



GC

International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXXII)/OR.312  
6 December 1988

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

THIRTY-SECOND (1988) REGULAR SESSION

RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna  
on Friday, 23 September 1988, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. HALIM (Malaysia)

## CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
7	Israeli nuclear capabilities and threat (continued)	1 - 55
20	South Africa's nuclear capabilities	56 - 126
21	Examination of delegates' credentials	127 - 139
22	Elections to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	140 - 141
23	Report on voluntary contributions pledged to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for 1989	142
-	Closing of the session	143 - 150

[\*] GC(XXXII)/856.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document  
GC(XXXII)/INF/262/Rev.2.

ISRAELI NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES AND THREAT (GC(XXXII)/849, 852 and 853/Rev.1)  
(continued)

1. Mr. CONSTENLA (Costa Rica) said that his delegation could not endorse the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1 because it related to a problem which was outside the Agency's purview and unconnected with its scientific and technical purpose, and because it called in question the solidarity of nations in the nuclear field. The Agency's mandate was to search for a solution to the problems of nuclear development, while reconciling the interests of all Member States concerned, with a view to achieving satisfactory and lasting agreement which would permanently guarantee the nuclear quietude so longed for, without the Agency becoming involved in regional problems which were not within its sphere of competence.

2. Costa Rica deplored the fact that the General Conference had to consider the question year after year; such a state of affairs could only contribute to eroding the atmosphere of co-operation so necessary to the work of the Agency. Interested countries should profit from the fact that Israel was willing to negotiate directly with them on achieving the nuclear quietude which everyone was aiming at. For that reason, he urged other States to vote against the draft resolution under consideration.

3. Mr. GHAZALI (Malaysia) said that his delegation's position on the subject was already well known. Scientists could not abdicate the responsibility to others when what was at stake was the survival of mankind and the world in which he lived. Man had always had to face mortal dangers, and he succumbed to one or another of them at some time. However, there was a fundamental difference between a danger which menaced the life of one individual, or even major groups of individuals, and a danger which placed life itself in jeopardy. It would be naïve to ignore the fact that society was steeped in politics. Although the scientists still took part in the nuclear debate, the latter was no longer a controversial subject on the scientific plane, but it continued to cause controversy on the sociological and political planes. For that reason, Malaysia endorsed the ideas put forward by the delegate of Kuwait and the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1.

4. Mr. CLARK (United Kingdom), adding to the statement made by the delegate of Greece on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, said that his country regarded non-proliferation as a key element of its foreign policy and viewed the acceptance of full-scope safeguards by States as highly desirable, since it was the most convincing measure of assurance that States could give to the international community with regard to the peaceful nature of their nuclear programmes. For that reason, the United Kingdom, like the Syrian Arab Republic, was entirely in favour of the extension of Agency safeguards, and it had therefore voted in favour of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which called upon Israel to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards. His country had also strongly urged Israel, and all the other States in the region, to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). He welcomed the recent decision of Saudi Arabia to take that step.

5. Nevertheless, the United Kingdom was opposed to the draft resolution under consideration, because it was not appropriate for the General Conference to condemn a Member State for its refusal to accept full-scope safeguards. Other Agency Member States were showing themselves equally unwilling to take that step, to the great regret of the United Kingdom, which declined to condemn unjustly only one of those States.

6. He doubted the usefulness of discussing the question repeatedly within the Agency, and urged that it should not appear again on the agenda of future sessions of the General Conference. The Agency was a technical organization, and it was unrealistic to suppose that it could solve political problems without damage to the harmony and efficiency of its operation. Moreover, he doubted whether it was proper for the Agency to examine allegations about nuclear-weapons programmes in Agency Member States. The draft resolution under consideration requested the Director General to continue to report, as appropriate, to the Board of Governors and General Conference on Israel's nuclear capabilities and threat. The United Kingdom was of the view that such an activity was more appropriate to the United Nations General Assembly.

7. In conclusion, he welcomed the constructive effort of the Egyptian delegation to turn the debate in a more promising direction. The United Kingdom, since it supported the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the

Middle East, could have voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/852 if it had been put forward separately.

8. Mr. SASTROHANDOYO (Indonesia) shared the concern of the Kuwaiti delegation with regard to Israel's expansionist policies vis-à-vis its neighbours. Given the constant danger of an escalation of the violence and a spreading of the Middle East conflict, the continual refusal of Israel to renounce the possession of nuclear weapons and to place all of its installations under Agency safeguards in accordance with Security Council resolution 487 (1981) not only posed a serious danger to peace and security within the region, but also endangered the non-proliferation policy which the other countries in the region were following. For that reason, the Indonesian delegation supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1.

9. Mr. BADRAN (Jordan), having listened carefully to the statements by the delegates of Israel and the United States, wished to clarify some points.

10. Firstly, with regard to the repetitious character of the draft resolution in hand, he noted that it was only to be expected that an item should recur systematically in the agenda when no decisive action was ever taken on it.

11. Secondly, it would be false and incorrect to link the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone with the signing of NPT or the application of safeguards, since the application of safeguards in itself constituted a real contribution to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Moreover, by signing NPT and accepting the application of safeguards, the signatory State made a concrete commitment not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons which worked directly in favour of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. One might ask whether one was not witnessing the arrival of a new era where the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would become the precondition for any application of safeguards and for the signing of NPT, and where States would have to abstain henceforth from signing NPT or accepting safeguards until such a zone existed.

12. Thirdly, countering the argument that the draft resolution was political in nature and discriminated against Israel, he noted that the same request had been addressed to another Member State, South Africa. In document GC(XXXII)/855, which had been distributed at the request of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States, one could read the following: "The Depositary governments are resolved to press South Africa further to accede to the NPT. Such accession we strongly believe is in the best interest of all countries of the region, and of the world as a whole." Thus, a State could become a source of concern and danger to the other States in a region, and indeed to the whole world. How was it that something that was political in the Middle East was not political in Africa?

13. Mr. MBODJ (Senegal) declared his country's solidarity with the countries of the Middle East in their struggle against the expansionist and oppressive policies of Israel, which constituted a flagrant violation of international law and the United Nations Charter. Agency Member States should use all their influence to counter the threat to the whole international community posed by the nuclear capability of Israel, which maintained close relations in that area with the racist régime of South Africa.

14. The recent information on Israel's possession of nuclear weapons was very worrying. For that reason, in the interests of international peace and security, Israel should place all its nuclear installations under Agency safeguards. His delegation urged those Member States which had not as yet done so to suspend all co-operation with Israel which might contribute towards strengthening its nuclear capabilities, particularly since Israel continued to oppress the Palestinian people and to violate systematically the territorial integrity of Arab countries which were simply fulfilling their duty of solidarity with the Palestinian fighters.

15. In conclusion, his delegation, desiring the preservation of peace and security, particularly in the Middle East, would vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1.

16. Mr. ZANGGER (Switzerland) recalled that his delegation had always believed that the Agency's Statute did not allow for the application of safeguards to a State except on its sovereign request. His delegation

therefore considered the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1 to be incompatible with the Agency's Statute and was therefore opposed to it.

17. Mr. MILAD (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) wished to recall the circumstances under which the Zionist entity had built up its nuclear arsenal. That entity, since its creation, had always been interested in scientific research and in particular atomic research. Thus, in 1941, before the proclamation of the State of Israel, when Jewish terrorist organizations were fully active and the war between the Jews and the Palestinians was raging, two men, Ernest Bergmann and Israel Dubrovsky, had gone to the Negev desert to study its mineral resources, notably phosphates. Subsequently, they had made their discoveries known to Chaim Weizmann. Thus, after the creation of the so-called State of Israel, Weizmann, its first President, had been able to announce to those running the new "State" that uranium had been discovered in the phosphate deposits of the Negev. Speaking to David Ben-Gurion, Moshe Sharett, Yigal Allon, Moshe Dayan, Menahem Begin and Yitzhak Shamir, and to other heads of armed terrorist organizations, that aged man, who had played a large part in convincing the British to lend their support to the creation of the new "State" in Palestine, had said that if the Zionist entity wished to achieve its objectives, it would have to apply itself to the development of scientific research, and in particular atomic research. He had, of course, been referring to the atomic bomb. Moreover, he had thought that the Zionist entity should avail itself of the atom to confront the Arab world. He had told Bergmann and Dubrovsky that the road was long and they were only at the beginning. A few months later, he had asked a group of research workers to sketch out a nuclear programme which was to be started up in 1949 in the Atomic Research Department of the Weizmann Institute. That department had achieved major results in the space of three years, and one of its research workers had succeeded in producing heavy water. There had been two consequences of that achievement: on the one hand, it had enabled the Zionist entity to compete with Norway in the production of heavy water and, on the other hand, it had marked the beginning of co-operation between the Zionist entity and France. Indeed, those two countries had concluded a co-operation agreement in the nuclear area, during the first half of 1953 and France had bought Dubrovsky's patent.

18. The Libyan delegation was drawing attention to the aforementioned facts in order to show that the Zionist entity had all along, from the outset of its rampage in Palestine, been committed to the acquisition of nuclear weapons and the building up of a considerable nuclear arsenal for the purposes of aggression against the Arab nation. On the other hand, that entity could never have manufactured or acquired the atomic bomb without the unlimited help it had received from imperialist States which were well known to everyone. Thus, before installing the Dimona reactor, it had bought a nuclear research reactor from the United States. Ben-Gurion had received ample encouragement to do so, since President Eisenhower had declared, in an address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 8 December 1953, that his country was prepared to make scientific information and nuclear facilities in its possession available to other States wishing to conduct peaceful nuclear research. From that moment the Zionist entity and the United States had begun to co-operate closely. The journal of the Institute for Palestine Studies had reported, in an article on science and technology in Israel, that Uzi Elam, the Director General of the Israeli Atomic Energy Commission, had stated that President Reagan had not only encouraged the construction of a new nuclear power plant, but had also said that he would support the construction of advanced reactors such as fast breeders, making it clear that the United States intended to regain its place at the head of those countries which exported nuclear technology.

19. Not content with concluding agreements, the Zionist entity had also resorted to other methods, such as theft and piracy, in order to acquire uranium and other nuclear materials. Thus, between 1963 and 1965, the Jewish director of a nuclear materials and equipment firm in Pennsylvania in the United States had helped smuggle 3600 kg of plutonium and highly enriched uranium, a quantity sufficient to manufacture dozens of nuclear bombs. Moreover, during the administration of President Johnson, the Zionist entity had been able to obtain 90 kg of uranium which had been delivered to it by a factory in Pennsylvania. It had also managed to acquire 200 tonnes of uranium which had been declared lost at sea on 17 November 1967 and had been subsequently discovered to have been smuggled to the so-called State of Israel.

20. Moreover, certain States had given that entity access to their best nuclear research and experience, and it had thus been able in a short time to

acquire and manufacture nuclear weapons, which had brought a serious threat to the peace and security not only of the Middle East but also of the entire world. The Zionist entity had always insisted that all of its nuclear facilities remain outside the international safeguards regime, and it had always refused to sign NPT for fear that the true nature of its activities would be discovered. In addition, in blatant contravention of the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law, it had attacked the Iraqi nuclear reactor which had been built for peaceful purposes and placed under Agency safeguards. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the General Conference had adopted a series of resolutions condemning the Zionist entity for its refusal to place its nuclear facilities under international safeguards, and urging other States to suspend all co-operation which might allow it to produce nuclear weapons. Far from paying the slightest attention to those resolutions, that entity had, on the contrary, committed itself to defying the international community.

21. He wished also to draw attention to the close links of co-operation uniting the regimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria, to which numerous reports bore witness. Moreover, he rejected categorically the allegations of the delegate of the Zionist entity that a number of countries, including the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, were among the principal purveyors of arms, and he emphasized that the Zionist entity alone held an arsenal which was greatly superior to that of all the States in the region. Recalling that his country was a signatory to NPT and that all of its nuclear installations were subject to Agency safeguards, he appealed to the international community, and in particular Agency Member States, to take the necessary measures to put an end to a danger which threatened the peace and security of the Middle East in particular, and of the world in general, and he urged Member States to approve the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXX11)/853/Rev.1.

22. Mr. WILSON (Australia) said that his delegation would oppose the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXX11)/853/Rev.1 because it dealt with a question which would be more appropriately discussed in other forums, and because it was discriminatory in the sense that it was directed against a single country.



23. His delegation was, of course, concerned by the absence of full-scope safeguards, not only in Israel, but also in other States. It had urged those States to accede to NPT or at least to accept full-scope safeguards. It therefore welcomed the intended accession of Saudi Arabia to NPT. Although it was opposed to the draft resolution, the Australian delegation sympathized with the ideas reflected in operative paragraph 6 and applauded the efforts of the Egyptian delegation in that area. He stressed, however, that the solution to the problem rested on the sovereign will of the States which were primarily involved.

24. Mr. KABBAJ (Morocco) expressed his full agreement with the statements made by those delegates who had supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1, which was notable for its flexibility, its realism and its moderation. He was amazed that certain delegates had declared that they intended to vote against the text.

25. In its preamble, the draft recalled the resolutions which had been adopted previously on that question, warned against the threat which the accumulation of nuclear weapons by the Israeli entity constituted, and took stock of the concern caused by Israel's refusal to place its nuclear installations under Agency safeguards as the resolutions of the General Conference and the General Assembly had requested it to do. In its operative part, the draft requested the Director General to take those measures which he was empowered to take in conformity with the Agency's Statute and the resolutions adopted by the General Conference. The reason for the draft being submitted was Israel's attitude, with which everyone was well acquainted. The argument that the question did not fall within the sphere of competence of the Agency and its policy-making organs was totally fallacious. In fact, all the points included in it were entirely in line with the objectives of the Agency as stated in the Statute, those being, in essence, to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and to maintain nuclear security and safety in the world.

26. With the exception of Israel, all the States in the Middle East had placed their nuclear installations under Agency safeguards. Israel, on the other hand, was pursuing both inside and outside the region its policy of aggression, expansion, repression and terror. It continued to occupy Arab

territories and to attack a people who were claiming their legitimate rights. It was Israel that continued to stockpile arms of all kinds including nuclear weapons. All those actions constituted a grave danger to peace and security not only in the Middle East but in the whole world. In addition, Israel had just launched its first artificial satellite, which was undoubtedly intended for military purposes. For those reasons, among many others, he appealed to all Member States of the Agency to support the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1.

27. Mr. MESLOUB (Algeria) said he was deeply concerned at the strengthening of Israel's nuclear capabilities, which constituted a grave threat to international peace and security, notably in the Middle East. The highly aggressive stance of Israel made that threat ever more certain and clear; Israel had adopted a policy of aggression, and was occupying the territory of neighbouring States in contravention of the aims and principles of the United Nations Charter. The Tel Aviv régime practised a policy of terror and oppression against the Palestinian people, thus rebutting their legitimate right to the establishment of an independent State in Palestine. In a desperate attempt to stifle the aspirations of that people, which had risen up to demand justice, Israel had resorted to barbarous repression, manifesting itself in murders and practices which had been reported on and castigated by the media in many places in the world. Israel had never hesitated to have recourse to State terrorism in its attempts to impose its hegemony, and had twice violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Tunisia, a neighbouring and sister State of Algeria known for its peaceful policies.

28. The close co-operation carried on by the Tel Aviv régime with the Pretoria one in the nuclear area was a normal and natural extension of such behaviour and actions. For that reason, Africa had always sided with those States which were the victims of Israel's constant aggression in their joint fight against a common enemy. He was convinced that the African States would be persuaded by that shared interest to show their solidarity once more and to support the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1. In addition, there could be no doubt about the true nature of the recent Israeli experiments in space. Those experiments constituted a very grave and real

danger for neighbouring States, and posed a serious threat to international peace and security extending well beyond the limits of the region.

29. The draft resolution under consideration endeavoured to draw attention to that danger and that threat, and called upon the international community to counter them; it also reflected the worry and concern of Israel's neighbours, which feared for their security. It was a moderate draft, the content of which lay clearly within the Agency's sphere of competence. For that reason, the Algerian delegation hoped that there would be general consensus on it. He joined with other delegations in requesting that there be a roll-call vote on it.

30. Mr. PECCI (Paraguay) said he was opposed to the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1. The majority vote had in the past led to the adoption of a series of resolutions hostile to Israel which had been inspired by the desire of certain circles to apply different criteria to that country from those normally used for other States. His delegation wanted Israel to be guaranteed the same treatment as all other Member States of the Agency. Moreover, he objected to the item's appearing systematically in the agenda of the General Conference. The principles of universality and non-interference in the internal affairs of States should be observed. The text under consideration demanded a sanction of a political nature which only the United Nations was competent to apply. The Agency had its own Statute, which should be applied to all Member States in the same way. All countries should be treated equally in accordance with the same criteria. In conclusion, he expressed his support for the statement made by the delegate of the United States and, underlining the fact that Paraguay was a country which lived in peace, he urged other Member States of the Agency to do the same.

31. Mr. ZHOU (China) recalled that Israel had been occupying Palestine and other Arab territories for a long time, and had reinforced its military oppression in those territories by denying the Palestinian people its fundamental rights. The Chinese Government was firmly opposed to Israel's policy of aggression and expansion and supported the Palestinian and Arab peoples in their just fight.

32. He called upon Israel to accept a global ruling on the Palestinian problem. Israel should abandon its policy of aggression and expansion,

retreat from the Arab territories occupied since 1967, and adopt a practical attitude aimed at finding a solution to the problems, by negotiation with its Arab neighbours and with the Palestine Liberation Organization, in order that all countries in the region might enjoy their right to exist, their independence and real peace. He was concerned over the threat which Israel's nuclear capabilities represented for the region, and supported the demand that Israel place its nuclear installations under Agency safeguards. For that reason, he endorsed the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1.

33. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) said he wished to make a few comments on the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor.

34. Firstly, he recalled that the representative of Israel, in a letter addressed to the Director General as well as in previous statements, had invited States in the Middle East to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region on the basis of arrangements similar to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Tlatelolco Treaty) and the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty (Rarotonga Treaty). However, the situation in the Middle East was very different from that in Latin America or the South Pacific, where there was no State occupying territory that did not belong to it and stockpiling nuclear weapons to defend that occupation. If Israel were situated in the South Pacific or in Latin America, the Rarotonga or the Tlatelolco Treaty would not exist.

35. Secondly, some delegations had asserted that the demand that Israel should submit its nuclear facilities to safeguards constituted a violation of the Agency's Statute. Those claims made his delegation wonder since when the Agency's main function was to promote the manufacture and production of nuclear weapons. The objectives and mandate of the Agency, as defined in Articles II and III of the Statute, were to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and that was exactly what the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration were demanding when they called for the application of safeguards.

36. The delegate of Israel and others claimed that the draft resolution discriminated against Israel. That accusation was unjust. In 1981, following

the destruction by Israel of the Iraqi nuclear reactor, the Security Council had unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon Israel to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards. His delegation believed it to be the Agency's practice to take account of United Nations resolutions, particularly when they were approved by all the members of the Security Council.

37. With regard to the claim that there were no nuclear weapons in Israel, the Sunday Times had published an article on 5 October 1986 containing the following statements: "Hidden beneath the Negev desert, the factory has been producing atomic warheads for the last 20 years. Now it has almost certainly begun manufacturing thermonuclear weapons, with yields big enough to destroy entire cities", and: "Vanunu's evidence has surprised nuclear weapons experts who were approached by [the Sunday Times] Insight [team] to verify its accuracy because it shows that Israel does not just have the atom bomb - which has been long suspected - but that it has become a major nuclear power." The Israeli Government had responded to Vanunu's accusations by accusing him of high treason and sentencing him to a heavy prison sentence.

38. Ms. TALLAWY (Egypt) reaffirmed her country's position on the matter under discussion, which it had already expressed on several occasions including the last meetings of the Board of Governors. She also wished to clarify a misunderstanding. Some delegations had said that the draft resolution submitted by Egypt altered the focus of the item on Israel's nuclear capabilities. In fact, however, that draft resolution in no way contradicted the one prepared by the other Arab delegations, indeed it complemented the ideas contained in that draft. Egypt and the other Arab countries had the same policy on that subject. Concerned about Israel's nuclear capabilities, they all urged Israel to accede to NPT and to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards.

39. Egypt had not insisted that its draft resolution be put to the vote because the Arab draft resolution, with some slight changes, incorporated its main idea, namely the proposal to prepare a technical study which would be submitted the following year and would take into account the Agency's experience with the application of safeguards, whether under NPT or under voluntary agreements, regional treaties or bilateral agreements. Contrary to what the Israeli delegate had claimed, the merging of the two drafts was not

the result of political pressures. It was well known that Egypt did not give in to political pressure, whatever the source. Egypt had always pursued an independent policy based on the defence of its own interests and those of Arab countries, African countries and Islamic countries, in other words, the three groups to which it belonged. Some delegations had expressed regret that the draft submitted by Egypt had been withdrawn. However, information which her delegation had received suggested that if it had been put to the vote, those same delegations would have abstained or voted against it.

40. Some delegates had asked why Israel had been singled out for special treatment with regard to the application of full-scope safeguards. The reply to that question could be found in the relevant documentation of the Security Council and in the 1981 resolution which it had adopted unanimously, in other words with the support of the United States. It was not the General Conference that was according special treatment. As to the Israeli idea that the issue of full-scope safeguards could be settled satisfactorily within the framework of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, all the Arab countries were ready to negotiate directly with Israel on the establishment of such a zone, provided that Israel accepted the participation in the negotiations of the representative of the independent State of Palestine.

41. The PRESIDENT, noting that there were no more speakers, invited the General Conference to vote on the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1. As had been requested, the vote would be taken by roll-call.

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

43. The result of the vote was as follows:

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

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

Abstaining: Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Guatemala, Republic of Korea.

44. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1 was adopted by 44 votes to 29, with 11 abstentions[1].

45. Mr. PABON (Venezuela) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting, as it had done in 1987 during the vote on resolution GC(XXXI)/RES/470, for two reasons. Firstly, the draft had related to a question which the competent political organs of the United Nations had already been examining for some time, and his delegation believed that the Agency's technical nature should be maintained as far as possible. Secondly, the draft resolution made reference to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly on which Venezuela had abstained or on which it had voted in favour while expressing serious reservations. Lastly, his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/852 submitted by the Egyptian delegation, if that had been put to the vote.

46. Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it was convinced that political questions should be considered by the United Nations itself and not by the technical organizations in the United Nations system. His country supported any initiatives in favour of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It would always show understanding for the concerns of any country or group of countries in that respect. However, it was worth stressing once again that the appropriate forum for examining matters of international security and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was the United Nations.

---

[1] Subsequently the delegation of Bangladesh informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

47. Mr. PEREIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation had abstained because, while supporting various aspects of the draft in question, it could not approve several passages related to safeguards, notably preambular paragraphs (c) and (d) and operative paragraph 1. His delegation wished to reiterate its opposition to certain assumptions underlying the draft resolution and other similar resolutions, namely that unsafeguarded nuclear activities were not for peaceful purposes and that international organizations had the right to demand that Member States submit their nuclear activities to safeguards, which was contrary to the Agency's Statute.

48. Mr. HIREMATH (India) said that his country had always been concerned by the threat to peace and security in the Middle East. It was essential that Israel should withdraw from all the Arab and Palestinian territories which it occupied, including Jerusalem, and that it restore the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to self-determination. Although that was a matter for the United Nations General Assembly, India had voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1 because it related to the Agency's activities and in order to indicate its support for the course of peace in the Middle East.

49. However, his delegation was a little confused about the proposal in operative paragraph 6 concerning the preparation of a technical study. He did not think a technical study on different modalities of application of Agency safeguards in the region, taking into account the Agency's experience in applying its safeguards, could in any way contribute to the objectives desired by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

50. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) expressed his delegation's reservations about several paragraphs of the draft resolution. The Director General's report in document GC(XXXII)/849 did not contain enough evidence to substantiate the claims made in preambular paragraph (g). Moreover, it was the Security Council, rather than the General Conference, that was competent to decide whether the situation was a threat to the region.

51. Furthermore, his delegation had difficulties in approving operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, for several reasons. Firstly, it referred to a wholly hypothetical situation, and the General Conference ought not to adopt resolutions based on hypotheses. Secondly, safeguards were a



technical instrument which should have a political basis, and such a basis did not exist in the present case. In addition, the draft resolution submitted by Egypt in document GC(XXXII)/852, which Mexico would have supported if it had been put to the vote, spoke of "safeguards requirements", whereas the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1 envisaged the direct application of safeguards, even though no country in the region had explicitly requested such safeguards. Lastly, if a nuclear-weapon-free zone were to be established in the Middle East, the decision to accept the application of safeguards could only be taken by each of the States involved, in all sovereignty.

52. His Government attached the greatest importance to observance of Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which called upon Israel to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards. The non-observance of that resolution constituted a serious obstacle to the implementation of a generalized non-proliferation regime in the region. It was well known that Israel had developed its nuclear technology to the point where it could serve military purposes. Since that matter was vital for peace, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world, Mexico urged Israel to implement the Security Council resolution unconditionally.

53. Mr. SHENSTONE (Canada) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it dealt with a military issue, and thus did not fall within the Agency's province. Furthermore, political issues threatened to undermine an institution which had a technical mandate. His country urged all States to accede to NPT and to submit all their nuclear facilities to full-scope Agency safeguards, but it could not support a resolution which singled out one country even though several others were in the same situation. Finally, there had been several positive elements in the draft resolution submitted by Egypt in document GC(XXXII)/852, and it was regrettable that those elements had not been adequately reflected in the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/853/Rev.1.

54. Mr. KAZUHARA (Japan) said that his Government's basic position on the matter remained unchanged: it urged Israel, as well as the other countries which had not yet done so, to accede to NPT as soon as possible and to agree to submit all their nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards.

However, the Agency was a technical organization with well-defined functions and objectives, and its mission was to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. To introduce into the discussions of the General Conference elements which were irrelevant to those functions would not yield any constructive results, but on the contrary would be likely to divert the Agency from its real goals and mandate. His country therefore regretted that the item was reappearing systematically in the General Conference's agenda.

55. Mr. GUYER (Argentina) said that his country's position with regard to safeguards was well known. Whatever the arguments put forward, his delegation had always clearly expressed its disagreement with any attempt to impose on a Member State, against its sovereign will, the obligation to accept Agency safeguards. Furthermore, it was firmly convinced that confidence in the Agency's safeguards system could be maintained only if that system were applied in complete conformity with the Statute. Therefore, any attempt to impose that system on a compulsory basis and against the sovereign will of a Member State would radically change the nature of the system and ultimately detract from its credibility. Even if it took a decision by consensus, the General Conference could not alter the principle that the submission of a Member State's facilities to safeguards must be voluntary. There was even less foundation for such a decision to make submission to full-scope safeguards compulsory, since that was not provided for in the Agency's Statute. The principle of such submission could be binding only if a State acceded freely to an international instrument whose provisions created such an obligation. Argentina considered that any decision by a policy-making organ aiming to impose such an obligation on a Member State was invalid.

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES (GC(XXXII)/844, 848, 855 and 858;  
INFCIRC/356)

56. The PRESIDENT noted that the item on South Africa's nuclear capabilities had been included in the agenda pursuant to resolution GC(XXXI)/RES/483. The Director General's report was contained in document GC(XXXII)/844.

57. The Conference also had before it, in document GC(XXXII)/858, a draft resolution submitted by Egypt on behalf of the African Member States, as well

as documents INF/CLRC/356 and GC(XXXII)/855, distributed at the request of the Resident Representatives of the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States, the NPT depositary countries, and document GC(XXXII)/848, distributed at the request of the Resident Representative of South Africa.

58. Ms. TALLAWY (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858, recalled that the matter had been on the agenda for meetings of the Agency's policy-making organs for several years and that the Board of Governors, in its report in document GC(XXXI)/807, had recommended that South Africa be suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership.

59. South Africa's nuclear capabilities had for a long time been, and continued to be, a source of grave concern to all African countries, not only because of the permanent violation by the South African régime of all the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter, but also because of its persistent refusal to submit all its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards. South Africa's intransigence and its refusal to observe General Assembly and General Conference resolutions showed very clearly that the Pretoria Government was trying to gain time to avoid implementation of those resolutions - as was illustrated by its latest manoeuvres, which had continued until just before the current session. The African delegations condemned South Africa for not having complied with those successive resolutions and for refusing to abide by the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter and the Agency's Statute.

60. Despite the great importance which it attached to implementing the recommendation to deprive South Africa of its privileges and rights of membership under Article XIX of the Statute, the African Group would agree to give South Africa time once more to enable it to comply with those resolutions, but then the Board's recommendation would have to be followed. In doing so, it hoped that the racist régime of South Africa would at last bow to the rules of international law and respect world public opinion, which consistently condemned its racist practices and the threats it posed to peace and security in the African continent and the whole world.

61. That was why the African Group was submitting to the General Conference the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858, which also requested

the Director General to continue to take all possible measures to ensure the full implementation of resolution GC(XXX)/RES/468 and to report on the matter to the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference. On behalf of the African Group, her delegation appealed to the General Conference to give its full support to the draft resolution before it, and urged all Governments to exert every possible political, moral and economic pressure on the Pretoria régime to force it to abide by international standards. It hoped that the draft resolution would be accepted by consensus, but if that were not the case it would request a roll-call vote.

62. Mr. MGBOKWERE (Nigeria) supported the draft resolution on South Africa's nuclear capabilities. The African Group regretted, however, that it had been necessary to postpone the decision regarding the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership until the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference. Some Member States felt that South Africa should be given more time to decide on accession to NPT, with the unfortunate result that various excuses had to be found to save the racist régime from suspension. In view of its record, he very much doubted that South Africa would eventually accede to NPT. South Africa's tactics and posturing should not be misconstrued, and the latest of the statements by the apartheid régime deserved careful consideration: "it is South Africa's objective and desire to accede to the NPT if South Africa could be satisfied that its concerns would be met".

63. Those concerns were well known to all, and even better to the depositary States, which seemed to have given firm replies to South Africa on that subject. The direct and unequivocal reply by the NPT depositaries to South Africa was encouraging, but it would be still more satisfying if those three States, with the members of their respective groups, were to join those voting in favour of the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858, thus demonstrating to South Africa the strength of their will to obtain satisfaction.

64. His delegation was convinced that no Member State would wish to condone the evil and mindless system of apartheid. It urged all Member States to translate into action their firm belief in the dignity and equality of all men, without distinction of race. Pressure to achieve meaningful and enduring change in South Africa should continue in all areas.

65. He was aware that some Member States invoked the principle of universality for the Agency, but he believed that a régime which denied its citizens their innate rights and established inhuman segregation on the basis of skin colour had no right to any privilege based on that principle. To accept, knowing the social and political structure of that country, that South Africa, meaning exclusively white South Africa, should be a member of common forums seemed incompatible with the principle of universality and made a mockery of the resolutions of the General Conference and the very principles of the United Nations Charter.

66. If the draft resolution could not be adopted by consensus, he would join the Egyptian delegation in asking for a roll-call vote. He did not want South Africa to think that the African Group's draft resolution expressed a position of weakness, since that was not the case: the draft was based on common sense, and time would be on its side.

67. Mr. OLUMOKO (United Nations Council for Namibia) expressed his delegation's full support for the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858. The United Nations had put an end to the mandate of the racist régime of South Africa in Namibia 22 years previously, but that régime continued to occupy Namibian territory illegally, ignoring the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people to self-determination, freedom and independence in a sovereign Namibia.

68. Furthermore, South Africa continued its illegal exploitation of Namibian uranium in violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia. That exploitation had helped to enhance South Africa's nuclear-weapons capability, which threatened not only the security of African States but also international security in general. In addition, South Africa was in the process of establishing a nuclear waste repository on the Namibian coast which posed a severe threat to the health of the population. For all those reasons, Namibia supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858, which called upon that country to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards within the coming year and to conduct itself in accordance with the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter and the Agency's Statute. All Member States were therefore urged to support that draft resolution.

69. Mr. CASTRO DIAZ-BALART (Cuba) recalled that, when the matter had been considered the previous year, a statement by the South African Government concerning possible accession to NPT had been put forward as a new element, and that the General Conference had not reached any conclusion on the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership - partly as a result of that statement - and had not implemented the recommendation which had been made to it by the Board of Governors. A year later, the South African Government had done nothing to carry out its declared intentions or to meet the repeated demands of the General Conference to submit all its nuclear facilities to safeguards.

70. South Africa's delaying tactics enabled it to continue to ignore the admonishments of the international community. Everyone knew that Cuba had always shown a firm attitude to that problem and, as had been pointed out on several occasions, the current attempts to find a negotiated solution to the question of southern Africa did not mean that Cuba had changed its position, since it condemned and rejected the apartheid régime. His delegation was strongly opposed to any dilatory manoeuvres by the South African Government which would enable it to go on ignoring the demands of the General Conference and awaited specific actions which would genuinely meet the legitimate demands of the international community.

71. Mr. MBODJ (Senegal) reaffirmed that South Africa's nuclear capabilities were a serious concern to African countries and to all that believed in peace and justice. His country therefore continued to think that everything should be done to suspend South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership until it acceded to NPT and renounced its policy of apartheid. That position reflected the desire of the African countries to isolate South Africa, which was the only country in the world where racism was constitutional. South Africa was a State which defended the interests of a minority forced to assert itself through the use of violence by its police and military apparatus and to maintain itself by means of a permanent state of emergency.

72. The South African régime threatened peace and stability in the African continent. It should therefore still be condemned, even if, regrettably, the support given to it by some countries to enable it to maintain the privileges

and rights of membership of the Agency only encouraged it in its policy of non-respect for human rights and violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, on which the Agency's activities were based according to Articles III.B.1 and IV.B of the Statute.

73. The international community should assist the African States in politically and diplomatically isolating that diseased régime, which stood in the way of all efforts to establish a democratic and multiracial system in the southern part of the continent. That goal would have to be achieved by strengthening, diversifying and deepening the links and types of support for all forms of South African resistance. His delegation, in its turn, appealed to all Member States to adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858 by consensus.

74. Mr. SILANGWA (Zambia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858, which was an expression of good will aimed at solving the problem posed by the racist régime of South Africa in the interest of international peace and security. That draft should therefore receive overwhelming support from all the delegations present. A similar resolution submitted by the African Group and adopted by the General Conference during its thirty-first session had given the South African régime the time to take concrete steps to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the General Conference. Nothing had come of it but an unequivocal demonstration of the tactics of the South African régime, which were to disregard those resolutions.

75. The events of the past twelve months proved beyond doubt that the South African régime remained determined to achieve its military ambitions in the region. It had openly increased its nuclear-weapons capability. Clearly, it would not voluntarily abandon its policy of apartheid or its military ambitions in southern Africa. For those reasons his Government had in various forums urged the international community to apply comprehensive and mandatory economic and military sanctions against the racist régime; for sanctions were the only peaceful means of compelling that régime to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards and to bring back peace and stability in the region. If South Africa would not accede to that demand, then comprehensive sanctions and suspension from exercising its privileges and

rights of membership would become the only logical and peaceful means of putting pressure on it to heed the objurgations of the international community.

76. The previous year, the Board of Governors had reached the logical conclusion of suspending South Africa from exercising its privileges and rights of membership. The General Conference should not pass by that opportunity for applying peaceful pressure: delaying implementation of the Board's recommendation was tantamount to according international legitimacy to the military ambitions of the racist régime in southern Africa. Those ambitions were not only sources of tension in the sub-region, but also threatened international peace and security. That was why Zambia exhorted the three NPT depositary States to make the South African régime place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards in the coming year. He reminded the Conference that the draft resolution before it was aimed at resolving the South African problem by peaceful means, and hoped that all delegations would support it.

77. Mr. GORDON (United Kingdom) recalled that his Government had frequently declared that it abhorred apartheid, and that its attitude had not changed. His delegation's difficulty and inability to accept the draft resolution under consideration in no way implied that the United Kingdom approved of the South African régime, but derived from the position which his country had consistently taken since the question had been examined in the Board of Governors in June 1987, as well as from more general principles. While some of the arguments put forward were certainly eloquent, his Government could not but warn against establishing a link between the internal policies of a country and its membership of the Agency, as suggested in the draft resolution. It also did not seem reasonable that a country should be deprived of its privileges and rights of membership entirely or partly on the grounds that there had been insufficient progress in the negotiation of safeguards agreements or towards accession to NPT. The danger of creating an unfortunate precedent was obvious.

78. The United Kingdom, convinced that all countries should accede to NPT, had pressed South Africa to do so. As could be seen from document GC(XXXII)/855, the depositary Governments would continue to press South Africa on that point. His delegation also strongly believed that the chances of a



positive outcome would be greater if South Africa remained a Member of the Agency. His delegation therefore welcomed the mutual understanding which appeared to be emerging on that difficult issue. He appreciated the sincerity of the previous statements. His country's objectives were the same as those of other Member States, and his delegation's sensitivity was just as great; the only difference was the appreciation of how best to achieve what all desired.

79. Mr. GHAZALI (Malaysia) said that nothing condemned a country or a system of government as irretrievably as resorting to methods which grossly violated universal norms. Arrogance and the deliberate disregard of regulations were the crimes of which the South African régime was guilty. Malaysia had never weakened in its opposition to South Africa's policy of apartheid. The acquisition by the South African régime of a nuclear-weapons capability seriously threatened international peace and security. No effort should be spared in compelling that régime to comply with the relevant resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. Malaysia therefore supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858.

80. Mr. Al NUWAISSER (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that the policies and nuclear ambitions pursued by the South African régime on the African continent were the same as those of its Israeli ally, with which it collaborated in developing military nuclear capabilities intended to intimidate and to threaten neighbouring countries. Furthermore, South Africa was violating the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, denying sovereignty to Namibia, plundering that country's wealth, ignoring all the appeals made to it by the international community and having recourse to all sorts of condemnable practices. His delegation fully shared the point of view of the African group, as expressed by the delegate of Egypt and the representative of Nigeria, and supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858, in the hope that it would be adopted unanimously.

81. Mr. CUEVAS GANCINO (Mexico) noted that there had been much discussion about the presence of South Africa among the Members of the Agency, about the appropriateness of applying sanctions - including suspension from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership - and about whether such suspension would infringe on the principle of universality. The Group of 77 had therefore, through the President of the General Conference,

requested the opinion of the Legal Adviser on the significance and consequences of such suspension. The Legal Adviser had given his opinion, and he (Mr. Cuevas Cancino) had asked the President, on behalf of the Group of 77, to have it published as a General Conference document. For the sake of brevity, he would limit himself to quoting three extracts from that opinion.

82. "Article XIX.B [...] deals only with suspension from the exercise of privileges and rights of membership and does not purport to affect the obligations of a State as a Member State of the Agency. It therefore implies the continuation of the bond of membership. The suspended State would continue to be a Member State of the Agency. As such it would continue to be bound by the obligations assumed under the Statute by Member States."

83. "Bilateral and multilateral agreements which have been concluded by the Agency or under its auspices with a suspended Member State would continue to remain in force."

84. "Suspension could be viewed as a means of applying additional pressure to a State in order to induce it to comply with the provisions of the Statute. It would not close the door for subsequent reconciliation and restoration of the privileges and rights of membership. It is thus by definition of a temporary character and could be lifted once the reasons underlying it no longer existed."

85. With regard to the draft resolution under consideration, which foresaw the inclusion of the item in the agenda for the following session of the General Conference, he appealed to all States that upheld the equality of all races, a key principle of the United Nations Charter and of all international organizations, to take due account of that legal opinion. His delegation would be very pleased if such a measure should prove to be unnecessary because South Africa had taken prompt action and seized the opportunity which it was being offered. He hoped that it would not be necessary to have a vote on a resolution of suspension the following year, and that the Member State concerned would make good use of the time so as to avoid such a weakening of the Agency's universality.

86. The PRESIDENT indicated that the text from which the delegate of Mexico had quoted would be issued as a General Conference document.[2]

---

[2] See document GC(XXXII)/INF/265.

87. Mr. QIN (China) supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858 and the inclusion in the agenda for the thirty-third session of the General Conference of the item related to South Africa's nuclear capabilities. The draft resolution was realistic and in line with the interests of the African peoples and countries. It was well known that South Africa had long persisted in its policy of oppression and apartheid, which constituted a serious threat to peace and security in the region. Recently, the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs had admitted that his country had the means of manufacturing nuclear weapons. That was why South Africa's nuclear capabilities caused serious concern to the international community in general and to the African countries in particular. His Government was firmly opposed to South Africa's policies and actions, and to all its activities relating to the manufacture of nuclear weapons, whose only goal was to maintain the system of apartheid and to jeopardize peace in the region. China would firmly support, as always, the countries of southern Africa in their justified struggle to re-establish peace and security in the region, and endorsed their proposal to create a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa. It urged South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the General Conference and to place all its nuclear activities under Agency safeguards.

88. Mr. ZANNAD (Tunisia) recalled that during the general debate his delegation had strongly condemned South Africa's racist policies and clearly expressed its views on the danger represented by South African nuclear installations for the countries in the region and for all of Africa. That danger was all the greater because of the policy of apartheid pursued by Pretoria towards the black majority and because of the illegal occupation of Namibian territory.

89. Although it seemed that relatively favourable developments were emerging, that should not dull the vigilance of the General Conference nor inhibit its attempts to make South Africa place its nuclear installations under Agency safeguards. On the contrary, concerted efforts should be continued with a view to reconsidering, at the following session, the need to

suspend South Africa from exercising its privileges and rights of membership under Article XIX.B of the Statute. The charm campaign and dilatory manoeuvres carried out recently by the Pretoria authorities should not be allowed to divert the General Conference from its objective, unless there were radical and positive changes in the policies of Pretoria on apartheid, on Namibia, on relations with neighbouring countries and on Agency safeguards. In conclusion, he hoped the draft resolution presented by Egypt on behalf of the African group would enjoy the support of all delegations.

90. Mr. SRINIVASAN (India) noted that the African States, once again demonstrating their moderation, their statesmanship and their proverbial patience, had abandoned their initial draft resolution, which more than one third of those voting would probably have opposed, and had agreed to defer consideration of the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights as a member of the Agency.

91. Nonetheless, he had taken the floor because he could not remain silent in the face of injustice, racism and discrimination against a population on the land of its own ancestors. Against such injustice the only means of exerting pressure which a peace-loving international community had at its disposal were the pressure of public opinion and the application of various sanctions or ostracism from important meetings so as to make known that there were wrongs to be righted and rights to be restored. Unfortunately, it had been the African States and not South Africa which had had to yield to geopolitical pressures once again. He concluded by quoting Wole Soyinka, the Nigerian writer and Nobel laureate: "The man dies in all who keep silent in the face of tyranny ... The balance sheet is very often on the side of outrage!".

92. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858. In June 1987, the Board of Governors had adopted an unfortunate resolution recommending that the General Conference suspend South Africa from exercising its privileges and rights of membership. Showing great wisdom, the General Conference had not implemented that recommendation. He pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration were not asking the General Conference to suspend South Africa from its privileges and rights of membership; such

moderation showed a growing realization that such a measure would not serve the interests of any Member State, and especially not those of the African Member States.

93. His country was nevertheless opposed to the draft resolution, above all because it considered it to be a purely political exercise bearing no connection to the Agency's responsibilities and role. His country had always argued in the past that initiatives to suspend any country from exercising its privileges and rights of membership for political reasons were contrary to several basic principles which were essential for preserving and strengthening the Agency.

94. The first principle was that of universality of international organizations. If nuclear energy was to be used for peaceful purposes only, in a safe and environmentally sound manner, it was necessary for all countries with nuclear programmes to participate in the Agency's activities and deliberations. To exclude a country or to limit its participation for political reasons would run counter to that principle. Secondly, a Member State could be disciplined only within the framework defined by the Statute, which protected Members against any arbitrary action based on political considerations. There was absolutely no justification for suspending South Africa from its privileges and rights of membership under Article XIX.B of the Statute, since that country had not persistently violated the provisions of the Statute or of any agreement entered into by it pursuant to the Statute. Thirdly, the peaceful nature of Member States' nuclear programmes was best ensured when safeguards were applied to the greatest possible number of installations. In the case of South Africa, suspension of the exercise of its privileges and rights would call in question the continued application of safeguards in that country and the extension of safeguards agreements to new installations, some of which could produce sensitive nuclear materials. Fourthly, safeguards should continue to be regarded by all Member States as measures accepted voluntarily and intended to confirm a country's peaceful nuclear intentions, and not as sanctions or penalties imposed from outside in response to alleged transgressions or misconduct. If Agency safeguards were to come to be seen as sanctions, their fundamental role in support of non-proliferation would be seriously undermined.

95. The draft resolution under consideration was clearly in conflict with those four principles because, though it did not call for an immediate suspension of South Africa from exercising its privileges and rights of membership, it nevertheless contained the seeds for such a decision the following year. It was because his delegation could not subscribe to the premises of the draft resolution that it could not support it. More specifically, his delegation objected to preambular paragraph (c), which seemed to arrogate to the Agency the right to state that South Africa had violated international law and the United Nations Charter. However, the Agency's Statute did not give it any mandate to make such statements of major legal significance. Such matters were exclusively the province of the Security Council. Operative paragraph 2, which committed the General Conference to taking a decision the following year on the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership, was also a problem. It was not within the Agency's competence to resolve political issues arising from the South African Government's attitude towards its citizens and the international community; the Agency should focus on scientific and technical questions which fell within its sphere of competence.

96. Moreover, his Government considered that the participation of South Africa in the Agency's activities should not depend on a possible accession to NPT. His country strongly supported NPT and urged all Member States to accede to it. As stated in the letter of the three depositary Governments, the United States would continue to press South Africa to accede to the Treaty and to place all its nuclear facilities under safeguards. However, for the reasons already stated, his country considered that South Africa should remain a Member of the Agency even if, like several other Member States, it had not yet acceded to NPT.

97. Finally, he emphasized that his country's position derived from its interpretation of the Agency's Statute and had nothing to do with the character of the South African Government. The United States fully understood and shared the aversion of the sponsors of the draft resolution to the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. His country was among those which had applied the strictest sanctions against South Africa. It also shared the

frustration of the draft resolution's sponsors at the delay in South Africa's consideration of a possible accession to NPT. It wished neither to defend nor to excuse South Africa when it said that it would be a mistake to exclude that country from the Agency. On the contrary, it was because his country was concerned at the size and level of complexity of the South African nuclear programme, from the point of view not only of non-proliferation, but also of health, safety and the environment, that it wanted South Africa to remain a Member of the Agency. It was absolutely necessary that the Agency should maintain contact with South Africa's nuclear programme, in the interests of the citizens of that country, of Africa and of the whole world. He appealed to other Member States also to oppose the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858.

98. Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) regretted that the General Conference had been incapable on two occasions of reaching a decision on the Board of Governors' recommendation to suspend South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership. The Pretoria régime was condemned and rejected by the international community for its policy of apartheid, which was an attack on human dignity and a negation of all humanitarian principles.

99. He had been surprised by the information regarding discussions between the Pretoria régime and the NPT depositary Governments. The fact that those talks had been announced just before the opening of the General Conference indicated that that had been an obvious attempt to influence the work of the General Conference and to delay the adoption of the measure recommended by the Board of Governors. In any case, it was difficult to understand why there should have been discussions between a State and the NPT depositary Governments. Any State could freely accede to NPT and deposit its instruments of ratification with the depositary Governments, without any need for negotiations. Furthermore, he did not see under what Article of NPT the depositary Governments had taken upon themselves such a responsibility.

100. The link established between the accession of South Africa to NPT, on the one hand, and the Board's recommendation to suspend it from its privileges and rights of membership on the other, seemed unclear and inconsistent. The Board's recommendation bore witness to the aversion which the world felt

towards the racist régime in Pretoria, its aggressive policies, the permanent threat it posed for the African States, and its persistent violation of the United Nations Charter. His delegation would have supported a draft resolution demanding that the Pretoria régime be suspended from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership because such a measure would not only have been a victory for the African States and other countries, but would also and above all have marked the triumph of human values and constituted a success for the Agency. However, given the circumstances which had led the African Group to submit the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858, his delegation would vote for it.

101. Mr. AL-MINAYES (Kuwait) said that since the South African régime practised racial discrimination, pursued a policy of aggression and collaborated with Israel to acquire nuclear weapons, his delegation fully supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858. By refusing to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and the General Conference, South Africa had clearly shown its disdain of the international community. The manoeuvres to which it had resorted in order to mislead international opinion with regard to NPT were aimed at diminishing the importance of the Agency and at sowing confusion in the debates of the General Conference. His delegation considered that the adoption of the draft resolution under consideration would constitute a deterrent and would enable justice to be done to the peace-loving peoples of Africa. His delegation therefore urged all others to support the draft.

102. Mr. EL-TAHIR (Sudan) said that South Africa continued to violate all international rules and customs by refusing to grant the African people the most basic human rights. After a year's debate on that country's nuclear capabilities, the situation remained unchanged. The Pretoria régime disregarded the principles and purposes of the international community by deliberately and persistently ignoring the United Nations Charter, the Agency's Statute and the various resolutions adopted by the General Conference. Any State which wished to enjoy the privileges and rights conferred upon it through its membership of the Agency was obliged to respect the principles on which the United Nations system was based. South Africa, however, far from showing the least wish to implement forthwith certain



decisions adopted by the international community, had, shortly before the opening of the session of the General Conference, stepped up its manoeuvres and given rise to all sorts of suppositions which had done nothing but maintain the status quo. The acquisition, by the Pretoria régime, of a nuclear capability represented a danger not only for African States, but also for international peace and security. Sudan therefore called on all Member States to support the draft resolution set forth in document GC(XXXII)/858.

103. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the discussions on South Africa's nuclear capabilities were similar in many ways to the debate concerning Israel. The two régimes were racist in nature, both practised a form of colonization and both collaborated in the nuclear field by giving each other assistance and aid. South Africa's nuclear capability was a danger to Africa and to world peace. His delegation would have wished the draft resolution under consideration to demand that South Africa be suspended immediately from its privileges and rights of membership. The adoption of such a measure would have allowed pressure to be put on that country and on other States of the same kind, to induce them to modify their behaviour. His country approved, despite its weaknesses, the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858.

104. Ms. OLEMBO (Kenya) said that her country abhorred South Africa's attempts to acquire a nuclear-weapons capability and feared that the acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against its neighbours would extend to other countries. The obstinacy with which South Africa refused to accede to NPT and to place its nuclear installations under safeguards clearly indicated that it wanted to keep a free hand to develop nuclear weapons. The draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858 was a gesture of good will towards South Africa and gave it time to decide to accede to NPT. However, that did not mean that the African States' determination to safeguard peace on the continent had weakened. If South Africa continued in its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the General Conference, Member States would have to take a definite decision on the matter. Her delegation therefore approved the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858.

105. Mr. ABDELBARI (Algeria) said that the General Conference was once again considering the issue of South Africa's nuclear capabilities because of the negative attitude of the South African racist régime which refused to comply with the resolutions of the General Conference and to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The régime persisted in applying the despicable and shameful policy of apartheid, and continued to threaten the sovereignty and security of neighbouring States through its warmongering policies, which it was backing up through the acquisition of a nuclear capability.

106. The Agency's Statute made membership conditional on two criteria: Members should act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and they should fulfil, in good faith, the obligations they had assumed under the Statute. Clearly, South Africa was far from meeting those conditions, preferring to use delaying tactics to evade its international obligations. The African Group had shown great patience towards the South African régime, as well as showing a spirit of co-operation and goodwill towards those who continued to believe that the position of that régime was likely to change. His delegation appealed to all Member States to exert all possible pressure to induce South Africa to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly and the General Conference, and hoped that the draft resolution submitted by Egypt on behalf of the African Group would be supported by all.

107. Mr. WILSON (Australia) recalled that his Government had repeatedly requested South Africa to accede to NPT or at least to accept full-scope safeguards. It was concerned to see that South Africa was delaying conclusion of a safeguards agreement for the Valindaba enrichment plant. His country also regretted to note that one year after having announced its intention to accede to NPT, South Africa had not yet done so. Representatives of his Government had conducted discussions with South Africa on that subject, both in Pretoria and in Vienna.

108. Nevertheless, while it deplored the fact that South Africa refused to accede to NPT and to submit all its nuclear facilities to safeguards, his delegation could not accept the draft resolution under examination. There was no point in reconsidering the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of

its privileges and rights of membership under Article XIX.B of the Statute the following year, because there were insufficient grounds for such a suspension. Moreover, the decision whether or not to accede to an international treaty was a sovereign State's prerogative, and failure to accede should not restrict its privileges and rights of membership of the Agency. To prevent South Africa from participating in the following sessions of the General Conference because it would not accede to NPT or accept the application of full-scope safeguards would be tantamount to selective application of the principle of non-proliferation, since several other Member States of the Agency had not taken such measures either, and would be contrary to the principle of universality of international organizations. Since Australia had adopted extremely severe sanctions against South Africa, his delegation trusted that its opposition to the draft resolution would not be interpreted as a weakening of its abhorrence of apartheid.

109. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) fully supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858, because it condemned the inhuman and racist policy pursued by South Africa, which consistently flouted the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Agency's Statute and completely ignored the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. The sponsors of the draft resolution had shown restraint and political sense. The South African people had suffered too much for too long; it deserved the compassion and respect of the international community. His country would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858.

110. Mr. CLADAKIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the twelve Member States of the European Community, noted that they fully shared the abhorrence of apartheid expressed by the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858. Nevertheless, they believed that suspension of South Africa or any other State from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership would run counter to the basic principle of universality of the United Nations and its related international organizations. Such a step would weaken the safeguards system, would be likely to reduce nuclear safety and would create a precedent which could jeopardize the participation of other countries in the Agency. The member states of the European Community were therefore opposed to any steps

which could lead to the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership of the Agency - a possibility clearly envisaged in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document GC(XXXI1)/858, which they could not therefore support.

111. The PRESIDENT, noting that there were no more speakers, invited the General Conference to vote on the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXI1)/858. As requested, there would be a roll-call vote.

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

113. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq.

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

Abstaining: Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala.

114. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858 was adopted by 58 votes to 27, with 4 abstentions.

115. Mr. GUYER (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution primarily in order to condemn the continued violations of the principles of the United Nations Charter by the South African régime. At the same time, it reaffirmed its opposition to any attempt to force any Member State to accept the application of safeguards.

116. Mr. KAZUHARA (Japan) said that his Government's attitude towards South Africa remained unchanged. The South African Government's policy of apartheid was wholly contrary to the dignity of human beings and was totally intolerable. Furthermore, his delegation regretted that the negotiations between the Agency and the South African Government regarding the application of safeguards had not yet produced any significant results. However, his delegation had followed with great interest and attention the steps taken recently by South Africa to begin consultations with NPT depositary Governments and with some other countries, including Japan. His delegation urged the South African Government to decide to accede to the Treaty as soon as possible.

117. The Japanese delegation firmly believed that the principle of universality and the technical nature of the Agency must be maintained and that any politicization of the Agency's activities should be avoided in order to ensure its effective functioning in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and in achieving effective world-wide non-proliferation. Thus, it would not be politically wise, legally appropriate, or technically effective to suspend South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership, because such a measure would in practice exclude all possibility of progress in negotiations relating to the application of safeguards.

118. Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria) said that his country had always supported the principle of universality of international organizations. In defending that principle, his country did not judge the policies of Member States in general or of the apartheid régime in particular. His country's position on that specific question had been clearly expressed on several occasions, in the United Nations General Assembly and elsewhere. Austria firmly supported the principle of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It therefore hoped that States which were not party to NPT would decide to accede to it in their own interests as well as for the sake of the stability and security of the international community.

119. Mr. GRAHAM (New Zealand) recalled that his country strongly condemned South Africa's apartheid policy, as it had made clear in the appropriate forums of the United Nations. As far as the Agency was concerned, it was South Africa's nuclear programme which was particularly relevant, for

important elements of the nuclear fuel cycle in that country were not covered by the safeguards system. His delegation saw that as a cause for grave concern, and for that specific reason was opposed to any suspension of South Africa from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership, which would be likely to be counter-productive and might impede negotiations on extending Agency safeguards to South Africa's nuclear facilities and perhaps jeopardize existing agreements. Such a step would therefore be likely from the outset to preclude appropriate control of South Africa's nuclear development. In addition, his delegation believed that a more general question of principle was at stake. To suspend South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership would be contrary to the principle of universality prevailing in all the United Nations organizations.

120. That being said, his country's abhorrence of apartheid and its insistence that the South African nuclear development programme be devoted to peaceful applications were in no way diminished. The previous year, his delegation had urged South Africa to carry out quickly its stated intention to accede to NPT. It now appealed to South Africa to do so before the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference.

121. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the statements made by several speakers on the principle of universality in the Agency called for some comments. That principle would not be contradicted by the suspension of South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership, since South Africa itself did not respect that principle within its frontiers, where blacks were persecuted because of the colour of their skin. South Africa must accept the principle of universality in its territory before that principle could be invoked in support of a decision not to suspend it. Any other approach would lead to illogicality and contradiction.

122. His country regretted that several countries were against adopting a resolution which constituted not only a warning by the international community to the South African Government, but also an encouragement to the victims of apartheid. Some Member States had also argued that to suspend South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership would jeopardize the safeguards system. But there could, in any case be no certainty that South Africa would submit its facilities to Agency safeguards. In that

connection his delegation wished to stress that NPT-related matters should not be mixed up with the problems in South Africa. In conclusion, he hoped that the countries which had opposed the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858 would show a better understanding of the problems at the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference. The events which would have taken place in the intervening period would perhaps have shown that the sponsors of the draft resolution were right.

123. Mr. MAROM (Israel) said that his country had consistently denounced racism and apartheid in all international forums. On 18 March 1987, the Israeli Cabinet had decided, inter alia, "to reiterate Israel's total condemnation of the apartheid policy". Moreover, his delegation had been obliged to vote against the draft resolution in document GC(XXXII)/858 because of its overriding belief in the principles of universality and constitutionality of the Agency and other international organizations. The issue at stake in the resolution which had just been adopted was not South Africa, but the maintaining of the Agency's integrity. The breakdown of those principles would be more damaging to the Agency than any act against South Africa.

124. Mr. OMWONY (Kenya) thanked the Member States which had supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXII)/858. Recalling that the Agency had been set up to promote the principle of atoms for peace, he noted that the question which arose in the event of a violation by a Member State was whether that State conformed to the peaceful intentions which had attended the Agency's establishment. The General Conference was meeting because the world was at peace, and a Member State could not be allowed to threaten that peace and keep its place in the Agency in the name of the principle of universality. Kenya voted systematically in favour of resolutions condemning South Africa and called for that country to be suspended from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership because South Africa continued to defy the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

125. Mr. PECCI (Paraguay) said that his country had always supported the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, particularly in the area of nuclear energy. All the same, it condemned apartheid, as it had stated in the United Nations.

126. Mr. BADRAN (Jordan) said that, as in previous years, his country supported unreservedly the draft resolution on South Africa's nuclear capabilities. With regard to the principle of universality invoked by a number of delegates, he noted that any Member State which upheld that principle should also accept the underlying principle of equality of States. However, since the South African régime did not respect that principle at the national or regional level, it did not seem justified to apply the principle of universality to it. Against the argument that the matter had nothing to do with the Agency's Statute, he pointed out that it was now universally agreed that South Africa constituted a threat to peace in Africa and in the world, and thus in blatant violation of the Statute.

EXAMINATION OF DELEGATES' CREDENTIALS (GC(XXXII)/866 and Add.1)

127. The PRESIDENT asked the General Conference to examine document GC(XXXII)/866, containing the report by the General Committee which had met to examine the credentials of all delegates in accordance with Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. Paragraphs 2 to 15 of the report described the manner in which the Committee had approached its task and the opinions expressed during the discussion. The Committee had decided to recommend the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 16.

128. The credentials of the delegate of Tunisia, which for technical reasons had not been submitted before the Committee met to examine credentials, had been received by the Secretariat earlier that day, and an addendum to the Committee's report (GC(XXXII)/866/Add.1) had been issued accordingly.

129. Mr. AL-MINAYES (Kuwait), speaking on behalf of the Arab delegations members of the League of Arab States and participating in the General Conference, recalled those delegations' reservations regarding the credentials of the Israeli delegate, set forth in the Attachment to document GC(XXXII)/854.

130. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) associated himself with the reservations contained in document GC(XXXII)/854. He also expressed reservations regarding the representation of Afghanistan, because the current régime in Afghanistan was not fully representative.

131. Mr. ABDEL-MONEIM (Egypt) reaffirmed the position of his delegation with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegate.



132. Mr. GHAZALI (Malaysia) expressed his delegation's reservations with respect to the credentials of the Israeli delegate.

133. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was surprised and shocked at the statement made by the delegate of Pakistan on the subject of Afghanistan. The Soviet delegation regarded that as an attempt to divert the General Conference from the tasks of the Agency, which were to foster international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime. He was all the more surprised because Pakistan was a party to the Geneva agreement, but was not applying the provisions of that agreement as it should be doing, at a time when a political settlement appeared to be emerging in Afghanistan.

134. Mr. MOOSAVI (Islamic Republic of Iran) expressed reservations regarding the credentials of the Israeli delegate.

135. Mr. MOHSENZADA (Afghanistan) strongly rejected the statement made by the delegate of Pakistan which denied Afghanistan's legitimate right to be represented at the General Conference. He shared the surprise expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union and considered that he had the legitimate right to represent Afghanistan and that Pakistan had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. His country had signed the Geneva agreements, and the "Afghan problem" was being settled.

136. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) regretted that unfounded reservations had been made regarding the Israeli delegate's credentials. All technically valid credentials conforming to the provisions of the Rules of Procedure should be accepted, as had been recommended by the General Committee.

137. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan), exercising his right of reply, rejected the allegations that Pakistan was not applying the provisions of the Geneva agreement on Afghanistan. His Government was respecting the letter and spirit of that agreement.

138. The PRESIDENT said that, since there were no more speakers, he took it that the General Conference was ready to adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXI1)/866. The observations and reservations made by delegates regarding certain credentials, as well as the reservations expressed by the members of the Arab Group, would all be reflected in the official records.

139. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 16 of document GC(XXXII)/866 was adopted.

ELECTIONS TO THE AGENCY'S STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE

140. The PRESIDENT recalled that the General Conference was currently represented on the Agency's Staff Pension Committee by two members, Mr. Morales Pedraza (Cuba) and Mr. Loedel (Uruguay), and two alternates, namely Mr. Itoh (Japan) and Mr. von Preuschen zu Liebenstein (Federal Republic of Germany). Since Mr. Itoh and Mr. von Preuschen zu Liebenstein were no longer available to serve on the Committee, he proposed that Ms. Bhaduri (India) and Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands) be elected as alternates.

141. Ms. Bhaduri (India) and Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands) were elected as alternates, Mr. Morales Pedraza (Cuba) and Mr. Loedel (Uruguay) continuing to serve on the Committee as members.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED TO THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CO-OPERATION FUND FOR 1989

142. The PRESIDENT said that, on 22 September 1988 at 6 p.m., the total of voluntary contributions pledged by Member States to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund had amounted to US \$19 044 229. Since then, Sudan had announced a voluntary contribution of \$4200. The total amount of contributions pledged was thus US \$19 048 429.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

143. Mr. BAEYENS (France), speaking on behalf of the Western Europe and Others Group, congratulated the President on the masterly way in which he had directed the work of the General Conference, paid tribute to his relentless search for understanding, compromise and consensus, and hoped that the future activities of all the Agency's organs would be inspired by that example.

144. Mr. SOWINSKI (Poland), speaking on behalf of the eastern European socialist countries, commended the President on the talented and competent way in which he had guided the session of the General Conference, thereby enabling many of the complex international problems examined during the session to be resolved in a constructive manner. He also thanked the Director and his staff as well as all delegates for their co-operation, which had contributed to the smooth running of the session.

145. Mr. CUEVAS GANCINO (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, congratulated the President on his skill in handling the work of the thirty-second regular session of the General Conference and on the success achieved on all items of the agenda. He also thanked the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole for his customary energy, the Director General for his extraordinary command of the problems facing the Agency, the Secretariat for its excellent work, and all those who had participated so actively in the smooth running of the session. Lastly, he thanked the Austrian Government for the facilities provided at the Austria Center.

146. The General Conference could be satisfied with the results of the session. It had begun to be concerned about the problems of pollution, the role of conventional energy sources in such pollution and the need for the Agency to make a greater contribution to environmental protection. The Agency should launch a major information campaign to convince the whole world that nuclear energy had ecological advantages and was without doubt one of the energy sources which would best meet future energy needs. Moreover, it seemed that the doubts which had arisen following certain recent accidents were beginning to be dispelled. The Group of 77 countries hoped that their needs in the nuclear field would be met through contributions by the industrialized countries. In conclusion, he warned against the dangers associated with zero growth of the Regular Budget for Third World countries, and stressed the importance of the issues of waste storage, both toxic and radioactive.

147. The PRESIDENT thanked all the delegates for their kind words. It had been an honour and a privilege for him to serve as President of the thirty-second regular session of the General Conference. He particularly wished to thank the members of the General Committee and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole for their help in the conduct of the Conference's work.

148. On behalf of the General Conference, he thanked the Austrian authorities and the City of Vienna for their hospitality and for the facilities provided for the second time at the Austria Center. Likewise, he thanked the Director General and his staff, the Secretariat of the Policy-making Organs, and all those who had contributed to the smooth running of the General Conference.

149. Before closing the session, he invited the delegates to observe one minute of silence dedicated to prayer or meditation, in accordance with Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure.

All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

150. The PRESIDENT declared the thirty-second regular session of the General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 7.5 p.m.