



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXXIII)/OR.322

8 November 1989

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

THIRTY-THIRD (1989) REGULAR SESSION

RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Austria Center Vienna
on Friday, 29 September 1989, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Mr. CHUNG (Republic of Korea)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
23	Participation of Palestine in the activities of the IAEA	1 - 10
24	South Africa's nuclear capabilities	11 - 57
25	Examination of delegates' credentials	58 - 67
27	Election to the Agency's Staff Pension Committee	68 - 70
28	Report on voluntary contributions pledged to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund for 1990	71
-	Closing of the session	72 - 79

[*] GC(XXXIII)/897.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXXIII)/INF/274/Rev.2.

PARTICIPATION OF PALESTINE IN THE ACTIVITIES OF THE IAEA (GC(XXXIII)/890 and Mod.1)

1. The PRESIDENT, recalling that the item entitled "Participation of Palestine in the activities of the IAEA" had been included in the agenda at the request of the Arab Permanent Missions to the Agency, announced that the extensive consultations which had been held on the matter had made it possible to arrive at an understanding which he proposed to formulate in the following manner:

"Taking account of United Nations General Assembly resolution 43/177 of 20 December 1988, and after consultations with delegations, I wish to announce that there is a broad consensus that as of today the designation "Palestine" should be used instead of "PLO". This change of designation is without prejudice to the observer status of the Palestine Liberation Organization in accordance with GC(XX)/RES/334 of 23 September 1976 and the continuance of its existing eligibility pursuant to Agency rules and practices to participate in open-ended and relevant meetings convened under the auspices of the Agency."

2. It was so decided.

3. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) said that his delegation had discussed the question at issue extensively in the General Committee, where it had strongly opposed its inclusion as an item on the agenda, indicating clearly that the question was a purely political one which had no place in a scientific and technical body such as the Agency. It now wished to record its opposition to the decision just announced by the President to replace the designation "Palestine Liberation Organization" by "Palestine".

4. His delegation had always objected to General Conference resolution GC(XX)/RES/334 of 23 September 1976, which invited the PLO to attend all future sessions of the General Conference as an observer, and continued to believe that it was a mistake to invite to the General Conference a purely political organization which had no other aim than to promote its own political objectives. That organization could make no contribution to the scientific and technical objectives of the Agency.

5. His delegation had listened carefully to the President's statement concerning the decision of the General Conference to change the designation "PLO" to "Palestine". It was clear from that statement that the decision did

not in any way alter the observer status of that organization in the General Conference. His delegation would find any decision to change the status of the PLO in the Agency totally unacceptable. The President's statement also made it clear that the decision to re-designate the PLO as "Palestine" did not in any way change the existing eligibility of the PLO to be invited to Agency meetings. It did not confer on the PLO, either explicitly or implicitly, new rights or privileges or expanded opportunities to participate in the work of the Agency.

6. Mr. ETTINGER (Israel) said he had noted the statement made by the President of the General Conference and wished to register strong reservations about, and objections to, that statement. If the matter had been put to the vote, Israel would have voted against it. He noted that the President's statement had no effect on the existing status of the PLO in the Agency as formulated in resolution GC(XX)/RES/334 of 23 September 1976. Indeed, the statement stressed that the change in designation had no further implication of any kind for the PLO's status.

7. Any participation of the PLO in the Agency's work beyond the present status was bound to introduce an undesirable element of politicization to the Agency, which was and ought to remain a purely technical and scientific organization whose task was to promote the utilization of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

8. For those reasons, his Government regretted the statement read out by the President.

9. Mr. MAHMASSANI (Lebanon) strongly supported the decision announced by the President. The views expressed by the two previous speakers did not in any way detract from the broad consensus on whose basis that decision had been adopted, a consensus which reflected General Assembly resolution 43/177 of 20 December 1988 through which the designation "Palestine Liberation Organization" had been changed to "Palestine". That change was without prejudice to Palestine's eligibility, under the Agency's rules and practices, to participate in open-ended and other relevant meetings convened under the Agency's auspices.

10. The emergence of such a broad consensus and the substance thereof clearly and categorically demonstrated the non-political nature of the change in designation. Throughout the consultations conducted by the President, the delegations of the Arab countries had shown their attitude to be one of co-operation and moderation, rather than confrontation. Their aim was to promote the Agency's goals and to accelerate and enlarge its contribution to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world.

SOUTH AFRICA'S NUCLEAR CAPABILITIES (GC(XXXII)/RES/503, GC(XXXIII)/894 and GC(XXXIII)/900)

11. The PRESIDENT said that the present item was included in the agenda pursuant to resolution GC(XXXII)/RES/503. In response to the request made in that resolution, the Director General had reported to the General Conference in his opening statement at the first meeting of the session.

12. The General Conference also had before it, in document GC(XXXIII)/900, a draft resolution submitted by the African group. In order to save time, he appealed to delegates to include in their statements comments on the draft resolution, which would be introduced by the delegate of Nigeria.

13. He also wished to draw attention to document GC(XXXIII)/894, which had been circulated at the request of the Resident Representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union in their capacity as representatives of the depositaries of NPT.

14. Mr. MGBOKWERE (Nigeria), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African group, recalled the provisions of General Conference resolution GC(XXXII)/RES/503 and stated that the African group, with the full support of the Asian group and the near-total support of the Latin American group, was submitting the draft resolution - whose text was identical to that submitted the previous year - to the Conference for its consideration in the hope of reaching a consensus which would clearly show Pretoria the abhorrence universally felt with regard to its policy of apartheid.

15. Since 1987 when the Board had taken the historic decision of recommending to the General Conference that it suspend South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership of the Agency, the Pretoria régime had resorted to diversionary tactics, a game in which it was a

past master, in order to undermine the will of the General Conference to take such a decision. Its strategy was evidently to dangle the prospect of its accession to NPT in front of the Conference in order to weaken its resolve. As his delegation had stated in the past, NPT was open to all countries wishing to accede to it and contained nothing which might form the subject of negotiation or consultation. The procedure adopted by the racist South African régime in claiming that it intended to sign NPT was both unusual and unnecessary.

16. The negotiations which had taken place in the course of the year between South Africa, the three depositary powers and a number of Agency Member States were simply posturing. The experience of the contact group on Namibia showed the extent to which over-optimism could end in disappointment and frustration, particularly where South Africa and its apartheid policy were concerned. The current developments in Namibia were due to a combination of factors, most notably armed struggle and the intensification of economic sanctions, among which those applied by American and European businessmen should not be underestimated.

17. Nigeria was following events in South Africa very closely. There were probably many who imagined that Mr. De Klerk, South Africa's new President, viewed or would view those events from a fresh perspective. But extreme caution should be exercised; there were no grounds for divining a change of heart. The apartheid régime had not yet taken practical measures to dismantle its oppressive race laws. No one should be taken in by any attempt by South Africa to use apartheid to reform apartheid, for it was well known that the nationalists were in the habit of using code language such as "homeland" and "separate political rights" to disguise their unyielding opposition to giving black South Africans complete freedom of political expression. Mr. De Klerk would have to prove that he had the means and the courage not only to make sweeping reforms, but also to keep them firmly on course.

18. The message which the African Group and virtually all the other members of the Group of 77 wished to convey was that pressure on South Africa to comply with the Agency's resolutions and to abandon its policy of apartheid should not be relaxed. The Agency placed emphasis on universality, but it had the duty, as the International Lawn Tennis Federation had recently done, to

expel South Africa in order to strengthen international pressure on it to establish a political and social structure based on the principle of the equality of its citizens regardless of race.

19. In conclusion, he urged all delegations to send a clear message to the racist régime of Pretoria by supporting the draft resolution under consideration, the simple aim of which was to defer a decision on suspending South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership of the Agency until the 1990 regular session of the General Conference. In the struggle to secure the desired changes in South Africa, Mr. De Klerk should not be given any respite. His delegation hoped that the draft would be adopted without a vote. If not, it requested on behalf of the African Group that a roll-call vote be taken.

20. Mr. YASSIN (Sudan) said that, during the year which had passed since the present matter had last been examined by the General Conference, the South African people had remained under the yoke of the hideous régime of apartheid. With the twenty-first century approaching, that nation continued to be oppressed on its own territory. All countries wishing to enjoy the privileges of membership of the Agency should respect the principles on which the United Nations system was founded. The African peoples had renounced the possession of nuclear weapons, even for the legitimate purposes of defence. If the South African régime wished, as it claimed, to embark on a policy of moderation, why was it unable to display moderation in the sphere of nuclear armaments and why did it not respect the principles adhered to by all the other Member States of the Agency?

21. The draft resolution under consideration demonstrated once again the patience of the African countries in their long struggle against apartheid in South Africa. It was therefore to be hoped that it would be supported by all Member States so that the question could be settled in 1990.

22. Mr. ABDEL-MONEIM (Egypt) said that South Africa continued to resort to excuses and pretexts which fooled nobody in order not to sign the NPT. Moreover, it persisted in its refusal to submit all its nuclear installations to Agency safeguards as requested by the General Conference in its previous resolutions on the matter.

23. The African Member States of the Agency wished the submission of the draft resolution in question to be regarded as a gesture of good will on their part, and not as a step backwards. They hoped that those whose basic responsibility it was to preserve peace and security in the world would respond to that gesture by intensifying the pressure on South Africa. Egypt's position on that issue had been well known for many years.

24. The African nations, acting through the Organization of African Unity (OAU), had wanted their continent to be free of nuclear weapons so that they might devote all their energy and resources to solving the problems confronting them. They aspired to progress and prosperity, one prerequisite for which was the opportunity to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. In conclusion, his delegation urged all countries participating in the General Conference to vote for the draft resolution.

25. Mr. BADRAN (Jordan) fully supported the draft resolution submitted by the African Group and requested the General Conference to adopt it by consensus.

26. Mr. SILANGWA (Zambia), associating himself with the statements made by the preceding speakers, said he had not discerned any change in the attitude of the Pretoria régime, which continued to threaten peace and security in the southern African region. As all Member States were aware, South Africa had continued to intensify its military nuclear activities. The South African Government would continue to govern the country without having been elected by a majority of its population, as recently confirmed by the President elect. The current situation in South Africa demanded that the entire international community urgently step up its pressure on the Pretoria régime to force it to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

27. As indicated by previous speakers, the draft resolution under consideration bore witness to the patience and good will of the African countries. It was to be hoped that all the delegates present would support the draft in order to show the South African Government that the international community would not tolerate its policy of apartheid, military aggression and collaboration with other States in the oppression of the peoples making up the majority of the southern African population. That region needed peace and

security for its further social and economic development. In conclusion, he hoped that the draft resolution under consideration would be adopted without a vote.

28. Mr. CASTRO DIAZ-BALART (Cuba) said that since 1987 when South Africa had announced its possible accession to NPT it had not made any serious move to confirm its intention to keep that promise. On the contrary, before every session of the General Conference South Africa had gone through the same charade, which merely confirmed what Cuba had stated on previous occasions about the South African Government's true intentions. Moreover, South Africa had not shown that it had the least intention to comply with the General Conference's recommendations that it submit all its nuclear installations to Agency safeguards, and it continued to drag out the negotiations on the application of safeguards to its semi-commercial enrichment plant.

29. If South Africa wished to accede to NPT, it had only to sign and ratify the Treaty as other countries had done, without making such a fuss. The special treatment which South Africa enjoyed in that regard was surprising, to say the least. His delegation therefore dismissed any delaying tactics enabling the South African Government to continue to trifle with the requirements of the General Conference and regretted that that respectable body had not adopted the same position with regard to South Africa as the overwhelming majority of international organizations.

30. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) expressed his support for the draft resolution in document GC(XXXIII)/900.

31. Mr. AYTOLLAHI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said he fully supported the draft resolution and hoped that the General Conference would adopt it without a vote.

32. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America), supported by Mr. CLARK (United Kingdom), requested a roll-call vote on the draft resolution.

33. The PRESIDENT announced that, as requested by the representatives of Nigeria, the United States and the United Kingdom, a roll-call vote would be taken on the draft resolution in document GC(XXXIII)/900.

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

35. The result of the vote was as follows:

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

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

Abstaining: Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Philippines.

36. The draft resolution contained in document GC(XXXVIII)/900 was adopted by 59 votes to 26, with 4 abstentions.

37. Mr. MARTINS FELICIO (Brazil) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution did not in any way imply that his Government believed that safeguards could be imposed on any Member of the Agency. Its vote should be interpreted as an act of resolute opposition to the South African régime of apartheid, a régime which was contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples.

38. Mr. BAEYENS (France), speaking on behalf of the European Community, said that the Member States of the Community could not, any more than the previous year, lend their support to the resolution which had just been adopted. They abhorred apartheid every bit as much as the sponsors of the resolution, had always condemned that system and would continue to do so,

but felt that the suspension of any Member of the Agency ran counter to the fundamental principle of the universality of the United Nations and its related institutions. Moreover, such a step would weaken the international safeguards system and would be likely to affect nuclear safety adversely and set a precedent which could jeopardize the participation of other countries in the Agency. Because operative paragraph 2 clearly envisaged the possibility of suspending South Africa from the exercise of its privileges and rights of membership of the Agency, the Member States of the European Community had been obliged to reject the draft resolution.

39. Mr. GUYER (Argentina) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution primarily in order to protest against the repeated violations of the United Nations Charter by the South African régime. However, his country continued to oppose any attempt to force any Member State to accept the application of safeguards.

40. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because although it did not call for the immediate suspension of South Africa, it clearly pointed to the threat of such a decision the following year. The United States Government was opposed to any measure of that kind for a number of fundamental reasons.

41. First, any attempt to exclude a Member State or limit its participation would undermine not only the fundamental principle of the universality of international organizations, but also the special role of the Agency. The Agency could successfully promote the peaceful and safe uses of nuclear energy only if all nations with nuclear energy programmes took part in its activities.

42. Second, disciplinary actions or sanctions had to be based on the rule of law. Article XIX.B of the Agency's Statute provided for suspension only if a Member State persistently violated the Statute or an agreement concluded pursuant to it, which South Africa had not done. If the membership took an illegal decision, the credibility of the Agency would be sacrificed.

43. Third, the Agency's safeguards system was a vital component of the non-proliferation regime. Any steps which would reduce the scope of such safeguards, make more difficult their extension or call into question their continued application in any country should therefore be avoided.

44. Fourth, safeguards were voluntary measures undertaken by governments wishing to confirm the peaceful nature of their nuclear activities. To treat them as sanctions or penalties could only undermine the common objective of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. In addition, preambular paragraphs (b) and (c) were totally unacceptable, the former because it referred to violations of international law and the United Nations Charter, which were properly the concern of the United Nations Security Council, and the latter because it made allegations about a nuclear weapons' capability of South Africa which had never been proved.

45. The United States position was based solely on its desire to see the rule of law observed and the interests of the Agency preserved. It should in no way be interpreted as condoning the abhorrent apartheid system of South Africa, which was morally reprehensible and should have been dismantled a long time ago. The United States fully understood the frustrations of many Member States with the apartheid system, and had adopted sanctions against South Africa which were among the most stringent in the world. However, it could find no connection between the internal policies of the South African Government and the Statute of the IAEA.

46. His country's opposition to the resolution did not suggest any slackening of its support for NPT, which it had consistently called on all States, including South Africa, to sign. In fact, that question was to be discussed by the three depositary Governments and the South African Government in early December. Nevertheless, adherence to NPT had never been and was not now a condition for membership of the IAEA - indeed, many States attending the General Conference had not acceded to the Treaty. He was therefore obliged to oppose any resolution which suggested that continuation of South Africa's rights and privileges of membership should be dependent on its signing NPT, since that would be contrary to the Statute and would undercut efforts to ensure that all nuclear programmes in all countries were carried out under effective non-proliferation conditions. In summary, his delegation understood and respected the views and concerns of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but feared that its adoption, far from promoting peace and justice in the region and encouraging South Africa to accede to NPT, might achieve the opposite result.

47. Mr. KAZUHARA (Japan) said that his Government continued to believe that the apartheid system was unacceptable and contrary to human dignity. His delegation regretted that negotiations on safeguards between the Agency and the South African Government had not so far achieved any significant result, but was pleased that further consultations were to be held between the depositary countries of NPT and the South African Government, which it urged to accede to the Treaty as soon as possible.

48. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution to protect the principle of universality and to avoid any form of politicization of the Agency which would harm its effective functioning. Moreover, it would not be politically desirable, legally appropriate or technically effective to suspend South Africa, because such suspension would bring to an end all hope of progress in the safeguards agreement negotiations between South Africa and the Agency.

49. Mr. SHENSTONE (Canada) said that his country had always taken a strong stance against apartheid at the United Nations General Assembly, within the Commonwealth and in other international bodies. It had also imposed a ban on all nuclear co-operation with South Africa and on the import of South African uranium. His Government urged all States not parties to NPT to accede unconditionally to the Treaty and to accept full-scope safeguards on all their nuclear activities.

50. Canada had voted against the draft resolution because it was firmly committed to the principle of universality in international organizations. It therefore opposed moves to suspend any Member State from the exercise of its rights and privileges in the Agency. Moreover, suspension of South Africa could undermine the Agency's ability to fulfil its responsibilities with respect to that country.

51. Mr. SINAI (India) said that his country had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it gave the Agency a further year to implement General Conference resolutions GC(XXX)/RES/468 and GC(XXXII)/RES/503, which India had supported. The statements made by the Indian delegation on that issue at the thirtieth and thirty-second regular sessions of the General Conference remained valid.

52. Mr. GLEISSNER (Austria) said that his country's position on the policy of apartheid had repeatedly been made clear, especially in the United Nations General Assembly. Austria had voted against the draft resolution because it had always supported the principle of universality in international organizations. Support for that principle did not imply any judgement on the policies of Member States in general and South Africa in particular.

53. Mr. GRIFFITHS (New Zealand) said that his country's abhorrence of the policy of apartheid had been frequently enunciated and was well known. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution, however, because it believed that the international community would be better able to exert effective pressure on a Member State of the Agency by not suspending it. New Zealand had always encouraged all Member States to accede unconditionally to NPT and to submit their nuclear facilities to full-scope safeguards. It was disappointed that the South African Government had not yet actually taken those steps, and repeated its call to that Government to follow up the intentions it had announced two years previously, as that would be convincing evidence of its true commitment to the principles and objectives of the Agency.

54. Mr. WILSON (Australia) said that there were no real grounds for suspending South Africa from the exercise of its rights and privileges of membership under Article XIX.B of the Statute. Such a step would in any case violate the principle of universality of international organizations.

55. His delegation was greatly disappointed that after South Africa's announcement two years previously that it was considering action leading to accession to NPT, it had still not done so. South Africa was not the only Agency Member State in that position however, and to use that as a basis for excluding South Africa alone would constitute a selective application of non-proliferation principles and would be counter-productive since isolating that country could have repercussions on the existing safeguards agreement. South Africa had recently shown itself willing to negotiate, and would in fact do so in December in further consultations with NPT depositaries. His delegation was hopeful that those actions would soon have the desired result and emphasized that its negative vote in no way represented any change in its position, which was that it abhorred apartheid. It was to be hoped that

recent developments in South Africa would soon lead to a dialogue between the Government and black leaders which would be the first step toward real reform.

56. Mr. MAROM (Israel) said that his country's consistent denunciation of racism and apartheid had been reaffirmed yet again by the Israeli Government on 18 March 1987. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution because of its overriding belief in the principles of universality and constitutionality of the IAEA and of all international organizations. Indeed the issue at stake was not South Africa's policies but the preservation of the Agency's integrity.

57. Mr. LAVIÑA (Philippines) said that his country had consistently supported resolutions against South Africa – in all fora, within and outside the United Nations system. In view, however, of paragraph 2 of the resolution in question (deferring action on South Africa); it had been constrained to abstain.

EXAMINATION OF DELEGATES' CREDENTIALS (GC(XXXIII)/899 AND GC(XXXIII)/910)

58. The PRESIDENT pointed out that document GC(XXXIII)/910 contained the report of the General Committee, which had met to examine the credentials of delegates as provided for in Rule 28 of the Conference's Rules of Procedure. Paragraphs 2-12 of the report explained how the General Committee had approached its task and conveyed the opinions expressed in the course of the discussion. The Committee had decided to recommend the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 13. Furthermore, the Secretariat had received telefax copies of the credentials of the delegates of Saudi Arabia and Uganda and had been assured that the originals would be presented in the near future.

59. Mr. AL-NOWAISER (Saudi Arabia), speaking on behalf of the members of the League of Arab States participating in the General Conference, drew attention to the reservations which the Arab delegations had expressed in document GC(XXXIII)/899 regarding the credentials of the Israeli delegation.

60. Mr. ALI (Malaysia), endorsing the statement by the Arab States, expressed his delegation's reservations in respect of the credentials of the Israeli delegation.

61. Mr. KENNEDY (United States of America) said he deeply regretted the reservations which had been expressed by previous speakers. The General Conference had a mandate to reject credentials if they did not meet the requirements of the Rules of Procedure, but could not do so on purely political grounds.
62. Mr. RADY (Egypt) said that his delegation had already explained its position on that issue during the general debate.
63. Mr. ARAIN (Pakistan) supported the position adopted by the League of Arab States with regard to Israel. His delegation also wished to express its reservations regarding the credentials of the delegate of the illegitimate régime of Kabul, which was not the true representative of the Afghan people.
64. Mr. AYTOLLAHI (Islamic Republic of Iran), endorsing the statement made by the Saudi Arabian delegation on behalf of the League of Arab States, expressed his Government's reservations with regard to the credentials of the Israeli delegate.
65. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan), replying to the statement by the representative of Pakistan challenging the legitimacy of his credentials, said that the democratically elected Government for which he spoke was the only legitimate representative of the Afghan people. The Republic of Afghanistan was a sovereign, independent and non-aligned State and was a full member of the United Nations and its agencies, including the IAEA. As such, it had signed the Geneva agreements with Pakistan on which that country's delegation was now attempting to renege, thus distorting the historical and political realities. That negative attitude ran counter to the efforts of the international community and the non-aligned countries to find a peaceful and negotiated solution to the problems of the region. His delegation therefore rejected those irresponsible statements, which were intended to undermine the process of national reconciliation.
66. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no more speakers, he would take it that the General Conference was prepared to adopt the draft resolution set forth in paragraph 13 of document GC(XXXIII)/910, on the understanding that the comments and reservations just expressed would be reflected in the official record of the meeting.

67. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 13 of document GC(XXXIII)/910 was adopted.

ELECTIONS TO THE AGENCY'S STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE

68. The PRESIDENT recalled that the General Conference was at present represented on the Agency's Staff Pension Committee by two members, Mr. Morales Pedraza (Cuba) and Mr. Loedel (Uruguay), and two alternates, Mrs. Bhaduri (India) and Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands).

69. As Mr. Morales Pedraza and Mrs. Bhaduri would no longer be available to serve on the Committee, he proposed that Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands) be elected as a member and that Mr. Kumar (India) and Mr. Tilemann (Australia) be elected as alternates.

70. Mr. de Klerk (Netherlands) was elected as a member of the Agency's Staff Pension Committee, and Mr. Kumar (India) and Mr. Tilemann (Australia) were elected as alternates, with Mr. Loedel (Uruguay) continuing to serve as a member of the Committee.

REPORT ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED TO THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CO-OPERATION FUND FOR 1990 (GC(XXXIII)/896/Rev.3)

71. The PRESIDENT said that by 6.30 p.m. on 28 September 1989 the voluntary contributions pledged by Member States to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund had reached a total of US \$15 337 482 (document GC(XXXIII)/896/Rev.3). Since then, Egypt had pledged \$31 850 and Guatemala \$9100, which took the total amount pledged for 1990 to US \$15 378 432.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

72. Mr. ALI (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of all delegations present, noted with pleasure that the discussions on all items of the agenda of the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference had been extremely productive. The General Conference had taken a number of important decisions in respect of the Agency's future programmes and activities, the majority of them by consensus, even where sensitive issues were concerned. It had therefore demonstrated the collective determination of delegations to

strengthen the Agency and make it an effective instrument for the promotion of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The General Conference commended the President for so ably guiding it through its work.

73. The PRESIDENT thanked the delegate of Malaysia for his kind words. It had been an honour and privilege for him to serve as President of the General Conference at its thirty-third regular session. He was grateful to all delegations for the co-operation extended to him during the conduct of the Conference's business. He expressed his deep gratitude in particular to the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for its co-operation. His unanimous election as President of the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference had without doubt contributed greatly to its smooth progress and to the success of its work.

74. He thanked the members of the General Committee and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole for their assistance. He likewise thanked the experts and scientists who had participated in the special scientific meeting on the new generation of nuclear power plants. He congratulated Mr. Blix on his re-election as Director General of the Agency.

75. Emphasizing the importance of nuclear science for the future of mankind, he expressed strong support for a revival of the nuclear option, which could only be achieved through the improvement of nuclear technology and the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear power within the framework of the Agency's safeguards system. In that connection, he appealed to those States which were considering concluding NPT safeguards agreements with the Agency to do so as soon as possible.

76. On behalf of the Conference, he wished to bid farewell to Ambassador Kazuhara of Japan, Ambassador Wiryono of Indonesia, Mr. Mahmoud of Iraq and Mr. Wu of China, who were leaving Vienna.

77. Finally, on behalf of the Conference, he thanked the Austrian authorities and the City of Vienna for their traditional hospitality and for the excellent facilities provided for the third time at the Austria Center Vienna. He also thanked the Director General and all his staff for their support, which had enabled the Conference to complete its work successfully.

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

All present rose and stood in silence for one minute.

79. The PRESIDENT declared the thirty-third regular session of the General Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.