now ready to work with the Board for the implementation of operative paragraph 6 of the resolution. The Board should also examine operative paragraph 7.

139. His delegation wished to state clearly that what the Board was examining was not the semicommercial enrichment plant under construction in South Africa. His delegation was aware that negotiations had taken place, indeed since before 1980. The negotiations on that semicommercial plant would last for at least another two years. However, all those negotiations had been conducted just before meetings of the Board as if someone was trying to pull the wool over the eyes of those who were sceptical about the intentions of South Africa. Since the Board could not be fooled by a mirage in the form of an uncompleted semicommercial plant, it was with operative paragraph 2 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 that the Board should concern itself.

140. The South African Government had insisted that it could not submit all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency. That was clear from paragraph 6 of document GOV/INF/454 and was implicit in document GOV/INF/478. As at the Board's meetings in June 1984, his delegation wanted to know what the Agency was doing in the face of South Africa's refusal to accept full-scope safeguards. His delegation was perfectly aware that South Africa's allies were secretly rejoicing, but it would continue its efforts until justice was restored in South Africa.

141. South Africa had always defied the resolutions of the General Conference, and that constituted a threat to peace. It had not paid its assessed contribution to the Agency's Regular Budget since 1979. However, some well-meaning Member States regarded South Africa as a Member of the Agency whose standing was too good for it to be called to order. In view of that country's attitude, the General Conference should take appropriate action against South Africa at its 29th regular session. It was for the Board to decide what constituted appropriate action.

142. During the debate at the time of the adoption of resolution GC(XXVII)/RES/408 in 1983, one delegate opposing the resolution had stated: "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 It was important to keep South Africa in the Agency precisely because it had a significant civil nuclear programme." A well-meaning and respected delegate had said: "The suspension of rights and privileges which the Board was being asked to consider ... 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." It should be noted, however, that that resolution did not call for such action. A delegate whose country was known to be negotiating the sale of heavy water reactors to South Africa had refused to vote in favour of any action against South Africa. One delegate had abstained from voting because he considered the Agency to be an organization of a technical nature, the aim of which was to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to ensure global non-proliferation. South Africa was, however, being encouraged to perfect its nuclear weapons. One delegate had almost gone as far as to say that South Africa would be a good thing for the rest of Africa. Another delegate had stated that any opposition to South Africa's nuclear programme was political in character, thereby forgetting that the decision to acquire nuclear weapons was itself political.

143. It was a patent fact that South Africa was perfecting its nuclear weapons with the assistance of many Agency Member States. It was also a fact

that certain Member States had discouraged prospecting for uranium in Africa because they wanted to have a reason for supplying nuclear equipment to South Africa in return for Namibian uranium. It was also well known that many developed countries were linking the question of South Africa to that of membership of NPT by other African States, suggesting that South Africa should be left alone until all African States had signed a safeguards agreement with the Agency. However, none of the friends of South Africa wished to make any commitments in that respect.

144. His delegation believed that the South African nuclear programme should be placed under Agency safeguards. To continue to encourage South Africa to acquire nuclear capacity was to disregard utterly the feelings of all African Member States of the Agency. His delegation wished to be reassured that non-proliferation was not a way of keeping Africa in a state of perpetual submission. If that were not so, why was South Africa being encouraged not to join NPT and not to submit its nuclear installations to Agency inspection?

145. Nigeria was now at an advanced stage in the process of signing a safeguards agreement with the Agency, but it was not going to sign the agreement in fear. The development of nuclear technology was not a priority for Nigeria. In conclusion, his delegation urged the Board to recommend action that the General Conference should take against South Africa.

146. Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia) thanked the Director General for his report on his meetings with South Africa on the continuing problem of the implementation of General Conference resolutions on South Africa's nuclear capabilities. Unfortunately, the policy and attitude of South Africa had not changed. In ignoring the resolutions of both the General Conference and the United Nations General Assembly and in pursuing, completely uncontrolled, the development of its nuclear capabilities, the apartheid régime posed a continuing threat to the security and stability of African States and world peace. It was therefore essential to ensure that full-scope safeguards were applied in South Africa.

147. Ms. AWADALLAH (Egypt) said that while her delegation commended the Director General on the efforts made, it noted that the measures taken to date by South Africa fell far short of fulfilling General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, which, in operative paragraph 2, requested South Africa to submit immediately all its nuclear installations and facilities to Agency inspection. In fact the news published recently in the press concerning the nature of South Africa's nuclear capabilities was very alarming and made the prompt submission by South Africa of all its nuclear installations to Agency safeguards all the more imperative. Her delegation requested the Director General to continue his efforts to secure full implementation of the resolution so that the Board could report to the General Conference on the issue.

148. Mr. BADDOU (Morocco) recalled that, at its last session, the General Assembly of the United Nations had again demanded that South Africa immediately submit its nuclear installations to Agency inspection and had again requested the Agency to refrain from extending to South Africa any facilities which might assist it in its nuclear plans. In September 1984, the Agency's General Conference had adopted two resolutions along the same lines. It was only within the framework of those resolutions that the question of South Africa's nuclear capabilities could be considered.

149. Those resolutions demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear facilities and installations to Agency inspection, called on Agency Member States to end their co-operation with South Africa, especially in the field of technology transfer, prohibited South Africa from participating in Agency working groups and called upon the Agency to refrain from providing South Africa, directly or indirectly, with any facilities in the nuclear field.

150. It transpired from the information given by the Director General that the negotiations undertaken by the Agency and South Africa in order to implement those resolutions had so far produced no concrete results. The problem was as great as ever, and the duty of Agency Member States was to be loyal to United Nations and General Conference resolutions and to keep a strict watch over their fair and honest implementation. That was the

delicate long-term task which the Director General was making considerable efforts to accomplish in order to bring about a change in South Africa's attitude towards the international community.

151. Mr. MORALES (Cuba) thanked the Director General for his efforts to ensure the implementation of General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. As could be seen from the Director General's report, the measures actually taken by the South African Government in response to General Conference requests were the minimum it could make and were designed to delay as long as possible the full implementation of the resolution. The South African Foreign Minister had not even bothered to reply to the letter addressed to him by the Director General. In view of South Africa's conduct on the international scene, its constant violation of past agreements with Governments from countries of the region aimed at reducing the danger of a general war between South Africa and its neighbours, and of the ambiguous statements made by the South African Government on the Namibia question, it was difficult for the Cuban Government to have any confidence whatsoever in South Africa's making the necessary efforts to respect resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. His Government believed that the basic provisions of that resolution remained valid: they had not been respected by the South African Government. The Cuban Government hoped that, by the next session of the General Conference, the South African Government would have taken the necessary steps to implement the resolution in its entirety.

152. Mr. SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia), recalling the provisions of General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 and United Nations General Assembly resolution 39/61A, said that, despite repeated requests by the Agency and the United Nations, it appeared once again that the South African Government had done nothing to implement those resolutions. South Africa's attitude continued to worry the international community. Since the Board and the Director General had to report to the General Conference at its twenty-ninth session on the implementation of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, and since the Board had to recommend appropriate action to be taken under the Statute if, by the time of that session, South Africa had still not applied the resolution, the Director General should continue his efforts so that the Board would be in a better position in September to submit a report and recommendations to the General Conference.

153. Mr. ZHOU (China) expressed his appreciation of the efforts of the Director General and said that resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 must be strictly implemented. His delegation shared the views expressed by previous speakers and requested the Director General to report on the implementation of the resolution at the next session of the General Conference.

154. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) associated himself with the statements made by the Governors from Nigeria, Tunisia, Morocco and Cuba.

155. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) noted that the Director General had been able to report some progress on the question of South Africa's nuclear capabilities. The results of the most recent discussions between the representatives of South Africa and the Agency demonstrated the seriousness of the approach adopted by all those involved. His country welcomed the announcement that a further round of talks was to take place in August in South Africa.

156. His Government had repeatedly urged the South African Government to adhere to NPT and to accept full-scope safeguards; it would continue to do so. It was concerned about the existence of unsafeguarded facilities in South Africa and had so informed the South African Government. The current dialogue between the Secretariat and South Africa on the application of safeguards to the semicommercial enrichment plant was an important contribution in that regard and one which the United States supported. It was precisely for that reason that those discussions should be continued in an atmosphere conducive to success. Calls for action to curtail South Africa's rights and privileges as a Member of the Agency could only harm the prospects for success. His Government had consistently condemned the policy of apartheid. That was not the issue at stake. The task of the Board was to encourage the wider application of safeguards, not only in South Africa but elsewhere. That was one of the most important objectives of the Agency and his delegation congratulated the Director General on the way in which he had so far carried out his mandate.

157. Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted that he was forced to note that South Africa was still ignoring the provisions

of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. The attempts being made by South Africa to achieve an unsafeguarded nuclear capacity were a source of grave concern and represented a serious threat to peace and security, especially on the African continent. South Africa's intention to submit its enrichment plant to safeguards did not change the situation in any fundamental way since that country still refused to sign NPT, to join a nuclear-free zone in Africa and to accept full-scope safeguards. All those interested in strengthening the non-proliferation regime should continue to put pressure on South Africa to comply with the General Conference's resolution.

158. Mr. ABURAS (Jordan) expressed his gratitude to the Director General for his efforts but regretted that South Africa had taken no positive steps to implement resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. He would greatly appreciate it if the Director General continued his efforts to secure South Africa's compliance with the resolution in question and to persuade Member States to put an end to co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field.

159. Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) recalled that his delegation had repeatedly expressed its indignation at the growing nuclear capability of the racist régime of South Africa and deeply regretted that South Africa was still enjoying the assistance and co-operation of certain States, despite repeated appeals from the United Nations General Assembly to all States to end such assistance. Iraq shared the concern expressed by previous speakers at South Africa's acquisition of nuclear weapons and its persistent refusal to submit its nuclear activities to Agency safeguards. His delegation would support any measure that the Board decided to take to bring about South Africa's compliance with General Conference resolutions.

160. Mr. WILMSHURST (United Kingdom) said he shared the concern of the Governor from Nigeria and other speakers. The United Kingdom wanted all countries who had not yet done so, including South Africa, to ratify NPT and submit their nuclear installations to Agency safeguards. His Government had recently requested many States not party to the Treaty - including South Africa - to ratify the Treaty without delay. His delegation urged the Director General to continue his efforts with the South African Government and hoped that they would produce results. It also hoped that other countries, including some which had spoken at the current meeting, would set an example for South Africa.

161. Mr. SITZLACK (German Democratic Republic) said his delegation shared the view expressed by various other delegations that the international community was facing a situation which was extremely dangerous for the non-proliferation regime. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Africa would constitute a serious threat to security not only at a regional level but throughout the world. In accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly which had received wide support, his delegation urged the Agency to continue to seek appropriate action which would ensure the full implementation of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. It took note of the Director General's report on the negotiations between the Agency and South Africa and felt that, as long as South Africa refused to place all its nuclear facilities and materials under Agency safeguards and to become a party to NPT, the provisions of the resolution could not be regarded as fulfilled.

162. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium), thanking the Secretariat for submitting a report which was clear and concise and covered the subject adequately, noted that some progress had been made but that it was minimal and insufficient. The report could be submitted as it was to the General Conference for information.

163. The policy and the attitude of Belgium towards South Africa were well known. They had been publicly expressed, notably within the United Nations. His country understood the concern, expressed again during the current session, at South Africa's continued failure to submit all its facilities to Agency safeguards. Belgium, too, regretted that situation. However, the submission of nuclear activities to Agency safeguards was a voluntary act and must remain so. It was not possible to demand that discriminatory treatment be applied to South Africa when several Members of the Board - including several designated Members - had not submitted all their installations to Agency control. Of the ten most advanced Members, six had not placed all their civil installations under safeguards. None the less, his delegation welcomed any progress made in securing South Africa's acceptance of Agency safeguards and understood the concern expressed by other Governors, notably the Governors from Nigeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Morocco, Cuba and Indonesia.

164. His delegation repeated its view that the principle of the universality of the United Nations was being undermined by the ostracism to which South Africa was subjected. Was it logical to request South Africa to submit all its installations to Agency safeguards and at the same time to exclude it from the General Conference or the Board of Governors? As far as Belgium was concerned, politics and realism were not irreconcilable.

165. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the discussion, said he took it that the Board wished to express its appreciation to the Director General for the efforts he had made pursuant to the resolution on South Africa adopted by the General Conference the previous year, and to take note of the Director General's most recent report. Several Members had expressed concern at the slow pace of the talks between the Agency and South Africa and had urged the Director General to intensify his efforts to ensure speedy compliance by South Africa with General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. The Board would await a further report by the Director General in September before considering what action it would take on that matter. He therefore proposed that the item be placed on the agenda for the September session.

166. It was so decided.

PROVISIONAL RECORD OF THE 641st MEETING (held on 19 September 1985)

STATEMENT BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL

He recalled that in June the Board had examined a Secretariat report on South Africa's nuclear capabilities and had requested him to make further efforts to ensure compliance by South Africa with General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 adopted in 1984, and in particular with the demand that South Africa submit all its nuclear activities to inspection by the Agency. Pursuant to the request by the Board, he had addressed a further letter in that vein to the South African Minister of Foreign Affairs in July 1985; however, no reply had been received.

For the current meetings of the Board, the Secretariat had circulated a report which was essentially an updating of the June report. It gave information about the technical discussions which had taken place at the end of August in South Africa on the safeguarding of South Africa's semi-commercial enrichment plant and about a visit by Agency representatives to parts of the plant and to some other nuclear facilities in South Africa. The Secretariat was now preparing the safeguards approach for the semi-commercial enrichment plant, and its proposals would be sent to South Africa as soon as possible with a view to early discussion.

Lastly, he wished to inform the Board that South Africa had just made a payment to the Agency of US \$450 000 in respect of its outstanding contributions to the Regular Budget.

DISCUSSION IN THE BOARD

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES (GC(XXVIII)/RES/423; GOV/INF/481 and Add.1)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that in June, when the Director General had once again reported to the Board on contacts with the South African authorities pursuant to General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, the Board had agreed that it would await a further report in September before considering what recommendations it would make to the General Conference on appropriate action to be taken by the Conference.

The Board now had before it, in document GOV/INF/481, a further report by the Director General which - inter alia - provided information on the discussions held in August between the Secretariat and the South African authorities concerning the application of safeguards to South Africa's semi-commercial enrichment plant at Valindaba. It also gave information on South Africa's present involvement in the Agency's activities. In paragraph 2 of the Note by the Director General it was suggested that that latest report could, if the Board so desired, form a part of the report from the Board and the Director General to the General Conference requested in General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. The summary records of the Board's discussions on the present item since the last session of the General Conference could be added to that report.

Since the release of document GOV/INF/481, an Addendum to it had been issued by the Secretariat. Additional information had also been provided by the Director General in his statement earlier in the meeting.

Mr. UMAR (Nigeria) commended the Secretariat on the precise and up-to-date report in GOV/INF/481 and the Director General on his statement at the beginning of the meeting.

The Director General had made laudable efforts in faithfully implementing his mandate pursuant to the United Nations General Assembly and General Conference resolutions on the topic under discussion, and he should continue to take the necessary measures to ensure that South Africa immediately submitted all its nuclear installations to Agency inspection. The Board and the Director General must not relent in their efforts to monitor closely South Africa's nuclear activities and development, which were no doubt being intensified.

In resolution 39/50.A the General Assembly had expressed grave concern at the acquisition of nuclear weapons capability by South Africa and had declared such acquisition to be a threat to peace and security in Africa while posing a danger to mankind. Moreover, on 26 July 1985 the United Nations Security Council had adopted resolution 569 (1985) urging States Members of the organization to adopt measures against the Republic of South Africa, including the prohibition of all new contracts in the nuclear field. The

Nigerian delegation welcomed the action taken by the President of the United States of America in imposing limited sanctions against South Africa, in particular with respect to nuclear technology, and hoped that the sanctions would remain in force until South Africa complied with the various General Assembly and General Conference resolutions.

Nigeria also greatly welcomed the statement by nine Ministers of Member States of the European Community on the situation in South Africa with particular reference to the suspension of nuclear co-operation. However, the dissenting view of one Community Member State was a matter for concern, and it was to be hoped that that Member would soon adopt the position of its fellow Members against South Africa.

It remained for the Board to decide what action to recommend to the General Conference with regard to South Africa. In view of the recent positive signs from certain western countries, there were grounds for hoping that all Governors would co-operate in recommending appropriate measures to the Conference. It should be borne in mind that South Africa had made no effort to respond to the request that it place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards; South Africa was working to acquire or had already acquired nuclear facilities which represented a threat to the region of Africa and to mankind in general.

Mr. SITZLACK (German Democratic Republic), thanking the Director General for his efforts in the matter, said that the development of South Africa's nuclear capabilities jeopardized the non-proliferation regime and that the acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Africa would constitute a serious threat to international security.

He therefore encouraged the Agency to continue considering appropriate action to ensure full implementation of General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. He reiterated his delegation's view that, as long as South Africa refused to place all its nuclear facilities and materials under Agency safeguards and to become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the provisions of that General Conference resolution could not be considered to have been fulfilled.

Mr. BADDOU (Morocco), referring to his delegation's statement on South Africa's nuclear capabilities at the last series of Board meetings, reserved the right to return to the matter during the General Conference's forthcoming session.

Mr. GOMAA (Egypt), expressing his delegation's indignation at the ferocious repressive measures currently being taken by the South African régime against the innocent black population, said that the explosive situation in that country posed a serious threat to world peace and was the result of the hateful policy of apartheid.

The South African régime was persisting in its defiance of the international community as represented by the United Nations and affiliated agencies. For example, it continued to ignore the Agency's resolutions. At its meetings in June 1985 the Board had commended the Director General on his efforts and asked him to continue them with a view to ensuring that South Africa complied with General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. Despite the skill and dedication demonstrated by the Director General, his efforts had been fruitless, since no significant change had been reported in South Africa's attitude.

Operative paragraph 2 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 demanded that South Africa submit immediately all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency. In its resolution 39/50.A the United Nations General Assembly had expressed grave concern at the acquisition by South Africa of nuclear weapons capability, which constituted a threat to peace and security in Africa and a danger to all mankind, and in its resolution 39/61.A and B the General Assembly also had demanded that South Africa submit forthwith all its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the Agency.

As to South Africa's responses to those resolutions, the Director General's updated report in document GOV/INF/481 stated in paragraph 6 that no reply had been received to his letters of December 1984 and July 1985. Moreover, paragraph 27 of that report indicated that none of South Africa's nuclear installations except the SAFARI research reactor and the Koeberg

nuclear power plant were at present under safeguards. The demand in resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 that all nuclear facilities and installations in South Africa be submitted to inspection by the Agency was therefore not being complied with. Furthermore, the negotiations between the Agency and South Africa concerning the semi-commercial enrichment plant at Valindaba had so far yielded no concrete results, although Agency representatives had been shown over the plant except for the cascade area. Talks had been under way for almost a whole year, but South Africa had shown no genuine readiness to respond positively to resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, even insofar as the Valindaba plant was concerned. The time had therefore come to draw the necessary conclusions and to take firm action against the South African régime, for the Member States of the Agency were duty bound to ensure that South Africa ceased to defy General Conference resolutions.

Mr. ZHOU (China) appreciated and supported the Director General's efforts with a view to implementation of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. That resolution expressed the repugnance felt by people throughout the world, and especially in Africa, towards the system of apartheid. However, the South African régime continued to apply apartheid and to persecute the South African people and was expanding its nuclear capability, which constituted a threat to peace and stability in Africa and in the world as a whole. China once again wished to condemn the South African régime and called upon it to cease such activities. The Director General should take further steps to speed up implementation of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 and should report on those steps to the Board at its next session.

Mr. ROSALES (Cuba) acknowledged the efforts made so far by the Director General and Secretariat with a view to the implementation of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 but considered that the Government of South Africa was continuing to ignore the main points of that resolution, in particular the one relating to the placing of all its nuclear installations under Agency safeguards.

That request had been included in the resolution because the international community wished to employ all possible means to prevent the Government of South Africa from using the capacity of its nuclear

installations for military purposes, as that would increase tensions in the southern part of the African continent and would have dangerous repercussions for peace and security throughout the world.

The behaviour of the South African régime was such that all peace-loving countries must make all possible efforts to prevent that régime from acquiring the ability to construct nuclear weapons, and the Agency was the organization best placed to meet that objective.

Cuba was not satisfied with the steps taken by the South African Government in recent months because their main objective had been to prolong the negotiations begun some time earlier with the Agency concerning the application of safeguards to a semi-commercial enrichment plant and to prevent resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 from being implemented in full. The Agency must continue with its efforts to speed up the conclusion of negotiations for the application of safeguards to the enrichment plant and should use all possible means to ensure that South Africa complied with the resolution in question.

As long as the South African régime did not so comply and did not stop its brutal and inhumane treatment of the majority of the country's population and cease by its irresponsible behaviour in the region to be an object of concern for the vast majority of peace-loving States, the Board and the General Conference must continue to pay particular attention to the matter under discussion in the spirit of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423.

Ms. SUDIRDJO (Indonesia) thanked the Director General for his report in document GOV/INF/181, which showed that he had deployed considerable efforts on behalf of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. However, it was clear from paragraph 6(b) of the report that the Government of South Africa had failed to respond positively to the Director General's efforts to implement that resolution. The negative attitude on the part of the South African authorities was a matter of serious concern to the international community. Hence, in view of the continuing disregard by South Africa of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the General Conference urging it to submit all its nuclear installations and facilities to Agency safeguards, Indonesia would support any recommendation that the Board might make to the twenty-ninth session of the General Conference as requested in operative paragraph 7 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423.

Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia), referring to his delegation's statement on South Africa's nuclear capabilities at the previous series of Board meetings, noted from the Director General's report that there had been no new developments concerning the implementation of General Conference resolutions GC(XXVII)/RES/408 and GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 and reserved the right to revert to that question during the twenty-ninth session of the General Conference.

Mr. CHAPMAN (United States of America), reserving his delegation's right to speak on the subject of South Africa's nuclear capabilities during the General Conference, said that clear evidence had recently been provided of his Government's abhorrence of apartheid in South Africa. The Agency mission to South Africa in the previous month appeared to have been very successful, and the Agency had now received sufficient information from the South African Government to begin work on the design of an effective safeguards approach for the semi-commercial enrichment plant at Valindaba. His Government presumed that that would be the main topic of discussion when the parties met again later in the year. In addition, he welcomed the fact that the South African Government had paid some US \$450 000 of its outstanding contributions. Both of those developments were positive ones and proved that the Agency's presence in South Africa was important. Nothing should therefore be done to jeopardize that presence or the possibility that that presence might be enhanced in the future.

Mr. SEMENOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) regretted the fact that the Director General's oral report on progress with implementation of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 showed that the South African authorities were continuing to ignore that resolution. The United Nations and the international community had repeatedly expressed their grave concern about the fact that South Africa was making every effort to build up, outside the framework of IAEA safeguards, a nuclear capability which represented a serious threat to peace and security, especially in Africa.

Recent moves by the authorities in Pretoria, including the statement of their intention to place one of their nuclear facilities under safeguards, were of little avail since that country was still refusing to join NPT, to

support the proposal for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Africa or even to place all its nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. Clearly, those interested in strengthening the non-proliferation regime should not slacken in their efforts to ensure that the South African authorities complied fully with resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423.

Mr. BADRAN (Jordan), thanking the Director General for his report, recalled that South Africa had not responded to resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 urging that country to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards. The South African régime was continuing its oppression of people in Africa and its activities aimed at the production of nuclear military equipment in co-operation with Israel, which represented a threat to peace in both Africa and the Middle East. The progress made with regard to South Africa's nuclear capabilities had thus been disappointing, and he appealed to the Director General and all Member States to increase their efforts to make South Africa change its aggressive policies and place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards.

Mr. HIREMATH (India) expressed his Government's sympathy with and support for the views on South Africa's nuclear capabilities put forward at the present meeting by Board Members from Africa.

The role being played by South Africa in its region of the world had recently been characterized by the meeting of non-aligned Foreign Ministers in Luanda as one of "destabilization, armed aggression and economic blackmail against the front-line States". In pursuing their racist policies the present rulers of South Africa had been impervious to opinion both at home and abroad. They had continued their flagrant defiance of Security Council resolution 435 on Namibian independence, which had been adopted as long ago as 1978. The United Nations Plan of Action calling for free elections in Namibia had been linked by South Africa, as far as implementation was concerned, with irrelevant factors which were intended to carry the East-West conflict into a part of the world where the principal problem was the restoration of human rights and the freedom of peoples in their own native country. Meanwhile, South Africa had continued to exploit the rich natural resources of Namibia,

including its uranium. From time to time South Africa had also resorted to armed aggression against neighbouring countries. It was thus unfortunate that certain powerful countries had, for the most part, persisted in their normal commercial and economic relations with South Africa, thereby encouraging that country in its intransigent behaviour. The symbolic gestures of moderation made by Pretoria following the recent hardening of positions were insufficient and had come too late. In any case, apartheid could not be reformed but had to be abolished.

For those reasons, India had supported resolution GC(XKVIII)/RES/423. The progressive building up of South Africa's nuclear capability posed a threat to peace, particularly in that part of the African continent. His delegation would therefore lend its full support to the representatives of African countries in any course of action that they considered appropriate for recommendation to the next session of the General Conference. A few days before the current session, South Africa had paid \$450 000 to the Agency in partial settlement of its outstanding contributions. That step had no doubt been intended to pre-empt the sort of action envisaged in Article XIX.A of the Statute. The Board need not, however, be influenced by a ploy of that kind when deciding on the action it should take.

Mr. BARBERIS (Ecuador) said that the Director General's statement and the report in document GOV/INF/481 showed that no substantive change had taken place with regard to South Africa's nuclear capabilities despite the efforts made by the Director General. Those capabilities were a matter for concern, especially since, with the exception of the SAFARI research reactor and the Koeberg nuclear power plant, none of the facilities listed in Attachment 2 in document GOV/INF/481 were under safeguards. It was desirable that all South African nuclear facilities should be placed under Agency safeguards and that the Agency should prepare the safeguards approach appropriate for the Valindeba enrichment plant as soon as possible. Finally, he hoped that the Director General's report in document GOV/INF/481 would be transmitted to the General Conference as requested in operative paragraph 6 of resolution GC(XKVIII)/RES/423.

Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq), after thanking the Director General for his report concerning the implementation of operative paragraphs 2 and 5 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, said that the apartheid régime posed a continuing threat to the security and stability of Africa and the Middle East and to peace in the world as a whole. The Board should therefore demand that South Africa immediately submit all its nuclear installations and facilities to IAEA safeguards.

Mr. PROENCA ROSA (Brazil) said that his country had consistently voted in the United Nations against the apartheid policies of South Africa and the illegal occupation by that country of Namibia, and it therefore noted with concern the lack of progress reported by the Director General despite all his efforts. While reserving the right to take up the matter again at the General Conference, his delegation wished merely to announce that on 9 August the Brazilian authorities had issued a decree under which all trading and other relations between Brazil and South Africa were to be limited as far as possible.

Mr. BELTRAMINO (Argentina) welcomed the action by the Director General and the Secretariat in connection with resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423 as outlined in document GOV/INF/481. However, the Agency must further increase its efforts to ensure that the resolutions on that subject adopted by the United Nations General Assembly were complied with.

The CHAIRMAN, observing that many Governors had expressed concern about the attitude of South Africa with regard to the implementation of General Conference resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423, said he assumed that the Board wished to take note of the Director General's report in document GOV/INF/481 and of the statement made by the Director General at the beginning of the meeting and that it further wished the contents of that report, together with the information provided in document GOV/INF/481/Add.1 about a payment made by South Africa and the summary records of the Board's discussion on the item "South Africa's nuclear capabilities" since the previous session of the General Conference, to be transmitted to the Conference as the report

from the Board and the Director General which had been requested in operative paragraph 8 of resolution GC(XXVIII)/RES/423. The General Conference would no doubt consider what action to take pursuant to the previous year's resolution on South Africa's nuclear capabilities in the light of the Board's discussion of the Director General's report and other relevant facts.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.