



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXX)/COM.5/OR.48

February 1987*

GENERAL Distr.

ENGLISH

THIRTIETH REGULAR SESSION: 29 SEPTEMBER-3 OCTOBER 1986

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Wednesday, 1 October 1986, at 10.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. de la BARRE d'ERQUELINNES (Belgium)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>	<u>Paragraphs</u>
- Discussion of draft resolutions under item 10	1 - 8
13 The financing of technical assistance	9 - 10
14 Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat	11 - 18
15 Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute	19 - 59
16 Revision of Article VI of the Statute as a whole	60 - 90

[*] A provisional version of this record was issued on 10 November 1986.

[*] GC(XXX)/789.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document
GC(XXX)/INF/238/Rev.4.

87-0270
1032e/0134e

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ITEM 10 (GC(XXX)/COM.5/45, GC(XXX)/COM.5/48 and Add.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that four draft resolutions had been distributed for discussion by the Committee: GC(XXX)/COM.5/45 submitted by Italy under item 10, "The Agency's programme and budget for 1987 and 1988"; GC(XXX)/COM.5/46 submitted by Egypt, Iraq and Mexico under item 13, "The financing of technical assistance"; GC(XXX)/COM.5/47 submitted by Egypt, Iraq and Mexico under item 14, "Staffing of the Agency's Secretariat"; and GC(XXX)/COM.5/48 submitted by Italy and Switzerland under item 10.
2. He proposed first of all to give the floor to the representative of Italy, so that the latter could present the two draft resolutions submitted under item 10, then to proceed to the draft resolution on the financing of technical assistance, and after that to take up the draft resolution on the staffing of the Agency's Secretariat.
3. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) observed that numerous delegations had not had time to study draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/48. During the negotiations for the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident, the experts had encountered difficulty in finding a precise meaning for the expression "radiological safety significance", which occurred in Article 1 of the Convention. Owing to lack of time it had not been possible to evolve a generally acceptable definition, and that gave rise to many problems for some delegations, particularly for his own. Although it was true that the Convention had been adopted at the special session of the General Conference and that a number of countries had signed or were about to sign it, it remained a fact that an effort must be made, in the near future, to define the expression in question more closely. The threshold fixed for the early notification of an accident was at present associated with the concept of "radiological safety significance". Application of that concept was not simple. The International Nuclear Safety Advisory Group (INSAG) had put forward a number of suggestions on the subject, particularly with regard to "intervention dose levels". Those two concepts were to some extent interrelated. The Italian delegation took it that the Agency intended to continue its work on the matter in the context of its expanded nuclear safety activities and by the draft resolution under discussion the Swiss and Italian

delegations were proposing that the Secretariat be urged to continue technical studies in that direction, in co-operation with other international organizations.

4. Draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/45 dealt with the Agency's Incident Reporting System, which had been discussed during the meeting of experts held during the summer. The Italian delegation had already indicated that it was in favour of that system, although it would like a number of improvements to be made to it, for at present everything depended on the goodwill of Member States, which was not a very satisfactory situation. Hence the Italian delegation was proposing, by means of the present draft resolution, that in the relevant Agency activities or activities conducted under the Agency's auspices particular emphasis be placed on the study of safety-significant events of which the Agency should be notified. His delegation considered that agreement should be reached on the deadline for reporting such events to the Agency, which should then proceed, possibly in the context of a group of experts, to a thorough study and evaluation of those events with a view to improving the safety of nuclear power plants throughout the world.

5. Mr. PICTET (Switzerland) said that the representative of Italy had very well described draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/48 presented by Italy and Switzerland and he himself wished simply to add a few words on the subject of "intervention levels". In Switzerland the effects of fallout from the Chernobyl accident had been more psychological and commercial than radiological. The commercial effect had affected both domestic and foreign trade. Unfortunately, the psychological effect had had important political repercussions and, in spite of the efforts of the Government, risked jeopardizing nuclear development in Switzerland. One of the grounds for the concern felt by the public lay in the fact that the protective measures taken had varied greatly from one country to another. In his delegation's opinion, therefore, it was necessary to evolve an international scientific basis which would make it possible to identify common criteria for implementing measures of protection against stochastic effects in the agro-food sector, i.e. to fix, inter alia, primary intervention levels, taking into account different scenarios, the criteria for derived intervention levels, and criteria for application of the optimization principle to corrective measures.

6. Switzerland had proposed that the World Health Organization hold a meeting in Switzerland to discuss those problems in the spring of 1987. Various international organizations, including the Agency and OECD in the nuclear energy field, should participate in that meeting. That was why it was important that the Agency should itself also prepare recommendations on the subject.

7. The Swiss delegation likewise gave its entire support to draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/45.

8. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order that Committee members might have time to study the draft resolutions contained in documents GC(XXX)/COM.5/45 and GC(XXX)/COM.5/48, the Committee now consider the other draft resolutions which were still before it.

THE FINANCING OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (GC(XXX)/COM.5/46)

9. The CHAIRMAN he took it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Conference adopt the draft resolution on the financing of technical assistance submitted by Egypt, Iraq and Mexico in document GC(XXX)/COM.5/46.

10. It was so decided.

STAFFING OF THE AGENCY'S SECRETARIAT (GC(XXX)/COM.5/47)

11. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee consider draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/47 on staffing of the Agency's Secretariat, submitted by Egypt, Iraq and Mexico.

12. Mr. HAWAS (Egypt) requested that the records of the discussions under the item be transmitted to the Board along with the resolution, if it was adopted.

13. Mr. MORALES (Cuba) said that he was not in principle opposed to the draft resolution under discussion, but wished to point out that the second paragraph of the operative part referred to the "next four years".

14. Mr. CHAUDHRI (Pakistan) considered that the observation by the representative of Cuba was entirely justified. In the resolution adopted at the previous regular session reference was made in the second paragraph of the operative part to a period extending over the "next four years". Since one year had passed since then, "four" should perhaps be replaced by "three".

15. Mr. MALU (Zaire) said that he had no particular objection to the draft resolution, which he was prepared to accept. He wished nevertheless to point out that among the developing countries some were more equal than others, and that the African countries were the least favoured. He therefore proposed adding to operative paragraph two the phrase "taking due account of the need for equitable geographical distribution", so as to draw the Director General's attention to the consistent under-representation of Africa.

16. Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he supported in principle draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/47, but believed that the concern of the Cuban representative was justified and should be taken into account. Also, he suggested adding to the preamble a reference to the value of the training programme for graduates and young professionals from developing areas, with the aim of increasing the participation of developing countries in the work of the Secretariat. He therefore proposed adding to the preamble a paragraph worded as follows: "Noting with satisfaction the Agency's programme for training young professionals from developing countries". That would more accurately reflect the point of view and the hopes of the developing countries.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that, there being no objections, he took it that the Committee wished to recommend adoption by the General Conference of draft resolution GC(XXX)/COM.5/47 amended as suggested by the representatives of Pakistan, Zaire and the Islamic Republic of Iran. He also took it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Conference that it request the Director General to transmit to the Board of Governors the records of its discussions under the item.

18. It was so decided.

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VI.A.2 OF THE STATUTE (GC(XXX)/787)

19. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia) recalled that the matter of the under-representation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia on the Agency's Board of Governors had been outstanding since February 1977. Since that date, the question of amending Article VI.A.2 of the Statute had figured without interruption on the agendas of the Board and of the General Conference, which suggested that the Agency's Member States believed that the matter was one of

great importance and required maximum support in the light of the provisions of the Agency's Statute.

20. Africa remained the least equitably represented area on the Agency's Board of Governors. With Zimbabwe and Namibia, there were now 27 African Member States, but Africa had only five full seats on the Board and a one-third share of a "floating" seat. It was as a result of that clear imbalance that all the African States attached great importance to amending Article VI.A.2 of the Statute.

21. The Tunisian delegation regretted that the Board had still not recommended any solution of the problem to the General Conference, although several informal proposals had been put forward. While remaining open to any dialogue on the subject, it associated itself with the consensus of the African countries.

22. Mr. GOMAA (Egypt) said that the representative of Tunisia had very clearly set forth the position of the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia, which were calling for an amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute. The item had indeed been before the Board and the General Conference for years, and it was essential to find a solution to the question of the representation of those two areas on the Board. Successive Chairmen of the Board had conducted consultations in an attempt to find a way of correcting the imbalance, but it had not yet been possible to arrive at any consensus. The Egyptian delegation again urged that the Board study the possible solutions and submit proposals to the General Conference at its following session.

23. On the previous day the African countries had decided to lend their unanimous support to a draft resolution whose text was similar to that of the resolution on the subject adopted by the General Conference at its twenty-ninth session. The text of the resolution had been discussed that very morning by the Group of 77. In the absence of an agreement on the subject within the Group of 77, the African group had decided to submit the draft resolution officially as soon as it could be distributed. The fact that it had been impossible to achieve results during the past eight or nine years was no reason for abandoning all hope of finding a solution. The Egyptian

delegation was therefore maintaining the position which it had repeatedly taken up at earlier sessions of the General Conference and at meetings of the Board of Governors.

24. Mr. ABOUTAHIR (Morocco) said it was time to examine with the interest and understanding which they deserved the legitimate aspirations of the African continent, which wished to achieve, on the Board, a representation corresponding to its representation in the General Conference. The Moroccan delegation reaffirmed its support for the African proposal, submitted several years previously, calling for the creation of five new seats, three for Africa and two for the Middle East and South Asia. That measure would result in equitable representation without upsetting the balance within the Board and without impairing the Board's effectiveness. The Moroccan delegation therefore associated itself with the African group's decision as described by the representative of Egypt and intended to support the draft resolution to be submitted on the subject.

25. The question of a revision of Article VI of the Statute as a whole was intimately connected with the item at present under discussion. In that respect his delegation considered that the proposal made by Italy and co-sponsored by Belgium, Portugal, Spain and Sweden was of interest as a basis for negotiation aimed at achieving an equitable geographical distribution in the Board. His delegation was prepared to discuss that proposal provided that the legitimate aspirations of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia - which had given rise to the agenda item under consideration - were safeguarded.

26. Mr. MORALES (Cuba), supported by Mr. DIDIER (Brazil), Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) and Mr. KOREF (Panama), recalled that various proposals for amending of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute had been submitted since 1977 without any of them obtaining the support necessary to permit their implementation. In the Cuban delegation's view, there was very little hope that proposals dealing with paragraph A.2 alone would be accepted, whatever the reasons adduced in their favour and however much they deserved to be implemented.

27. He wondered whether it was realistic to continue advocating proposals which had no chance of being adopted, and whether it would not be preferable

to seek a more general solution taking account of the interests of all the geographical areas represented on the Board. The only realistic way of finding a compromise solution was undoubtedly to undertake an overall analysis of the problem, but it was essential to take account of the interests of the developing countries.

28. The Cuban delegation remained prepared to examine with care any proposal for a solution which took account of the interests of Latin America.

29. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that the matter before the Committee, which had been the subject of long discussions since 1977 and had given rise to a record number of proposals without any solution having been found, was quite clear. In numerous resolutions (GC(XXI)/RES/353, GC(XXII)/RES/361, GC(XXIII)/RES/370, GC(XXIV)/RES/378, GC(XXV)/RES/389 and GC(XXVIII)/RES/438) the General Conference had recognized that Africa and the Middle East and South Asia were under-represented on the Board of Governors. A moderate expansion of the Board, far from impairing its efficiency, should enhance it, as had been the case with numerous governing bodies within the United Nations system.

30. The continuation of discussions on the subject could only have a negative effect. The time had come to propose a genuine solution and to create an atmosphere more favourable to real co-operation in the Agency, so that all Member States could enjoy the same advantages. The Iraqi delegation would support the draft resolution which was to be submitted and hoped that the Chairman of the Board would soon start consultations with the various groups of Member States in order to find a just and equitable solution to the problem.

31. Mr. MELIBARY (Saudi Arabia) said there was an absence of real will to solve the problem of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute, despite the expansion of the Agency's activities in Africa and in the Middle East and South Asia and the large number of countries in those two areas which were Member States of the Agency. Since 1977, those countries had been requesting - without success - that the existing imbalance in the membership of the Board be remedied through the creation of three additional seats for Africa and two additional seats for the Middle East and South Asia. It was high time to solve that problem.

32. Mr. CHAUDHRI (Pakistan) recalled that in order to correct the under-representation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia on the Board various proposals had been made over the years, beginning -- in 1977 - with the proposal that three additional seats be created for Africa and two for the Middle East and South Asia; among other objections to that proposal, it had been claimed that such an expansion of the Board would adversely affect its efficiency. A compromise proposal had then been made - that one additional seat be created for each of the two underprivileged areas. Although such a measure would not be enough to correct the existing imbalance, the countries making that proposal had hoped that it would be acceptable to the majority of Member States. A large number of Member States had indeed supported the proposal in 1978, but the two-thirds majority required for its adoption by the General Conference had not been reached, and the General Conference had instead adopted resolution GC(XXII)/RES/361.

33. The modest proposals which had been made by the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia were based on the Statute, which spoke of "equitable representation on the Board as a whole", but they were countered by arguments - such as the desirability of maintaining the "political balance" - which were not based on the Statute.

34. Proposals had also been made for a more substantial increase in the membership of the Board, but they had not won the support of a sufficient number of countries. Pakistan appreciated the concerns of the Member States making such proposals, but continued to believe that a start should be made by partly correcting the present imbalance through a very modest increase in the number of Board Members.

35. Ms. WU (China) entirely appreciated the viewpoint of the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia. The Board of Governors and the General Conference had been discussing the matter of the under-representation of those areas on the Board for nine years. That was a worrying situation, and China had already had occasion to recall that the distribution of seats on the Board should provide for a proper balance between areas. In view of the under-representation of two of the areas, reasonable adjustments should be made, in accordance with the principle of universality as applied in

United Nations bodies. In her view, a more equitable representation of those two areas would impart greater efficiency to the Board. Hence priority should be accorded to the question of amending Article VI.A.2 of the Statute, and China trusted that all Member States would participate in consultations on the subject in a spirit of mutual understanding and with the will to find a solution acceptable to all.

36. Mr. SUBKI (Indonesia), noting that the Board had begun to consider the item under discussion nearly nine years previously, said that Indonesia had always supported the legitimate claim of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia which were under-represented on the Board.

37. In spite of the efforts made and of the consultations held thus far, the General Conference, far from having a solution in sight, was now faced with an additional problem, in that it had before it a proposal to amend Article VI of the Statute as a whole. He believed that, instead of making things easier, that proposal had rendered the situation even more complicated. The only solution would be for the Conference to agree that Africa and the Middle East and South Asia were in fact under-represented on the Board and that their representation should accordingly be increased. While recognizing that other areas also had the right to submit their own proposals for an increase in representation, as provided under Article XVIII of the Statute, he considered that the point to be dealt with as a matter of priority was the under-representation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia.

38. Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that non-respect for the spirit of General Conference resolutions, together with the inadequate representation on the Board of the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia, had struck a blow at the Agency's credibility which, because of its wider implications, he considered to be even more serious than the harm suffered by those two areas. There was no question but that the interests of all Member States should be taken into account in discussions about Article VI, but each problem should be handled in accordance with its priority. In the case in point, priority should be given to amending Article VI.A.2 of the Statute, and only then should the question of revising Article VI as a whole be taken up.

39. In conclusion, he thanked the delegations of China, Indonesia and other countries outside Africa and the Middle East and South Asia which had expressed support for the claims of the countries of those two areas.

40. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) said that previous discussions, both in the Board and in the General Conference, had shown how difficult it was to arrive at a consensus when points of view were very divergent. On the matter of the composition of the Board, the essential criteria must be the effectiveness of the Board's work on the one hand and a balanced distribution of seats between the various areas on the other. The Board as at present constituted was very well balanced and did its work efficiently, and Bulgaria was far from convinced that an increase in the number of seats would improve its functioning. Nevertheless, Bulgaria appreciated the desire of the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia to be better represented on the Board. He was of the opinion that only the continuation of informal consultations under the auspices of the Board would enable a realistic solution to be arrived at.

41. Mr. MALU wa KALENGA (Zaire) said that he had been convinced by listening to certain representatives that the General Conference would see not only the tenth anniversary of the placing on the agenda of the matter under discussion but probably the twentieth as well. Certain countries and regions appeared more concerned to maintain vested interests than to remedy distortions resulting from historical circumstances and Africa's position of weakness. The point would not be lost on the countries of Africa, which would bear it in mind when other agenda items were being discussed - for example, when the discussion turned to the question of universality and the need for the rights of all Member States to be equal.

42. Mr. KHAIRUL (Malaysia), expressing his complete sympathy with the concerns of the countries in the areas of Africa and Middle East and South Asia, recalled that Malaysia had always given its support to their request for their under-representation on the Board to be remedied. However weighty the positions and proposals of other regional groups in that connection, it was beyond doubt that an amendment to Article VI.A.2 which would provide a modest increase in the representation of those two areas was a matter of priority.

43. Mr. JANOWSKI (Poland) said that the item under discussion should be viewed in a wider context, that of the role of the United Nations, an organization with a universal vocation founded 40 years before; in recent years, voices had been raised with ever greater insistence to demand that the United Nations Charter be amended and that some bodies, such as the Security Council, be operated on different lines. While it was true that the United Nations - like every human endeavour - had its faults, all recognized that it had rendered very great service and that without it the world would be much worse. Even if some parties had been demanding change for ten years past, the majority of States were of the opinion that the United Nations, all-in-all, gave satisfaction and that it was better not to change anything in, for example, the composition of the Security Council.

44. Poland thus concurred with Bulgaria in considering that an increase in the number of seats on the Board of Governors would be to the detriment of its efficiency, which was not a result desired by anyone.

45. Mr. KARIYAWASAM (Sri Lanka) considered that to rehearse once more the background to the matter under discussion served no purpose, the more so as the arguments in favour of altering the composition of the Board as proposed by the countries of Africa and Middle East and South Asia were given in document GC(XXX)/787. Some delegations were in favour of maintaining the status quo, which they considered satisfactory. However, the two under-represented areas included many developing countries which would in the near future be using nuclear power to meet their energy needs and ought therefore to play a greater role in the work of the Board.

46. The proposal to revise Article VI as a whole had made matters rather more complicated, and it required close scrutiny. While it was true to say that the concerns of all Member States had to be taken into consideration within a body which aimed to be universal, an item which had been on the agenda of the General Conference for nine years should obviously have priority and be settled quickly. In addition, Sri Lanka had reservations concerning the proposal to revise Article VI.

47. Ms. LACANLALE (Philippines) recalled the importance her country attached to the principle of the universality of the Agency, a principle which

must be reflected in an equitable representation of Member States on the Board of Governors. The under-representation of the two areas in question was widely recognized, and the imbalance should be remedied before any proposal concerning other areas was considered.

48. Mr. SILANGWA (Zambia) associated his delegation with those which had announced their support for an amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute which would meet the concerns of the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia; the arguments put forward for nine years in favour of such an amendment were sound, and the question of creating three additional seats for Africa and two for the Middle East and South Asia should receive priority treatment. Africa would one day be one of the major regions using nuclear energy, and it was time for the continent to make itself better heard within the Board. The principle of equitable geographical distribution must be applied without delay. Regarding the Board's effectiveness, it was his opinion that it would be increased, from the point of view of the developing countries, by the creation of five additional seats for the two areas under consideration.

49. Mr. CHE CRECY (Cameroon) said that he shared the opinion of those delegations which were concerned by the highly inadequate representation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia on the Board. Although opinions differed on the matter of the number of seats to award them, all were agreed that it was necessary to increase their representation, even if such an increase would necessarily affect the representation of the other areas; the latter must demonstrate their political will to make the Agency's universality a reality.

50. Mr. ADEBARI (Nigeria), noting like the representative of Zaire that 1987 would be the tenth anniversary of the submission of the proposal that three additional seats be created for Africa and two for the Middle East and South Asia, stressed that an attempt must be made to resolve old problems before starting on new ones. His delegation could not accept the delegate of Poland's claim that increasing the number of seats on the Board would reduce its efficiency. Also, Africa produced a major part of the nuclear fuel used in the world, and due account should be taken of that fact.

51. Mr. LAMPARELLI (Italy) recalled his Government's well-known interest in the matter under discussion. The problem could not be ignored at such an important moment in the life of the Agency, and no effort should be spared to find a solution.

52. Italy considered that the request of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia for additional seats was legitimate and justified; that request had been the subject of debate for a very long time, with no solution yet having been found. For that reason, with the support of Belgium, Portugal, Spain and Sweden, the Italian delegation had proposed an amendment of Article VI of the Statute as a whole, the purpose being to meet the concerns of the two areas in question and deal with the problem in a less piecemeal manner. It was not a matter of which proposal should have priority over the other, but of finding the basis for a broad consensus. In restricting the quest for a solution to a few aspects of the problem, much time was likely to be wasted and, since it was quite clear that a solution must be found quickly, it should be a solution which did not run counter to the wishes of anyone.

53. Mr. HAUSTRATE (Belgium), expressing his great sympathy with the point of view of those delegations which wished to remedy the under-representation of their own areas on the Board and recalling that some representatives had noted that the item under discussion would soon have been on the General Conference's agenda for ten years, said it was his delegation's opinion that it was likely to stay there even longer if delegations insisted on amending only sub-paragraph A.2 of Article VI. However justified the request of the countries concerned might be, they must face the political realities; the only possibility of modifying sub-paragraph A.2 was to do so within a broader framework. For that reason, Belgium was one of the co-sponsors of the Italian proposal in the Annex to document GC(XXX)/780 and called upon all delegations to support it.

54. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia) enquired whether the Committee was now being called upon to discuss item 16 of the agenda, or whether it was supposed still to be dealing with item 15. He himself would have thought that, before speaking on item 16, every delegation which wished to do so should have spoken on item 15.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that it was apparent that delegations had already begun to discuss item 16, which was difficult to separate from item 15, and that -- unless the Committee objected -- he would permit speakers to address both items together.

56. Mr. LOPEZ-MENCHERO (Spain) recalled that Spain had in the past submitted to the Board proposals for remedying the under-representation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia, and was doing so once more in associating itself with the proposal made by Italy. Both the proposal which Spain had submitted at the twenty-ninth session of the General Conference and the proposal now submitted by Italy would lead to an increase by two and two-third seats in the representation of Africa and by one and one-third seats in that of the Middle East and South Asia under Article VI.A.2; if either proposal were accepted, the representation of the various areas would be proportionally about the same, with a slight disadvantage to the Far East and to South East Asia and the Pacific. Over all, a relatively balanced distribution would result.

57. As the observations he had just made concerned only sub-paragraph A.2 of Article VI, he reserved the right to revert to the matter of the revision of Article VI as a whole.

58. Mr. MEYER (German Democratic Republic) recalled that his country's position on the matter under discussion was that the present composition of the Board of Governors enabled it to operate effectively. Proof of that fact was that during the past five months the Board had dealt with a large number of complex problems in a very short time. Any major changes in the composition of the Board would be likely to detract from its efficiency.

59. At the request of Mr. Besrouer (Tunisia), the CHAIRMAN, summarizing the discussion under item 15, stated that a majority of countries appeared to be in favour of amending Article VI.A.2, as they considered that Africa and the Middle East and South Asia were under-represented on the Board of Governors. A certain number, on the other hand, were totally opposed to any change. Among those which favoured amendment there was a split as to how to proceed: some were basically concerned about the representation of the two

areas in question, whereas others wished the problem to be treated in a more general manner. Also, the Committee of the Whole would have before it, under item 15, a draft resolution which was being prepared.

REVISION OF ARTICLE VI OF THE STATUTE AS A WHOLE (GC(XXX)/780 and Add.1, GC(XXX)/788)

60. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document GC(XXX)/780 containing a proposal by Italy for amending of Article VI of the Statute; the proposal was co-sponsored by Belgium, Portugal, Spain and Sweden. In addition, document GC(XXX)/788, in which there was a report by the Board of Governors, also contained the record of the Board's discussions on the matter since the preceding regular session of the General Conference.

61. Mr. ALESSI (Italy) said that his delegation was greatly impressed by the arguments of the under-represented areas and genuinely wished to guarantee adequate participation by the countries of those areas in the work of the Board of Governors, in view of the activities they were carrying out in pursuit of the goals of the Agency. It also appreciated the arguments of those countries which were concerned about the effectiveness of the Board of Governors, and to reconcile those two positions was no easy task. The enlargement of the Board proposed by Italy could therefore only be a limited one, as it was impossible to meet the wishes of all the countries concerned. The present imbalance should nevertheless be corrected; that imbalance was due to the fact that Article VI, which some delegations considered unalterable (a view not shared by Italy), did not take into account the technical and political changes which had occurred over the past decade.

62. The criteria and methods used in evaluating the contributions made by each country to the Agency's activities should also be changed, and Italy's goal was to enable countries which wished to participate more actively in the work of the Agency to do so. Unfortunately, the consultations so far conducted had not been sufficient to guarantee a thorough and continuing examination of the problem and its possible solutions. The Italian proposal was an attempt at a compromise which would avoid any tension which might have unfavourable repercussions on the Agency at such a critical moment of its existence.

63. Mr. TITKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), recalling the position of principle of his delegation on the subject of revising Article VI as a whole, said that the Agency was an international organization with a high degree of specialization in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Not only did it promote international co-operation in that field - it also fulfilled, thanks to safeguards, extremely important international control functions designed to strengthen the international non-proliferation regime.

64. In order to discharge its functions effectively, the Board of Governors must be balanced, diligent, compact and able to react rapidly. That last-mentioned attribute had proved itself to be extremely important during the May and June meetings, when the Board had had to take a series of urgent measures to strengthen and extend international co-operation in nuclear safety. The Soviet delegation considered that the proposal to revise Article VI as a whole would inevitably lead to a reduction in that capacity for rapid action. The composition of the Board was governed by the fundamental principles set out in Article VI of the Statute, under which the countries most advanced in the technology of atomic energy were represented on the Board of Governors together with the countries which received technical assistance. Article VI guaranteed that all the main groups of States enjoyed optimum, balanced representation.

65. It would be very dangerous to alter the composition of the Board, as that would disturb the balance which had been achieved through delicate political negotiations. The Board would run the risk of turning itself into a talking shop, incapable of taking effective, rapid action. Also, enlargement would give rise to tensions and confrontations between the various groups of States and would call forth new requests for expansion on the part of countries which still considered themselves under-represented.

66. Under present conditions, proposals to revise Article VI as a whole could only be harmful, not only to the Board of Governors but also to the Agency itself and to its functioning. The Soviet delegation therefore opposed such proposals.

67. Mr. MALM (Sweden), recalling that Sweden was a co-sponsor of the Italian proposal, said his delegation continued to consider that the present

distribution of seats did not reflect trends either in the membership of the Agency or in the technical capabilities of several countries. Sweden was convinced that a reasonable solution could be found only by reviewing Article VI as a whole, and considered that the Italian proposal could enable a balanced solution to be achieved and future tensions to be avoided.

68. Mr. BESROUR (Tunisia) expressed his satisfaction at the Chairman's summary of the Committee's discussions on Article VI.A.2.

69. The Tunisian delegation had examined the proposal to revise Article VI of the Statute as a whole which had been submitted by Italy. The African countries welcomed that proposal, as it attempted to correct the relative under-representation of Africa on the Board of Governors. Until a solution to the problem of amending Article VI.A.2 was found, Africa would not cease to denounce the injustice done to it in contempt of its interests and its rights. It was the Tunisian delegation's sincere hope that, at its current session, the General Conference would succeed in unfreezing the situation.

70. On the subject of the procedure to be followed, he proposed that the General Conference request the Board of Governors to set up an open-ended working group, with no financial implications, in order to prepare - for submission at the thirty-first session of the General Conference - a solution of the question of a revision of Article VI as a whole. The Tunisian delegation was preparing a draft resolution reflecting that proposal and hoped that it would receive very broad support.

71. Mr. ORNSTEIN (Argentina) said that ten years of continuous frustration had clearly demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the system of consultations set up by the Board of Governors to find an adequate solution to the problem of the geographical distribution of its membership. The Argentine delegation deemed it unjust that during those consultations only the opinions of the Members of the Board had been taken into account, whereas the matter affected all Member States. For that reason Argentina strongly supported the Tunisian proposal to set up an open-ended working group with a mandate to draft recommendations for submission to the General Conference at its thirty-first session.

72. Mr. ROIG (Cuba) recalled that the question of revising Article VI as a whole had been the subject of regular discussions, on the basis of a proposal submitted by Spain to the Board in 1985, since the twenty-ninth session of the General Conference. The purpose of the proposed revision was to modify the present composition of the Board of Governors so as to take into account the interests of all the geographical areas represented in the Agency. The merit of such an approach was that it would increase the number of Board Members without affecting the fine political balance which had been struck, maintaining as it would the respective levels of representation of the developed and the developing countries.

73. The Italian delegation had submitted at the June meetings of the Board a new formula, based on an earlier Spanish proposal, which, while not challenging the basic principles of that proposal, introduced certain changes and attempted to take into account the suggestions and observations put forward by other interested countries. The Cuban delegation viewed the Italian proposal very sympathetically and, although Cuba was prepared to take into account the reservations that some countries might express with regard to the text, it considered that those reservations did not appreciably alter the principles on which the proposal was based.

74. The Cuban delegation, moreover, wished to stress that the Italian proposal was the only one which, under present conditions, was likely to be broadly supported within the Agency, taking maximum possible account as it did of the interests of all the geographical areas. The proposal could be a real starting point for efforts to find an acceptable final solution to the problem in hand.

75. The Cuban delegation was prepared to participate in all consultations and studies on the matter, to take part in any formal or informal working group and to do its utmost to find such a solution in the near future. For that reason Cuba supported the Tunisian proposal.

76. Mr. SOLTANIEH (Islamic Republic of Iran) gave his support to the Tunisian proposal on the procedure for amendment. If all Member States contributed, a solution to the problem could be quickly found.

77. Mr. CEJNAR (Czechoslovakia) said that the Czechoslovak delegation had closely examined the Italian proposal to revise Article VI as a whole. His delegation had already expressed its disagreement in that regard on several occasions in the Board of Governors and the General Conference, basing itself on the same considerations as those advanced by the delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

78. Mr. SOLANO (Mexico) was of the opinion that the question of revising Article VI as a whole should be examined thoroughly and with the participation of all Member States; the Mexican delegation therefore supported the Tunisian proposal.

79. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) said that his delegation supported the Italian proposal, which had been made in response to the grievances expressed by the countries of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia. Nevertheless, despite the overall increase proposed by Italy, under-representation would persist.

80. His delegation also supported the Tunisian proposal for the establishment of an open-ended working group in which measures to achieve a more equitable representation might be worked out.

81. Mr. RODRIGUEZ CEDENO (Venezuela) said his delegation wanted a geographical balance within the Board of Governors and was therefore prepared to support any action to intensify consultations aimed at finding a satisfactory solution to the problem; it therefore supported the Tunisian proposal for the establishment of a working group.

82. Mr. BAMSEY (Australia) said that his delegation understood what had motivated those countries which supported the proposal contained in document GC(XXX)/780; also, it appreciated the concerns of those which considered it necessary to amend Article VI.A.2.

83. Nevertheless, the paramount consideration in discussions concerning the composition of the Board must be to ensure that that body kept its effectiveness and its capacity to manage the Agency's activities. For that to be achieved the Board must remain of limited size and its composition must reflect a balance between the various regional groups in accordance with the

principles of the Statute. Australia considered that the present composition of the Board fulfilled those requirements, and would not wish to detract from the ability of the Board to act effectively.

84. The Australian delegation reserved its position on the Tunisian proposal pending the provision of further details and an opportunity to reflect upon it.

85. The CHAIRMAN announced that a draft resolution relating to item 15 of the agenda had been distributed in document GC(XXX)/COM.5/49, and proposed that discussion be postponed to the following day in order to give delegations time to study it.

86. Mr. BASSOY (Turkey) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXX)/COM.5/49 and also the proposal made by Italy. Turkey also welcomed the Tunisian proposal.

87. Mr. BAEYENS (France) recalled that his delegation favoured a relatively small Board, as limited size was a necessary condition for it to be effective. In that respect France considered that the present composition of the Board, comprising as it did almost one third of the Agency's Member States, was broad enough to be representative and limited enough to guarantee effectiveness. It was a good reflection of the balance laid down in the Statute, whether in respect of advancement in the nuclear field or in respect of geographical distribution. Any change in that composition might impair a statutory mechanism which had demonstrated its effectiveness, most recently in difficult circumstances, and would introduce imbalances whose consequences had not been adequately studied. France had no desire to freeze the situation but considered that, before an amendment was approved, all its implications should be very carefully evaluated.

88. Mr. SHASH (Egypt) believed that it was unfortunately impossible to achieve a consensus on the substance of the matter at issue. Some countries wanted a revision of Article VI as a whole while others wanted an amendment of sub-paragraph A.2 of the Article, and yet others were opposed to any change. That situation would soon have lasted ten years.

89. Member States could, it would appear, agree only on the procedure to be applied in solving the problem, but not on the problem itself. The consultations which the Chairman of the Board of Governors had conducted to date had had no effect, and a new formula must therefore be found. The Egyptian delegation thus supported the establishment of an open-ended working group, to meet as soon as possible. Member States might communicate their views to the Chairman of the Board forthwith, so that the working group could examine them.

90. Finally, he urged States favouring the status quo to be more considerate towards those countries which regarded themselves as under-represented. In the present situation all Member States should work together to achieve a solution.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.