

# INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Distr.
RESTRICTED
GC.1(S)/GEN/OR.2\*
6 February 1958

## **General Conference**

First special session

GENERAL COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THI SECOND MEETING

Held at the Musikakademie, Vienna, on Tuesday, 23 October 1957, at 10.10 a.m.

#### CONTENTS

Agenda item		Paragraphs
-	Date of the second regular session	
	of the General Conference	1 - 23

<sup>\*</sup> This is the final version of the record previously issued under the same symbol and number, embodying the corrections requested by delegations.

## Present

President of the Chairman: Mr. GRUBER General Conference

Mr. HOOD Australia Members:

> Mr. BERNARDES Brazil Mr. WERSHOF Canada Mr. de MAUTORT France Mr. RAJAN India

Mr. SURJOTJONDRO Indonesia

Mr. NOMIYAMA Japan Mr. BILLIG Poland

Mr. SOLE Union of South Africa

Mr. EMELYANOV ) Union of Soviet Mr. ZAMYATIN Socialist Republics

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Mr. MICHAELS

Mr. McKINNEY United States of America

Mr. LUJÁN Venezuela

Mr. WINKLEE Chairman of the Board of Also present:

Governors

Secretariat: Mr. JOLLIS Secretary General of the

General Conference

Mr. URQUHART Secretary of the Committee

#### DATE OF THE SECOND REGULAR SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

- Mr. JOLLIS (Secretary General) stated that in fixing the l. date of the second regular session of the General Conference it must be remembered that the Secretariat had to prepare important documents, including the budget estimates, the annual report to the General Conference, and the annual report to the United Nations. Under the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Board of Governors, those reports had to be submitted to the Board at least forty-five Under the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the days in advance. General Conference, they had to be circulated to Members at least sixty days before the General Conference, Those periods totalled about three and a half months. At least two weeks would have to be allotted for discussion of the documents in the Board of Governors, after which they had to be redrafted, translated, printed and distributed. That would take at least another month. The Secretariat would accordingly have to complete the initial drafts of those documents five months before the General Conference; thus, if 15 August were the date chosen, the reports would have to be ready by 15 March.
- 2. The Board of Governors had no authority to make proposals, but had discussed the matter informally; several dates had been suggested, and arguments advanced for and against. The general feeling had been that August would be too early; on the other hand, the second regular session must, to satisfy the Statute, take place before the end of 1958. The majority had thought that October or November might be most suitable. The argument had also been put forward that it would be an advantage to overseas delegations to hold the session as soon as possible after the second International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva in other words during the second half of September.
- 3. As a compromise, 15 October might be a possibility. The only other major conference taking place in Europe about that time would be the General Conference of UNESCO to be held in Paris in November.

- 4. Mr. McKINNEY (United States of America) wondered if it might not be possible to reduce the time requirements of forty-five and sixty days imposed on the Secretariat by the rules of procedure, especially since the first working year would be shorter than usual.
  - 5. There seemed to be general agreement that August would be too early. On the other hand, as the Geneva Conference would end on 13 September, overseas delegations would not be much helped if the second regular session were fixed for 15 October. His own delegation would favour 22 September, but was prepared to agree with the majority.
  - 6. Mr. WERSHOF (Canada) felt that, unless the second regular session were held about a week after the end of the Geneva Conference, it might be as well to give the Secretariat more time by holding the session towards the end of October.
- 7. It would be unwise to make at the present stage any formal proposal to alter the sixty-day period required by the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. The Board of Governors could, however, decide during the coming year to shorten the period required by its Provisional Rules of Procedure from forty-five to thirty days.
- 8. Mr. RAJAN (India) agreed that the Board of Governors could make such a decision, and that there would be difficulty in reducing the sixty-day period required by the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the General Conference; in any case, under Article VI. J of the Statute, no reduction below thirty days was possible. He was in favour of holding the second regular session in late September. Countries far distant from Europe would be sending skilled technicians to Geneva, and it would be very inadvisable to keep them too long away from their normal work.
- 9. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Geneva Conference would be mainly scientific, whereas the General Conference session would be mainly political, though delegations to it would probably include some scientific advisers. The extent to which the same persons would be attending both Conferences would therefore be relatively small.

- 10. One argument in favour of holding the second regular session at the end of October was that the facilities at the Hofburg might be available by then. In view of the time-table and of the need to do constructive practical work during the forthcoming year, his delegation would favour the later date.
- lieved that the Agency should not lose sight of the purpose for which it had been set up: to contribute in the widest manner to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. If the second regular session were put off to the end of October, many experts would be kept away from their practical work for three months. That was a paramount consideration, and his delegation therefore favoured a date as soon as possible after the ending of the Geneva Conference.
- 12. <u>Hr. HOOD</u> (Australia) shared the doubts of the United Kingdom representative about the extent to which the same persons would be attending both Conferences; although his country was one of the most distant from Europe, his delegation believed that that argument could be exaggerated. Bearing in mind the time factor which had been emphasized by the Secretariat, his delegation was in favour of a date in late October.
- Mr. SURJOTJONDRO (Indonesia) said that, besides being very distant from Europe, his country had too few scientists to be able to spare them for long periods. Many, in addition to being research workers, were also teachers. It would be very helpful if representatives from countries like his own could attend both meetings. Not only could they give practical effect to decisions on their return home, but the meetings provided many occasions for very useful contacts. His delegation therefore favoured a date as soon as possible after the Geneva Conference.
- 14. Mr. SOLE (Union of South Africa) agreed that scientists should not be kept too long from their regular work. The time-table imposed by the Provisional Rules of Procedure would have to be taken into account, together with the time which must elapse before the technical staff of the Agency could be

recruited. There seemed to be two trends of opinion: one favouring a date about 22 September, the other a date about 27 October. The Committee should not divide, but should suggest two specific dates and leave the plenary Conference to take a final decision.

- 15. <u>Ifr. BILLIG</u> (Poland) was convinced that the second regular session should be held as soon as possible after the Geneva Conference.
- 16. Mr. McKINNTY (United States of America) pointed out that the first regular session was about to end. To avoid reopening the discussion in a plenary meeting, it might be better to decide on one date by a show of hands; his delegation would agree to any date acceptable to a majority.

On a show of hands, the Committee expressed itself in favour of 22 September 1958 as the opening date for the second regular. session of the General Conference.

- 17. The <u>CHAIRMAN</u>, on a point of order raised by <u>Mr. HOOD</u> (Australia), agreed that that decision would not preclude any representative from expressing a different opinion in a plenary meeting.
- Mr. SOLD (Union of South Africa) thought that the General Conference should be informed of the arguments advanced in favour of each date. He proposed that the Secretary General should make an oral report summarizing the arguments and stating in conclusion that the consensus of opinion had favoured 22 September.
- 19. Mr. MICHAELS (United Kingdom) supported that proposal, but observed that an informal vote of the Board of Governors had yielded the contrary result, namely a majority in favour of 27 October.
- 20. Mr. MELYANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
  pointed out that a plenary meeting of the General Conference could
  accept or reject any recommendation, but that the General Committee
  was obliged in the first place to make a definite recommendation.

21. Mr. SOLD (Union of South Africa) agreed; his proposal was that a recommendation should be made but that the background to it should be suitably explained by the Secretary General.

### It was so decided.

- Mr. JOLLIS (Secretary General) felt it his duty, in view of the recommendation that the Committee had decided to put forward, to inform the meeting that he had made some preliminary investigations about the cost of obtaining the Konzerthaus for the second regular session if no other facilities were available. Rent at the dates recommended would cost some US \$90,000 more than the figure shown in the budget estimates.
- 23. The CHAIRMAN believed that the figure mentioned by the Secretary General could probably be reduced. He was not in a position to make any formal statement, but felt that the Austrian authorities might be able to contribute towards any increased cost. He suggested that no further action by the Committee was necessary at the present stage.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.