

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Distr.
RESTRICTED
GC(II)/GEN/OR.4
23 October 1958
ENGLISH

General Conference

SECOND REGULAR SESSION

GENERAL COMMITTEE

OFFICIAL RECORD OF THE FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna, on Thursday, 25 September 1958, at 9.40 a.m.

CONTENTS

Item of the agenda*		Paragraphs
8	Determination of the closing date for the session (continued)	1 - 4
26	Month in which regular sessions of the General Conference shall be convened	5 - 17
27	Opening date of the third regular session	
	Programme of work for the General Conference	18 - 23

^{*} GC(II)/57.

Present

Chairman:	Mr. SUDJARWO	President of the General Conference
Members:	Mr. JAY	Canada
	Mr. DELEAU	France
	Mr. RAJAN	India
	Mr. MATSUI	Japan
	Mr. CLEMENTE	Philippines
	Mr. NICUTZA	Romania
	Mr. de ERICE	Spain
	Mr. VEJYANT-RANGRISHT	Thailand
	Mr. YEMISCIBASI	Turkey
	Mr. MIKHAILOV	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. FAHMY	United Arab Republic
	Mr. WAKEFIELD	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Miss BELL	United States of America
Also present:	Mr. WINKLER	Chairman of the Board of Governors
Secretariat:	Mr. JOLLES	Secretary of the General Committee

DETERMINATION OF THE CLOSING DATE FOR THE SESSION (continued)

- The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the General Committee to its previous decision which had been communicated to the Conference, and pointed out that with the agreement of the Conference, the list of speakers for the general debate would be closed at 10.30 a.m. that day. In view of the number of speakers on the list it should be possible to conclude the general debate by the following Friday afternoon at the latest. Therefore the General Committee could recommend the General Conference to decide on Saturday, 4 October as the closing date for the session.
- 2. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) asked if it was a fixed date or merely a time limit which they should endeavour to respect. He did not think that the General Committee could recommend a fixed date.
- Mr. de ERICE (Spain), Chairman of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, pointed out that under Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure it was incumbent upon the General Committee to recommend a fixed date. Moreover, it was preferable to do so. It would be a good thing if the President of the Conference informed the delegates that it was absolutely necessary for them to conclude their work by that date, even at the risk of having to hold evening meetings.
- 4. The <u>CHAIRMAN</u> stated that Rule 8 did not prevent the Conference from altering the closing date for the session, if necessary. He thought that with the co-operation of everyone present, the Conference would be able to conclude its work by the end of the following week. He therefore proposed to recommend the Conference to decide on 4 October as the closing date for the session.

It was so agreed.

MONTH IN WHICH REGULAR SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE SHALL BE CONVENED OPENING DATE OF THE THIRD REGULAR SESSION

5. The <u>CHAIRMAN</u> proposed that the General Committee should proceed to a preliminary consideration of items 26 and 27 of the agenda for the General Conference, and should formulate at a later meeting the recommendations it would submit to the Conference. He also suggested that those two items, which

^{1/} GC(II)/GEN/OR.3, paragraph 22.

were closely linked, should be considered together.

- 6. Rule 1 of the Rules of Procedure was incomplete, as the month in which the General Conference should normally meet in regular session had been left open. In view of the terms of the resolution adopted on that point during the first special session of the General Conference was not obliged to come to a decision at once, but if it could reach a decision at the present session, considerable administrative advantages would ensue: the Governments of Member States would know at what time of year the General Conference would be held and could make the necessary arrangements; co-ordination of the activities of the Agency with those of the United Nations Organization and of other international organizations would be facilitated; finally, the Board of Governors and the Secretariat would be better able to plan and execute the many tasks which they had to carry out each year by a fixed date, before the General Conference met.
- 7. There were many arguments in favour of maintaining the present system:namely, the opening of the annual General Conference during September or
 October. Some delegations, however, would prefer the annual session to take
 place during the first half of the year.
- 8. Without opening the substantive debate that day, he would like the members of the General Committee to think the subject over, and in particular he would like the delegates who favoured sessions of the General Conference in April or May to state the reasons for their preference. A basic alteration in the opening date of the General Conference would have serious consequences for the preparation of the budget.
- 9. Mr. de ERICE (Spain), Chairman of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, thought that, as a general principle, it would be preferable for the General Conference to meet in April or May, because in September a considerable proportion of the staff of Ministries and other governmental services, was on holiday, the General Assembly of the United Nations was holding its annual session, and it was difficult to get rooms in Vienna hotels.
- 10. However, an alteration in the opening date of the General Conference would have some effect on the work of the Board of Governors. Rule 83 of

^{2/} GC.1(S)/RES/15, paragraph 2 of the operative part.

the Rules of Procedure provided that the Conference should, at each regular session, elect Members to the Board of Governors. The term of office of such Members was two years. If the General Conference were to meet in April or May, the term of office of the Members of the Board of Governors whose mandate would expire at the end of the first session following such alteration would be reduced to one and a half years, which would be contrary to the Statute. To rectify that anomaly, it would therefore be necessary to amend Rule 83. To avoid such complications, it would be simpler to maintain the existing system, in spite of the advantages of holding the session in the first half of the year.

- 11. <u>Mr. WINKLER</u> (Chairman of the Board of Governors) pointed out that the method to be followed by the General Conference in electing Members of the Board of Governors was laid down not only in Rule 83 of the Rules of Procedure but also in Article VI of the Statute, which would be much more difficult to amend.
- 12. On the other hand, if the date of the regular session of the General Conference were altered, the term of office of some Members of the Board of Governors would be modified only for the year in which such alteration took place.
- Mr. WAKEFIELD (United Kingdom) said that he would prefer that the General Conference should normally meet in September. Apart from the budgetary complications that a modification in the existing system would entail, it was necessary to bear in mind the annual report that the Agency had to submit to the General Assembly of the United Nations, which met in September. For the report to be as nearly up to date as possible, the General Conference would need to adopt it at a date sufficiently close to that of its submission to the General Assembly.
- 14. <u>Ifr. MIKHAILOV</u> (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and <u>Mr. FAHMY</u> (United Arab Ropublic) agreed with the opinion expressed by the delegate of the United Kingdom.
- 15. The <u>CEATRMAN</u> proposed that the Director General be requested to draw up a document setting out the various aspects of the problem and the advantages of all the solutions envisaged. He hoped that the next meeting of the General Committee would be able to reach agreement on the recommendations to be submitted to the General Conference.

16. The decision on the opening date of the third regular session was of particular concern to the Austrian authorities. They would have to be consulted beforehand, particularly to ascertain whether the Hofburg would be available to the Agency at the proposed date. He therefore suggested that the Austrian delegate be invited to attend the next meeting of the General Committee.

It was so agreed.

Replying to Mr. JAY (Canada), Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General 17. Committee) explained that the General Conference, acting on the recommendation of the General Committee, would be responsible for deciding whether the opening date of the regular session of the General Conference would be in the first or second half of the year. In the document to be compiled, the Director General would give details of the budgetary difficulties that a change of date would entail. If the date of the session were merely altered by one month, such difficulties would be insignificant. the future sessions of the Conference were to be held in April or May, it would first be necessary to consider the question of the financial year, for the year in which the alteration would occur. In the transitional period, the financial year would no longer coincide with the calendar year, and it would be necessary to consider a budget covering a period of 15 to 18 months or one of 12 months and another of from 3 to 6 months.

PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

- 18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the small number of speakers who had asked to speak at the general debate in plenary, the General Committee should authorize him to invite the General Conference to interrupt that debate for the purpose of considering other items on its agenda, for instance, item 17 "Measures to obtain voluntary contributions to the General Fund, including the calling of a pledging conference".
- 19. Mr. JAY (Canada) stressed the urgent need for the General Conference to reach an early decision on the joint draft resolution relating to item 17 of the agenda . In his opinion it could be examined on the same day.

^{3/} GC(II)/54.

- 20. Mr. MIKHAILOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not be able to participate in any debate on item 17 on the same day. He requested the Chairman to invite the Conference to examine the item on the following day, at such a time as he deemed fit. He suggested that the Conference should use the time available on the same day to elect Members to the Board of Governors (item 23 of the agenda).
- 21. Mr. RAJAN (India), Chairman of the Administrative and Legal Committee, supported the proposal of the delegate of the Soviet Union. The General Conference had received the General Committee's report on item 234/ and nothing remained for it but to proceed with the election. It was desirable that the election should take place as soon as possible, as the Board of Governors would meet immediately after the General Conference and the new Members would have to be given their mandate before that meeting and prepare themselves to participate in the work of the Board.
- Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) reminded the meeting that his Government was one of the compilers of the draft resolution submitted on item 17. He shared the opinion that the General Conference should take an immediate decision on the draft, but he expressed the hope that the Canadian delegate would have no objection to discussing item 17 on the following day, as the delegate for the Soviet Union had requested.
- 23. After an exchange of views in which Mr. de ERICE (Spain), Chairman of the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee, Mr. JOLLES (Secretary of the General Committee), Mr. VEJYANT-RANGRISHT (Thailand) and Mr. WAKEFIELD (United Kingdom) participated, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the General Committee should authorize him to inform the General Conference that the election of Members to the Board of Governors would take place that day, if possible during the morning, and to invite the General Conference to interrupt the general debate on the following day in order to examine item 17 of the agenda.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.