

Board did not do so, it would be acting in bad faith. In replying to that argument the proponents of safeguards pointed out that what the Board had been invited to do was to take the views of the General Conference into account "before giving effect to this document." "This document" was the document that had already been given provisional approval by the Board and it was quite clear from the discussion in the General Conference that the majority of member states did not intend that fundamental changes should be made in it. Apart from fundamental changes, the one point on which there appeared to have been a disposition in favour of some relaxation was in relation to exemption limits for source material. That was a point to which we had given some thought and on which an amendment had been tabled by the delegation from the Union of South Africa.

7. I think it was clear to the other side throughout that discussion that there was a substantial majority in the Board which was prepared to vote in favour of putting the safeguards document, as revised in the course of our meetings, into effect. The delegations of the Soviet bloc tried to argue that this was an unrepresentative majority and spoke of terms being dictated to the membership of the Agency at large at the behest of the United States. The Indian delegation adopted a somewhat different line, urging the proponents of safeguards not to be inflexible and to avoid doing anything that might give rise to dissension and have detrimental effects on the work of the Agency. They thought that it would be contrary to the spirit of the General Conference resolution to give final approval to a document that had generated such strong opposition and appealed for respect for the views of the minority.

8. At the end of the general debate the Board was faced with two procedural motions. The first of these, which was tabled by the Soviet delegation, would have set up a special committee of the Board to draw up a new document which would take into account all the views that had been put forward in the General Conference and be as widely acceptable as possible. That motion was defeated by 16 votes to 5 with 2 abstentions. The second motion was tabled by India and proposed that all votes on the safeguards item be deferred until the April series of meetings. It, too, was defeated by 16 votes to 6 with 1 abstention.

9. When these procedural motions had been disposed of, the Board turned its attention to document GOV/676. This contained a proposal by India and Ceylon which was in all respects identical with a proposal which India had joined with four other countries in putting before the General Conference. As the Indian delegation explained, that proposal was based on two guiding principles: that safeguards were required by the Agency's Statute and that it was the Agency's main function to develop the world's resources of nuclear energy for the maximum benefit of all countries. The Indian proposal had not been put to the vote at the General Conference and when it appeared that no account was likely to be taken by the Board of the views expressed at the General Conference, the Indian delegation had concluded that it would be useful for them to reintroduce that proposal in the Board. It was a proposal which, in their view, provided for an adequate system of safeguards bearing in mind that such a system would apply only to countries which needed assistance from the Agency and whose current state of industrial development made it impossible for them to produce nuclear weapons. After a relatively short debate, the proposal submitted by India and Ceylon was defeated by 17 votes to 6.

10. With the defeat of that proposal the Board was free to revert to the basic safeguards document, GC(IV)/108/Rev.1, to which no fewer than 28 amendments had been tabled. One of these was the South African amendment (GOV/659) which was adopted by 17 votes in favour, none against, with 6 abstentions. In introducing the amendment, the South African representative covered all the points which we regarded as being open to ambiguity and the record makes it clear that the Board, in adopting the amendment, did so on the basis of the