

**INTERNATIONAL
ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY**

Distr.
RESTRICTED
GC(III)/GEN/OR.6
9 December 1959
ENGLISH

General Conference

THIRD REGULAR SESSION

GENERAL COMMITTEE

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Tuesday, 22 September 1959, at 3.15 p.m.

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda*</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Adoption of the agenda for the meeting	1
6	Adoption of the agenda and allocation of items to committees	2 - 34
7	The closing date for the session	35 - 45
20	Election of Members to the Board of Governors	46 - 48
23	Opening date of the fourth regular session	49 - 51

* GC(III)/88/Rev.2.

Present

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. FURUUCHI	President of the General Conference
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. CUNHA	Brazil
	Mr. NADJAKOV	Bulgaria
	Mr. WERSHOF	Canada
	Mr. FINKELSTEIN	France
	Mr. SPANIDIS	Greece
	Mr. RAJAN	India
	Mr. de ARAOZ	Mexico
	Mr. TAMMES	Netherlands
	Mr. SCOTT	New Zealand
	Mr. AHMAD	Pakistan
	Mr. EL ANNABI	Tunisia
	Mr. NOVIKOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. MICHAELS	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. FOSTER	United States of America

<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. JOLLES	Secretary of the General Committee
---------------------	------------	---------------------------------------

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING (GC(III)/GEN/13)

1. The agenda for the meeting was adopted.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO COMMITTEES (GC(III)/72 and Corr.1; GC(III)/GEN/11, 12)

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested that discussion should be based on the draft report of the Committee to the General Conference, contained in the annex to the Director General's memorandum (GC(III)/GEN/11).
3. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada), referring to Annex II to the draft report - Agenda and Allocation of Items for Initial Discussion -, thought that the only item which could give rise to discussion was item 24, "The principles to govern the provision of technical assistance by the Agency", which the Board of Governors had asked to have placed on the agenda for the session (GC(III)/GEN/12). He suggested that the matter should be referred to the Administrative and Legal Committee which had a smaller workload than the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee. If that proposal was accepted he would suggest that the Administrative and Legal Committee should consider the item at the beginning of its work, before the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee reached the technical assistance elements of item 13 - the Agency's Programme, Budget and Working Capital Fund for 1960. He also asked that an informal show of hands be taken on his proposal.
4. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America) supported the Canadian delegate's proposal.
5. Mr. NOVIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that item 24 of the agenda was a matter for the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, not for the Administrative and Legal Committee, since it was concerned with the Agency's programme and budget for future years.
6. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia), Chairman of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, pointed out that item 24 had not only legal and administrative aspects, but also a financial aspect which was of concern to the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee. He therefore suggested that the officers of the two committees meet to study the question together.

7. Mr. NOVIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he supported the proposal that item 24 be referred to the two main committees for joint consideration.
8. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) was against referring the item to both committees. He did not think that the Chairman of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee had proposed anything of the sort; he had simply suggested that the officers of the two committees meet to study certain aspects of the question. If the Soviet Union delegate was opposed to an informal show of hands, he (Mr. Wershof) would formally propose that the item be referred to the Administrative and Legal Committee.
9. Mr. EL ANNABI (Tunisia), Chairman of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, inquired what would happen if one committee made recommendations which committed the other committee. Would the latter be obliged to accept them or could it reject them?
10. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) feared that the General Committee could not solve that problem. In any case he did not think that it would arise, since the same delegations were represented on both committees and they would certainly not express different views in each.
11. Mr. RAJAN (India) said that if the General Committee decided to refer the question to the Administrative and Legal Committee, the latter could not examine all its aspects. He did not think there could be any conflict, however, as the same delegations were represented on both committees.
12. The CHAIRMAN called for a show of hands on the proposal by the Canadian delegate that item 24 of the agenda be allocated to the Administrative and Legal Committee.
13. The proposal by the delegate of Canada was adopted.
14. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) thought that adoption of the draft report of the General Committee to the General Conference should be the subject of a formal decision relating to the document as a whole. In that connexion, the attention of members of the Committee should be drawn to the fact that Annex III to the report contained a draft resolution providing for the establishment of a Standing Committee for Pledges of Voluntary Contributions to the General Fund.

15. In reply to a question by Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan), the CHAIRMAN explained that the Standing Committee would be set up by the General Conference and would meet each year during the Conference's regular session.

16. Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General Committee) said that the draft resolution in Annex III had been prepared in the light of what had been done at the preceding session and that its purpose was to facilitate the steps to be taken to obtain voluntary contributions to the General Fund in future years. Should the General Conference adopt the draft resolution, the committee thus established would become a permanent organ of the Conference.

17. Mr. NOVIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, except for item 24, the USSR delegation had no objections to raise concerning the proposed allocation of the items of the agenda to committees.

18. In his opinion, the matter dealt with in Annex III was very important, since the proposal to establish a Standing Committee for Pledges of Voluntary Contributions to the General Fund should be the subject of an amendment to Rule 45 of the General Conference's Rules of Procedure.

19. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) also thought that the establishment of the Standing Committee would entail an amendment to Rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure. That being so, it would probably be preferable to defer a final decision until the next session.

20. Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General Committee) pointed out that Rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure authorized the General Conference to set up such committees as it deemed necessary for the performance of its functions.

21. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) considered it desirable to establish the Standing Committee at once, since the question of receiving pledges of contributions arose automatically every year. That action was permissible under Rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure, and since Rule 45 referred to the Main Committees - to which the Standing Committee could not be assimilated - no amendment to that rule was required.

22. However, if a majority of the Committee preferred not to take a decision involving future commitments, a minor amendment to the draft resolution contained in Annex III would make it possible to settle the matter for the present

session. Another solution would be to revert to the text on the same subject adopted at the 1958 session of the General Conference^{1/}.

23. Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General Committee) explained that it would be difficult to apply the latter solution, as the text adopted at the second regular session contained points which had since lost their raison d'être. However, the Secretariat was quite prepared to draft a new text which could be put before the General Committee very shortly.

24. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) expressed his willingness to support the draft resolution contained in Annex III as it stood.

25. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan) thought that the adjective "standing" gave the impression that the Committee could be convoked while the Conference was not in session and proposed that it be deleted from paragraphs 1 and 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution. Moreover, in order to avoid taking a decision involving future commitments, the whole of paragraph 2 should be deleted.

26. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America), supported by Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom), agreed with the delegate from Pakistan but thought that where paragraph 2 was concerned it would be enough to delete the word "standing" and the words "each year during its regular session".

27. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) considered that, if paragraph 2 of the operative part were to be entirely omitted, it would be preferable to specify in paragraph 1 that the Committee's function was "to receive from the delegates of Member States announcements of their Governments' pledges of voluntary contributions of money to the General Fund"

28. It should also be pointed out that any amendment to the text of the draft resolution must necessarily be accompanied by a corresponding amendment to paragraph 5 of the report.

29. Mr. NOVIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the suggestion of the United States delegate, on the understanding that the Committee would not be considered as one of the main Committees of the General Conference.

^{1/} GC(II)/RES/18.

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the General Committee adopt the proposal of the delegate of Pakistan for paragraphs 1 and 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution and that of the United States delegate for paragraph 2 on the understanding that the word "standing" would also be omitted from the title.

31. It was so decided.

32. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) suggested the following changes in paragraph 5 of the draft report: to delete the second sentence; to delete the word "standing" from the third sentence; to delete the last sentence except for the words: "The General Committee accordingly recommends for adoption the draft resolution contained in annex III to the present report".

33. It was so decided.

34. The draft report of the General Committee, as amended, was adopted.^{2/}

CLOSING DATE FOR THE SESSION (GC(III)/72)

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the opinion of the Secretariat, if the general discussion could be concluded at the end of the morning of Friday, 26 September, the two main committees could meet for the first time on the afternoon of the same day. On that assumption, it would be possible to close the session on Friday, 2 October.

36. Mr. FOSTER (United States of America) observed that before commenting on the date suggested, it might be useful to know approximately how many delegates wished to take part in the general discussion.

37. Mr. NOVIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed.

38. Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General Committee) said that at the moment there were little more than half a dozen speakers on the list.

39. At its last session the General Conference had devoted six meetings to the general discussion; but owing to lack of speakers some of those meetings had been very short. On the basis of that experience the Secretariat estimated that four and a half meetings should be enough.

^{2/} The report of the General Committee was issued as document GC(III)/86.

40. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan) wondered whether it was absolutely necessary for the General Committee to decide the question now. It might be preferable to wait until the general discussion had begun, when its duration could be estimated more reliably and the closing date could be fixed with fuller knowledge of the situation.

41. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) pointed out that under Rule 8 of its Rules of Procedure, the General Conference was required to fix a closing date for the session at the beginning of each session, though it might change that date subsequently if the need arose.

42. If, however, some delegations thought that the Conference could not complete its work on the date proposed, it might be better to set the closing date of the present session at Saturday, 3 October.

43. Mr. RAJAN (India) was in favour of choosing 3 October, as he considered that the time allowed for the general debate was insufficient.

44. After a brief exchange of views in which Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom), Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General Committee), Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) and Mr. FOSTER (United States of America) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the General Committee recommend that the General Conference decide that the third regular session would close on 3 October, on the understanding it could alter that date if it thought fit to do so.

45. It was so decided.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (GC(III)/77; GC(III)/GEN/9)

46. The CHAIRMAN submitted for the General Committee's approval the draft report to the General Conference on the election of Members to the Board of Governors (GC(III)/GEN/9, Annex).

47. Mr. de ARAOZ (Mexico) regretted that in paragraph 2 of the draft report Latin America was not mentioned among the geographical areas in respect of which an election was required. With the expiration of Argentina's term of office, Latin America was losing a seat on the Board of Governors, and that fact should be taken into account if it were considered that the representation of geographical areas on the Board had been equitable hitherto.

48. The draft report was adopted.

OPENING DATE OF THE FOURTH REGULAR SESSION (GC(III)/GEN/10)

49. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) said that, bearing in mind what had happened in previous years, he proposed that the General Committee recommend that the General Conference decide that its fourth regular session would open on Tuesday, 20 September 1960.

50. Mr. RAJAN (India) drew the attention of the members of the General Committee to the fact that the United Nations General Assembly held its annual session at the same time of year, which created some difficulties for his delegation. To avoid that overlapping he would prefer the General Conference to meet during the first half of September.

51. The United Kingdom proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

