



GC

International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

---

GC(XXXIV)/OR.331  
20 February 1991

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

## THIRTY-FOURTH (1990) REGULAR SESSION

### RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna  
on Friday, 21 September 1990, at 10.35 a.m.

President: Mr. VAJDA (Hungary)

### CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
7	Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat	1 - 59
24	Examination of delegates' credentials	60 - 71
25	Elections to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	72 - 74

---

[\*] GC(XXXIV)/939.

---

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXXIV)/INF/287/Rev.2.

ISRAELI NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES AND THREAT (GC(XXXIII)/RES/506; GC(XXXIV)/926 and 935/Rev.2)

1. The PRESIDENT noted that the item had been included in the agenda pursuant to resolution GC(XXXIII)/RES/506 adopted by the General Conference at its thirty-third session. Pursuant to operative paragraph 2 of that resolution, the Director General had submitted the report contained in document GC(XXXIV)/926. The General Conference also had before it in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2 a draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia and the United Arab Emirates.

2. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic), introducing, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat" contained in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2, said that the draft contained six preambular paragraphs which noted that the Israeli nuclear capability had grown to the point where it constituted a threat to the region, which stressed the collusion between Israel and the racist régime of South Africa, and which recalled the importance which the Security Council and the General Conference attached to the issue. Both bodies had expressed their deep concern at the race to build up nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, which threatened peace and security in the area. The preambular paragraphs also deprecated the continuous refusal by Israel to place all its nuclear installations under Agency safeguards as requested by the Security Council and the General Conference, although it ought to do so as soon as possible if it wanted to help establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

3. There were four operative paragraphs in the draft resolution. Paragraph 1, which once again called upon Israel to comply without delay with Security Council resolution 487(1981) urging it to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards, concerned a matter of great importance, particularly in view of the present international climate of détente and desire and determination to enforce international law and to implement all Security Council resolutions with a seriousness and readiness which had previously been lacking since the establishment of the United Nations.

4. Operative paragraph 3 requested the Director General to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations about the resolution, and pursuant to operative paragraph 4, the item would again be included in the agenda for the thirty-fifth regular session of the General Conference.

5. Operative paragraph 2 requested the Director General to deploy further efforts in continuing consultations with the States concerned in the Middle East area. The steps taken by the Director General the previous year should be regarded as a first step towards achieving the main objective sought by all States. Although there remained a long way to go and many obstacles to overcome, it was to be hoped that a result could be achieved swiftly if the Director General deployed intensive efforts to that end.

6. In that context it was worth stressing one positive point. Other bodies were also discussing the matter and had devoted much attention to it. Thus, the Secretary-General of the United Nations had recently set up a committee consisting of three persons of international standing, Mr. James Leonard (United States of America), Mr. Jan Prawitz (Sweden) and Mr. Benjamin Sanders (Netherlands), to carry out a feasibility study on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. That study had been submitted to the Secretary-General in August 1990[\*]. Paragraph 175 stated:

"The present study of the path to a nuclear-weapon-free zone for the Middle East has been made in a spirit of 'realistic optimism'. There clearly is no instant solution to the problem. There is also no doubt that the goal can be reached; it is not an idle dream. Intensive and sustained efforts can overcome the most serious difficulties, provided that these efforts attract the participation and support of the States of the region and of the major outside Powers. In the end, the co-operation of the international community as a whole will be essential. This consideration alone points to a central role for the United Nations".

7. In paragraph 176, it was observed that:

"The effort required will be great, but so will the benefits of success".

---

[\*] The study was published on 10 October 1990 in document A/45/435.

8. Lastly, paragraph 181 noted that:

"Adherence to the NPT by all States of the region - and notably by Israel - would be a most significant milestone. Pending such a measure, the acceptance by Israel of safeguards on the Dimona facilities would be an important move towards the establishment of a zone and could be realized well in advance of its adherence to the NPT".

9. The recent events in the Middle East, which were of concern to the whole world, had shown the validity of what the sponsors of the draft resolution had stated in 1989 and in previous years on the issue under consideration. They had noted that the Middle East had its own characteristics and its own sensitivity and vision of world peace and security. That highly volatile region was the birthplace of three religions. It was the cradle of great civilizations and formed a link between East and West, North and South. Oil was only one of its riches.

10. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not intend to emphasize the nature of Israel and its policy. They were simply requesting the General Conference and the Agency to study the problem, since Israel had a tremendous nuclear-weapons capability and was in a position to use that capability. It therefore constituted a unique threat to the Middle East which could lead to an escalation of the build-up of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Their aim was to avoid triggering a conflict which would end in the use of such weapons with terrible consequences directly or indirectly affecting not only the region but the whole world.

11. The three persons mentioned, who came from North America and Western Europe, had carried out their study carefully without any diplomatic or political pressure. Since their conclusions corresponded to those contained in the draft resolution, it was to be hoped that those delegations which had traditionally objected to any examination of the subject would reconsider their position, particularly as the General Conference was, both from a scientific and cultural and from a diplomatic point of view, a leading body with the historic responsibility of eliminating the threat of nuclear war in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world. The increasing number of delegations supporting the draft resolution would lend an additional impetus

enabling the Director General to pursue his efforts in that area. Moral pressure had to be exerted on Israel to make it place all its facilities under Agency safeguards. In conclusion, he requested that the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2 be put to a roll-call vote.

12. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) said that his delegation regretted having to speak again on an issue which had already been discussed so many times, with so many political ulterior motives that the main point was being forgotten. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2 was almost identical to that submitted the previous year. His country had voted against that draft resolution in 1989 and would have to do so again in 1990. In its explanation of vote, his delegation had commended the efforts which had been made to render the resolution less aggressive and more constructive than in previous years. It had also expressed the hope that the positive development which the resolution represented would continue in the future. Unfortunately, that had not been the case.

13. Like the delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic, he thought that the study on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East undertaken on behalf of the United Nations had been useful and that the path towards creating such a zone would be a long and difficult one, but not impassable. Unfortunately, the draft resolution, by continuing to address matters of a political nature which went beyond the mandate and competence of the Agency, did not at all help to make that path easier or shorter. The preamble contained the same tired and one-sided assertions as the previous year's resolution. It referred to an Israeli threat to peace and security in the area, but completely ignored the statements made by the Israeli Government to the Director General that it had no intention of threatening countries in or outside the Middle East region. It also ignored the fact that the General Conference itself had accepted those statements. Furthermore, it did not mention the very real fact that another State in the Middle East was, by its actions, presenting such a threat to peace and security in the region that the Security Council had taken unprecedented steps to deal with that threat. In addition, concern was expressed in the preamble at the co-operation between Israel and South Africa in the nuclear field, even though both Israel and South Africa had denied those allegations.

14. Operative paragraph 1 reiterated the call made the previous year to Israel to submit all its nuclear installations to Agency safeguards. While urging all non-nuclear-weapon States to place all their nuclear activities under Agency safeguards, his delegation could not support a proposal directed against one State alone, for the issue was of global importance and did not just involve one State. Moreover, his delegation rejected the notion implied in the draft resolution that the implementation of safeguards was a sanction rather than a voluntary step taken by Member States to confirm the peaceful nature of their nuclear activities.

15. His delegation strongly objected to the title of the draft resolution, which introduced political and security considerations lying beyond the mandate and competence of the Agency. Moreover, the title had nothing to do with the one substantive and constructive paragraph of the resolution, operative paragraph 2, which requested the Director General, among other things, to continue consultations with the States concerned in the Middle East with a view to applying Agency safeguards to all nuclear facilities in that area.

16. Finally, operative paragraph 4, which called for the inclusion in the agenda for the thirty-fifth session of the General Conference of an item entitled "Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat", was counterproductive. That proposal continued to involve the Agency in complex questions of international and regional security which ought to be resolved through negotiations in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. Maintaining that item on the General Conference agenda could only divert it from the Agency's proper scientific and technical tasks.

17. The need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East had become all the more apparent in the light of the current situation in that region. His delegation therefore hoped that the sponsors would understand the need to move away from the negative and discriminatory type of resolution which they had traditionally imposed on the Agency for the last few years, and to adopt a more positive and constructive approach. Such an approach was suggested in operative paragraph 2 of the draft. Although his delegation would have to vote against the draft resolution as a whole, it

strongly supported the request to the Director General to examine the issue of the application of Agency safeguards in the Middle East.

18. Mr. SAETI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, far from being of a political nature, the draft resolution under consideration was a technical one and therefore within the Agency's sphere of competence. Although the question was a very important one, the text did not call for condemnation of Israel for its violation of Arab territories, its expulsion of the autochthonous population from those territories, its infringement of human rights and the barbarous way in which it had quelled the uprising in the occupied territories. It concerned only the growing Israeli regional nuclear capability, which threatened peace and security in the Middle East and throughout the world. In that light, he hoped that all delegations would support the draft resolution.

19. Ms. TALLAWY (Egypt) said that her country continued to believe that, in view of the dangerous and sensitive situation and the specific and complex conditions in the Middle East, it was necessary to discuss all the issues affecting peace and security in that part of the world with a new vision and approach if a solution was to be found. Accordingly, Egypt continued to consider that, in order to build up confidence gradually, it was essential that all States in the Middle East accede to NPT, that all nuclear facilities in the region be placed under safeguards, and that weapons of mass destruction be totally eliminated.

20. In the case of the Middle East, it was no longer acceptable to postpone or prevent the adoption of such measures by suggesting that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region should precede the application of safeguards, or that the drawing up of an agreement on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should proceed by way of direct negotiations, or that acceptance of safeguards should be a voluntary act within the framework of a State's sovereignty and not a compulsory step comparable to a sanction, or, lastly, that no link could be made between the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons. Given the present situation, all of those arguments were out of place. Disarmament initiatives could offer a way of emerging from the present crisis and ensuring the future peace and security of the region. For

all those reasons, Egypt welcomed the steps taken by the Agency during the past two years, namely the preparation of a report on the modalities of application of safeguards in the Middle East and the Director General's consultations with States in the region, and hoped that those efforts would be stepped up.

21. Events in the Gulf should not serve as a pretext for minimizing the question of the Israeli nuclear capability. On the contrary, they showed that the problem had to be dealt with in a practical and rational way in order to strengthen peace and stability in the Middle East.

22. Her delegation wished to stress three points. Firstly, Egypt had been working since 1974 for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East because it was convinced that such a step was inextroably linked to efforts aimed at establishing a peace based on justice and developing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy to ensure the progress and well-being of the peoples in that part of the world.

23. Secondly, it believed that the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should go hand in hand with wider application of Agency safeguards in the region. The strengthening of efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East was not only a means of developing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, but a necessary condition for such development. It was essential to prevent the explosion of regional conflicts which could affect world peace, security and stability.

24. Thirdly, her Government was firmly convinced that the Middle East region should be completely free of weapons of mass destruction. It was working actively to ensure that the initiative taken in that connection by President Mubarak was put into effect. Such a development would be beneficial not only for the Middle East but for the whole international community. Nuclear weapons were the major weapons of mass destruction. Accordingly, Egypt considered that if a nuclear-weapon-free zone was to be established in the Middle East, the Agency's Director General would have to continue his consultations aimed at reaching an agreement on the modalities of application of full-scope safeguards to all nuclear installations in the region, and the Israeli Government would have to react favourably to those efforts by placing

all its nuclear facilities under full-scope Agency safeguards. In that context, her delegation requested the Director General to bear in mind the four proposals contained in the letter sent in reply to a letter from him by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt (reproduced on pages 1 and 2 of Annex 2 to document GC(XXXIV)/926). The Agency could also consider other approaches within its sphere of competence, such as the preparation of a model safeguards agreement specific to the region.

25. Noting that it was on the basis of those last points that it had co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2, her delegation urged others to adopt the resolution.

26. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his country's consistent policy was to oppose all politicization of the United Nations system. Canada set great store by that system of international co-operation and was concerned that the introduction of political issues in non-political bodies tended to disrupt the work of organizations which contributed much to global well-being.

27. His country had repeatedly urged and would continue to urge all Member States which had not yet done so to accede to NPT and to agree to place their nuclear facilities under full-scope Agency safeguards. However, it could not support a draft resolution which singled out one country for failing to submit its nuclear facilities to safeguards while there were other major offenders.

28. Mr. CHIKELU (Nigeria) supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2 on the Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat.

29. He noted with regret that the only nuclear installations in the Middle East which were not subject to safeguards were those of Israel. In fact, whereas the other States in the region were party to NPT, had signed a safeguards agreement with the Agency or did not have any nuclear facilities, Israel had three such facilities which were not under safeguards. He accordingly joined other delegations in requesting Israel to accede to NPT and to sign without further delay an agreement for the application of full-scope safeguards to its installations. Such a step would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region, which would have a very positive impact on peace and security in the Middle East.

30. Mr. ALLAGUI (Tunisia) said that the draft resolution under consideration, of which his country was a co-sponsor, expressed the concern felt by Tunisia and all States anxious to preserve peace and security in the Middle East and elsewhere. Since Security Council resolution 487(1981), Israel had repeatedly been requested to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards and to refrain from attacking or threatening to attack nuclear installations. Despite all the steps taken, including those taken by the Director General, Israel continued to refuse to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards.

31. That refusal with virtually permanent impunity only exasperated the other States in the region, discouraged more moderate voices and drove others to greater excesses and despair - and then people were suddenly surprised when international law was flouted and upheavals threatened in that part of the world.

32. It was essential that all Security Council resolutions should be equally strict and binding and should be applied with the same effectiveness. It was also very important that the Director General should continue to intensify his efforts and consultations with the States concerned in the Middle East with a view to the application of Agency safeguards to all nuclear facilities in that region, thereby contributing to the initiation of a peace process at the end of which reason would triumph over passion and the moral strength of the international community would sweep away arrogance and injustice.

33. For all those reasons, his delegation called upon all Member States to vote for the draft resolution under consideration.

34. Mr. AMROLLAHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had always maintained that the nuclear capability of the Israeli entity had long been a threat to peace and stability in the Middle East. Furthermore, that capability was currently the major obstacle in the path of making the region nuclear-weapon-free. Therefore the Iranian delegation strongly supported the draft resolution and urged that it be adopted and implemented.

35. He regretted that, until the Israeli entity was forced to accede to NPT and to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards, the region would remain unstable and would continue to represent a threat to world peace and security.

36. Mr. KABBAJ (Morocco) said that his delegation was a co-sponsor of the draft resolution and had been amazed at the pretexts put forward for dismissing the draft. None of those pretexts did justice to the current situation in the Middle East. In particular, owing to the difficult and dangerous circumstances now arising in the region, it was more urgent than ever in 1990 that Israel be requested to place its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards without further delay, and that it be forced to abide by the relevant Security Council and General Conference resolutions. Accordingly, he appealed to all delegations which had declared their intention to vote against the draft resolution to reconsider and change their position, and thus to demonstrate their love of peace and contribute to the strengthening of stability and security in the Middle East.

37. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) raised objections against two of the arguments put forward by the delegations of the United States and Canada on the present item, namely that the Agency should not concern itself with such matters and that Israel should not be singled out in the draft resolution. Referring to Security Council resolution 487(1981), he pointed out that it was in fact the Security Council which had been the first to single out Israel, by asking it to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards. Consequently, there was indeed a link between the Security Council's request and the Agency's safeguards system. It was therefore quite in order for the Agency to concern itself with the modalities of applying safeguards in view of the close and direct link created by the Security Council resolution.

38. Mr. ARAIN (Pakistan) shared the concern expressed by many delegations regarding the Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat. All Israel's neighbours had placed their nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards, and so he earnestly requested the Director General to continue his efforts to put into effect resolution GC(XXXIII)/RES/506, which his delegation

had fully supported. Pakistan also was in favour of setting up a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, because it was a measure that would strengthen the non-proliferation regime.

39. The PRESIDENT, noting that there were no more speakers, invited the General Conference to vote on the draft resolution in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2. As had been requested by the delegate of the Syrian Arab Republic, the vote would be taken by roll-call.

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

41. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Holy See, Hungary, Namibia, Poland, Romania, Venezuela.

42. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2 was adopted by 42 votes to 27, with 14 abstentions.

43. Mr. FAHAD (Iraq) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution, it wished to emphasize that certain paragraphs, in particular paragraph 2, did not come up to its expectations. His delegation had already commented very clearly on all the documents and proposals put

forward on the matter so far, in particular at the Board of Governors meetings in June. It did not believe that any significant practical progress had been made towards implementing the resolutions adopted by the General Conference in connection with the application of safeguards to Israeli nuclear facilities, as was apparent from the various reports on the subject by the Director General.

44. Mr. TALIANI (Italy), speaking on behalf of the 12 member countries of the European Community, said it was a matter for regret that the draft resolution had not confirmed the progress noted the previous year towards accommodating the concerns of a larger number of Member States. The Twelve could not support it for the same reasons that had led them to decide against the resolution the previous year. By its very existence, the resolution just adopted would perpetuate the debate within the Agency on a question which distracted it from its proper tasks and had a divisive effect on its membership. By its content, the resolution was at variance with the specific objectives of Agency safeguards, which were the cornerstone of international relations in nuclear matters and which the Twelve wished to see applied as widely as possible so as to exclude the risk of proliferation. Any attempt to use safeguards as a means of exerting pressure or as a sanction perverted the purpose for which they had been designed.

45. Nevertheless, the Twelve wished to emphasize that they fully shared the sponsors' concern regarding the need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in any region of the world.

46. Mr. WILSON (Australia) said that his delegation had opposed the resolution just adopted because it sought to keep on the General Conference's agenda political issues extraneous to the functions and responsibilities of the Agency. The resolution was also discriminatory in that it singled out the safeguards situation in one State for criticism and condemnation. Australia had always urged all States to accept NPT or at least the application of full-scope safeguards. Failure to do so on the part of Israel or any other State was a source of concern to his country, which again called upon all States that had not yet done so to accede to NPT or at least to accept full-scope safeguards.

47. Mr. SANTANA CARVALHO (Brazil) said that his country had always fully supported non-discriminatory measures in favour of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and of nuclear disarmament. For example, it had signed and ratified the Tlatelolco Treaty, and its constitution prescribed a policy of peaceful use of nuclear energy.

48. Although very concerned by the escalation of tension in the Middle East, and well disposed to all efforts aimed at promoting peace in that region under the United Nations Charter, his delegation had nevertheless abstained in the vote that had just taken place. The Agency's Statute clearly stipulated that where safeguards were concerned, each Member State had full sovereign power to choose the solution it deemed most appropriate. Any attempt to impose the application of safeguards against the sovereign will of a country was contrary to the spirit of the Agency's Statute and would have a negative impact on the credibility of the safeguards system.

49. Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria) said that as a party to NPT, his country was firmly convinced of the merits of the safeguards system and was thus in favour of widening its scope. However, it considered that such widening should not be required on an individual basis, because that approach was likely to make the attainment of the desired objective more remote. For that reason, Austria had voted against the draft resolution in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2.

50. Mr. ANGUIANO ROCH (Mexico) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution, it had reservations regarding preambular paragraph (b). The General Conference was not competent to deal with situations threatening international peace and security. Those matters were the exclusive preserve of the Security Council. His Government also found certain wordings in the resolution inappropriate.

51. Mr. MONDINO (Argentina) said that his country unreservedly endorsed the principle of non-proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, and that it was guided by that principle in the conduct of its international affairs. Thus, it fully shared the deep concern of the international community of the escalation of tension in the Middle East and reaffirmed the

need to encourage and support all efforts aimed at preserving peace, stability and compliance with the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter in the region.

52. The position of Argentina regarding the application of safeguards was well known: it was firmly convinced that confidence in the Agency's safeguards system could only be maintained if the system was applied in strict conformity with the Statute. Consequently, any attempt to impose safeguards against the sovereign will of a Member State would strike at the essence of the system and detract from its credibility. Even a decision taken by consensus by the General Conference could not alter the voluntary nature of a Member State's acceptance of Agency safeguards, let alone make obligatory the acceptance of full-scope safeguards, which were not mentioned in the Agency's Statute. Acceptance of such safeguards could be legally binding only for States which had freely acceded to an international instrument imposing on them an obligation to that effect. Accordingly, Argentina had abstained from voting.

53. Mr. SINAI (India) recalled that according to Article III.A.5 of the Agency's Statute, safeguards could be applied "at the request of the parties, to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or at the request of a State, to any of that State's activities in the field of atomic energy". Therefore any application of safeguards on a regional basis required prior approval from all the States in the region.

54. Despite that principle, India had supported the draft resolution submitted in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2, as well as all earlier resolutions passed by the General Conference on that issue, because of the exceptional situation created in the Middle East by the undisclosed Israeli nuclear programme, by Israel's refusal to withdraw from the occupied territories, and by its continued denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. It was on account of that threat that, following the Israeli military attack on an Iraqi nuclear reactor subject to Agency safeguards, the Security Council had adopted its resolution 487(1981) calling upon Israel urgently to submit all its nuclear installations to the Agency's safeguards. That requirement still remained unfulfilled, and so the task entrusted to the Agency by the

Security Council had yet to be accomplished. To date, with the exception of Israel, all countries in the Middle East having a nuclear programme had voluntarily placed all their nuclear facilities under safeguards or expressed their willingness to do so. The resolution just adopted would enable the Agency to carry out the task entrusted to it by the Security Council, and that was why India had supported it.

55. Operative paragraph 2 of the resolution mentioned document GC(XXXIV)/926. His delegation considered that certain proposals and opinions contained in that document did not, strictly speaking, fall within the purview of the Agency. His delegation's vote in favour of the resolution should therefore not be interpreted as an endorsement of those proposals, but rather as a result of the exceptional situation in the Middle East, which required that all possible efforts be deployed to achieve the objectives of Security Council resolution 487(1981).

56. Mr. BROOKS (New Zealand) said that his delegation had been disappointed to find that the draft resolution before the Conference was almost identical in substance to that which had been submitted on the same subject to the thirty-third session of the General Conference and which his country had voted against. Naturally, his delegation's position remained unchanged, and he regretted that discriminatory draft resolutions continued to be submitted to the General Conference.

57. New Zealand supported the principle of universal application of Agency safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in all countries and urged all States which had not yet done so to accede to NPT. The general situation in the Middle East was of great concern to New Zealand and it therefore regarded operative paragraph 2 of the resolution as constructive.

58. Mr. VETTOVAGLIA (Switzerland) said that his country had always sought to prevent the United Nations specialized agencies from debating subjects which by rights were the province of other bodies. Paragraphs (b), (d) and (e) of the preamble and operative paragraph 1 of the resolution contained wordings which did not fit in with established facts or the Agency's concerns. Switzerland attached the highest importance to non-proliferation

and thus to the safeguards system. However, acceptance of safeguards was exclusively a matter for sovereign decision by States. Therefore there could be no question of singling out one State and subjecting it to special treatment.

59. Mr. GALLOWAY (Namibia) said that his delegation wished to foster peace and nuclear safety worldwide. It therefore called upon all States to accept Agency safeguards. However, not being in possession of full background information concerning the draft resolution submitted in document GC(XXXIV)/935/Rev.2 and earlier resolutions on the matter, his delegation had abstained from voting.

#### EXAMINATION OF DELEGATES' CREDENTIALS (GC(XXXIV)/936 and Add.1, 944)

60. The PRESIDENT drew attention to document GC(XXXIV)/944, which contained the General Committee's report on its meeting to examine delegates' credentials, as provided for in Rule 28 of the General Conference's Rules of Procedure. Paragraphs 2 to 12 of the report described the manner in which the Committee had approached its task and conveyed the opinions expressed during the discussion. The Committee had agreed to recommend the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 13 of its report.

61. Mr. ARAIN (Pakistan) endorsed the last sentence of paragraph 9, regarding the credentials of the delegate of Afghanistan, about which the Pakistan delegation had reservations.

62. Mr. FAHAD (Iraq) said that his delegation had reservations concerning the credentials of the delegate from the so-called "State of Kuwait".

63. Mr. KABBAJ (Morocco), speaking on behalf of the delegations from member countries of the League of Arab States participating in the General Conference, drew attention to the reservations expressed by those delegations in documents GC(XXXIV)/936 and Add.1, with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegate.

64. Mr. AL-SAEID (Kuwait) said that he had no intention of reiterating the statements his delegation had made in response to the allegations by the

representative of the Iraqi régime. Remarking that it would be more appropriate for Kuwait to express its reservations about the credentials of the delegate of the Baghdad régime, which was not representative of the Iraqi people it had reduced to helplessness, he rejected the assertions made by the delegate of a régime that flouted Security Council resolutions, such as resolution 662(1990).

65. Mr. MOOSAVI BIOKI (Islamic Republic of Iran), referring to the Israeli delegate's credentials, said that his country was not prepared to approve the credentials of a delegate from an illegal State which was occupying Palestine by force.

66. Mr. SULAIMAN (Saudi Arabia) rejected the statements made by the representative of Iraq regarding the credentials of the delegate of Kuwait, at the thirty-fourth session of the General Conference. In that context, he stressed that successive Security Council resolutions had reaffirmed the legitimacy of the Kuwaiti Government and had called on Iraq to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from Kuwaiti territory.

67. Mr. ABDEL MONEIM (Egypt) said that, in view of his country's well-known position on the matter, and given the rule of international law and the relevant Security Council resolutions, his delegation wished to oppose the reservations expressed by the Iraqi representative concerning the credentials of the delegate of Kuwait.

68. As to the credentials of the Israeli delegate, he wished to reiterate the stance his delegation had taken on previous occasions.

69. Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) said it was truly a matter for regret that the Iraqi representative should express reservations concerning the legitimacy of the Kuwaiti delegate's credentials. The delegation of Qatar wished to reaffirm that Kuwait, as an independent sovereign State, was a stabilizing factor in the Arab region. He therefore took exception to the Iraqi delegation's remarks.

70. The PRESIDENT, noting that there were no more speakers, assumed that the General Conference was prepared to accept the draft resolution contained in paragraph 13 of document GC(XXXIV)/944, on the understanding that

the remarks and reservations of delegates would be reflected in the summary record of the meeting.

71. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 13 of document GC(XXXIV)/944 was adopted.

ELECTIONS TO THE AGENCY'S STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE

72. The PRESIDENT recalled that the General Conference was currently represented on the Agency's Staff Pension Committee by two members, Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands) and Mr. Loedel (Uruguay), and two alternates, Mr. Kumar (India) and Mr. Tilemann (Australia).

73. As Messrs. Loedel, Tilemann and Kumar would no longer be available to serve on the Committee, he proposed that Ms. Schick (Australia) be elected as a member and Mr. Hamada (Tunisia) and Mr. Hernandez (Argentina) as alternates. On behalf of the General Conference, he thanked Mr. de Klerk for continuing to serve on the Committee and the newly elected members for undertaking to serve the Agency in such a way.

74. Ms. Schick (Australia) was elected as a member of the Agency's Staff Pension Committee, and Mr. Hamada (Tunisia) and Mr. Hernandez (Argentina) were elected as alternates, with Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands) continuing to serve as a member of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

