



International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXI)/COM.5/OR.7  
March 1978\*

GENERAL Distr.  
ENGLISH

## TWENTY-FIRST REGULAR SESSION: 26—30 SEPTEMBER 1977

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna, on Thursday, 29 September 1977, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. RÖHNSCH (German Democratic Republic)

Item of the agenda**	Subject	Paragraphs
11	Amendment of Article VI, A, 2 of the Statute (continued)	1 - 23

\* A provisional version of this document was issued on 6 October 1977.

\*\* GC(XXI)/591.

## THE RECORD

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VI. A. 2 OF THE STATUTE (continued) (GC(XXI)/584, 584/Add. 1-4; GC(XXI)/COM. 5/5 and 6)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue its discussion of the proposed amendment of Article VI. A. 2 of the Statute.

2. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that in the opinion of his delegation the draft resolution set out in Annex II to document GC(XXI)/584, submitted jointly by Bangladesh, Egypt, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria and Pakistan, and subsequently supported by many other countries, constituted a very reasonable proposal - one which had the signal merit of giving special attention to the sovereign equality of Member States. After consultations with countries from other regions, however, the co-sponsors and their supporters had decided, in a spirit of compromise, not to insist on putting the draft resolution to the vote. He hoped that, in the light of that decision, the Committee would see its way clear to a consensus on the matter.

3. Mr. CARDENAS VALDES (Cuba) said that the Latin American Group believed that the question of amending the Statute required thorough study. In order to help in reaching a consensus, the Latin American Group would not insist on its joint draft resolution (GC(XXI)/COM. 5/6) and would be prepared to accept the draft resolution submitted by Yugoslavia (GC(XXI)/COM. 5/5).

4. Mr. OSREDKAR (Yugoslavia) thanked the sponsors of other proposals for their understanding. He pointed out that the final version of the Yugoslav draft resolution contained in document GC(XXI)/COM. 5/5 was not exactly the same as the version agreed on during consultations, but he hoped it would be satisfactory to all. In paragraph (a) of the preamble the words "... the under-representation ..." would be replaced by "... an increase in the representation ..." In paragraph 1 of the operative part the words "... a report ..." would be replaced by "... its observations ..."

5. Mr. STONE (United States of America) thanked the delegation of Yugoslavia for its spirit of compromise. He thought that the draft might gain even more support in the Committee if the words "... relating to an increase in the representation ..." were replaced by "... claiming the under-representation ..."

6. Mr. OSREDKAR (Yugoslavia) said that the change proposed by the delegate of the United States of America meant going back to an earlier version which had already been discarded. He could accept the change suggested, but preferred his own version.

7. Mr. MALU wa KALENGA (Zaire) said that his delegation regarded the original Yugoslav

text set out in document GC(XXI)/COM. 5/5 as preferable but was prepared to accept the changes just mentioned by the delegate of Yugoslavia.

8. Mr. HABASHI (Sudan) thought that the word "claiming", suggested by the delegation of the United States of America, implied that there was some doubt about the fact of under-representation when in fact there was none. He would also prefer one of the Yugoslav versions.

9. Mr. AL-KHATER (Qatar) said he preferred the original formulation of the Yugoslav text since it stressed the undoubted fact of under-representation.

10. Mr. THOMAS (German Democratic Republic) said he felt it would be wrong to use the word "claiming" in paragraph (a) of the preamble and suggested simply deleting the second part of that paragraph after the words "document GC(XXI)/584".

11. Mr. STONE (United States of America) said that his delegation could also agree to the Yugoslav amendment. His suggestion had been made only with the view to achieving a broader consensus.

12. Mr. SHIBAB-ELDIN (Kuwait) said that his delegation, too, was prepared to accept the draft resolution proposed by Yugoslavia in order to achieve a consensus.

13. Mr. KHOR (Malaysia) said that most of the texts that had been quoted differed only in subtleties of form, not in substance. The important thing was to select the clearest version, which in his opinion was the Yugoslav text.

14. Mr. KATTAN (Saudi Arabia) said his delegation could accept the Yugoslav text.

15. Mr. EROFEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Soviet delegation had been opposed to the inclusion of item 11 on the agenda in the first place, fearing that it would not be possible to reach a consensus, as indeed had proved to be the case. Moreover, the text presented by the Yugoslav delegation was not the same as the text agreed on during the consultations: in the original text, paragraph (a) of the preamble had finished with the words "document GC(XXI)/584", without any further qualifications. In the circumstances, he thought that more time was needed to consider the various proposals and, in application of Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure, suggested that the meeting be adjourned until the following day.

16. Mr. SIAZON (Philippines) did not doubt the sincerity of the motives of the delegate of the Soviet Union in requesting adjournment of the meeting, but appealed to him to help the Committee terminate its discussions in a spirit of goodwill. The delegate of the Soviet Union would surely hear that plea with sympathy, since the attitude of his country was known to be a comradely one towards the countries of Africa

and Asia, and indeed towards all Third World countries. In the Agency, as in the specialized agencies of the United Nations, it was important to co-operate with all States. He believed that the wording of the draft resolution submitted by Yugoslavia was neutral and pointed out that the General Conference was not being asked to take positive action by preambular paragraph (a); moreover, no reference was made to the bar on re-election of Governors.

17. Mr. HOFFMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) believed that the Committee was nearing consensus on the draft resolution submitted by Yugoslavia and that disagreement persisted only in relation to subtle points of style. He was in favour of the proposal to end preambular paragraph (a) with the words "document GC(XXI)/584", because reference to the document would make quite clear what was at issue, without any need for further explanation. However, he would also be prepared to accept replacement of the word "under-representation" by the word "representation".

18. Mr. MALU wa KALENGA (Zaire) said his delegation was prepared to accept that the meeting should be adjourned, since in his view the Soviet Union's proposal to that effect was legally justified. However, in the interests of terminating the Committee's work, he would accept the proposal of the Federal Republic of Germany to replace "under-representation" by "representation".

19. Mr. LINDSAY (Ghana), Mr. EROFEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. THOMAS (German Democratic Republic) and Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) were also prepared to accept the replacement of "under-representation"

by "representation", as proposed by the delegate of the Federal Republic of Germany.

20. Mr. OSREDKAR (Yugoslavia) thanked delegations for their help in trying to reach a solution, although he felt that the wording of his delegation's proposal could perfectly well stand as it was. He also reminded the Committee that he had been prepared to accept the proposal by the delegate of the United States of America to replace the words "relating to" by the words "claiming the". However, he would likewise accept the wording proposed by the Federal Republic of Germany, in which "under-representation" was to be replaced by "representation".

21. A consensus appeared to have been reached, but he noted that a misunderstanding might have occurred, and he wished to correct it. During the course of discussions, nearly ten different drafts of the same resolution had been proposed. He had not guaranteed to any delegation that he would propose a particular wording, nor had he been representing any particular group of States in the negotiations relating to the draft proposal. His delegation had merely been attempting to mediate between others; it had not broken any agreement, nor had it wished to mislead anyone.

22. The CHAIRMAN took it that the draft resolution proposed by Yugoslavia in document GC(XXI)/COM. 5/5 was acceptable to the Committee with the word "under-representation" in preambular paragraph (a) replaced by the word "representation" and with the words "a report" in operative paragraph 1 replaced by the words "its observations".

● 23. It was so agreed.

● The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

