



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC (XXV) /OR.237

May 1982*

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

TWENTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION: 21-27 SEPTEMBER 1981

RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Saturday, 26 September 1981, at 4.20 p.m.

President: Mr. XUTO (Thailand)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
8	Military attack on Iraqi nuclear research centre and its implications for the Agency (resumed)	1 - 76
18	Appointment of the External Auditor	77 - 79
19	Elections to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	80 - 81
5	Arrangements for the Conference	
	(b) Closing date of the Session and opening date of the next session	82 - 83
16	Election of Members to the Board of Governors	84 - 87
-	Report by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the following items:	88 - 104
	The Agency's accounts for 1980	
	The Agency's budget for 1982	
	Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1982	
	The financing of technical assistance	
	Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute	
	Amendment of Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference	
20	Report on voluntary contributions pledged to the Technical Assistance Fund for 1982	105 - 106
16	Election of Members to the Board of Governors (resumed)	107 - 123
17	Appointment of the Director General	124 - 148
-	Closing of the session	149 - 158

*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 12 October 1981.

**/ GC (XXV) /652.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC (XXV) /INF/201/Rev.2.

MILITARY ATTACK ON IRAQI NUCLEAR RESEARCH CENTRE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE AGENCY (GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2, 653/Rev.2/Corr.1, 654/Rev.1) (resumed)

1. The PRESIDENT said that lengthy consultations had been held and he wished to thank all those who had assisted in trying to find an agreed solution. Two draft resolutions had been submitted (documents GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2, as modified by GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2/Corr.1, and GC (XXV) /654/Rev.1). He understood that the Conference wished to proceed first to a vote on the draft resolution contained in GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2.

2. It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT said that before the vote was taken he would give the floor to the delegations of Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic.

4. Mr. EILAM (Israel) said his delegation rejected the draft resolution contained in document GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2 since it represented an attempt to drag the Conference into a political debate and threatened an illegal action against a Member State. The language and spirit of Article XIX of the Statute were clear: the violations referred to were non-compliance with inspection procedures (Article XII.C) or arrears of more than two years in the payment of membership dues. Israel had an immaculate record on those points. Attempts to introduce politics would erode the authority of the Agency and hamper it in the performance of its duties. It was anyway clear that acceptance of safeguards could not be a condition of Agency membership.

5. Israel had shared its experience in the peaceful uses of atomic energy with other developing countries and had extended its help to them. On various occasions it had declared itself ready to expand those activities. The suspension of technical assistance to Israel by the Agency would be contrary to the provisions of Article III.A.1. Also, such a decision would erode the principle of universality, which was fundamental to the Agency's existence.

6. Israel had been trying to promote the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and had called on other States to join in creating such a zone. That initiative would be harmed if the General Conference adopted the draft resolution under discussion.

7. He requested all delegates to bear those points in mind when they voted.

8. Mr. KHAYAT (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution in document GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2 was the weakest imaginable response to the Israeli act of aggression against Iraq and the international community. Many Member States considered that any delay in the suspension of Israel from the rights of membership would in fact represent a suspension of the safeguards system and of the Agency's rules.

9. Israel had in effect already excluded itself from the community of peaceful users of atomic energy. Any disregard of the military attack would tend to encourage future acts of war by Israel.

10. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with what had been agreed, he would now ask the Conference to vote on the draft resolution contained in document GC (XXV) /653/Rev.2.

11. At the request of Mr. Al-Kital (Iraq), a roll-call vote was taken.

12. Sri Lanka, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

13. The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, 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, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Israel, Paraguay, United States of America, Uruguay

Abstaining: Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

14. There were 51 votes in favour and 8 against, with 27 abstentions. The draft resolution was adopted.

15. Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) said he wished to express his appreciation of the way delegations had dealt with the Board's recommendation on the subject of the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear research centre. Statements made in the course of the general debate had shown that the majority of Members took a very serious view of the Israeli action. Many had demanded that Israel be expelled or at least suspended. It was regrettable that such a step had been obstructed by certain States, who had tried to use the principle of universality as an argument to keep Israel in the Agency. Their move would be considered by the Arab world as a biased and political act, which could damage international co-operation.

16. The Iraqi Government was not satisfied with the action that had so far been taken and reserved the right to pursue the matter further.

17. Mr. DEPRSCH BARTSCH (Chile) said it was common knowledge that his country had traditionally defended the right of States to participate as members of international organizations. It opposed any form of suspension from the Agency as being inconsistent with the Statute. The resolution that had been adopted implied that Israel could be suspended for not submitting to safeguards. However, acceptance of safeguards could not be a prerequisite for membership of the Agency.

18. Chile had condemned the Israeli attack at the June meetings of the Board, but believed the necessary actions had already been taken by the competent international bodies. It was now deeply concerned about the increasing politicization of the Agency, which was clearly a technical organization; that trend hampered the work of the Agency and led only to sterile confrontation.

19. Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela), before beginning his statement, protested because his country had not been inscribed in the speakers' list, although a request for inscription had been made in good time and repeatedly.

20. In his statement he said that Venezuela had condemned, through various channels and in different fora, the Israeli attack on a peaceful nuclear facility in Iraq as a violation of the principles and standards of international law and an assault against the Agency's safeguards system.

21. Venezuela had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/653/Rev.2, but had reservations concerning operative paragraph 3 as it prejudged the future action of the General Conference. Venezuela had doubts about the competence of the General Conference to apply, with a political aim, a measure like that expressed in operative paragraph 3. The Security Council, or - failing that - the General Assembly, was the competent organ for applying sanctions against a country that had committed aggression.

22. Reiterating Venezuela's confidence in the Agency, he said his country would have difficulties in supporting a recommendation along the lines foreseen in operative paragraph 3 as it would be contrary to the principle of the universality of international organizations.

23. Speaking on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) said that those States strongly condemned Israel for its premediated and unjustified attack on the Iraqi nuclear research centre. Nevertheless, they saw a serious practical difficulty with the procedure proposed in the draft resolution. Operative paragraph 3 implied that if Israel failed to implement Security Council resolution 487, which called upon it to place all its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards, the General Conference could at its next session consider suspending Israel from the rights and privileges of membership. However, Article XIX.B, which dealt with the suspension of rights and privileges, could be invoked only if there had been persistent violation of the Statute or of any agreement entered into in pursuance of it. The Statute did not require the application of safeguards to all the nuclear facilities in a country, so it would not be violated if Israel failed to implement the Security Council resolution. It was not the job of the Agency, whose tasks were not political, to attempt to enforce resolutions of the Security Council, which was the senior political body of the United Nations family.

24. The draft resolution submitted by Member States of the European Community (GC(XXV)/654/Rev.1) had proposed a solemn warning that any further Israeli action would have most serious consequences for the position of that country in the Agency and had called upon Israel to refrain from any action inconsistent with the Agency's objectives. It had also contained a request to the Board of Governors not to consider the provision of any further technical assistance to Israel for the time being and to undertake an urgent examination of ways of increasing the provision of technical assistance to Iraq. Finally, it had reaffirmed confidence in the effectiveness of the Agency's safeguards system.

25. However much the Israeli action deserved condemnation, the principle of universality of participation in organizations of the United Nations family, upon which their effective working so much depended should not be breached.

26. Mr. BARREDA DELGADO (Peru) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution. However, it wished to express reservations with regard to operative paragraph 3, as it opposed extreme measures with a political content which lay outside the technical terms of reference of the Agency and affected the principle of universality. In addition, if Israel was suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership, there would be no means of making that country submit its nuclear facilities to Agency safeguards.

27. Mr. EILAM (Israel) said that the decision adopted by the General Conference was an arbitrary and discriminatory act carried out for political reasons. The military operation of 7 June 1981 could not possibly justify that decision, which was incompatible with the Statute of the Agency.

28. By adopting the resolution, the Conference had helped to convert the Agency into an instrument of political warfare and had endangered the Agency's authority, which it owed to its reputation as a responsible and autonomous body. The Agency had regrettably now joined other United Nations agencies whose efficiency had been greatly impaired by their involvement in politics.

29. The decision was discriminatory because Israel had been singled out for special attention. The fact that there were other Member States which did not comply with, nor had any intention of complying with, the basic requirements of the Agency's Statute or their obligations under international agreements had been completely disregarded.

30. For its part, Israel had recently taken a number of initiatives towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East which was to be freely negotiated and modelled on the Tlatelolco Treaty. That was a promising way of eliminating further threats in the region. The decision by the Conference had been distinctly unhelpful to that cause.

31. Israel rejected the condemnation of the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear reactor. The decision to destroy the reactor had been taken only when it had become absolutely certain that Iraq was on the verge of producing nuclear bombs, the principal target of which would have been Israel.

32. Mr. YAMATO (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. It would have voted against the original draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/653 if that had been put to a vote, and it acknowledged the improvements made in the revised draft. Despite those improvements, however, a number of difficulties had remained.

33. First, as the Agency was highly technical in nature, the principle of the universality of its membership must be carefully safeguarded. Any encroachment on that principle should be avoided as far as possible. Secondly, there was some legal doubt as to whether suspension could be enforced in the present case under Article XIX.B of the Statute, as that required persistent violations of the provisions of the Statute before action could be taken.

34. In addition, his delegation believed that acceptance of safeguards, however desirable, was a separate issue unrelated to that of suspension. The linking of the two issues - suspension and acceptance of safeguards - was therefore irrelevant.

35. His delegation strongly condemned the Israeli attack, which was a grave challenge to the Agency's safeguards system. Japan's abstention in the vote did not imply any weakening of its sense of outrage at, or codemnation of, the Israeli attack.

36. Mr. do NASCIMENTO e SILVA (Brazil) said that his Government had on several occasions joined the international community in condemning the Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear installations as a totally unjustifiable act of aggression.

37. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the resolution just adopted for several reasons. Traditionally, Brazil was not in favour of the expulsion or the suspension of Member States from United Nations bodies. In addition, his delegation had specific doubts regarding the effectiveness of the expulsion or suspension of a Member State from an organization such as the Agency, which had an important role to play in safeguarding the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

38. The references to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in the text of the resolution constituted a further reason for Brazil's abstention. It was widely known that Brazil maintained a firm position on the Treaty because of its discriminatory nature.

39. Finally, the concept of the inalienable right of all States to develop fully nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, a concept which his Government supported, was connected in the resolution with the vague concept of "internationally accepted safeguards".

40. In conclusion, his delegation wished to reiterate its firm belief in the effectiveness of the Agency's safeguards system.

41. Mr. DALAL (India) recalled his country's clear and unequivocal condemnation of the unjustified military attack by Israel on the Iraqi nuclear research centre. That attack had threatened the maintenance of international peace and security in clear violation of the United Nations Charter. It was also an act of aggression by one Member of the Agency against another and had therefore merited punitive action by the current session of the General Conference. Following the Board's recommendation for certain action to be taken by the Conference, India had supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/653/Rev.2.

42. His delegation also wished to reiterate its consistent position on certain issues raised during the discussion of the question and mentioned in the resolution. References to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to full-scope and other safeguards were irrelevant and only served to divert attention away from Israel's unprovoked aggression. Even if Iraq had not been a party to NPT and had not accepted safeguards at all, the attack would have been equally reprehensible. His delegation's vote in favour of the resolution should not be taken to imply any change in its position on issues such as NPT, full-scope safeguards and the criteria relevant for suspension of membership in the Agency.

43. In his view, the grounds for the suspension of Israel's membership were its repeated disregard and grave violations of the basic provisions of the Statute, in law and in spirit; they were not conditional upon any factors external to the Agency.

44. Mr. ALHOLM (Finland) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it objected to paragraph 3 of the resolution, which contained the concept of suspending a Member State from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership. Apart from anything else, it was questionable whether suspension was the best method of achieving the desired goal. His delegation could, however, accept in principle other parts of the resolution.

45. Finland's views on the Israeli attack had been expressed on several occasions. It supported resolution 487 of the United Nations Security Council as well as the resolution adopted by the Board of Governors on 12 June 1981. The attack represented a new form of international violence; it had been carried out against a State party to NPT, and on a facility under Agency safeguards. It must not be repeated.

46. Mr. KROI (Albania) said that his delegation had abstained because it could not condone the deferment of the issue to the next session of the General Conference. Israel's acts had been committed and ought to be condemned immediately. His Government deplored the attack and wished to express its solidarity with the Arab peoples.

47. Mr. PULIT (Argentina) said his Government condemned the Israeli attack, which violated the principles of international law. It constituted a dangerous precedent as well as an attack on the Agency's role in safeguarding the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. His delegation had supported the resolution for those reasons, but it also had certain reservations. The reference to NPT was neither a positive part of, nor an additional reason for, the condemnation of Israel. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, to which his country was not a party, was not part of the Agency's Statute nor could it in any way be considered to be complementary to it.

48. Similarly, his delegation had strong reservations concerning paragraph 3 of the resolution. Argentina had always maintained that no Member State should be excluded from an international forum since such action had consequences which were contrary to the objectives of the international organizations. The suspension of Israel would be counterproductive and would further weaken the influence or control which the international community was able to exercise.

49. Mr. PECCTI (Paraguay) said that, as a technical and scientific organization, the Agency should avoid involvement in politics and concentrate on activities such as manpower training and monitoring compliance with safety standards and safeguards, which should be applied in all Member States without exception. His country supported the principle of the universality of international organizations and the inalienable right of all Member States to participate in all those activities which concerned them. The purpose of developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes was the well-being of Member States. For those reasons, Paraguay could not support any measure which was aimed at suspending the basic rights of, or expelling, any Member of the Agency, particularly as there was no basis for such action in the Statute. It had therefore voted against the resolution. His country's political stand on the question had been made clear in the United Nations.

50. Mr. MEYER (Uruguay), explaining his country's vote on the resolution, said that the matter had already been discussed in the appropriate forum of the United Nations and, because of its political nature, was outside the scope of the Agency. Uruguay had always defended peace and scientific progress: it condemned aggression, supported the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of countries and maintained that any act which represented a threat to world peace should be dealt with in the United Nations.

51. Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) said that his Government had voted against the resolution because it opposed operative paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 of it. It could not support the view that the Israeli action constituted an attack on the Agency and its safeguards regime or that it had caused damage to that regime. His Government disagreed with those

international observers who had concluded that the international safeguards system was ineffective. It had confidence in that system, believing that, although not perfect, it would continue to be improved to take into account recent technological developments.

52. The United States opposed suspension of technical assistance to Israel on the grounds that such a sanction was contrary to the Statute. As a Member of the Agency, Israel was entitled to participate in the Agency's technical assistance programme. Technically sound proposals and available resources, not political considerations, had been and should continue to be the criteria used by the Agency under that programme.

53. His delegation most vigorously opposed paragraph 3 of the resolution; which requested the General Conference to consider at its next session the suspension of Israel's privileges and rights of membership if by that time it had not complied with United Nations Security Council resolution 487. Given the recommendation of the Board of Governors in June, it could only be assumed that the resolution's sponsors had decided to defer the matter for another year because they realized that a significant number of Member States would not support suspension. Such a delay would only prolong that divisive issue and continue to distract the Agency from its regular duties. It was another example of the Agency, a technical body, being turned into a forum for debating political issues. That pattern of abusing the United Nations system to carry on political vendettas was corrosively dangerous. The politicization of specialized international organizations such as the Agency must cease.

54. His Government believed that the suspension of Israel's membership would be harmful to the objectives of the Agency and to peace and security in the Middle East. It found no legal basis for such suspension. Article XIX.B of the Statute specifically dealt with that question. First, the Article stated that a Member could only be suspended when it "... has persistently violated the provisions of this Statute or of any agreement entered into by it pursuant to this Statute" Although Security Council resolution 487 (1981) condemned Israel's raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor, the Israeli action did not violate any specific provision of the Agency's Statute or any agreement

entered into by Israel pursuant to the Statute. The attack therefore did not constitute proper grounds for a resolution of suspension under Article XIX.B. Secondly, even if the Israeli attack could be deemed a violation of the Agency's Statute, it could not be construed as the kind of "persistent" violation required for suspension. The adjective "persistent" obviously indicated a course of conduct occurring over an extended period of time and involving repeated separate incidents. Further, it also involved the notion of wilful continuation of disregard for opposition or warnings. The Conference was concerned in the present case merely with a single act which clearly did not involve a course of conduct which would justify the application of Article XIX.B.

55. Suspension of Israel from the exercise of the privileges and rights of Agency membership would also be inconsistent with Security Council resolution 487. First, the resolution contained no recommendation that Israel's privileges or rights of membership in the Agency be withdrawn. It did, however, contain a specific provision calling upon Israel "urgently to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards". The latter provision recognized that it was in the interest of the community of States to encourage Israel's maximum participation in the safeguards activities of the Agency. Suspension would thus run counter to the considered judgement of the United Nations organ specifically entrusted with responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, a responsibility recognized by the Agency in Article 1(3) of its relationship agreement with the United Nations^{1/}. It would be improper and inappropriate, therefore, for the Agency to attempt to enforce a decision made by another United Nations body.

56. Acceptance of safeguards was not a condition of membership in the Agency nor was non-acceptance grounds for suspension under the Statute. Several Agency Members did not accept safeguards on all their nuclear facilities.

^{1/} Contained in document INF/CIRC/11.

57. Those supporting the resolution were now maintaining that the primary legal basis for suspension was Article IV.B. That Article, however, quite clearly applied only to the consideration of new Members. Even if that criterion were accepted, it could not be concluded that the Israeli action constituted grounds for suspension. Military action across national boundaries involving Members of the United Nations had occurred in every continent since the foundation of that organization, but no nation had yet been suspended for failure to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

58. The meaning of the resolution just adopted should be made quite clear. The proposal to consider the matter a year hence in no way prejudged the outcome of that consideration. It did not constitute a recommendation by the General Conference at its present session for suspension. In addition to his delegation's objections to the resolution on legal grounds, it believed that it was not in the interests of the international community to deprive Israel of the rights of membership, in the one agency designed to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the broad extension of international safeguards. His Government had urged and would continue to urge Israel to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to accept Agency safeguards on all its nuclear facilities and to work towards a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Any hope of progress in those endeavours would be severely damaged by Israel's suspension from the exercise of the privileges and rights of Agency membership.

59. His Government had immediately condemned the Israeli air strike and had joined others in the Security Council in the adoption of resolution 487. Such acts of violence undermined the stability and well-being of the Middle East. The problem of recurring violence in that troubled region was a political one; the solution lay outside the mandate of the Agency and was, in fact, being tackled in other fora.

60. In conclusion, he wished to make clear his country's grave concern over the proposal to suspend Israel. The suspension of Israel from any United Nations body could have serious consequences for the continued participation of the United States and would jeopardize its continued support.

61. Mr. ESKANGI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) stated that his delegation reserved the right to appeal to the General Conference to take stronger measures against Israel in order to ensure respect for NPT and safeguards agreements. If the General Conference failed to take the appropriate action, the Agency and its safeguards system would be placed in great danger.

62. Mr. MUSSI (Austria) recalled that his country had condemned the Israeli attack as a serious violation of the United Nations Charter and as a breach of the norms of international law which might impair the effectiveness and credibility of the Agency. His delegation would have welcomed a resolution which exhausted all the legal possibilities for sanctions against Israel. It was to be hoped that efforts could be made before the twenty-sixth regular session of the General Conference to find a resolution which constituted an appropriate response to the Israeli action and which took due account of the legal position. With the exception of operative paragraph 3, the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/653/Rev.2 would have been acceptable to his delegation.

63. Mr. CAIRO (Guatemala) declared that his country was opposed, as a matter of principle, to depriving a Member State of its rights. However, that statement should not be taken to mean that Guatemala condoned the Israeli attack nor that it was against operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the resolution.

64. Mr. MANZ (Switzerland) explained that his country was consistently opposed to the suspension of the rights and privileges of any Member State of any universally oriented international organization if the statutory conditions governing that suspension were not satisfied. According to the Statute, the right to be a Member State of the Agency was not subject to the acceptance of safeguards, and it was therefore not possible to consider suspending a Member State not satisfying that condition.

65. Nevertheless, his Government strongly condemned the use of force in relations between States. Respect for international public law was an essential requirement for proper international co-operation. His delegation

therefore condemned the Israeli attack, deploring it all the more since - inter alia - it had caused serious harm to the Agency's safeguards system, to which his country attached the greatest importance. Switzerland had always been a defender of the principle that attacks, even in the event of armed conflict, should not be launched against facilities containing substances which could be dangerous to the civilian population, such as a nuclear power plant. That principle had been enshrined in Article 56 of the Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 concerning the protection of victims of international armed conflicts.

66. Mr. CALISTO VARELA (Ecuador) recalled that his country had voted in favour of Security Council resolution 487 (1981) condemning the Israeli act of aggression, which had also been publicly censured by the President of the Republic of Ecuador. His country was a firm supporter of the principle that the use of force was proscribed by the international community.

67. His delegation had, however, reservations regarding operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution, which went beyond the Agency's competence in calling upon it to judge political acts. Moreover, operative paragraph 3 prejudged the line to be adopted at the twenty-sixth regular session of the General Conference and could jeopardize the functioning of the Agency through the suspension or exclusion, albeit temporary, of one or more of its Member States.

68. Mr. THAM (Sweden) observed that his country had strongly condemned the Israeli attack as a flagrant violation of international law which could under no circumstances be justified. Israel had sought to apply Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which permitted the exercise of self-defence in the event of an armed attack until such time as the Security Council had taken the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security. The construction of a nuclear research reactor could certainly not be viewed as a threatened or imminent armed attack. The Israeli interpretation of Article 51 implied that the concept of legitimate self-defence could be extended almost limitlessly to cover all conceivable dangers. World peace would, indeed, be in jeopardy if other nations adopted that argument. The Israeli attack could

seriously undermine respect for the safeguards system. Sweden could not support operative paragraph 3 of the resolution since suspension would not be in accordance with the Statute. His delegation did support, however, the other operative paragraphs and fully endorsed the Security Council's call upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards.

69. Mr. SUAREZ de PUGA (Spain) recalled that his country had unreservedly condemned the Israeli attack in the Security Council. Although supporting the resolution, his Government still maintained that every State should be free to decide whether or not to accede to NPT. Furthermore, his delegation could not support preambular paragraph (h) of the resolution.

70. Mr. SYVERTSEN (Norway) stated that his country and Iceland strongly condemned the Israeli raid, which constituted a serious threat to the safeguards system - the foundation of NPT. Being confirmed supporters of the principle of universality, however, both Norway and Iceland regarded the call for the suspension of Israel as unjustified. Furthermore, such action would not be in accordance with the Statute.

71. Mr. OTALORA (Colombia) explained that his country pursued a traditional policy of non-interference in the affairs of other countries. Colombia had severely condemned the Israeli raid in the United Nations at the appropriate time. The Agency was a purely technical organization which was not competent to deal with political matters.

72. Mr. KOREF (Panama) declared that his delegation had supported the resolution because consideration of the suspension of Israel had been postponed until the twenty-sixth regular session of the General Conference. Such suspension could be justified only in the event of great danger. His delegation had also supported the resolution because it was consistent with the relevant resolutions adopted by the Board of Governors and the Security Council of the United Nations.

73. Mr. PARIS-STEFFENS (Costa Rica) said that his country vigorously condemned any wilful act of aggression by one country against another. It therefore condemned the Israeli raid as well as all other acts of aggression that had punctuated the short history of the United Nations. His delegation had, however, very serious reservations regarding operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution. The legality of operative paragraph 3 was dubious since it represented an attempt to force the acceptance of safeguards upon a Member State and especially since it was not envisaged to take similar action against all other Member States whose facilities were not subject to safeguards.

74. Mr. AMPUERO ANGULO (Bolivia) recalled that his delegation had already censured Israel for its attack. He had voted against the resolution because the Agency was not the place to apply sanctions based on political motives. Since consideration of the suspension of Israel's privileges had been postponed for one year, much of the Agency's time would be taken up with that matter. The General Conference should confine itself to encouraging Israel to comply with the terms of resolution 487 (1981) adopted by the Security Council, which was the body empowered to deal with political problems between States. His delegation renewed its appeal for respect for the right of countries to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and for non-interference in their internal affairs.

75. Mr. COPITHORNE (Canada), speaking also on behalf of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, said that they would have been prepared to support a resolution again condemning the attack in strong and forthright terms. However, the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/653/Rev.2 touched upon the question of universality in international organizations, and operative paragraph 3 was prejudicial in that regard.

76. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) observed that the suspension of privileges was intended to be applied under the conditions described in Article XIX of the Statute. Universality had no place if those conditions existed. In accordance with Article II of the Statute, Iraq was seeking to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity by constructing nuclear facilities. The attack by Israel on those

facilities constituted a violation of Article II. The threat by the Prime Minister of Israel to destroy any other Arab nuclear facilities constituted a persistent violation of the Statute, as defined in Article XIX.B.

APPOINTMENT OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR

77. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that the Agency's External Auditor had originally been appointed to audit the Agency's accounts for 1976-77 and had since been reappointed for two further periods. Under Financial Regulation 12.01^{2/} the External Auditor was to be appointed from among the Auditors General of Member States, and it was customary for the President to put before the Conference a specific proposal for such an appointment. In the light of the consultations which had been held, he accordingly proposed that the Comptroller and Auditor General of Kenya be appointed to audit the Agency's accounts for 1982-83.

78. The President's proposal was accepted.

79. The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Conference would wish him to convey its gratitude to the Netherlands Government, which had placed the services of its Auditor General at the Agency's disposal since 1976. During that period the Conference had had a number of opportunities to express its great appreciation of the excellent work done by the Auditor General and his staff.

^{2/} INF/CIRC/8/Rev.1.

ELECTIONS TO THE AGENCY'S STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE

80. The PRESIDENT recalled that the General Conference was at present represented on the Staff Pension Committee by two members - Mr. Scheller (Federal Republic of Germany) and Miss Castaño (Philippines) - and by Mr. Rybka (Hungary) and Mr. Alvarez Vita (Peru) as alternates. Since three of them were no longer able to serve on the Committee, he proposed that the General Conference elect Mr. Aman (Indonesia) and Mr. Hofland (Netherlands) as members and Mr. Ugalde Bilbao (Chile) and Mr. Rybka (Hungary) as alternates.

81. Mr. Aman (Indonesia) and Mr. Hofland (Netherlands) were elected as members of the Agency's Staff Pension Committee and Mr. Ugalde Bilbao (Chile) and Mr. Rybka (Hungary) as alternates.

The meeting was suspended at 6.25 p.m. and resumed at 10.40 p.m.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONFERENCE

(b) CLOSING DATE OF THE SESSION

82. The PRESIDENT recalled that, under Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure, the Conference had to fix a closing date for the session, on the recommendation of the General Committee. The General Committee had considered the matter and had authorized him to recommend on its behalf that Saturday, 26 September be fixed as the closing date of the twenty-fifth regular session.^{3/}

83. The recommendation of the General Committee was accepted.

^{3/} The Conference in fact ended at 1.20 a.m. on Sunday, 27 September.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXV)/644, 657)

84. The PRESIDENT reminded the Conference that 11 Members had to be elected to the Board from the geographical areas specified in paragraph 2 of document GC(XXV)/657 to ensure that the Board would be constituted in accordance with Article VI.A of the Statute.

85. At the invitation of the President, a member of the Ecuadorian delegation and a member of the United Kingdom delegation acted as tellers.

86. A vote was taken by secret ballot to elect 11 Members of the Board of Governors.

87. The PRESIDENT said that the counting of votes would take some time and therefore suggested that the remaining business under item 16 be deferred until the tellers had reported to him.

REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

88. Mr. DALAL (India), Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, presented the Committee's report on items 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the agenda, which had been referred to it by the General Conference for examination.

89. The Committee recommended that the General Conference adopt the following draft resolutions:

- The draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXV)/645 (item 9 - The Agency's accounts for 1980);
- The three draft resolutions set out in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 and the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/659 (item 10 - The Agency's budget for 1982);
- The draft resolution set forth in document GC(XXV)/647 (item 11 - Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1982);

S. Laffing

- The draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/660 (item 12 - The financing of technical assistance);
- The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/661 (item 13 - Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute); and
- The draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/650 (item 14 - Amendment of Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference).

90. The PRESIDENT thanked the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole and suggested that the draft resolutions and proposals relating to the items of the agenda that had been referred to the Committee could now be considered by the General Conference with a view of their adoption.

91. It was so agreed.

The Agency's accounts for 1980

92. The draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXV)/645 was adopted.

The Agency's budget for 1982

93. The three draft resolutions contained in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646 and the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/659 were adopted.

Scale of assessment of Members' contributions for 1982

94. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/647 was adopted.

The financing of technical assistance

95. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/660 was adopted.

96. Mr. DAVIS (United States of America) made the following statement^{4/}:

(1) "First, I should like to discuss the resolution adopted under agenda item 10.

(2) "In accepting this resolution, my Government as well as other Governments understands that operative paragraph one applies to Professional personal and is not intended to mean that existing IAEA personnel should be dismissed or in any way deprived to their rights as staff members, and further, that any increases in staff members drawn from developing areas would occur only by filling available and authorized vacancies on the IAEA staff.

(3) "In addition, with respect to preambular paragraph (e) of this resolution, my Government wishes to point out our understanding that UN resolutions 35/210 and 33/143 refer only to the United Nations Secretariat, and not to the whole UN system. Further, UN resolutions concerning staffing generally avoid dividing the composition of the Secretariat into two camps, that is developed and developing countries. Instead, they generally refer to the need for increased appointment of nationals of under-represented Member States. Accordingly, we would hope that this resolution will not have an undesirable polarizing effect on this Agency.

(4) "I should now like to turn to the resolution adopted under agenda item 12.

(5) "In accepting this resolution, the United States has again registered its support of the Agency's technical assistance programme. We were able to join the consensus in support of this text on the basis of a clear common understanding that it in no way prejudices the ways one can assure that technical assistance is supported on a predictable basis.

(6) "I wish to emphasize that my Government is unable to agree to provide for the financing of technical assistance from the regular budgets of international organizations or commit itself in advance to increase its voluntary contributions to the IAEA. Future contributions obviously must be governed by our budgetary and appropriation process. We understand other important donor countries are in the same position. The United States has given very generously to this organization for more than 20 years and we hope to be able to continue to do so. But my Government

^{4/} This statement is reproduced verbatim at the speaker's request under Rule 89(b) of the Conference's Rules of Procedure.

cannot accept any arrangement which is not in accord with our established policy and Congressional appropriations process. Accordingly, our acceptance of this resolution, particularly operative paragraph one, must be read in this light.

(7) "The present arrangement in which an understanding was reached on indicative planning figures for the target for the Technical Assistance Fund for a three-year period appears to be working well. And, while there is no commitment to provide contributions to the Technical Assistance Fund, there is no evidence to suggest that Member States are not willing to provide stable and predictable technical assistance financing, voluntarily and in good faith."

97. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of the Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Hungarian, German Democratic Republic, Polish, Ukrainian and Czechoslovak delegations, said that the fact that those delegations had not opposed the resolutions which had just been approved did not indicate any change in the positions they had adopted up till then. They would continue to maintain those positions at future meetings of the Board of Governors.

98. He wished to make some specific comments on the resolution concerning the financing of technical assistance contained in document GC(XXV)/660. His delegation fully supported the Agency's activities in the field of technical assistance and felt that technical assistance to the Agency's developing Member States should be increased. It understood the importance which the developing countries attached to increasing technical assistance and to its provision through predictable and assured resources; that was necessary for sound planning of the development of peaceful nuclear activities in those countries and was reflected in the resolution adopted. The East European countries had consistently increased the size of their contributions each year and, as could be seen from document GC(XXV)/651/Rev.5, had in most cases exceeded the figure recommended for them for 1982. In so doing, they had kept to the accepted practice in the Agency of providing that assistance in national currency. The arrangement whereby the donor State determined the currency in which its contribution was made stemmed from the voluntary principle of technical assistance and complied fully with the Agency's Statute. On that basis his country had already agreed to the establishment of indicative planning figures for the years 1981-83.

99. It should also be pointed out that the resolution adopted represented a compromise. In particular, it contained a proposal to request the Board of Governors to take the necessary measures so that technical assistance was funded either through the Regular Budget or through comparably predictable and assured resources.

100. He had been instructed to say that, when the Board considered the matter, his delegation would oppose the transfer of the Agency's Technical Assistance Fund from a voluntary to a compulsory basis with funding supplied through the Regular Budget. Such a step would be contradictory to the Agency's Statute. The resolution adopted mentioned another method of financing technical assistance, namely on a voluntary basis. His delegation fully supported that approach and was confident that it would provide the broadest foundation for increasing technical assistance in a predictable and assured way.

101. Mr. DE PEYSTER (France) explained that his delegation's support for the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/660 should in no way be seen as prejudging its position on that matter in the future. In any event, the adoption of that resolution could not mean any alteration of the Statute, which did not provide for the funding of technical assistance through the Regular Budget.

Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute

102. The draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/661 was adopted.

103. Mr. RIOSALIDO (Spain) explained that, in a spirit of co-operation, his delegation had not objected to the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/661 on the understanding that the study by the Board would take full account of the records of the discussions on that subject in the Committee of the Whole, so that the study would cover the amendment of Article VI as a whole.

Amendment of Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference
GC(XXV)/650, 650/Corr.1 and 2)

104. The draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/650 was adopted.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED TO THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUND FOR
1982 (GC(XXV)/651/Rev.5)

105. The PRESIDENT stated that by 1 p.m. on 25 September 1981, 56 Member States had pledged voluntary contributions amounting to \$8 071 794, to which had to be added a pledge of \$33 600 by Romania, making a total of \$8 105 394. Because of the dates fixed for the adoption of their national budgets, some Member States were not yet able to pledge their contributions, but would do so at a later stage.

106. The pledges so far amounted to 50.66% of the target figure. He therefore appealed to Member States that had not yet done so to pledge their voluntary contributions at their earliest convenience, for which purpose they should contact the Agency Secretariat. His appeal was addressed in particular to those Member States which were sufficiently developed to be able to afford easily their base rate share of the target recommended by the Board.

The meeting was suspended at 11.25 p.m. and resumed at 12.15 a.m.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(XXV)/644, 657) (resumed)

107. The PRESIDENT informed the General Conference of the results of the voting:

108. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Latin America was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	17
<u>Valid votes:</u>	145
<u>Required majority:</u>	37
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Panama	77
Colombia	68

109. Having obtained the required majority, Panama and Colombia were elected to the Board.

110. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Western Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	8
<u>Valid votes:</u>	154
<u>Required majority:</u>	39
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Spain	78
Netherlands	76

111. Having obtained the required majority, Spain and the Netherlands were elected to the Board.

112. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Eastern Europe was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	2
<u>Valid votes:</u>	160
<u>Required majority:</u>	41
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Romania	81
Czechoslovakia	79

113. Having obtained the required majority, Romania and Czechoslovakia were elected to the Board.

114. The result of the election of two Members from the area of Africa was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	5
<u>Valid votes:</u>	157
<u>Required majority:</u>	40
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Zambia	79
Algeria	78

115. Having obtained the required majority, Zambia and Algeria were elected to the Board.

116. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Middle East and South Asia was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	5
<u>Valid votes:</u>	76
<u>Required majority:</u>	39
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Bangladesh	76

117. Having obtained the required majority, Bangladesh was elected to the Board.

118. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Far East was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	1
<u>Valid votes:</u>	76
<u>Required majority:</u>	39
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Republic of Korea	47
Mongolia	29

119. Having obtained the required majority, the Republic of Korea was elected to the Board.

120. The result of the election of one Member from the area of the Middle East and South Asia or of South East Asia and the Pacific or of the Far East was as follows:

<u>Abstentions:</u>	1
<u>Valid votes:</u>	80
<u>Required majority:</u>	41
<u>Votes obtained:</u>	
Indonesia	80

121. Having obtained the required majority, Indonesia was elected to the Board.

122. The PRESIDENT, after congratulating the 11 Members so elected, recalled that under Article VI.D of the Statute they would hold office from the end of the current session until the end of the twenty-seventh regular session of the General Conference, i.e. for a period of two years.

123. He thanked the delegations of Ecuador and the United Kingdom, which had provided tellers, the two tellers themselves, and their Secretariat assistance.

APPOINTMENT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL (GC (XXV) /658)

124. The PRESIDENT declared that, pursuant to Article VII.A of the Statute, the Board had appointed Mr. Hans Blix to serve as Director General of the Agency for a term of four years from 1 December 1981 and had requested the General Conference to approve that appointment by adopting the draft resolution contained in document GC (XXV) /658.

125. The draft resolution in document GC (XXV) /658 concerning the appointment of the Director General was adopted.

126. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Conference confirm the appointment of Mr. Blix by acclamation.

127. The Conference confirmed the appointment of Mr. Blix to the post of Director General by acclamation.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Blix entered the meeting.

128. The PRESIDENT informed Mr. Blix that the Conference had approved his appointment to the post of Director General. He was pleased to be the first to congratulate him, and invited him to take the oath of office.

129. Mr. BLIX took the following oath:

"I solemnly swear to exercise in all loyalty, discretion and conscience the functions entrusted to me as Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, to discharge these functions and to regulate my conduct with the interests of the Agency only in view, and not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duties from any Government or other authority external to the Agency."

130. Mr. BLIX said that he wished to express his gratitude to the General Conference for its approval of his appointment as Director General. He pledged to do his utmost to live up to the confidence placed in him. It was

perhaps inevitable that the choice of the executive head of an international organization was influenced by views on his country of origin. No one could entirely free himself from his background, and he had to admit that he was another Swede. It should be emphasized, however, that the step from a national to an international civil service was a fundamental one. It was important, indeed vital, that international civil servants enjoy the full support of all Member States. To that end, they must be guided in their work exclusively by the objectives and principles laid down in the statute of the international organization they served and by the guidelines established by the policy-making organs of that organization.

131. An international organization was the common tool of its founding Member States and needed their continued co-operation to function successfully. The co-operation of its staff was also a prerequisite, and they must effectively, diligently and intelligently perform all the tasks incumbent upon them. He wished to assure the Conference that he would devote all his energies to the service of the Agency. He did not have the scientific background nor the erudition of Mr. Eklund. That was a handicap which he recognized and which could not be remedied. He trusted that it would be compensated to some extent by competence within the staff.

132. During his 20 years as Director General, Mr. Eklund had helped to build up one of the world's most effective and competent international organizations, and all were indebted to him. He (Mr. Blix) could offer only the experience of a career during which he had been extensively involved in international law and organization, disarmament, détente and development co-operation. Energy, including nuclear energy, was an important item in all those areas. He had also learned from experience that it was vitally important to listen to the voices of all countries, both large and small, from both East and West, North and South. Harmony was created only when all the instruments were in tune. He was aware that much needed to be done by the Member States and by the staff of the Agency to bring about agreement and consensus. The Member States did have different interests in various

matters. However, all were agreed on the importance of nuclear energy, its technical promotion, its safe use and its public acceptance. The need for safeguards to guarantee exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy was also generally recognized. He was a strong supporter of technical assistance, which was vitally important to the developing countries and hence to the Agency. Lastly, he was deeply convinced of the need for international community building. The growing interdependence of all States had an inescapable corollary in the need for consultation, co-operation and common action. That was, first of all, the task of Governments, but the staff and the Director General of an international organization could and should facilitate and contribute to that task.

133. The PRESIDENT observed that Mr. Blix came to the Agency with a distinguished career in international law, both in the academic field and in the service of his Government. He had gained experience in the work of the United Nations system and had achieved great distinction in representing his country in many important activities of the United Nations. He knew from experience the aspirations and problems of the developing countries and had worked in the cause of disarmament: both fields were central to the work and progress of the Agency. He had supported the cause of nuclear energy in his own country, and the Agency could look to him to champion the spread and development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. He would be assuming the leadership of the Agency at a very important and difficult time and he could rest assured of the support of a competent and experienced Secretariat which had been guided over the previous 20 years by the very able, wise and dedicated leadership of Mr. Eklund. In following Mr. Eklund, Mr. Blix was perhaps taking on the most challenging task in his distinguished career. He (the President) was confident that he would carry out that task with dedication and distinction.

134. On behalf of all Member States he wished to pay tribute to Mr. Eklund for his services to the Agency. Throughout his long career as Director General, he had given dedicated and selfless service to the development of peaceful

nuclear energy and its techniques for the betterment of mankind and to the cause of non-proliferation. The Agency, the United Nations and the world had much to thank Mr. Eklund for, and he was sure that the Conference would join him in applauding Mr. Eklund's distinguished services to the Agency and wishing him and his family all good fortune in the years ahead.

135. Mr. COPITHORNE (Canada), speaking as the outgoing Chairman of the Board of Governors, recalled that Mr. Eklund had served the Agency for a period of 20 years, during which nuclear energy had firmly established itself as the only foreseeable alternative to fast-disappearing fossil fuels. That achievement was in no small part due to Mr. Eklund's personal conviction and determination concerning the potential of nuclear power to enhance the quality of life. During that same period, the membership of the Agency had more than doubled. There had been many crises, some small and some large, but Mr. Eklund's calm counsel and personal dedication had always carried the Agency through.

136. The outgoing Board of Governors had unanimously adopted the following resolution in appreciation of Mr. Eklund's long service to the Agency and to the nuclear community of the world:

"The Board of Governors,

- (a) Recalling that Dr. Sigvard Eklund has served the Agency throughout his twenty years of service as Director General faithfully and with untiring dedication,
- (b) Deeply appreciative of the contribution he has made to the promotion of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and the cause of peace,
- (c) Conscious that no man has done more than he to further the development of the Agency and the attainment of the objectives of its Statute, and

(d) Mindful of his great human qualities and his achievements as a statesman and scientist,

Expresses its sincerest gratitude and deepest appreciation to him for the way in which he has discharged the responsibilities of his high office."

137. Mr. Eklund had served well the cause of the individual Members of the Agency, and they offered him their gratitude, respect and homage for his outstanding leadership. They hoped that he would continue to be associated with their joint endeavours to implement the key objective of the Agency, that of accelerating and enlarging the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. The charm, warmth and dedication of Mr. Eklund's wife, Anna-Greta, would long be remembered. On behalf of all concerned, he offered his deepest and humblest appreciation to both Mr. and Mrs. Eklund.

The meeting rose and stood in prolonged applause.

138. Mr. SETHNA (India) said that on behalf of his delegation he wished to congratulate Mr. Blix on his appointment and welcome him to the Agency. He was coming with a distinguished record in national and international affairs and was bringing with him qualities which would serve him well. He was replacing someone who had become a legend and in that difficult task he could be certain of the fullest support.

139. Mr. Eklund had had the unique distinction of serving for five terms. When he had joined the Agency he had brought with him a sound knowledge of nuclear energy, which had been an essential qualification in the early years. He had guided the Agency with wisdom and courage through difficult times. His patience had become proverbial. Member States owed him a great debt of gratitude.

140. As a farewell tribute, he proposed that Mr. Eklund be given the title of Director General Emeritus of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

141. The proposal was approved by acclamation.

142. Mr. Eklund (Director General) said he wanted on his own behalf and that of his wife to express warm appreciation for the kind words that had been addressed to them during the general debate and the present meeting. It had been a privilege to serve the Agency and its Member States. He had been very happy in his work and the years had passed very quickly. He was deeply indebted to the specialists in Member States who had kept him informed of progress in the nuclear field.

143. He thanked the Members of the Board of Governors, who had always been extremely helpful to him in his work. He particularly appreciated the confidence they had shown in him on the question of the appointment of senior staff. They had never refused to accept any of his proposals.

144. He was also grateful to the members of the Secretariat. It had been a good and disciplined staff, which had worked well and efficiently. Many of them had shown those qualities which Dag Hammarskjöld had thought essential for their profession - "an inner quietness and a heightened awareness".

145. He wanted to make special mention of two people with whom he had had the privilege of working over a long period: Dr. Hall, the former Deputy Director General of Administration, and Professor Zheludev, former Deputy Director General of Technical Operations. He also wished to say a special word in gratitude to the staff of his office, who had served him so faithfully. Finally, he thanked the General Conference for the unexpected honour it had done him by conferring on him the title of Director General Emeritus.

146. Congratulating his successor, Mr. Blix, he said he could wish him nothing better than that he should enjoy the same confidence, understanding and collaboration from the Board, Member States and the Secretariat as he himself had.

147. The future of the Agency was closely related to the question whether nuclear energy had a long-term future or not. He himself belonged to those who thought that it did. In that context, the Agency could contribute much to the fostering of nuclear energy for peace, health and prosperity throughout the world.

148. Finally, he wanted once again to thank everybody on behalf of himself and his wife.

The meeting rose and stood in prolonged applause.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

149. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Western Europe group, said the fact that the Conference had successfully completed a difficult week of meetings was to a large extent due to the ability and wisdom of the President, who deserved everyone's deep appreciation.

150. As spokesman for the Latin American countries, Mr. CALISTO VARELA (Ecuador) paid tribute to the President for the intelligent way he had guided the twenty-fifth session through its complex tasks. He also thanked the host country, Austria, for its hospitality, and the Secretariat for the competent and diligent work it had done. He assured the Director General elect of the full support of the Latin American countries.

151. Mr. BENNINI (Algeria), speaking for the African group, complimented the President on the competent and efficient manner in which he had conducted the discussions. He also congratulated Mr. Blix on his appointment and paid tribute to Mr. Eklund for the expertise and wisdom he had shown during his long period of office.

152. Mr. OSZTROVSZKY (Hungary), acting as spokesman for the East European countries, said that under the President's wise guidance the twenty-fifth session had completed its work successfully in spite of many difficulties. He thanked the Director General warmly for all he had done both for the Agency and for the progress of nuclear energy, and he congratulated Mr. Blix on his appointment.

153. Mr. COPITHORNE (Canada), speaking on behalf of the North American region, paid tribute to the skill, efficiency and patience of the President.

154. For the countries of the Middle East and South Asia, Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) congratulated the President on the manner in which he had conducted the meetings. He also thanked the host country, Austria, and the City of Vienna. A special tribute was due to the Director General for the wisdom and dedication he had shown during his tenure of office.

155. Mr. CAMPBELL (Australia) said it was a privilege to compliment, on behalf of the region of South-East Asia and the Pacific, the President on bringing the work of the session through to a successful conclusion. He expressed admiration for the accomplishments of Mr. Eklund as Director General and welcomed Mr. Blix to the Agency. He hoped that, after a period of tension and distraction in the Agency, all could now return to the normal consensus approach in the discharge of membership responsibilities.

156. Mr. YAMATO (Japan), as spokesman for the countries of the Far East, thanked the President for his expert guidance. He expressed appreciation of Mr. Eklund's efforts over the previous 20 years and congratulated his successor on his appointment.

157. The PRESIDENT thanked all the delegates for their kind words. It had been a privilege to serve at the session. He also thanked the Austrian authorities and the City of Vienna for their hospitality and expressed his gratitude to all delegates for their participation and to the Director General and his staff for providing the necessary support for the meetings. Before closing the session, he invited all those present to observe a minute's silence for prayer or meditation.

All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

158. The PRESIDENT declared the twenty-fifth session of the General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 1.20 a.m.