



International Atomic Energy Agency

General Conference

GC(V)/OR.58
6 December 1961
GENERAL Distr.
ENGLISH

FIFTH REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Wednesday, 4 October 1961, at 3.25 p.m.

President: Mr. QUIHILLALT (Argentina)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
10	The composition of the Board of Governors (continued from the 55th meeting)	1 - 70
23	Appointment of an External Auditor	71 - 72
24	Election of members to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	73
18	The Agency's accounts for 1960	74 - 75
19	The Agency's relations with inter-governmental organizations	76 - 94

* GC(V)/171.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(V)/INF/42/Rev.3.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, (GC(V)/151 and Add.1, 169)
(continued from the 55th meeting)

1. Mr. GRAEF FERNANDEZ (Mexico) said that his Government was most sympathetic towards the desire of the new African States to be represented on the Board of Governors. Mexico recognized that at present the "Africa and the Middle East" area had the lowest representation on the Board, and justice required that that situation be remedied. New States were continuing to gain independence in that part of the world and they might soon be Members of the Agency; hence it was clear that the adoption of a resolution providing them with adequate representation on the Board was urgently required.
2. At its fourth regular session, the Conference had adopted a resolution^{1/} recommending the Board to solve the problem of equitable representation of the "Africa and the Middle East" area. Following detailed consideration of the question, the Board had recommended the Conference to amend Article VI.A.3 of the Statute to provide two additional seats on the Board, for allocation to the "Africa and the Middle East" area.
3. During the Board's discussions on the question, Mexico had sought to secure better representation for the Latin American area which, after Africa and the Middle East, had relatively the smallest number of representatives on the Board. Under the Statute, it was entitled to only two Members, one being the State in the area which was most advanced in the technology of atomic energy and the other elected from the area under Article VI.A.3 of the Statute. For the time being, Latin America also had two "floating" seats. The Government of Mexico considered that the four seats it now occupied on the Board should be expressly allocated to Latin America in the Statute. The two floating seats would be converted into area seats and permanently allocated to Latin America. The draft resolution recommended by the Board for adoption (GC(V)/151) satisfied those claims; it created two new seats on the Board, which it allocated to the "Africa and the Middle East" area, and definitely reserved for Latin America the four seats currently held by that area. Moreover, it changed the representation of other areas as little as possible.

^{1/} GC(IV)/RES/85.

4. His delegation supported the draft resolution, and would vote against the amendment submitted by Czechoslovakia (GC(V)/169) because the purpose of paragraph (c) of the preamble, which Czechoslovakia wished to delete, was, precisely, to explain the reasons justifying the provision concerning Latin America in the operative part. It was in order to avoid any action detrimental to the existing pattern of area representation on the Board that it was proposed to write the existing representation of Latin America into the Statute. The proposed amendment of the Statute would satisfy the just aspirations of the new African countries, without prejudice to the rights of other areas.

5. Mr. SOLE (South Africa) said he was deeply gratified that the Conference was taking steps to approve the amendment of the Statute in a way which would secure equitable representation of the "Africa and the Middle East" area on the Board; it was the culmination of the efforts he had made in common with the Governors from Iraq and Mexico, to whom he would like to pay tribute.

6. During the consultations which had led to the Board's present recommendation, many Governors had at first not thought it possible to allocate more than one additional seat to the "Africa and the Middle East" area. It had, however, been possible to convince them that two new seats and their allocation to the area were essential if equity and the needs of the States concerned were both to be satisfied.

7. During the negotiations, South Africa had submitted to the Board a proposal which was identical with the draft resolution recommended by the Board except in two respects. At first South Africa had not considered that Conference Resolution GC(IV)/RES/85 gave the Board a mandate to consider problems relating to areas other than "Africa and the Middle East", hence no mention had been made of Latin America in its original proposal. Furthermore, sub-paragraph (c) of the preamble had not appeared in the text. As the delegate of Mexico had pointed out, that sub-paragraph had been inserted in order to justify the fact that the proposed amendment of the Statute applied to an area other than Africa and the Middle East. If the sub-paragraph was omitted, it could be maintained that the amendment referring to Latin America which had been introduced was not in conformity with the mandate given the Board by the Conference.

8. South Africa had always been mindful of the moral obligation it had undertaken during the Conference on the Statute in respect of the allocation of the three floating seats; as in the past, it would continue to honor that obligation.

9. Mr. ALLARD (Sweden) warmly supported the amendment of the Statute in the manner recommended by the Board. In order to permit the two new Members to take part in the Board's work as soon as possible, his Government would deposit an instrument of acceptance of the amendment as soon as it had been approved by the Conference.

10. Sweden would vote against the Czechoslovak amendment.

11. Mr. NADJAKOV (Bulgaria) pointed out that many changes had taken place in the world since the adoption of the Statute. As at present composed, the Board included only three representatives of the socialist countries and three of the neutral countries of Asia and Africa, as against 17 representatives of Powers linked to the Western bloc by military and economic pacts or by ideological affinities. That no longer reflected the real international situation.

12. Accordingly, at its fourth regular session, the General Conference had asked the Board to review the relevant provisions of the Statute, at least insofar as they related to the "Africa and the Middle East" area. The amendment proposed by the Board did not offer a radical solution. Bulgaria was, however, ready to accept it, since it would at least improve the existing situation on the Board. The Board's amendment would, however, be improved by the adoption of the further amendment proposed by Czechoslovakia. Actually, having regard to the time taken by the acceptance procedure, the two new seats could, at the earliest, be filled at the Conference in 1962. But the existing representation of Africa and the Middle East was universally recognized to be inadequate. Hence it would, in the meantime, be no more than just to allot the third floating seat to a country of that area, and Bulgaria proposed Ghana.

13. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia) recalled that his country had supported Resolution GC(IV)/RES/85, which proposed an increase in the number of seats allocated to the "Africa and the Middle East" area. Even at the time of

the Conference on the Statute, the representation provided for the area had appeared inadequate, and at the time the United States representative had let it be understood that the third floating seat would be allocated to it. In point of fact, that seat had gone successively to Turkey, Spain and the Federal Republic of Germany, and was now to go to Greece. If that was in the interests of the countries in question, Tunisia did not object, but wanted the two supplementary seats to be permanently allocated to Africa and the Middle East.

14. Rumor had it that it was proposed, pending the entry into force of the amendment to the Statute, to provide the area with two provisional observer seats. Tunisia was not opposed to that course, but wondered how it was to be given effect. Actually, nothing was said in the Statute about observers. Should the Board be able to overcome that difficulty and establish an appropriate procedure, the Tunisian delegation would agree to one of the two observers being selected from among the African countries to the north of the Sahara and the other from the countries to the south.

15. He hoped that the Statute would be progressively improved with a view to ensuring the most equitable representation possible of all parts of the world. In any case he was confident that the Conference would unanimously approve the proposed amendment.

16. Mr. BORISEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said his delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by the Board, which would go some way towards eliminating the injustice represented by the existing representation on the Board of the countries of Africa and the Middle East.

17. However, the draft resolution was no more than a half-measure and offered no real solution of the question - long since urgent - of modifying the structure and composition of the Board.

18. As early as 1956, during the Conference on the Statute, the Byelorussian delegation had pointed out that the Board's structure was far from satisfactory. In the light of the profound changes that had taken place and were continuing to take place in the world, the imperfections had become intolerable. Ever since the Agency's establishment, the United States and those that formed part of its military grouping had never ceased to impose their will on the

Board. That hampered collaboration in connection with the peaceful uses of atomic energy and could have serious consequences for the work of an international organization such as the Agency. The Board's structure must be brought into line with the present balance of power and the existence in the world of three groups of States. If that were done, an end would be put to the absolute power exercised in the Agency by certain States.

19. The United States delegate, in saying that any amendment to the draft resolution submitted by the Board would make it difficult for the United States to accept the amendment to the Statute^{2/}, was using undisguised pressure on those who desired to meet the just requirements of the countries of Africa and the Middle East and to support the Czechoslovak amendment.

20. Paragraph (c) of the preamble to the draft resolution should be eliminated, since it was totally irrelevant to the question referred to in Resolution GC(IV)/RES/85. The paragraph was unsatisfactory even from the legal point of view. What did the words "any statutory amendment" mean? The Member States might in future consider that the Statute must be so amended that the Board would become essentially different in structure from what it now was. Their freedom of action would however be restricted by the provisions of paragraph (c). His delegation would accordingly vote for the Czechoslovak amendment.

21. Mr. AZAD (Iran) wholeheartedly supported the Board's recommendation. Moreover, the question of the insufficient representation of the "Africa and the Middle East" area should be resolved not only as regards the Board, but also as regards the allocation of senior posts in the Secretariat.

22. If the proposed amendment was adopted by the Conference, his Government intended to deposit its instrument of acceptance without delay. However, it would not agree that the composition of the Board should be further changed until it had been possible to study the practical effects of the present amendment.

23. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) supported the Board's recommendation, but with several reservations. The present period of time was characterized by two phenomena: the over-growing power of the socialist camp, and the process of decolonialization. The most spectacular aspect of that process

^{2/} GC(V)/OR.55, paragraph 84.

was the triumphal entry of most of the African countries onto the international scene. The structure of the Agency, however, and particularly that of the Board, reflected neither the changes which had taken place in the world nor those which had occurred in the Agency itself, as a result of the admission of new Member States from Africa. That was an obvious fact, and the Board's recommendation and the present debate were only a very pale - but nevertheless true - reflection of it.

24. It was only a pale reflection, because the majority of the Board, being bound to the Western bloc, had tried to neutralize in practice what it had been forced to concede in principle. Even when the proposed amendment came into force, two-thirds of the seats on the Board would continue to be occupied by representatives of the West and only one-third by those of the socialist and non-aligned countries. In all fairness, the seats should be divided equally between the three groups, in accordance with the real relationship between forces in the world and in the Agency. The Polish delegation did not expect that the change would come about immediately, but a start must be made now on the urgent aspects and the most blatant injustices rectified. That was why the Governor from Poland, at one of the Board's meetings, had proposed allocating one of the floating seats forthwith to an African Member State. That proposal had not been accepted, but the Polish delegation intended to repeat it during the Conference. The Western Powers had to make room for the young countries of Africa, and Poland would therefore support the Czechoslovak amendment which had that as its aim. The least which could be done would be to elect Ghana to the Board; that would be a gesture of goodwill and good intentions to countries which had just become independent.

25. Mr. MAHMOUD (United Arab Republic) recalled that his delegation had been one of the co-sponsors of Resolution GC(IV)/RDS/85, and it was with the aim of putting that resolution into effect that the Board proposed modifying the wording of Article VI.A.3 of the Statute. That recommendation still did not take sufficient account of the new developments in Africa and the increase in the number of African Member States, but it did represent some improvement on the present situation; his delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Board.

26. With regard to paragraph (c) of the preamble, the United Arab Republic had often stressed the need to modify the Statute. It would therefore abstain from voting on that paragraph, and reserved the right to revert to that question during discussion on the general review of the Statute.

27. Mr. MYSLIL (Czechoslovakia) wished to correct a misunderstanding which he had noted in the remarks of the Mexican delegate. The Czechoslovak amendment did not apply to the representation of Latin America and was not directed against that area. The socialist countries were faithful to their undertakings, as could be seen from the record of the elections of Latin American countries to the Board.

28. His delegation considered it quite unacceptable to say that "any statutory amendment should not be detrimental to the existing pattern of area representation on the Board", even if that wording appeared only in the preamble to the draft resolution. As the Byelorussian delegate had pointed out, adoption of that wording would mean that neither by virtue of the present amendment nor in the light of any considerations which might arise in the future to justify modifying the composition of the Board should the pattern of representation of other regions on the Board be affected. That would amount to making any subsequent change within the Board impossible.

29. Even if the wording of paragraph (c) were amended to read that "the present amendment of the Statute should not be detrimental to the existing pattern", his delegation still could not accept it, as it would be tantamount to legalizing the abuse by which Western Europe held on to the floating seat which should be allocated to Africa and the Middle East. Western Europe at present held six seats, which was quite enough.

30. Several delegations, apart from those of the socialist countries, had expressed the opinion that the present composition of the Board no longer corresponded to political reality and requested that it should be thoroughly revised. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the creation of two new seats on the Board was only a first step in that direction.

31. Moreover, the work of the Board might be seriously jeopardized if the attempt of certain Western Powers to introduce into the Board the spokesman of a discredited regime, which survived only through the support of foreign troops and which represented no one, proved successful. The Czechoslovak delegation would resist that energetically.

32. Resolution GC(IV)/RES/85 referred exclusively to representation of the "Africa and the Middle East" area. His delegation therefore considered that the representation of other areas could not be considered under the terms of that resolution. The matter should be dealt with, however, when the Conference considered the question of the general review of the Statute. If the Conference was not of the same opinion, the Czechoslovak delegation was ready now to submit its own proposals concerning the equitable representation of other areas.

33. Mr. LALL (India) pointed out that the responsibilities of the Board were different from those of corresponding bodies in other organizations, its duty being to ensure continuity in the operation of the Agency. Its composition was therefore a highly significant factor so far as the success of the Agency was concerned, and particularly the work of the annual General Conference.

34. The present composition of the Board was the result of lengthy negotiations which had taken place in Washington during the winter of 1955-56, and the structure of the United Nations itself had served as a model. Then, however, the United Nations had had only 60 States Members, whereas now there were 100. As the United Nations grew, so the composition of the Board ceased to reflect the international situation.

35. The Indian delegation, concerned about that state of affairs, had been led to send a note to the Governments of certain friendly countries, indicating why it considered that it was necessary to revise the concepts that had guided the establishment of the Board. In view of the changes which had taken place in the political structure of the world, his delegation believed that the pattern of the Board must be considerably changed, and brought into line with what had taken place in the United Nations itself.

36. The Indian delegation, like that of the United Arab Republic, felt that the draft resolution which the Board recommended for adoption was only one step in the right direction. It would certainly vote for it, although the draft was not altogether in accordance with its own views.

37. Bearing in mind the importance of ensuring equitable area representation on the Board, the Indian delegation considered that paragraph (c) of the preamble was pointless. It tended to give the impression that the Conference was to

some extent trying to perpetuate the present situation. Moreover, the amendment to the Statute would come into force only when duly accepted by Member States in accordance with their respective legislative procedures. The countries of Africa and the Middle East should immediately be assured of a more equitable representation on the Board, and the Conference should therefore allocate one of the floating seats to a new African State.

38. Mr. MARINUCCI (Italy) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the spirit of equity reflected in the draft resolution put forward by the Board. As a large number of countries, mostly African, had recently become Members, a modification of the present composition of the Board seemed justified. His delegation hoped, however, that the interests and rights on the Board of countries from other areas would not be prejudiced.

39. Italy supported the proposed amendment to Article VI.A.3 of the Statute. The statements which had been made showed the extent to which that amendment was necessary. It would entrust greater responsibilities to certain countries, and enable them to participate more actively in the solution of different problems - particularly technical assistance - which Italy regarded as being of great importance.

40. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia) paid tribute to the work done by the delegates of South Africa and Iraq with a view to settling the problem of the representation of the "Africa and the Middle East" area. He knew how difficult their task had been. He also wished to express his gratitude to all who had taken part in preparing the draft resolution now before the Conference.

41. Mr. McADAM CLARK (United Kingdom) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, which recognized the increasingly important role which the new Members from Africa and the Middle East were required to play in the Agency's activities, and which assured the Board of their co-operation and counsel. The draft resolution was reasonable and realistic in content, and should be acceptable to all. Any modification on the lines proposed by Czechoslovakia in its amendment could only create difficulties. His delegation would therefore vote in favor of the draft resolution and against the Czechoslovak amendment.

42. Mr. BREW (Ghana) agreed that a concession had been made. It had been admitted that in view of the changing situation in Africa and the Middle East, the growing number of nations gaining independence and the increasingly

important role played by Africa on the world scene, representation should be made more equitable by creating two new seats on the Board for Africa and the Middle East. That indicated that facts had finally been recognized.

43. It had been emphasized on several occasions that the Agency was an international organization. It was useless to state that fact - it must be proved by action. Some progress had been made in that direction, but only a preliminary step, for the delegation of Ghana considered that the representation of areas on the Board should not be such as to favor any particular part of the world. Ghana was aware of the existence of alliances, and realized that there was a tendency for countries to band together to support particular points of view; it hoped that that attitude would be abandoned in time.

44. In view of its international character, the Agency need not adopt a fixed system once and for all. In the representation of areas, there must be some degree of flexibility to allow for developments in the international situation and avoid discouraging applications for admission by new States, which might have a preconceived idea that the Agency was controlled by a particular group. His delegation was in favor of the draft resolution submitted by the Board, but would support the Czechoslovak amendment.

45. Mr. AMAN (Ethiopia) said that his delegation unreservedly supported the amendment to the Statute proposed by the Board. However, that amendment would not take effect until it had been accepted by two-thirds of the Members, which would take at least two years. The Ethiopian delegation hoped that, meanwhile, at least one seat on the Board would be allocated to an African country since, as a result of what might be termed an historical accident, certain countries had become Members of the Board merely because they had once possessed, or still possessed, African colonies which produced raw materials.

46. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the amendment submitted by the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (GC(V)/169) to the draft resolution in document GC(V)/151.

47. In accordance with a request received by the President, a roll-call vote was taken.

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

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Cuba, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon.

Against: Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia.

Abstaining: Holy Sec, Iraq, Lebanon, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Viet-Nam, Burma.

48. The Czechoslovak amendment was rejected by 31 votes to 20, with 7 abstentions.

49. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada), on a point of order, observed that under Rule 69 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference and Article XVIII.C(i) of the Statute, the Czechoslovak amendment, and also the draft resolution itself, required a two-thirds majority for approval.

50. Mr. MITRA (India) said he could not vote in favor of paragraph (c) of the preamble to the draft resolution. He therefore requested that that paragraph be put to the vote separately.

51. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) objected to the request for a separate vote. He would not use legal arguments, however, nor the argument that by rejecting the Czechoslovak amendment, the Conference had in effect approved paragraph (c).

52. Nevertheless, he wished to point out that if the motion for division was carried, paragraph (c) would also require a two-thirds majority, under Rule 69 of the Rules of Procedure. If, as was quite possible, it did not obtain that majority, paragraph (c) would be rejected. The draft resolution would then

be put to the vote without paragraph (c) and would, in turn, require a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting in order to be adopted. Insistence that paragraph (c) be put to the vote separately might produce a result contrary to the interests of the African States: namely, rejection of the draft resolution proposed by the Board.

53. Mr. MITRA (India), in defence of his motion for division, said that according to the Canadian delegate's argument, if paragraph (c) were deleted, the whole of the recommendation would be endangered. That could only be regarded as a threat, and amounted to forcing the Conference to retain paragraph (c), which many Member States - in particular the African States, which were most concerned in the matter - did not want.

54. Mr. MYSLIL (Czechoslovakia) supported the motion for division. He would adduce only one argument: in the previous voting, 20 delegates had voted against retaining paragraph (c) and 7 had abstained; hence it was obvious that paragraph (c) might not obtain a two-thirds majority. He was convinced that the opinion of the 27 States concerned should be taken into account, and could not be set at naught by procedural maneuvers. His delegation would vote against paragraph (c), but in favor of the remaining paragraphs.

55. Mr. CARGO (United States of America) opposed the motion for division. It would be inadvisable for the Conference to vote on the draft resolution in parts; it had been carefully drawn up in order to produce a calculated and balanced text, of which paragraph (c) was an integral part, and it should therefore be voted on as a whole.

56. The PRESIDENT said he would put the Indian motion for division to the vote.

57. Mr. MITRA (India) requested a roll-call vote.

58. Mr. SOLE (South Africa) said that before the vote was taken, he would like to ask whether it was necessary for a preambular paragraph to be approved by a two-thirds majority, and whether Rule 69(b) of the Rules of Procedure was applicable in the present case.

59. Mr. MITRA (India), on a point of order, said that under Rules 73 and 75 of the Rules of Procedure no speaker was allowed to take the floor.

60. The PRESIDENT put the motion for division to the vote.

61. In accordance with the request by Mr. Mitra (India), a roll-call vote was taken.

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

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favor: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ethiopia, Ghana.

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

Abstaining: None.

62. The motion for division was defeated by 42 votes to 22.

63. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Board concerning the composition of the Board of Governors (GC(V)/151).

64. The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

65. Mr. MITRA (India) deeply regretted that pressure had been used to secure the rejection of the Czechoslovak amendment. Such methods were not calculated "to bring peace out of the existing discord", to quote the words used by the delegate of the Holy See at the previous meeting.^{3/}

66. Mr. WARSZOF (Canada) pointed out that when the draft resolution had been discussed by the Board it had received wide support: only one or two delegations had expressed reservations concerning paragraph (c).

67. He saw no reason to apologize for having called the Conference's attention to the consequences of rejecting that part of the text. On the contrary, he felt he had shown the greatest concern for the interests of the countries of Africa and the Middle East, which, as a result of the adoption of the amendment to the Statute, could expect to be better represented on the Board.

68. Mr. McKNIGHT (Australia) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and pointed out that it had taken six months of consultations and a great deal of goodwill to formulate the final text.

69. Mr. MOLOTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the attitude of the Soviet delegation to the draft resolution had been explained by the Soviet delegate^{4/}. The Soviet delegation was in favor of adopting the draft resolution, which was intended to remedy an injustice. Nevertheless, it would have been better to take account of the legitimate wishes expressed in the Czechoslovak amendment.

70. Mr. MYSLIL (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had asked for the deletion of paragraph (c) of the preamble in the interests of the African and Middle East States and in order to allow them to improve their representation on the Board pending the entry into force of the new text. Unfortunately the Western Powers and the countries linked economically and militarily with them had prevented the adoption of the Czechoslovak amendment. It was to be hoped that when the elections to the Board took place, the States concerned would change their attitude.

APPOINTMENT OF AN EXTERNAL AUDITOR

71. The PRESIDENT invited the Conference to proceed to item 23 of the agenda. He recalled that the term of office of the Agency's External Auditor, Mr. G. Hertel, Auditor-General of the Federal Republic of Germany,

^{4/} GC(V)/OR.57, paragraphs 55-63.

was due to expire that day^{5/}. It would be in the Agency's interest if Mr. Hertel could remain in office, which he was prepared to do. He therefore proposed that the General Conference should appoint the Auditor-General of the Federal Republic of Germany to audit the Agency's accounts for the years 1961-63 inclusive.

72. It was so decided.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE AGENCY'S STAFF PENSIONS COMMITTEE

73. The PRESIDENT said he understood from the Secretariat that there was no need for the Conference to hold elections to the Agency's Staff Pensions Committee during its current session.

THE AGENCY'S ACCOUNTS FOR 1960 (GC(V)/177)

74. Mr. BITTENCOURT (Brazil), Rapporteur of the Administrative and Legal Committee, presented the Committee's report on item 18 of the agenda (GC(V)/177).

75. The draft resolution in paragraph 3 of the report was adopted unanimously.

THE AGENCY'S RELATIONS WITH INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (GC(V)/178)

76. Mr. BITTENCOURT (Brazil), Rapporteur of the Administrative and Legal Committee, presented the Committee's report on item 19 of the agenda (GC(V)/178).

77. Mr. MAHMOUD (United Arab Republic) said he was firmly opposed to any relations between the Agency and the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa South of the Sahara (CTCA). That body had been set up by the colonialist Powers in order to divide the African continent. Africa was one and indivisible and the expression "South of the Sahara" did not correspond to any reality.

78. Mr. MOLOTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that everyone was aware of the Soviet delegation's attitude in the matter. It would vote in favor of the draft resolution recommended by the Committee but was compelled to make two reservations. First of all it was inadmissible that the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) should be authorized to send observers to

^{5/} See GC(II)/OR.24, paragraph 4.

the regular sessions of the Conference, since that organization was also concerned with questions involving the military uses of atomic energy. Secondly, it was not at all necessary for the Agency to establish relations with CTCA. The independent countries of Africa did not think that it would serve the interest of African countries or international collaboration. The proposal was clearly one more attempt to bolster up the colonialist position in Africa. The Soviet delegation was against such attempts and considered that no grounds existed for supporting CTCA.

79. Mr. SCHULTE-MEERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to EURATOM, appealed to the Conference's good sense. For four years EURATOM's achievements had shown considerable growth, and it could easily be seen by everybody that its activities were carried on in the open. Their entirely peaceful character could not seriously be called in question. It was therefore difficult to see why certain delegations persisted in regularly disputing what that organization had achieved, and its contribution to the well-being of humanity.

80. Mr. QUANSAH (Ghana) strongly protested against sending an invitation to CTCA. He had received instructions from his Government to make its position clear beyond all doubt. Any program tending to divide the African continent must be considered unacceptable. The Sahara must be regarded as a bridge uniting the north and south of Africa.

81. CTCA had been set up by the colonialist Powers without consulting the African countries, and it was therefore natural that the latter should be very reluctant to take part in it.

82. It must also be recognized that there were plenty of organizations with aims similar to those of CTCA, and the best solution would be for CTCA to be amalgamated with the others.

83. Mr. MITRA (India) shared the views expressed by the delegates of Ghana and the United Arab Republic. In actual fact the Conference was confronted with a fait accompli, since the invitation to CTCA had already been sent out by the Board. It was to be hoped that in future better methods of collaboration would be established, which, as the delegate of the Holy See had said^{6/}, would conduce to an atmosphere of hope and friendship rather than of fear and hatred.

^{6/} GC(V)/OR.57, paragraph 97.

84. Precious time had been devoted to the problem of the representation of intergovernmental organizations. He thought it would be simpler to adopt the system of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, since the Agency too belonged to the United Nations family. Meanwhile, it must be hoped that in future more attention would be paid to the interests of the African and Middle East countries.

85. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said he had himself been on the Board when the invitations to intergovernmental organizations had gone out. The assertion that the Conference had been confronted with a fait accompli was quite unwarranted, since the Board had taken that step only after receiving formal authorization from the 1960 session of the Conference^{7/}. The decision in question had been approved by a big majority of Members of the Board.

86. Canada, for its part, was not directly interested in CTCA's activities, but he thought he could say that it was in the interests of African countries themselves that that organization should be represented in the Agency.

87. Mr. MITRA (India) pointed out that no observer from CTCA was present at the current session of the Conference and therefore the decision to invite that organization could only be classified as a political decision.

88. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) said he was not concerned with the legal arguments put forward by the delegate of Canada, but he wished to emphasize that CTCA was an organization concerned with technical co-operation and one which kept as far as possible out of political controversy. It was doing work of great practical utility, and included 20 African States, collaborating with four European States. That collaboration had so far been carried out to the benefit of both sides. Ghana was perhaps thinking of withdrawing from CTCA but he hoped that it would reconsider its decision. In any case, the other African States would remain members of the Commission, whose headquarters were in Africa, at Lagos, capital of Nigeria.

89. In his opinion, the Board should be authorized to send out invitations to CTCA as in the past.

90. Mr. QUANSAH (Ghana) remarked that the delegate of the United Kingdom had inadvertently revealed that four European States were members of CTCA. That was precisely the point at issue. Technical co-operation took

place in Africa independently of that organization and Ghana was receiving assistance from the United Kingdom and other countries. Neither Ghana nor the other African States, however, were willing to accept the imposition of certain forms of assistance, which moreover would be limited to Africa south of the Sahara, and would exclude countries in the north.

91. Mr. ZHMUDSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation was also of the opinion that observers from CTCA and EURATOM should not be invited to the next regular session of the Conference.

92. The discussion which had just taken place showed that it was the representatives of the Western Powers who were insisting on an invitation being sent to CTCA. The African States were opposed to that invitation. Was that not the best indication that the organization concerned should not be invited to send observers to the next regular session of the Conference?

93. As regards EURATOM, convincing arguments had been advanced in the Administrative and Legal Committee showing that EURATOM was concerned with the military uses of atomic energy. The delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany had been unable, either in the Committee or at the present meeting, to refute those arguments. His delegation therefore maintained once more that organizations such as EURATOM and CTCA should not be invited to the next regular session of the Conference.

94. The draft resolution following paragraph 3 of the Committee's report (GC(V)/178) was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

