



International Atomic Energy Agency

# GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXIX)/COM.5/OR.44  
February 1986<sup>\*/</sup>

GENERAL Distr.  
ENGLISH

TWENTY-NINTH REGULAR SESSION: 23-27 SEPTEMBER 1985

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE FORTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,  
on Thursday, 26 September 1985, at 3.50 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. SCHEEL (German Democratic Republic)

## CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
-	Election of the second Vice-Chairman	1 - 2
20	Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute (resumed)	3 - 33
21	Revision of Article VI of the Statute as a whole (resumed)	34 - 70
19	Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat (resumed)	71 - 78

\*/ A provisional version of this document was issued on 5 November 1985.

\*\*/ GC(XXIX)/763.

The composition of delegates attending the session is given in document GC(XXIX)/INF/227/Rev.3.

86-0385  
0380e

ELECTION OF THE SECOND VICE-CHAIRMAN

1. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to designate Mr. Koref (Panama) as second Vice-Chairman.

2. It was so decided.

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VI.A.2 OF THE STATUTE (GC(XXIV)/761;  
GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 and Add.1; GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41 and Add.1 to 3)  
(resumed)

3. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to study the first of the two draft resolutions which had been submitted - namely, the one contained in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1.

4. Mr. GOMAA (Egypt), rising to a point of order, noted that that draft resolution had been presented under both item 20 and item 21 of the agenda; it could, however, be said that in its substance it was more relevant to item 21. At all events, it seemed logical to reach a conclusion on the documents proposed under item 20 before studying those submitted under item 21. In that connection he wished to obtain the advice of the Legal Adviser, especially since it would seem normal to examine first the more specific aspect of the matter - namely, the amendment of Article VI.A.2 - before going into the wider question of the revision of Article VI as a whole. He therefore requested that the Committee first take a decision on draft resolution GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41.

5. Mr. ARAOYE (Nigeria) supported the point of order raised by the representative of Egypt. Item 20 had been on the General Conference's agenda for several years and was a source of concern to many Member States; that being the case, one should not shorten unduly the deliberations on that matter through the expedient of procedural finesse. Besides that, the Rules of Procedure did not provide for combining two separate agenda items - and items 20 and 21 were definitely different. Item 20 should be considered before moving on to item 21.

6. Mr. CAO (China) supported the point of order raised by the representative of Egypt.
7. The CHAIRMAN read out Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure, in which it was stipulated that he himself had to decide on any point of order raised. Having consulted the Legal Adviser, he felt that the representative of Egypt's point was in order and ruled that under item 20 the Committee would have to take a decision on draft resolution GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41.
8. Mr. LOPEZ-MENCHERO y ORDONEZ (Spain) felt that there was some misunderstanding with regard to the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1. The draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40 had been submitted by Tunisia in relation only to agenda item 20, and it was at the request of the Spanish delegation that the revised version (in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1) had been submitted also in relation to item 21. For practical reasons, it had been regarded as simpler to submit to the Committee a single document; there had never been any question of combining the two agenda items.
9. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia) pointed out that on the previous day, when he had orally introduced the draft resolution later issued in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40, there had been no other draft resolution before the Committee under item 20. The draft resolution now before the Committee in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 was as relevant to item 20 as to item 21 of the agenda. While fully understanding the point of view expressed by the representative of Egypt, he wished to stress that the text submitted by Belgium, Italy, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 had been submitted first.
10. Mr. ARAOYE (Nigeria) wished to have it made clear to him under which agenda item the Committee was supposed to consider the draft resolution in question. One thing was clear: given its contents, it could not be considered under item 20.
11. Mr. GOMAA (Egypt) felt that the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 could not be submitted under two agenda items at the same time; it would be difficult to consider it twice, first under item 20 and then under item 21. Its sponsors would therefore have to choose to submit it

under one or the other of those two items and to modify the content of it accordingly.

12. Mr. RAINER (Legal Adviser) said that there were two separate questions to be considered: the question whether two agenda items could be combined or not and the question whether the Committee was bound to follow the chronological order in which the drafts had been submitted. With regard to the first question, it was true that the Rules of Procedure did not provide for several agenda items to be considered together, but nothing formally opposed that. As to the order in which the drafts submitted should be considered, the Committee was fully empowered to decide on that. However, in the given instance a point of order had been raised and the Chairman had given a ruling on it. It was now for the committee to decide whether to accept that ruling or appeal against it.

13. Mr. LOPEZ-MENCHERO y ORDONEZ (Spain) pointed out that in his comments the Legal Adviser had not referred to the clarification which he himself had made, - namely, that there was no question of combining two items, but merely a matter of two documents being submitted together for the sake of simplicity.

14. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia) said that it was clear from the Legal Adviser's comments that the Committee was its own master with regard to the consideration, separately or otherwise, of items 20 and 21 and the order in which to study the draft resolutions, but account should be taken of the order in which they had been presented. The crux of the matter was that items 20 and 21 were closely interlinked; paragraph A.2 of Article VI, which the General Conference had for a long time found to be a stumbling-block, was inseparable from paragraph A.1, and it would not be possible to alter the balance within the Board without making allowance for that fact. That being the case, it was essential for delegations to have a chance to speak on both aspects of the matter - in other words, on both paragraphs.

15. Mr. GOMAA (Egypt) recalled that he had raised a point of order and that the Chairman had ruled that it was admissible. If the Chairman's ruling was being challenged, the Committee should proceed to a vote.

16. Mr. HAUSTRATE (Belgium), quoting Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, said he wished to appeal against the Chairman's ruling: he called on those delegations which felt that the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 should be the first to be considered under item 20 of the agenda to make it known by their vote.

17. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the appeal brought by the representative of Belgium.

18. There were 42 votes in favour of the Chairman's ruling and 13 against. The Belgian appeal was accordingly rejected.

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41.

20. Mr. GOMAA (Egypt), presenting the draft resolution on behalf of the co-sponsors, said that the question of amending Article VI.A.2 of the Statute had been pending for more than eight years. It had been the subject of several General Conference resolutions, in which the General Conference had recorded the goodwill and understanding of Member States with regard to the regions which were underrepresented on the Board. That goodwill must now be translated into specific action. The draft resolution submitted was a simple one, being based on previous resolutions; in submitting it, the co-sponsors had sought to keep in mind the complexity of the matter.

21. Mr. PRIBICEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the question of reorganizing the Board was far from being a recent one; the first resolution on the matter went back almost nine years. It was therefore high time that action was taken and that the Agency accorded to the matter the priority which it deserved. The flagrant underrepresentation of certain regions had time and again been acknowledged in General Conference resolutions.

22. Members of the Committee would have noted that the draft resolution attempted to focus attention on one question, which was subsequently to be considered by the Board. His delegation would, of course, have preferred to be able to take a clearer stand, but the matter seemed too complex to be solved at the present session of the General Conference; hence all one could do was to settle for further consultations.

23. In their statements, numerous representatives had said that the position of their Governments was well known. The root of the problem was actually that each maintained a fixed point of view, while the opponents of any change defended the status quo. It was time to change that attitude and open up the way to restructuring the Board in a manner reflecting the changes which had taken place in the world political situation as a whole. For its part, his delegation firmly supported the idea of change.

24. That did not diminish the importance of the draft resolution submitted by Belgium and others, and his country was naturally ready to join in discussion of any problems to which it might give rise.

25. He felt that the General Conference should adopt the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41, of which Yugoslavia was one of the sponsors.

26. Mr. BADRAN (Jordan) supported the draft resolution submitted by Egypt, Mexico, Pakistan and Yugoslavia. As everyone was aware, the matter of representation on the Board had been under consideration for a long time; it was now time for the General Conference to make its position clear, since there was underrepresentation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia.

27. He did not see why the proposal of Belgium and others should be thought of as a counter-proposal. It related to a separate issue, to be considered at a later stage. As a starting point, one could modify Article VI.A.2. Then, if it was thought necessary to restructure the Board as a whole, that could be done afterwards. On the other hand, to postpone a solution which had long been the expressed desire of the General Conference in order to allow restructuring of the Board as a whole would run counter to the spirit of the relevant Conference resolutions. That was why his delegation supported the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41. There would be time to consider the proposal made by Belgium and others, or any similar one, at a later stage.

28. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia) said that his delegation was not against the idea of pursuing informal consultations under the guidance of the Chairman of the Board of Governors, given the complexity of the matter and the importance accorded to it on all sides. He was anxious that there should be full compliance with the Agency's Statute, with the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Board and with the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. He believed that the consultations advocated in the draft resolution could be more easily carried out within a group open to all Member States and with terms of reference set by the General Conference.

29. A mechanism of that kind would serve a useful purpose, but it did not mean that he was against the idea of continued consultations among the Members of the Board. Such consultations had already been going on for a number of years, and it was the Board's responsibility to continue with them. His delegation considered that the demands of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia should be carefully considered. Whether it was a question of amending Article VI.A.2 or of revising Article VI as a whole, the important thing was that justice should be done to the two underprivileged areas. Tunisia therefore supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41.

30. Mr. KOREF (Panama), referring to Rule 60 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference, moved the closure of the debate. The matter under consideration had been discussed in depth at the previous day's meeting and he believed that all delegations had already expressed their views. The representative of Tunisia had supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41, and it was therefore possible to close the debate and to take a decision on that draft either by vote or by consensus.

31. The CHAIRMAN read out Rule 60 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference; noting that there was no objection to the motion which had just been proposed, he declared the closure of the debate on item\*20 of the agenda.

32. He took it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Conference adopt draft resolution GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41.

33. It was so decided.

REVISION OF ARTICLE VI OF THE STATUTE AS A WHOLE (GC(XXIX)/752 and Add.1 to 3; GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1) (resumed)

34. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of item 21 and to take a decision on the draft resolution submitted by Belgium, Italy, Morocco, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia (in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1) and sponsored by Guatemala and Panama, bearing in mind the initial consideration of the matter which had taken place at the previous meeting and of the decision which had just been taken with regard to item 20 of the agenda.

35. Mr. KOREF (Panama) suggested that the Committee approve the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1.

36. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had always been in favour of amending Article VI.A.2 so as to ensure fairer representation for Africa and the Middle East and South Asia. For eight years no progress had been made on that matter. Each group had adopted a point of view and was abiding by it. Since another group of countries, different from those which had previously called for an amendment of Article VI.A.2, was now submitting a draft resolution, his delegation felt that the time was ripe to contemplate a revision of Article VI as a whole.

37. His delegation considered that, in order to break the deadlock which had existed for years, it would be useful to recommend to the General Conference that it adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1. It contained two new elements: support from a group of European States which showed their interest in a total or partial amendment of Article VI, and the establishment of a working group, which would be more mobile and more dynamic than the consultations so far held between the Chairman of the Board and the Board Members.

38. Those were the reasons why his delegation had co-sponsored the draft resolution, the aim of which was to amend Article VI so as to do justice to the two underrepresented areas and, if necessary, to make changes in the position of other areas.



39. Mr. GOMAA (Egypt) saw nothing wrong in a given country or area seeking a certain level of representation. He fully appreciated their motives and had already submitted a proposal of his own under a different item.

40. He wished, however, to make known his views on the draft resolution under consideration. First, the title should refer only to revising Article VI of the Statute as a whole. Second, he was pleased that the sponsors of the draft resolution had mentioned the request made in 1977 by Africa and the Middle East and South Asia.

41. From Rule 67 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference it would seem that a proposal to set up a working group, which might involve expenditure by the Agency, had to be the subject of a report from the Director General and a report from the Committee to the General Conference. His delegation therefore preferred the draft resolution which was to be recommended for adoption under item 20, since it did not call for the formation of a working group, leaving it to the discretion of the Board to set up an informal working group composed of Board Members if it saw fit. However, if the title of the draft resolution referred only to revising Article VI as a whole, and if it was understood that the interests of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia would have priority during the discussions, his delegation would not oppose the draft resolution.

42. Mr. STORHAUG (Norway) felt that, with regard to the question of revising Article VI of the Statute as a whole, it would be reasonable to adopt a procedure similar to the one that had just been agreed on with regard to the question of amending Article VI.A.2 of the Statute.

43. Like the representative of Egypt, he felt that the title should be modified. Furthermore, the first paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, the rest remaining unchanged; that would bring the text more into line with the resolutions on Article VI.A.2.

44. Mr. BRADY ROCHE (Chile) recalled that his delegation had indicated at the previous meeting that it supported the establishment of a working group open to all Member States but that such a group would have to bear in mind the existing relative representation of Latin America in the Board of Governors.

45. Since paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 did not fully reflect that position, his delegation would not be able to support it.

46. Mr. HAUSTRATE (Belgium) fully supported the statement made by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. Belgium had always believed that the legitimate claims of the developing countries should be given consideration. As the consensus on the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/41 had shown, Belgium had no basic objection to amending Article VI.A.2; however, his country felt that for reasons of efficiency and procedure it would be far preferable to give consideration to the claims of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia within a broader framework. That was why his delegation recommended adoption of the draft resolution now before the Committee.

47. Mr. DANIELS (United Kingdom) said he saw merit in the continuation of informal discussions under the guidance of the Chairman of the Board of Governors. He understood, however, that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 did not rule out consideration by the proposed working group of any new proposals which might be made. On that basis, if it was the wish of the majority to set up a group, he was prepared to agree to that.

48. Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic), noting that the Norwegian delegation was in favour of deleting paragraph 1 from the draft resolution, pointed out that the draft would then lose most of its meaning. Moreover, his delegation attached great importance to amending Article VI.A.2 and therefore insisted that the title of the draft resolution remain unchanged.

49. Mr. MAKAREVITCH (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Norwegian proposal to delete the first line of the title of the draft resolution and also the first paragraph of that draft.

50. Mr. ALER (Sweden) felt that, as he had indicated the previous day, consultations represented a more effective mechanism than a working group. Hence he supported the Norwegian proposal.

51. Mr. SPILKER (Federal Republic of Germany), said he had noted from document GC(XXIX)/752 the great differences of opinion which prevailed in the

Board with regard to the question of revising Article VI. It was clear that it would take time to resolve the matter and that the arguments put forward would need to be considered in depth. Nevertheless, his delegation did not support the idea of entrusting the search for suitable solutions to a working group, which would lack flexibility. He therefore endorsed the proposal made by the representative of Norway and would join a consensus in favour of inviting the Board to arrange informal discussions under the guidance of the Chairman.

52. Mr. HAUSTRATE (Belgium), noting that in the draft resolution the Board was requested to establish a working group open to all Member States with a mandate to propose amendments to Article VI.A.2 and A.1 of the Statute, said that, as reference was thus made to Article VI.A.2, the title was of little importance.

53. Mr. BARTELL (United States of America) and Mr. ALMINAYES (Kuwait) supported the proposal put forward by the representative of Norway.

54. Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina), expressing the belief that it was vital to find a solution to the problem of representation within the Board of Governors and that undesirable tensions should be avoided, said he was prepared to join any consensus on the procedure to be followed if such would make it possible to arrive at a definite solution.

55. Mr. TAKABE (Japan), noting that his delegation's position was clearly stated in the report of the Board of Governors (GC(XXIX)/752/Add.3) and that he did not wish to restate it, said his delegation also supported the proposal made by the representative of Norway.

56. Mr. PERRIER de LA BATHIE (France) also supported the proposal made by the representative of Norway to delete paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1; it should be left to the Board of Governors to decide on the procedure to be followed.

57. Mr. BORGA (Italy), stating that he was in favour of the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1, said his delegation sympathized with the just aspirations of the areas which were calling for fair

representation on the Board. A more effective mechanism was needed to that end, and paragraph 1 of the draft resolution before the Committee accordingly seemed to his delegation to be essential.

58. Mr. CEJNAR (Czechoslovakia) considered that the way in which the Board of Governors achieved the desired end, i.e. a revision of Article VI of the Statute as a whole, was up to the Board itself. Hence his delegation also subscribed to the opinion that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution should be deleted.

59. Mr. MORALES (Cuba) considered likewise that the title of the draft resolution lent itself to confusion and, though not opposed to it, his delegation felt it would be better to make it more precise. If a working group open to all Member States was created, his delegation would participate in its work.

60. Mr. DIDIER (Brazil) associated himself with the Norwegian proposal.

61. Mr. HOEHNE (German Democratic Republic) said he could not support the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1; his delegation would prefer consultations to continue under the guidance of the Chairman of the Board. He could accept the proposal made by the representative from Norway.

62. Mr. HERNANDEZ MATA (Mexico) joined all those delegations which had requested the deletion of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution under discussion.

63. Mr. B.W. LEE (Republic of Korea), Mr. KENYERES (Hungary), Mr. ADAMS (Nigeria) and Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) supported the Norwegian proposal.

64. Mr. ROBOTHAM (Jamaica) felt that the title of the draft resolution might be confusing and proposed that the first line be deleted; also, the deletion of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution was acceptable to his delegation. His delegation was of the belief that, as all regions had the right to equitable representation on the Board of Governors, they would be able to support the draft resolution. However, the observation made by the representative from Chile would have to be borne in mind and allowance made for the interests of Latin America.

65. Mr. ASHAN (United Republic of Tanzania) said he could accept the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 on condition that the first line of the title and also paragraph 1 were deleted.

66. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia), said that from the observations made by many delegations, it was clear that the idea of creating a working group was encountering considerable opposition and complicating the situation. Referring to Rule 65 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference concerning the withdrawal of proposals, he invited the other delegations which had co-sponsored the draft resolution under consideration to express an opinion on that matter; he himself was prepared to withdraw the draft resolution.

67. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 were in agreement with the representative from Tunisia on its withdrawal.

68. The draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/40/Rev.1 was withdrawn.

69. The CHAIRMAN assumed that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Conference take note of the report from the Board of Governors contained in document GC(XXIX)/752/Add.3.

70. It was so agreed.

STAFFING OF THE AGENCY'S SECRETARIAT (GC(XXIX)/755; GC(XXIX)/COM.5/42/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 (resumed)

71. Mr. SHASH (Egypt), presenting the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/42/Rev.1, recalled that a large number of informal consultations had taken place during which he had gained the impression that, generally speaking, it was felt that the draft resolution submitted by Egypt, Iraq, Pakistan and the various countries mentioned in Addendum 1 should be flexible and moderate.

72. In those consultations, certain amendments to operative paragraph 2 had been agreed on. They were: the addition of the words "in accordance with the Statute" after the words "further steps"; the addition, after the words "staff

members", of the words "at all levels"; and, in the English version, the replacement of "over" by "in". Moreover, in the French version, the end of the last line of operative paragraph 2 should read "quatre prochaines années". His delegation had endeavoured to devise a text which could be adopted by consensus, as had been the case in 1981 with resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. That resolution was the authoritative one, and it was important for the developing countries, which accounted for two thirds of the Agency's membership and whose nationals in 1981 had occupied only 19% of the total number of Agency posts. Between 1981 and 1984, there had been an improvement and the percentage had reached 21%, for which he was grateful to the Director General. In the 1981 resolution, a period of four years had been proposed for correcting the imbalance; that period was over and it was necessary to renew the efforts which, in 1981, had led to the adoption of resolution GC(XXV)/RES/386. In operative paragraph 1 of that resolution, the General Conference had requested the Director General "to take immediate steps to increase substantially the number of staff members drawn from developing areas at all levels, and particularly at the senior and policy-making levels, and to make maximum efforts to rectify the existing imbalance over the course of the next four years". The previous year's resolution had reiterated that request, and the draft resolution in document GC(XXIX)/COM.5/42/Rev.1 was based on the Statute, which clearly set forth the criteria to be observed in appointing personnel, particularly to senior posts. The Agency had to comply with the obligations imposed on it by the Statute, and efforts should be renewed to rectify the imbalance which still obtained; it was to be hoped that all representatives would support the text of the draft resolution.

73. Mr. ZOBOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that during the consultations which had taken place the representatives of Egypt and the representatives of the countries of Eastern Europe had endeavoured to ensure that the draft resolution reflected changes in the recruitment of Professional staff which had taken place over the previous four years in order to give a true picture of the situation, for, whereas the representation of seven geographical areas (and that of the developing countries) had increased, the representation of one area had not only not increased but even been

reduced, which was obvious discrimination. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution had unfortunately not agreed to a phrase reflecting that situation appearing in their text. As a result, the Soviet delegation could not accept the draft in its entirety and would be unable to support it, should it be put to the vote.

74. Mr. BORGA (Italy) could accept the draft resolution, but wished to point out his interpretation of the text. The draft resolution in no way modified the conditions set forth in Article VII.D of the Agency's Statute. The reference to the Statute which the representative of Egypt had introduced orally as an addition to the text should be construed in accordance with that paragraph of Article VII.

75. Mr. BARTELL (United States) said that the United States, like other countries, had acknowledged the Secretariat's success in increasing the number of nationals from developing countries amongst the Agency's staff. The draft resolution under discussion further commended the efforts of the Director General and the steps he had taken to implement the 1981 resolution and to increase the number of Professional staff from developing countries. His delegation endorsed that commendation and therefore disagreed with the statement in paragraph (c) of the preamble that the representation of developing countries in the Secretariat remained "inadequate". Like other countries, the United States, both in the Board and during the current session of the Conference had emphasized that the Secretariat, and also individual Member States, should do everything possible to ensure that the best applicants, regardless of national or regional origin, were recruited. The proper functioning of the Agency was the principal goal of Member States, hence it was essential for the Director General to follow the paramount consideration set forth in Article VII.D of the Statute. It was most inappropriate to expect the Director General to let the selection criteria for Professional staff indicated in the Statute be unduly influenced by other considerations. He believed, accordingly, that in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution the request that the Director General take further steps to increase "substantially" the number of staff from developing countries should be deleted so as to permit him to continue taking responsible steps towards achieving balanced geographical representation. Without that deletion the United States delegation could not accept the draft resolution.

76. Mr. SPILKER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the information submitted to the Committee of the Whole in document GC(XXIX)/755 gave proof of the Director General's continuing efforts to take into account the General Conference resolutions requesting him to take steps to increase the number of staff members from developing areas, particularly at the senior and policy-making levels. There could be no doubt that in the implementation of those resolutions, the relevant considerations in Article VII of the Statute had been duly taken into account. As to the draft resolution, his delegation welcomed the changes introduced orally by the representative of Egypt, in particular the addition of "in accordance with the Statute"; nevertheless, like the United States delegation, he could not accept operative paragraph 2, where it was requested that the number of staff members drawn from developing countries be increased substantially. While it was true that in 1981 the word "substantially" had appeared in the resolution, action had been taken to put the situation right and the progress made ought to be reflected in the text under discussion; the word "substantially" should therefore be deleted. The first sentence of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution might perhaps be changed to read: "... Requests the Director General to take steps in accordance with the Statute to further increase the number of staff members ..." In submitting that proposal to the Committee, his delegation considered it was important to obtain a consensus on the matter.

77. Mr. SHASH (Egypt) pointed out that the proposal before the Committee had nothing new in it: it simply asked the Director General to continue the efforts which he had already been making, and for which he should be thanked, by taking further steps. The developing countries' concerns had already been expressed in the Board of Governors. As far as introducing the amendment "in accordance with the Statute" was concerned, he would have preferred the phrase to come in the preamble, but his delegation could accept it in operative paragraph 2. Everyone was aware that an imbalance still obtained in the representation of the developing countries, but that did not mean that other areas might not feel themselves underrepresented or that they would not be entitled to demand appropriate representation. Nevertheless, he might not believe that the socialist countries were opposed to the right of the developing countries to improved representation. To weaken paragraph 2 further would not be acceptable to the Group of 77. He therefore abided by the text of the proposal.



78. The CHAIRMAN proposed that delegations be left time for further reflection on the matter with a view to the draft resolution being adopted by consensus.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.

