

**INTERNATIONAL
ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY**

Distr.
GENERAL
GC(II)/OR.15
29 October 1958
ENGLISH

General Conference

SECOND REGULAR SESSION

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE FIFTEENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Tuesday, 23 September 1958, at 3.25 p.m.

President: Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Czechoslovak proposal regarding the representation of non-member States	1 - 14
7	Adoption of the agenda and allocation of items to Committees	15
9	Report of the Credentials Committee	16 - 69
8	Determination of the closing date for the General Conference	70

* GC(II)/57.

N.B. The list of delegations attending the second regular session
of the General Conference was issued as document GC(II)/INF/17/Rev.3.

CZECHOSLOVAK PROPOSAL REGARDING THE REPRESENTATION OF NON-MEMBER STATES

1. Mr. BRAZDA (Czechoslovakia) said that the Agency should allow all countries which so desired to send observers to the sessions of the General Conference. The Agency must apply the principle of universality if it wished to attain the objectives set out in Article II of its Statute, and fulfil the functions devolving upon it under the terms of Article III. It was, moreover, contrary to the principles of the Statute to make a distinction between two categories of countries. The Czechoslovak delegation accordingly proposed that the General Conference should invite all States which so desired to send observers to the second session of the General Conference of the Agency.

2. The PRESIDENT recalled that, under the terms of Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure, "Representatives of States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies which are not Members of the Agency shall be invited to attend the General Conference ...". The Director General had acted in accordance with the provisions of that Rule when sending out invitations for the present session. It was, however, for the General Conference to decide whether invitations should be sent to States other than those referred to in Rule 30.

3. Mr. NICUTZA (Romania) supported the Czechoslovak proposal. He recalled that, under the terms of Article II of the Statute, the Agency must seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. It must therefore allow all States to participate in its work. Certain sovereign States not Members of the United Nations or of a specialized agency desired to send observers to the General Conference in order to see for themselves what advantages there would be in becoming Members of the Agency. It was unjust that they were not invited while international inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations which had no atomic resources were authorized to send representatives.

4. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said that there had been lengthy discussion^{1/} on that point at the previous session, when the General Conference had adopted the present text of Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure. The Director General

^{1/} GC.1(S)/OR.12 and 13.

could not, therefore, be blamed for abiding by the provisions of that Rule and the Czechoslovak delegate should not be allowed to re-open discussion on the matter. His proposal should be ruled out of order.

5. If the delegates of Romania and Czechoslovakia wished to amend Rule 30 of the Rules of Procedure, they should act in accordance with Rule 104, which provided that proposals for amendments should be submitted to the appropriate committee.

6. Mr. RAJAN (India) said that, under Rule 30, representatives of States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies had to be invited to attend the General Conference. The Rule did not, however, exclude the possibility of inviting other States. The Czechoslovak proposal was therefore receivable under that Rule and had to be considered on its merits. Article II of the Statute provided that the Agency should accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. Article III.A.I authorized the Agency to encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes throughout the world. It was clear from these Articles that universality was one of the basic premises of the Agency's work. That universality could not be achieved if certain areas were excluded from participating in the work of the Conference even as observers. For that reason, his delegation would support the Czechoslovak proposal.

7. Mr. VERKIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that all the countries of the world should participate in the work of the Agency, whose aim was to hasten and increase the contribution of atomic energy to world peace, health and prosperity. To achieve that aim the principle of universality would have to be strictly applied. He therefore supported the Czechoslovak proposal and hoped that all the members of the Conference would do likewise.

8. Mr. McCONE (United States of America) said that the question raised by the Czechoslovak delegation was not a new one. He agreed with the Canadian delegate that the Czechoslovak proposal was a breach of Rule 30 and therefore out of order. If the proposal were to be put to the vote, his delegation would vote against it.

9. Mr. BRAZDA (Czechoslovakia) said that when the Canadian delegation had proposed an amendment to Rule 30 at the first session, the Canadian delegate had said **that nothing** in the proposed amendment would legally prevent the General Conference from inviting a State which was not a Member of the United Nations or of a specialized agency to attend the Conference; the General Conference, he had explained, was master of its own procedure and could always adopt a motion inviting a country to participate^{2/}. That statement was totally at variance with what the Canadian delegate had just said.

10. He also pointed out that the Canadian delegate's opposition had taken up more of the time of the Conference than the Czechoslovak proposal itself.

11. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) said that he could not accept the Indian delegate's interpretation of Rule 30; for its title, "Representatives of States not Members of the Agency", showed that it embodied all the provisions relating to States not Members of the Agency.

12. He was surprised that delegates who wished to make the Agency a scientific and technical organization concerned mainly with assistance to under-developed countries should try and delay the work of the Conference. If the Czechoslovak delegate wished to amend the Rules of Procedure, he should proceed in accordance with Rule 104; if he wished the Rules of Procedure to be suspended, he should submit a proposal to that effect, whereupon the Conference would have to proceed in accordance with Rule 105.

13. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the Czechoslovak proposal that the General Conference should authorize the Director General to invite all States so desiring to send observers to the second regular session of the General Conference.

At the request of Mr. McCone (United States of America), the vote was taken by roll-call.

^{2/} GC.1(S)/COM.2/OR.4, paragraph 53.

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

The result of the voting was as follows:

For: Morocco, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Indonesia.

Against Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vatican City, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan.

Abstention: Israel.

The Czechoslovak proposal was rejected by 43 votes to 16, with one abstention.

14. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) observed that the vote which had just taken place created an unfortunate precedent. The Czechoslovak proposal amounted to an amendment either to the Statute or to the Rules of Procedure; in either case a decision should be taken by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO COMMITTEES (GC(II)/35 and Corr.1 and Add.1, GC(II)/55)

15. The PRESIDENT invited members of the General Conference to consider the relevant report by the General Committee (GC(II)/55) submitted under Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure.

The report by the General Committee was adopted.

REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (GC(II)/56 and Corr.1).

16. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan), Chairman of the Credentials Committee, presented the Committee's report (GC(II)/56 and Corr.1).
17. Mr. EMEL'YANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that certain persons were attending the Conference without any justification, since they represented nothing more than a political clique which was enjoying a last lease of life under the protection of the United States of America. The attitude of the United States Government was the only obstacle to the admission of the People's Republic of China. The proposal of the United States delegation contained in paragraph 5(a) of the report was not based on any argument at all. He hoped that the General Conference would put an end to the practice of subordinating the interests of the Agency to those of certain Governments, and that it would recognize the indisputable rights of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. He requested that a separate vote be taken on the credentials of the Chinese delegate.
18. Mr. VORSHIRM (Dominican Republic) said that the Credentials Committee, in accordance with Rule 29 of the Rules of Procedure, had duly examined the credentials of the delegate of the Republic of China and considered that they entitled him to be accredited as the delegate of a Member State of the Agency.
19. The delegate of the Soviet Union had claimed that a representative of the People's Republic of China should occupy the place legitimately occupied by the delegate of the Republic of China. But, before approving the admission of a State, the General Conference should make sure that it was able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership in the Agency, and due consideration should be given to the ability and willingness of the State to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Recent world events and what was happening in the Straits of Formosa showed clearly that Communist China had no desire to act in conformity with those principles, and that the delegate of the Soviet Union had chosen a bad time to plead its cause.

20. He then asked the Conference to approve the report of the Credentials Committee and to end a discussion which could only impede its real work.

21. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) made the following statement^{3/}.

"Sir, with your permission, I would like briefly to state the views of the delegation of the United Arab Republic in connexion with the report of the Credentials Committee which is under discussion. While my delegation is in a position to approve, generally, the report as submitted to us, nevertheless we would like to put on record that this approval is coupled with a reservation regarding the representation of China in the Conference. As you all are aware, the United Arab Republic recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only Government which, legally and in fact, represents China, and consequently is entitled to sign the Statute on behalf of the Chinese people. Therefore, so far as China is concerned, we cannot consider any other credentials as valid except those issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

"It is not my intention to debate this question or to adduce any arguments to this effect. The question is very well known, and we believe that if you put aside political considerations and base yourselves on the Statute and its purposes, and if you will bear in mind the lofty aims of the Agency, you will agree that it is indispensable for this Agency to have the Government of the People's Republic of China among its Members.

"It may, once again, be argued that the United Nations General Assembly has already taken a stand on this issue. I humbly submit that this is an old argument which has no value, especially if you take into consideration the various important developments which have very recently taken place. Among the most important, in our opinion, are the conclusions which the scientists from East and West recently reached in Geneva regarding the detection of explosions of atomic weapons. In our opinion - I hope you will all agree and realize this - these historic conclusions cannot be acted on unless

^{3/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 92(b) of the Rules of Procedure.

there is close co-operation with the Government of the People's Republic of China. Similarly, if this Agency is to have any role whatsoever, either in this connexion or in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, it must admit that the Government of the People's Republic of China represents 600 million people and that its territory occupies a major part of the globe.

"Not only that, but as you all know, because of this situation and because of the particular nature of this Agency, it is the first time to my knowledge that an international organization, whether a specialized agency or not, has failed to include China among the members of its main organ - I mean the Board of Governors. This very important fact proves beyond any doubt that this Agency is not similar to other agencies and therefore should see its way clear to seek the co-operation of the authorities on the mainland in China, if it wishes to reach its goal, as defined in Article II of the Statute, which provides that the Agency shall 'seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world'. Gentlemen, in my opinion international co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy is not only a boundless field, but also a matter of international concern to all peoples all over the world.

"Mr. President, the Statute, in our opinion, does not prevent any State or any nation from benefiting from the Agency. The Agency is international in character and was created to serve the human race and ameliorate its conditions. And this in itself could not, in our opinion, be achieved by ignoring 600 million people. For this reason, Mr. President, we hope that the time will come to realize this fact and give the Government of the People's Republic of China its rightful place."

22. Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia) made the following statement:^{4/}

"In view of the fact that the only legitimate Government of China is the Central People's Government of the People's Republic

^{4/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 92(b) of the Rules of Procedure.

of China, the Czechoslovak Government, in conformity with its previous statements made at the International Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency and at the First General Conference, does not recognize any signature for China appearing in the Statute in the name of China which is not the signature of a representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. For the same reasons, the Czechoslovak Government does not recognize any credentials issued on behalf of China which do not originate from the legitimate Government of China".

23. He expressed on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation deep regret that the People's Republic of China was still debarred from becoming a Member of the Agency and that that great country was therefore not represented at the Conference. It was well known that the so-called representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique did not in fact represent anybody and that their very presence at the Conference was possible only because of the protection given that clique by the armed forces of the United States of America. He was convinced that the time was not far distant when that clique would no longer be in a position even to claim that they represented China.

24. He added that he supported the proposal of the Soviet Union delegation asking that the part of the Committee's report dealing with the representation of China should be put to the vote separately.

25. Mr. PAL (Hungary) made the following statement^{5/}.

"The proposal contained in the report of the Credentials Committee that the question of the credentials of the delegate from the Hungarian People's Republic should remain in abeyance has filled me with profound indignation.

"By disputing, without any cause, the credentials of the representative of the legitimate Hungarian authorities, certain States, Members of the Agency, which for several years have been entertaining diplomatic relations with the Hungarian People's Republic, are tending to turn the Agency into an instrument for their political manoeuvres, which is in flagrant contradiction to the spirit and letter of the Statute.

^{5/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 92(b) of the Rules of Procedure.

"I must emphasize in the most formal manner possible that neither the Credentials Committee nor the General Conference, nor any international organization whatever, has the right to question the legitimacy of the government of any country. Allow me also to state in this connexion that in deciding to leave in abeyance the question of the credentials of the Hungarian delegation, the twelfth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations seriously violated the United Nations Charter.

"I consider it essential to recall that the representative of the legitimate Government of the Hungarian People's Republic took an active part, in New York, in the work of the Conference on the Statute. Now the Credentials Committee proposes that the question of the credentials of the delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic, which is a founder member of the Agency, should remain in abeyance.

"As delegate of the legitimate Government of the Hungarian People's Republic, supplied with full credentials, I protest against the proposal in question which on the one hand represents a discrimination against the Hungarian People's Republic and on the other poisons the atmosphere of the Conference.

"May I be allowed to express the hope that the General Conference will reject as being void of any foundation the proposal to leave in abeyance the question of the credentials of the Hungarian delegate."

26. He then turned to the question of the representation of China, and protested most vigorously on behalf of his delegation against acceptance of the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek authorities. The only lawful government of China was that of the Chinese People's Republic, with which an increasing number of countries maintained diplomatic relations. The Agency should decide without more ado either to recognize the representatives of the de facto and de jure government of 600 million people or to accept the credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek delegate; the latter course would involve the exclusion from the Agency's activities of one of the major world powers.

27. Under Article II of the Statute it was the Agency's task to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. The Agency could not fully discharge those duties if it excluded from its activities the Chinese People's Republic, without which it was impossible to reach decisions of truly international significance. The Chiang Kai-shek Government had the greatest difficulty in asserting its nominal authority over a small territory which formed an integral part of the Chinese People's Republic. The lawful Government of the Chinese People's Republic, on the other hand, supported by 600 million Chinese, was the de facto authority. Under its direction the Chinese people had already achieved, in the space of a few years, striking economic, cultural and scientific successes.

28. His delegation recognized the representatives of the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic as the sole representatives of China, and it would therefore vote against recognition of the credentials of the so-called Nationalist China.

29. Mr. McCONE (United States of America) said that the recommendation of the Credentials Committee that no decision be taken on the credentials submitted by the Hungarian delegation was in conformity with decisions taken by the United Nations General Assembly.

30. The United States could not accept the charges levelled against it by the Soviet Union delegate and regretted that questions irrelevant to the work of the Conference had been raised.

31. Two years previously the Republic of China had taken part in the Conference on the Statute of the Agency; it had signed and ratified the Statute and was a member of the Agency. Only the delegate of the Republic of China could represent China in the Agency as in other international organizations.

32. The Soviet request for a separate vote on the credentials of the Chinese delegation dealt with the very point which the Credentials Committee had already considered and on which it had put forward its recommendations in paragraphs 5 and 7 of its report. His delegation felt that the report itself and its recommendations should be voted on. If the Soviet proposal were to be put to the vote it would constitute a motion for division under

Rule 75 of the Rules of Procedure. His delegation was opposed to such a division and hoped that the Conference would adopt the Committee's report.

33. Mr. SOHN (Republic of Korea) said that the question of the representation of China had nothing to do with a conference mainly concerned with the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Moreover, the Agency had been set up under United Nations auspices and should abide by United Nations decisions, and a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 1 February 1951^{6/} had branded the People's Republic of China as an aggressor. The Korean delegation considered that China was properly represented at the Agency.

34. Mr. SEVCHENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that China's seat legitimately belonged to the delegate of the People's Republic of China and not to the delegate of the Chiang Kai-shek clique. It was inadmissible that a country representing one-quarter of the world's population should not be represented in an international organization such as the Agency; such a situation diminished the Agency's authority and the scope of its activities.

35. At the present time, no international problem could usefully be studied or settled without the People's Republic of China, which had immense resources and was making enormous progress economically, culturally and scientifically and which, contrary to the slanderous assertions against it, was proving its desire for peaceful co-existence in all its activities.

36. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic would therefore support the Soviet Union motion for a division and vote against the recognition of the alleged credentials of the Chiang Kai-shek delegate.

37. Mr. IEN (China) said that no new line of reasoning could be expected from the ruling circles of Communist imperialism. The Government of the Republic of China had on many occasions challenged the Peking puppet regime, the tool of the Kremlin, to hold free elections in China under the supervision of the United Nations, in order to ascertain whom and what party the Chinese people would support. The Government of the Republic of China would abide by such a verdict, but the Mao Tse-tung clique had refused to accept the challenge.

^{6/} Resolution 498(v).

38. It was regrettable that the Conference should waste time on political discussions and he formally moved the closure of the debate under Rule 60 of the Rules of Procedure.

39. Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia) said that he could not support the motion. If only for the sake of courtesy, the General Conference should give the floor to delegates who wanted to state their views. To propose such a motion was a trick by which the delegation making use of it hoped to suppress the truth. But nothing could prevent the truth from coming to light.

40. Another reason for not adopting the motion for closure was that some of the questions in the Committee's report, which had been submitted hastily, had still not been tackled.

41. He reserved the right to speak on the USSR motion.

The motion for closure was adopted by 33 votes to 14, with 6 abstentions.

42. Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia), referring to the USSR motion, said that it was normal and legitimate to request a separate vote on part of a report or proposal. As a rule, such a request was readily granted in all international organizations and was, moreover, a matter of elementary courtesy. It was regrettable not only that there was a departure from the usual practice at the present meeting but also that it was not even thought necessary to give any reasons.

43. He also pointed out the difficulty that would arise if the motion for a separate vote were rejected, many delegations would be obliged to oppose the report as a whole, which might throw doubt on the validity of the credentials of other delegations.

44. For all those reasons, and in the interests of the Agency itself, the motion should be carried.

45. Mr. McCONE (United States of America) said it was necessary to be quite clear on the issue before the Conference. The Soviet proposal constituted a request for division under Rule 75, to which his delegation had made objection. The Conference should now vote on the request and not on the substance of the issue of the representation of China. He had previously stated his delegation's opposition to the Soviet proposal for a

division of the report of the Credentials Committee and for a separate vote on the credentials of China. He considered that a vote should be taken on the report as a whole or on its recommendations as contained in paragraphs 5 and 7.

46. Mr. EMEL'YANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), after pointing out that the United States representative had failed to offer any argument in support of his objection to the motion, said that if it were rejected he would be forced to vote against the report as a whole.

47. The PRESIDENT said that, as the Conference was at present engaged only in considering the Credentials Committee's report, he must interpret the Soviet Union proposal as a motion to vote separately on that section of the Committee's report which dealt with the representation of China. He accordingly put that motion to the vote.

At the request of Mr. Inan (Turkey), the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania.

Against: Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vatican City, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium.

Abstentions: Ethiopia, Morocco, Portugal, Switzerland, Austria.

The motion was rejected by 35 votes to 19, with 5 abstentions.

48. Mr. BRAZ MIMOSO (Portugal) said that, consistently with his delegation's past attitude, he had abstained from voting in the belief that the Agency, which was first and foremost a technical body, should not be called upon to settle political problems which were the concern of the United Nations.

49. Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia), referring to the Credentials Committee's recommendation in paragraph 18, proposed an amendment to add at the end of the draft resolution the words "with the exception of the tenth name in the first column of the list contained in paragraph 13". Strictly speaking, of course, his delegation should abide by the provisions of Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure in submitting that amendment, and was ready to do so. However, he pointed out that that rule had not been complied with in the case of the recommendation itself.

50. In the United Nations every motion for a separate vote on the representation of China had been carried, and that had enabled delegations which had objections to the present representation of that country to support the report of the Credentials Committee as a whole. The United Nations considered that a regrettable precedent would be created if the report as a whole were not adopted unanimously, since that would cast doubt on the credentials of all the members of the General Assembly. In submitting its amendment, the Czechoslovak delegation was making a final effort to avoid such a precedent.

51. Mr. CARSTENS (Federal Republic of Germany) regarded the Czechoslovak amendment as unacceptable because, in a different form, it sought to secure a separate vote on part of the report - a procedure which the General Conference had just rejected by defeating the motion for division.

52. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) said he also considered the Czechoslovak draft amendment unacceptable, but for a different reason. The General Conference had adopted a motion for the closure of the debate in accordance with Rule 60 of the Rules of Procedure, and therefore no delegate was entitled to submit an amendment on the substance of the question.

53. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) agreed with the delegate of Canada. Acceptance of the Czechoslovak amendment would be contrary to Rule 66 of the

Rules of Procedure, for it would be equivalent to reconsidering a proposal without obtaining the requisite two-thirds majority. He therefore asked the President to declare the Czechoslovak amendment out of order.

54. The PRESIDENT remarked that the objection raised to the Czechoslovak amendment by the delegate of the German Federal Republic was well founded, although both technically and legally there were undoubtedly some differences between that amendment and the motion for division.

55. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) recalled that in the United Nations the practice of deliberative bodies examining any question was to hold a general discussion first and then consider proposals and amendments. He agreed with the delegate from the Union of South Africa that after closure of the general debate, delegations should abstain from making statements of a general nature. However, all had the right to give their opinions on proposals and amendments and, if necessary, to make new proposals on condition that no vote had been taken. The question whether the Czechoslovak amendment was acceptable in substance was an entirely different one and could be decided by the General Conference by vote.

56. Mr. McCONE (United States of America) considered that the Czechoslovak amendment was out of order. He asked the President to make a more precise ruling and to state whether he intended to put the Czechoslovak amendment to the vote.

57. The PRESIDENT said that he had no intention of putting the amendment to the vote.

58. Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia), replying to the objection raised by the delegate from Canada, observed that the Czechoslovak amendment could not have been put forward earlier, namely, before the result of the preceding vote had been known. If the motion for the division of vote had been accepted, it would not have been necessary to propose an amendment to the recommendation of the Committee. The Czechoslovak amendment could not therefore be out of order for the reason given by the delegate from Canada. No other reasons had been advanced against the acceptance of the Czechoslovak amendment. As it had always been the policy of the Czechoslovak delegation to support the President wholeheartedly it would respect whatever ruling he made.

59. The PRESIDENT noted that the Conference accepted his ruling and put to the vote the report of the Credentials Committee as a whole.

At the request of Mr. McCone (United States of America) the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vatican City, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, El Salvador.

Against: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Abstentions: Ethiopia, Morocco, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Burma, Ceylon.

The report of the Credentials Committee was adopted by 42 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.

60. Mr. EMELYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that the rejection of his delegation's motion for division had obliged him to vote against the adoption of the report. He had already had occasion to define his country's attitude to the representation of China and the credentials of the Chinese delegate.

61. Further, he could not accept paragraph 10 of the report in which, on a motion by the United States representative, an attempt had been made to cast doubt on the validity of the credentials of the Hungarian delegate. Such an

attitude did not contribute to the creation of the atmosphere necessary for the success of the Conference and was harmful to the Agency's work. It was a tactical move by the United States, forming part of that country's subversive activity against Hungary. There was no justification for paragraph 10, since the Hungarian delegate had been appointed by the legal Government of the Hungarian People's Republic. Hungary could contribute much to the development of the Agency's activities, and it had sent an eminent scientist to take its legitimate place at the Conference.

62. Mr. ZHMUDSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he had voted against the adoption of the report, because he could not accept the validity of the credentials presented by the Chiang Kai-shek group. China's place at the Conference should only be occupied by a delegate appointed by the Central Government of the Chinese People's Republic. The attitude adopted by the United States was depriving the Agency of the co-operation and assistance of eminent Chinese scientists. The statement by the so-called delegate of China and the insinuations he had made showed that it was Chiang Kai-shek's followers who were poisoning the atmosphere of international relations.

63. Mr. MELLER-CONRAD (Poland) regretted that the Conference had rejected the proposal for a separate vote; that had prevented him from voting for the adoption of the report. It was clear that the Kuomintang group wanted a third world war, while the Chinese People's Republic had demonstrated that it was a peace-loving country. Moreover, it had made immense progress in atomic science during the last ten years.

64. Mr. RAJAN (India) said that he had been instructed to make a brief statement on his country's attitude to the credentials of the Chinese delegate and to vote in favour of the adoption of the report. The motion for closure of the discussion had prevented him from making that statement. The rejection of the proposal for a separate vote had made it impossible for him to express his views in any other manner, and he had thus had no alternative but to vote against the adoption of the report. His vote did not in any way mean that he wished to cast doubt on the validity of the credentials of other delegates.

65. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that he had intended to vote in favour of the report, with the reservation he had made when he had first

spoken, but he had been obliged to abstain from voting for reasons similar to those given by the Indian delegate and in particular because the Conference had not agreed to separate voting.

66. Mr. NAKICENOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that he had abstained from voting, because the representation of China had been dealt with in an unsatisfactory manner in the report of the Credentials Committee. His delegation believed that the Government of the People's Republic of China was the only one entitled to represent China.

67. His Government had always been of that opinion, regardless of the attitude adopted by the People's Republic of China towards the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, because it believed that the principle of universality should prevail in international organizations.

68. Finally, his delegation did not believe that such discussions contributed to the success of the Agency's work^{7/}.

69. Mr. NICUTZA (Romania) said that he had voted against the adoption of the report, because he had not been able to cast separate votes on the representation of China and Hungary. His delegation considered that the only person entitled to represent China was the delegate of the Chinese People's Republic. Furthermore, it was inadmissible that doubt should be cast on the validity of the credentials of the Hungarian delegate, who was his country's legitimate representative.

DETERMINATION OF THE CLOSING DATE FOR THE SESSION

70. The PRESIDENT announced that the General Committee had provisionally fixed Saturday 4 October as the closing date. It was too soon, however, to regard that as a firm date.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

^{7/} This summary of a statement which was not delivered at the meeting, is inserted in the record by direction of the President.

