



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXV)/COM.5/OR.23
March 1982*

GENERAL Distr.
ENGLISH

TWENTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION: 21-27 SEPTEMBER 1981

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Wednesday, 23 September 1981, at 10.40 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DALAL (India)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
9	The Agency's accounts for 1980	1 - 2
10	The Agency's budget for 1982	3 - 59

* A provisional version of this document was issued on 2 October 1981.

** GC(XXV)/652.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XXV)/INF/201/Rev.2.

THE AGENCY'S ACCOUNTS FOR 1980 (GC(XXV)/645)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee of the Whole wished to recommend the General Conference to adopt the draft resolution contained in Part I of document GC(XXV)/645.
2. It was so decided.

THE AGENCY'S BUDGET FOR 1982 (GC(XXV)/646; GC(XXV)/COM.5/15)

3. Mr. MENON (India) said that Member States were once again being asked to adopt a budget in which the growth of the Agency's regulatory functions was financed by a reduction in the funds available for the promotional functions. His delegation was concerned at the proposal to reduce the Agency's activities in connection with the exchange of information on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and the study of their economic, legal, health, safety and environmental aspects. During the meetings of the Board of Governors his delegation had already expressed its reservations concerning the method of financing proposed for the international plutonium storage study.
4. It was stated in paragraph 15 of the Introduction to the budget for 1982 that there was now "a need to adopt a clear policy on the scope of the implementation of safeguards under 'voluntary offer' agreements with nuclear-weapon States". As his delegation had stated in plenary session, the application by the Agency of limited safeguards at a small number of non-military nuclear facilities in certain nuclear-weapon States, the facilities being chosen by the States themselves, did not in any way contribute to the effectiveness of safeguards or to the promotion of non-proliferation. It merely increased the activities of the Department of Safeguards, thereby increasing its budget.
5. The Committee of the Whole had before it a draft resolution presented by the Group of 77 concerning the composition of the staff of the Secretariat. His delegation attached great importance to that draft resolution and in that connection welcomed the announcement made by the Director General in plenary session. His delegation hoped that the Committee of the Whole would arrive at an agreement concerning the draft resolution and related questions before adopting a recommendation on the budget for 1982.

6. The current budgeting exercise had been complicated by unprecedented fluctuations in the rate of exchange of various currencies. In spite of those difficulties and others, the Director General and the Secretariat had performed their tasks remarkably well, and the Indian delegation was sincerely grateful to them.
7. Mr. STROHAL (Yugoslavia), congratulating the Secretariat on the excellent quality of the budget document, said that the problems raised in that document had already been discussed in meetings of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee and of the Board of Governors. His delegation wished to reiterate its remarks and reservations concerning the financing of the international plutonium storage study under the Regular Budget. The study had never been discussed by the Board of Governors, and during the last four years the Board had received no report on it. A final decision on the financing of the study could not be taken until Member States had discussed it and expressed their views on it. With that reservation, his delegation approved of the draft budget for 1982.
8. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that his Government approved of the draft budget for 1982 and especially of the importance given to safeguards, while hoping that similar importance would be attributed to technical assistance. His delegation supported the proposal of the Yugoslav delegation concerning the financing of the international plutonium storage study.
9. Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea) congratulated the Director General and the Secretariat on the excellent quality of the draft budget for 1982, which his delegation was able to approve. However, as his delegation had stressed on numerous occasions, the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, one of the two principal objectives assigned to the Agency by its Statute, was not receiving a sufficient proportion of the resources. In view of the world economic situation, Member States were obliged to accept zero growth of the budget in real terms, which implied selective programming. However, his delegation would prefer higher priority to be given to the Agency's promotional functions, such as technical assistance, training, technical operations and research and radioisotope applications.

10. Mr. HOFLAND (Netherlands) said that his delegation appreciated the redistribution of resources within the budget which had made it possible to assign additional resources to priority programmes. The Secretariat had been able to prepare a budget with near zero growth in real terms, taking into account inflation and exchange rate fluctuations. The Agency's principal functions - safeguards, technical assistance and nuclear safety - were receiving appropriate funding.
11. The increase in the number of facilities and the amount of material under safeguards had made it necessary for the safeguards budget (which was funded largely by the industrialized countries) to be increased so that the Agency could fulfil its obligations to Member States.
12. His delegation supported the agreement arrived at by the Board of Governors during its meetings in June concerning the financing of the international plutonium storage study under the Regular Budget.
13. With regard to technical assistance, his delegation noted that the resources available for that important function of the Agency were the only ones that were increasing in real terms from one year to the next. Thus, more than 85% of technical assistance requests had been met in 1980. In addition, technical assistance was being provided not only under the programme of that title, but also under other headings ("Food and agriculture" and "Life sciences", for example). In the previous year his delegation had approved of fixing indicative planning figures for the Technical Assistance Fund for several years, and it continued to consider that the system provided the recipient countries and the Agency with some predictability of resources. Subject to parliamentary approval, the Netherlands would contribute to the Technical Assistance Fund for 1982 the full amount corresponding to their base rate of assessment, namely US \$264 000.
14. His delegation attached the greatest importance to the Agency's activities in the field of nuclear safety, which was one of the essential conditions for acceptance of nuclear power by the public. That was true also of the management of radioactive wastes. It was necessary to fix international standards and criteria in that domain. The Nuclear Safety Standards (NUSS) programme and the recently revised basic standards for radiation protection were of the

- greatest importance. The proposal of the United States concerning an international convention on mutual assistance in the event of nuclear accidents should receive all possible attention, as should the Austrian proposal concerning the trans-frontier effects of nuclear power plants.
15. Finally, his delegation reserved its position with respect to the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15.
16. Mr. IONESCU (Romania) noted with satisfaction that the Agency had continued its activities under its substantive programmes, which were of particular importance to Member States, especially to developing countries. The results obtained in the programme of technical assistance and training of national staff were good, since an increase in that priority activity over the preceding year had been recorded. Nevertheless, the Agency's technical assistance activities should represent a far greater proportion of its activities as a whole, especially since the regulatory activities were already highly developed. For that reason it was necessary to provide more financial and material means for international co-operation with a view to supporting the efforts of the developing countries.
17. With regard to the supply and transfer of technology, his delegation supported the work of the Committee on Assurances of Supply (CAS).
18. The Agency's activities during the last year which had led to the preparation of safety guides and standards in many fields had been very useful. The continuation of those activities would be an effective aid to the regulatory institutions and bodies of Member States, and his delegation hoped that such guides would be prepared for other stages or operations of the fuel cycle.
19. The Romanian delegation considered that the funds allocated to research contracts should be increased. With regard to the "Information and technical services" programme, INIS was an activity of great value to national research centres. His delegation also approved the programme of conferences, symposia and seminars, believing that such meetings should further the exchange of technical information and information on individual applications of radiation and isotopes. Moreover, financial support should be provided in order to facilitate the participation in those meetings of more experts from developing countries.

20. With regard to the technical assistance programme, his delegation was convinced that the indicative planning figures agreed to for 1982 and 1983 represented minimum amounts which would be greatly exceeded as a result of the voluntary contributions of developed countries, since that activity was extremely useful to recipient countries. In that respect, the Romanian delegation believed, as did others, that efforts to improve the representation of developing countries in the professional ranks of the Secretariat should be increased, and it approved the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15. Finally, Romania would make a voluntary contribution in accordance with its base rate of assessment to the Technical Assistance Fund for 1982.

21. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) said that there was an imbalance between the funds allotted to technical assistance on the one hand and safeguards on the other. That imbalance was well known and could be seen in each of the sections of the budget taken separately, while operating costs and administrative expenses accounted for 40-50% of the total funds for each programme. Thus, over one half of the funds for technical assistance was destined to be spent on salaries and wages, common services and similar expenses. Administrative expenses and operating costs represented a very large proportion of the Regular Budget, while the funds actually available for technical assistance were considerably below the level shown by the budget as a whole. That problem required further study.

22. Mr. DE PEYSTER (France) approved the proposed increase in funds for technical assistance, safeguards and nuclear safety. The French delegation would have preferred expenses on travel and publications to have been lower. With regard to voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance Fund, the French Government would endeavour to pay its share, namely \$1 012 800. Finally, the French delegation would have to study the resolution in document GG(XXV)/COM.5/15 in greater detail before making a statement on it.

23. Mr. PICTET (Switzerland) welcomed the fact that the increase in the Agency's activities in real terms reflected in the budget for 1982 was relatively low, namely 0.7%, which was an acceptable figure. The Swiss delegation believed that the growth rate of the budget in real terms should be near zero. It welcomed the fact that, since the first draft of the budget had been submitted in May 1981, a reduction of \$12.6 million had been made in order to take account of the strengthening of the dollar.

24. With regard to individual programmes, it was "Safeguards" and "Nuclear power" which were to receive the largest increases in real terms. That was entirely justified both for safeguards - since the increase related, apart from operating expenses, to a whole range of scientific and technical services, such as the study of international plutonium storage - and for nuclear power, a sphere of particular interest to Switzerland, which had been the Agency Member State with the highest proportion of electricity generated by nuclear power in 1980. The conference to be held on the subject in September 1982 would provide the occasion for a useful and instructive status report.

25. In the face of the increases mentioned, the Secretariat had still achieved a substantial reduction in expenses on general services, for which it was to be congratulated. On the other hand, certain scientific areas had regrettably been subject to budgetary reductions - a situation that should be avoided in future, since a suitable balance must be maintained between promotional and regulatory activities

26. With regard to the financing of technical assistance, in 1980 the Swiss delegation had expressed the wish that a multi-year programme should be drawn up and that post-project evaluation reports should be submitted on the various elements of that programme. It noted with satisfaction that efforts had been made to that end. As regards Switzerland's contribution towards the target of US \$16 million, the Swiss delegation had been able, at the beginning of the Conference's session, to inscribe its pledge for 1982, subject to parliamentary approval of the Federal budget.

27. Finally, the Swiss delegation approved the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 in principle, subject to replacement of the words "by 1985" in the fourth line of paragraph 1 of the operative part by the words "during the next few years", for an express condition of such a growth in staff should be that the quality of staff be maintained. Given the current difficulties of recruiting qualified personnel, it would be rash to set a deadline at the moment.

28. Mr. KIRK (United States of America) said that his delegation approved the draft budget for 1982, which was well balanced and would lead to an increase in the effectiveness of the Agency's activities. With regard to the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15, the United States delegation had not had time to study it closely and would like discussion of it to be postponed to a later meeting.

29. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) said that his country, like many others, was feeling the effects of a difficult world economic and financial situation; the British Government had reduced its public expenditure considerably and had declared itself in favour of a similar policy for international organizations, which, it believed, should respect the principle of zero growth in expenditure. However, it seemed reasonable that the Agency should be an exception to that rule, and the modest increase in expenditure shown in the draft budget for 1982 was acceptable in view of the emphasis laid on technical assistance, nuclear safety and safeguards.

30. The target for voluntary contributions for technical assistance had been raised somewhat, and the United Kingdom intended to participate in the joint effort, since technical assistance activities should not be jeopardized by financial problems. Nor should safeguards operations suffer from restrictions, although they should be subjected to strict financial discipline. Programmes had indeed been readjusted but it should be possible to make yet further economies.

31. He wished to make a preliminary comment on the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15: an instructive comparison could be made, as far as the composition of the Agency's Secretariat was concerned, with the representation of women on the staff. If women were under-represented in the Secretariat, especially at the higher levels, that was presumably not because they were less able than male staff, nor because of any ill will on the part of those in charge of recruitment, but because women with the required ability had not been applying for posts. In those circumstances, although it would be equitable to have more women working in the Secretariat, he very much doubted whether the setting of a deadline for the achievement of that goal would be effective. Those remarks applied equally to the recruitment of nationals of developing countries; the situation would not improve from one day to the next.

32. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) believed that the budget proposed for 1982 was perfectly balanced; the Secretariat had made great efforts to eliminate unjustified increases in expenditure and had taken the serious financial problems which all countries were facing into account. The Agency was thus consistently slowing down the increases in its budget and must continue to do so, keeping unproductive expenditure as low as possible. The increase in voluntary contributions was entirely justified and the Soviet Union supported it unreservedly. Finally, he approved the three draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646.

33. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) noted with satisfaction that the draft budget for 1982 showed practically no increase in expenditure in real terms; the Japanese Government was following a similar policy for its own public expenditure, and was very anxious that that principle should be consistently applied in view of the current world economic situation. However, the application of that principle should not be allowed to hamper promotional activities, and he welcomed the fact that in the final version of the budget efforts had been made to reverse some of the original cuts in those activities; if necessary, economies should be made in other parts of the budget. Japan would thus approve the draft resolutions in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646. It would, however, be preferable to postpone consideration of the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 in order to give delegations time to study it.

34. Mr. SCHMIDT (Austria) said that the draft budget was very well balanced and that it attached the proper importance to safeguards and technical assistance activities. It was now generally held that nuclear energy would have to be developed if energy needs were to be met in the years 1980-90; in that context, the question of nuclear safety standards had assumed vital importance. In 1979, Austria had been responsible for an initiative aimed at securing closer co-operation between neighbouring countries with regard to the consequences which nuclear accidents might have beyond national frontiers. Although the risks were extremely low, the possibility that the population of a neighbouring country might be affected by an accident at a site near a frontier could not be excluded, and it was therefore essential to draw up safety standards for that type of situation. The United States proposal regarding mutual emergency assistance complemented

rather than duplicated the Austrian proposal. The Agency was the competent authority to handle that issue and it should, in accordance with the proposal put forward by the Austrian Government and Dr. Eklund and supported by many countries, seriously consider the establishment of a technical working group to study the problems. Finally, he wished to reserve the right to speak again on all draft resolutions which might be submitted under the present agenda item.

35. Mr. LÖRINC (Hungary) said that, although his Government was not happy about the increased expenditure foreseen in the draft budget for 1982, it was nevertheless aware that the increases represented a response to the requests and requirements of Member States. His Government was therefore prepared to approve the budget document and in particular the three draft resolutions annexed to it, as they were the result of praiseworthy efforts to find an acceptable balance between regulatory and promotional activities. In view of present circumstances, the Hungarian contribution had risen considerably. His delegation reserved the right to return to the estimates for 1983 and 1984, on which it had not yet expressed its views.

36. Mr. ROEHNSCH (German Democratic Republic) felt that the draft budget was well balanced. He would restrict himself to a few comments. First, although there was a slight rise in expenditure for promotional activities, that was due basically to inflation and not to the expansion of those activities. In curtailing expenditure, the Director General should take care that scientific and technical activities were not affected. The priority given to safeguards, technical assistance and nuclear safety activities was perfectly justified. With regard to safeguards, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons was clearly a constant concern of the international community. In the technical assistance sector, he welcomed the stress which had been placed on post-project evaluation and the planned extension of the computerized system of data-processing and report production to information concerning fellowships and training courses. His country had previously expressed its approval of the increase in the target for voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance Fund. He noted that the increase in expenditure under the "Nuclear power" programme was very modest. The International Conference on Nuclear Power Experience, which was to be held in 1982 and which would take stock of past experience, would be of great interest to the developing countries. In conclusion, his delegation supported the three draft resolutions annexed to document GC(XXV)/646.

37. Mrs. DAVIDOVÁ (Czechoslovakia) said that document GC(XXV)/646 and the three resolutions annexed to it should be approved by the Committee. The Secretariat had made praiseworthy efforts to effect economies while taking into account the views expressed by Member States as well as the programme and budget adopted at the twenty-fourth session of the General Conference. Her Government felt that costs should be curtailed as far as possible without impairing the Agency's effectiveness. Priority must be given to activities which benefited the developing countries, and to the safeguards, nuclear safety and nuclear power programmes. In the past, co-operation between Czechoslovak experts and the Secretariat in those fields had been entirely satisfactory. In view of the needs of the developing countries, the improvement of radioisotope techniques should also receive high priority, as should the development of the data-processing system, which would enhance the exchange of information. Her country considered that technical assistance activities should be further expanded and would substantially increase its voluntary contribution. Thanks to close collaboration with the Secretariat, the resources supplied in the past for technical assistance had been effectively used, and she was confident that that augured well for the future.

38. Mr. TEODORANI FABBRI POZZO (Italy) noted with satisfaction that account had been taken of the wish expressed by many countries that the budget should be weighted more heavily in favour of promotional activities. Three important areas of activity - safeguards, technical assistance and nuclear safety - had rightly been given priority. His delegation therefore supported the three draft resolutions contained in Annex VII to the budget document. With regard to the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15, his delegation needed time to study it in detail before stating its views.

39. Mr. RIOSALIDO (Spain) approved document GC(XXV)/646. With regard to the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15, he took note of the justifiable wish of its sponsors to secure more equitable representation within the Secretariat. However, delegations required a little more time to study the draft in greater depth. He was not of course calling into question the principle of equitable geographical distribution, but it seemed at first sight that certain passages of

the draft would profit from a more subtle wording. Thus, in the first paragraph of the operative part the expression "immediate measures" seemed a little strong. Similarly, it was expecting rather a lot simply from the practical and administrative points of view for the target of at least a third of the total staff to be achieved by 1985. A more flexible wording would therefore be preferable.

40. Mr. SIAZON (Philippines) recalled that his delegation had stated its views in detail before the Board of Governors; nevertheless he wished to make a number of observations. In the first place, it was not quite true to say that the Agency's budget showed zero growth compared with the budget for the previous year. The cash surplus, which had been \$4.5 million in 1979, might well reach \$14 million in 1981. The aggregate budget figure for 1982 was \$86 million whereas it had been \$88 million in 1981. Further, paragraph 25 of the Introduction to document GC(XXV)/646 stated that there would be a net price decrease of 4.9% compared with the 1981 budget, and paragraph 26 pointed out that the assessment for 1982 would be 5.3% lower than that for 1981. All those facts combined to contradict statements to the effect that the draft budget showed zero growth: in fact it was lower than the budget for 1981.

41. Furthermore, numerous criticisms were being levelled at the Agency. The developing countries were complaining about the inadequacy of technical assistance, and in the industrialized countries the press was voicing doubts about the effectiveness of the safeguards system. The Israeli attack on Iraq had likewise dealt a severe blow to the Agency. Finally, the Safeguards Implementation Report for 1981 showed that the equipment being used for safeguards was presenting serious problems.

42. Against that background, the developing countries were being requested to place all their nuclear activities under Agency safeguards in the name of non-proliferation. If safeguards were so important, it was essential that all nations, including the industrialized countries, should accept them. The United States Government had recently declared that security and non-proliferation were closely linked. But for the developing countries security was not merely a military question, it was also a matter of economic stability. The important thing, then, was to link assurances of supply, military security and economic stability. That was in fact what had been done at the time the Agency's Statute had been drafted, for the Statute attributed equal importance to technical assistance and safeguards.

43. With regard to the draft resolution on the staffing of the Secretariat, he recalled that the developing countries made up 66% of the Agency's membership, whereas only 15% of the Professional posts in the Secretariat were occupied by nationals of those countries. The text of the draft resolution had been the subject of criticism, but he believed that it would be possible to make certain modifications. Reference had been made to the statement of the Director General on that question; however, he (Mr. Siazon) wished to emphasize that the Director General's words were no more than a declaration of intent, whereas it was important to take definite measures very quickly.

44. Mr. COUSINS (Australia), expressing appreciation of the Secretariat's efforts in achieving a budget that ensured the implementation of priority programmes while limiting real growth to the minimum, supported adoption of the budget. As to the draft resolution on the staffing of the Secretariat, his delegation accepted the principle underlying it, but felt the implementation of such a resolution would encounter practical difficulties; for that reason, he requested time to study it more closely and consult with other delegations on the subject.

45. Mr. AAMODT (Norway) felt that in drawing up the draft budget the Secretariat had succeeded in striking an appropriate balance between regulatory and promotional activities. It was a matter for regret that variations in exchange rates should have had such a powerful effect on the budget, and he urged the Secretariat to do what it could to solve that problem. His delegation reserved the right to revert to the questions raised by document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15. It fully endorsed the principle put forward by the Director General, according to which preference should be given to candidates from developing countries when they could offer equal qualifications.

46. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that he wished to supplement what his delegation had said in the Board during the June series of meetings. First of all, while the Secretariat might deserve congratulations for having prepared a zero-growth budget draft compared to the budget for the previous year, it was a matter for regret that the principle of zero growth should also have been applied to promotional activities. The developing countries were increasingly in need of the Agency's technical assistance. He could not but observe that the appropriations for "Food and agriculture", "Physical sciences" and "Life sciences", which were of particularly great interest to the developing countries, showed at most a very slight increase over the previous year. No doubt it was a

good thing that the "Nuclear power", "Nuclear fuel cycle" and "Nuclear safety" programmes should show a marked increase because they were of interest to all countries. On the other hand, the principle of zero growth had not been applied to safeguards appropriations, which alone accounted for 33% of the Regular Budget. It was not right that there should be such a huge disparity between the growth of the safeguards budget and that of the technical assistance budget. His delegation reserved the right to revert to the question when the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/16 came up for consideration. Furthermore, it was opposed to financing the international plutonium storage study from the Regular Budget: the study should be paid for out of voluntary contributions. With regard to the other draft resolutions, concerning amendment of Article VI of the Statute and the staffing of the Secretariat, his delegation reserved the right to revert to each of them separately.

47. Mr. NANIOV (Bulgaria) felt that the Secretariat's efforts to realize economies deserved praise. In 1982 Bulgaria would be making a contribution to the Technical Assistance Fund in accordance with its base rate of assessment. It approved the draft budget for 1982 and draft resolutions A, B and C reproduced in Annex VII thereto.

48. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt) felt that promotional activities in general, and technical assistance activities in particular, should not be subject to the principle of zero growth. Those were exceptionally important activities, and they should not be neglected for the benefit of the safeguards programme. His delegation supported the draft resolution set out in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 because at present far too few nationals of developing countries held posts in the Agency's Secretariat. In general, his delegation approved the draft budget for 1982, but it reserved the right to revert later to the question of technical assistance.

49. Mr. LUCZKIEWICZ (Poland) thought the budget was well balanced and that the principle of zero growth was in keeping with the present economic situation. As to the financing of technical assistance, the Polish Government favoured a system of voluntary contributions in national currency.

50. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) felt that technical assistance was being very much subordinated to safeguards. The two activities were surely equally important. He was in favour of the draft resolution set out in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15.

51. Mr. CHOI (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) favoured the principle of zero growth but felt that it should not be applied to promotional activities.

It emerged from the draft budget that the resources available for technical assistance had not benefited from the same increase as those allocated to other programmes. The Secretariat should remedy that situation.

52. Mr. CHITUMBO (Zambia) stressed that, even though promotional activities were just as important as safeguards, they were suffering far more than safeguards from the present economic situation and from budgetary restrictions. Thanks were due to countries - notably the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and the United States - which had placed extrabudgetary resources at the Agency's disposal. He supported the three draft resolutions on the financing of technical assistance, the staffing of the Secretariat and the amendment of Article VI, all of which were particularly important to the developing countries.

53. Mr. GALVEZ VILLARROEL (Peru) was not in favour of the zero-growth principle. He supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15 and said that he would revert to that question later.

54. Mr. BELLOUKI (Morocco) emphasized that the budget was not properly balanced because the resources allocated to activities of benefit to the developing countries, particularly technical assistance, were not adequate. As to the staffing of the Agency's Secretariat, he recalled that the majority of Member States of the Agency were developing countries; the Secretariat should accordingly have a much larger complement of staff members from those countries.

55. The CHAIRMAN, noting that all representatives who had expressed the wish to speak on the subject of the budget for 1982 had now done so and that some delegations wished to give further study to the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/15, suggested that the Committee should consider that draft resolution and those annexed to document GC(XXV)/646 at its next meeting.

56. Mr. KHLESTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. KIRK (United States of America), Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan), Mrs. DAVIDOVÁ (Czechoslovakia), Mr. NANIOV (Bulgaria), Mr. HOFLAND (Netherlands) and Mr. RIOSALIDO (Spain) proposed that the Committee of the Whole should decide immediately on the three draft resolutions annexed to the draft budget and postpone consideration of the draft resolution concerning the staffing of the Secretariat until its next meeting.

57. Mr. MENON (India) and Mr. RAHMOUNI (Algeria) felt that all four draft resolutions related to the Agency's budget and should therefore be considered at the same time.

58. Mr. BUHOARA (Romania) and Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) felt that the Committee should decide on the four draft resolutions at its next meeting.

59. Mr. LÖRINC (Hungary), Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan), Mr. KIRK (United States of America) and Mr. BARUTÇU (Turkey) said they took it that, at its next meeting, the Committee would start by formulating its recommendation on the three draft resolutions contained in Annex VII to document GC(XXV)/646.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

