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* GC(XI)/368.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. The CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the two vice-chairmanships.

2. Mr. TIBULEAC (Romania) nominated Mr. Torki (Tunisia) and Mr. van Bueren (Netherlands).

3. Mr. AZAD (Iran) seconded the nominations.

4. Mr. Torki (Tunisia) and Mr. van Bueren (Netherlands) were elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

5. The CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the office of Rapporteur.

6. Mr. TACAR (Turkey) nominated Mr. Malu (Democratic Republic of the Congo).

7. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) seconded the nomination.

8. Mr. Malu (Democratic Republic of the Congo) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

9. The CHAIRMAN said that the General Conference had referred items 13, 14 and 15 of the agenda to the Committee [GC(XI)/COM.1/104], and suggested that they be taken in that order.

10. It was so agreed.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document GC(XI)/INF/96/Rev.2.
THE AGENCY’S BUDGET FOR 1968
[GC(XI)/360]

11. The CHAIRMAN invited any delegates who so wished to make general statements on the Agency’s Budget for 1968 [GC(XI)/360].

12. Mr. RAMEY (United States of America) said he wished to speak specifically in support of the Agency’s activities in nuclear power and desalting. A country’s requirements in energy and fresh water had to be satisfied if its economy was to prosper; nuclear energy had a unique part to play in that connection because of its almost boundless resources and the economic advantages of large desalting plants. Nuclear power reactors, either singly or in combination with desalting plants, were rapidly becoming conventional, in the sense that nuclear energy was automatically considered as one of the prime contenders where medium- or large-size power plants were needed. In the United States there was a definite trend towards the increased use of nuclear power by electric utility companies. In 1966 about 40% of the new steam-generating capacity ordered by utility companies had been nuclear. Since 1957 over 50 United States utility organizations had built or planned 83 nuclear power plants with capacities of up to 1100 MW(e). Those units represented a future generating capability of about 55 million kW(e). He believed that a similar trend would soon be observed in nuclear desalting, once it had been demonstrated that nuclear plants could operate at realistic costs. A large nuclear desalting plant had recently been authorized for the Los Angeles area of California to produce 1,800,000 kW of electric power and ultimately 150 million gallons of fresh water per day.

13. Referring to studies recently undertaken at Oak Ridge National Laboratory on the “energy centre” concept, he expressed the view that the concept had tremendous long-term possibilities. The Oak Ridge studies had been mainly concerned with the benefits of nuclear-powered industrial and agro-industrial complexes, which would make use of the economic advantages of large-scale nuclear power plants in combination with desalting plants to produce large amounts of low-cost energy and water for a variety of purposes; copies of the final report would be made available to the Agency, and he hoped it would be drawn to the attention of Member States.

14. In view of the social and economic importance of energy and water, he thought the Agency had a duty to ensure that Member States had the most up-to-date information on nuclear power and desalting plants; the Agency should advise on the possible use of such plants to meet specific needs, as in the IAEA-Mexican-United States study [1], and should provide the necessary services involved in selecting and siting a plant. The United States would continue to support the Agency’s work relating to nuclear power and desalting and in other important areas by providing information, panel and mission experts, training opportunities and fellowships, and by arranging visits to United States power and desalting facilities.

15. He was glad to note that the proposed budget for 1968 would provide resources for the Agency to carry on and expand its important activities in those areas, and urged that the Committee support those activities.

16. Mr. TAPE (United States of America) said he too wished to comment on three specific parts of the Agency’s Budget for 1968, those relating to safeguards, the International Nuclear Information System (INIS) and the International Centre for Theoretical Physics at Trieste.

17. He supported the increase in safeguards staff which was referred to in paragraph 13 of the draft budget and justified in Annex I thereto. That increase had become necessary because of the Agency’s increasing inspection workload and the need for new safeguards methods and devices. He pointed out that there were only a few trained and experienced safeguards experts available, and said he thought an Agency programme of safeguards training would be extremely valuable; it would also be advantageous to encourage participation by staff from private companies and national or regional institutions handling nuclear materials. The task of applying Agency safeguards would thereby be facilitated.

18. His suggestion would need to be studied, but he thought it could be at least partially implemented under the proposed 1968 budget. Use could be made of the Seibersdorf Laboratory and of the Agency’s regular staff, and guest lecturers could be provided by Member States. The United States would co-operate in that sense and would provide information and documentation.

19. As regards INIS, he saw an important role for the Agency in developing a system of international co-operation for collecting, processing and distributing to all Member States information on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. His Government was in favour of the INIS plans described in paragraph 15 of the draft budget and Annex III thereto, and supported the relevant budget appropriation of $98,000.

20. Finally, he recalled that the Board had recognized the importance of the Trieste Centre because of its valuable contribution to basic research and because of the international co-operation which it fostered between theoretical physicists from different centres. The plasma physics programme of 1965-1966 and the conference on modern theoretical physics planned for June and July 1968 were examples of such co-operation.

21. Paragraphs 17, 18 and 52 dealt with the Agency's proposed budget allocations for the Trieste Centre and the intended use of a grant made by the Ford Foundation. He hoped the proposals contained in those paragraphs would be supported. His country would be willing, at its own expense, to assign to the Centre lecturers and scientists in high- and medium-energy physics and controlled fusion research.

22. Miss HERPELS (Belgium) said she would not dwell at length on the draft budget, since her Government's views regarding it had already been expressed in the Board and also in the general debate. However, she thought it necessary to stress that her Government had certain misgivings regarding INIS; it was not opposed to INIS in principle, but was not convinced that centralization provided the best solution. It would be wrong to start on a pilot project before a detailed study of the whole question had clearly shown the need for a worldwide organization dealing with nuclear information.

23. Having carefully examined Annex III to the draft budget she wanted to make a number of specific comments. First, it would be difficult to avoid duplicating work already being carried out by other national and international bodies, for instance the International Documentation Centre of the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). Secondly, she did not share the view that the distribution of technical reports to libraries was not as well developed as that of the other forms of scientific literature. Thirdly, referring to paragraphs 9 and 10, she thought it would be better to arrange for EURATOM to do the job against payment. Fourthly, she would like to know whether the new staff members mentioned in paragraph 13 would be working on studies to determine the need for INIS or would actually initiate the proposed pilot project, without ever carrying out such studies. Fifthly, paragraph 15 was vague: there was no definite programme and it was difficult to assess how many staff members would be required. Lastly, on what terms would the publishers of Nuclear Science Abstracts agree to internationalize their work, and to what extent would non-Western sources be covered as a result?

24. It appeared from Annex III that the system advocated by the Agency could very well be built around the EURATOM automated system as far as the mechanization of nuclear documentation was concerned and around Nuclear Science Abstracts as far as publication of a nuclear abstracts journal was concerned. In that work the Agency should act solely in a co-ordinating capacity, to ensure the necessary standardization, and as a clearing-house, to bring more non-Western sources within the scope of the EURATOM system and extend its benefits to the developing countries.

25. At all events, it must be realized that the introduction of INIS would bring difficulties.

26. Mr. BRIESKORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the implementation of the INIS project would take several years and would need a cautious, step-by-step approach. The Agency would have to solve various problems. It would have to assess the differing needs of the Member States in the field of information; it would have to standardize the input data and organize decentralized input of date; it would also have to perform clearing-house functions in copying documents and distributing them to developing countries.

27. The first step should be a detailed systems analysis and a thorough study of the project. A pilot project in data processing should be organized in order to gain practical experience.

28. It would be necessary to gain the support of the publishers of Nuclear Science Abstracts and of EURATOM. His Government was willing to help and participate in expert panel meetings.

29. He was glad to note that the work of the Seibersdorf Laboratory was oriented towards the needs of the developing countries.

30. When the Agency's long-term programme was being prepared it should be borne in mind that one of the main tasks was to clarify the question of waste disposal into the sea, and any assistance which the International Laboratory of Marine Radioactivity in Monaco could give in that connection should be encouraged: it might be wise to follow the recommendations of the ad hoc committee of scientists which had studied the work and future of the Monaco Laboratory and increase the Laboratory's activities, and the agreement with the Monaco Government should be renewed for a reasonably long period.

31. At the outset of any plan for international co-ordination of research, a meeting of a small number of experts should be held, and even in the case of a programme which had been running for several years regular meetings were necessary; that also applied to the co-ordinated research contract programme, and he therefore though it unwise to reduce the number of such meetings. It was noticeable that as the Agency's staff and programme expanded, those meetings decreased in number.

32. The Agency should continue to co-operate with other international nuclear energy organizations and with interested Member States in studying the legal questions connected with nuclear energy, the transport of nuclear fuel and radioactive materials, the disposal of radioactive waste, food irradiation, etc. That would ensure that regulations kept in step with technical developments.

33. He was interested to learn of the Secretariat's training course in nuclear law planned for 1968 for lawyers from countries which were newcomers to nuclear energy activities. He thought the course
would be of value to developed countries as well. National nuclear legislations could be harmonized under the aegis of the Agency. He hoped the necessary funds could be made available for the proposed training course.

34. Mr. DUMONT (France) recalled that the French delegation had participated in the discussions of the Board and its committees on the budget, and he would therefore confine himself to a few brief remarks regarding his Government's attitude to the amount of the budget. Although he realized the value and diversity of the Agency's work, he considered that the proposed increase was too high, and he would therefore be unable to vote for the budget. He repeated his delegation's view that increases in the budgets of international organizations should not exceed the increase in the budgets of the Member States. His delegation realized that the Agency had many tasks to perform and that there were divergent opinions as to the priorities which should be accorded to them; in view of the international character of the Agency and the different levels of development of its Members, the only approach which would give general satisfaction seemed to be to increase appropriations in a balanced and uniform manner, within the limits he had already indicated.

35. Mr. SUICA (Yugoslavia) pointed out that expenditure under the Regular Budget was increasing year by year, while the Operational Budget was decreasing, and it seemed that nothing could be done to remedy the situation. Under the circumstances, more should be done to ensure a fair distribution of the benefits derived from the Agency. Expenditure on administration and staff salaries was increasing by 9-10% every year, while the increase in programme expenditure was only about 5%. For years the provision of technical assistance and other services to developing countries had been based on a target figure for voluntary contributions, although the target figure had never yet been reached; the Agency's programmes should therefore be made more realistic. The Agency could still be free to propose additional projects for each developing country, indicating what resources would be needed to implement them; the more highly developed countries could then be invited to make the necessary additional voluntary contributions in the form of money, equipment, experts, fellowships, etc.

36. The financial implications of safeguards were becoming increasingly onerous and it was to be hoped that that trend would not be to the detriment of other Agency activities. That part of the safeguards programme which ought properly to be financed from the Regular Budget should be carefully delimited and defined. Other safeguards expenditure such as that entailed in connection with bilateral agreements and inspections should be financed by special arrangements; the way things were going, safeguards expenditure would soon exceed the present level of the entire budget and that would impose an intolerable burden on Member States. On the other hand, the normal work of safeguards and inspection should not be hampered.

37. The technical qualifications of safeguards staff was another issue. Their work would undoubtedly be made more efficient if they underwent special training before recruitment.

38. The cost of the Seibersdorf Laboratory per scientist amounted to almost $30,000 a year (three or four times more than in the laboratories of the advanced countries), and the total allocation for 1968 was 10% more than in 1967; at the same time, the allocation for technical assistance and training was 4% less than in 1967.

39. The volume of work performed by the Seibersdorf Laboratory was increasing faster than had been foreseen in the long-term programme adopted at the seventh regular session of the General Conference in 1963 [2], and that had placed an increased burden on the Regular Budget. His Government considered that the importance of the Seibersdorf Laboratory should be judged in the light of how atomic energy was developing in general throughout the world and the work performed in the different national laboratories. He did not wish to underestimate the scientific ability of the Laboratory's staff or the value of their achievements, but considered nevertheless that their work should be much more closely related to urgent problems, especially those of a regional character deriving from the geographic and economic conditions of the region in question. It should also be much more closely related to the work of national and regional laboratories and form an integral part of joint research programmes. That would be cheaper both for the Agency and the countries concerned; as co-ordinator and catalyst, the Agency would also be playing a more effective part and the Laboratory would gain in prestige. One example of such a joint programme would be work on the problem of animal radiobiology as related to the production of high-grade meat, milk and other animal products; although the improvement of animal production was a problem of the greatest importance, and even a vital necessity for many countries, it was not approached on a wide enough scale. Joint research programmes could be developed, in collaboration with other United Nations agencies as appropriate, once it had been determined what subjects were of most interest to Member States. He suggested that the Secretariat should take the initiative and draw up preliminary analyses based on field studies and the proposals of Member States or of ad hoc working groups. He was convinced that a considerable number of countries would be interested in such mutual co-operation co-ordinated by the Agency's Laboratory.

40. In general, closer collaboration between the

Laboratory and the national institutes directing research would give better results at no increased cost to the Agency. Such an arrangement would certainly free the Laboratory to some extent from red tape, and in that way a larger number of countries could benefit from its services.

41. With regard to INIS, he believed that the problem of collecting and distributing scientific information was of indisputable importance. The question was how to organize the work so as to build up a rapid and efficient system on a worldwide scale. From the technical point of view the problem could only be solved by the use of digital techniques. The experience of national and regional centres afforded useful, though not fully adequate, information for setting up the world-wide system which it was the purpose of INIS to create.

42. In its capacity for processing and storing data, INIS offered no improvement over the EURATOM system; its only advantage, though potentially a great one, was that the Agency would be collecting data from no less than 102 Member States. The problem was to standardize the method of presenting data, the microfiches and the key words used, in order that they could be adopted and applied by all Member States. He was convinced that the Agency's system would be superior to those already in existence, provided that it made the best use of the experience already gained with them. The Agency's role was to set up and promote a world system which would take into account geographical and regional factors and the potential interest of the users, with particular reference to the requirements of developing countries. The establishment of such an information network was a long-term project which must be approached carefully and systematically. Its development should not involve the Agency in large additional expenses, and overlapping with other organizations of the same kind should be avoided.

43. Mr. TACAR (Turkey) said that his Government's principal concern with regard to INIS was how the Secretariat proposed to establish relationships with developing countries, and what would be required of those countries at the present time in the field of nuclear documentation. Other relevant questions had been raised by the delegate of Belgium, and he would reserve his delegation's further comments until those questions had been answered by the Secretariat.

44. Mr. IVANCHEV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was concerned at the increase of over 10% in the draft budget for 1968; if such a rate of increase continued, the contributions required would be beyond the means of many Member States. The number of new posts requested was also excessive, totalling almost 9% of the Agency's total staff; he felt that the Secretariat should be more flexible and whenever possible make an effort to transfer staff from one section to another. It should also review its requirements for new staff and attempt to reduce them to a minimum.

45. Almost 80% of the Regular Budget, or two thirds of the total budget, was used to cover administrative and other expenses not connected with technical assistance or the Agency's scientific activity. His delegation could not accept the increase in the allocations for the laboratories at Seibersdorf and Monaco, and was also opposed to the inclusion in the budget of a section for contingent extraordinary expenditures.

46. The Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Atomic Energy in Food and Agriculture was performing work of great importance to developing countries, but an attempt should be made to reach an agreement with FAO whereby it would take upon itself a larger part of the expenses involved. The Agency should be more concerned with the development of new methods than with the application of already proven ones.

47. While he approved the proposal to set up INIS, he felt that great care should be taken to collaborate with the other organizations concerned.

48. Since atomic energy could be used in all branches of science and technology, his delegation agreed that the Agency should try to obtain additional financial support from outside sources, in particular under the United Nations Development Programme and by co-operation with the specialized agencies. Activities such as research contracts or symposia on medical or agricultural subjects should be financed by the Agency jointly with WHO or FAO, while the Agency's work in training personnel should in part at least be financed by UNESCO. That would enable the Agency to devote more funds to problems which were its own exclusive concern.

49. Mr. van BUEREN (Netherlands) said that his delegation supported in principle the creation of a widely accessible nuclear documentation centre. However, as the Belgian delegate had stressed, it was important to profit as fully as possible from already existing facilities and services, for example those operated by EURATOM and the European Nuclear Energy Agency (ENEA) and the national centres in the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Far East. The task of INIS could therefore be summed up in the three words "collect, co-ordinate and distribute". INIS should make available to all Member States abstracts and microfiches in one language, preferably English, using a uniform code. To prevent duplication, some rule should be adopted for deciding which centre should prepare the first abstract of a particular paper.

50. The International Centre for Theoretical Physics should not remain a direct concern of the Agency, but should if possible be converted into an
independent supranational organization like the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN). He noted with satisfaction that the Director General intended to undertake negotiations with UNESCO, and pointed out the need to avoid rash measures which might endanger the existence of the Centre. The Centre was of paramount though indirect importance to developing countries, and his delegation therefore supported the six-year extension of the status-quo, while stressing the need for a new type of financing outside the Agency after that period.

51. Mr. AFONIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was natural for the Agency’s activities to expand in new directions corresponding to current requirements; examples were the development and improvement of safeguards and inspection system and the setting up of INIS. Such developments obviously required financial support, but he felt that the expenses involved should be provided for by suitable redistribution of the available resources. That would mean reducing the allocations for other activities which did not constitute a fundamental part of the Agency’s programme and did not interest all Member States; an example was the activity of the laboratories.

52. The draft budget for 1968 showed an increase of 10.4% over the budget for 1967, and such an increase was not acceptable to his delegation. Section 7 of the Regular Budget appropriations provided for an increase of $199 000 in expenditure on scientific and technical services and laboratory charges; such an increase was unjustified, in particular as far as the laboratories at Monaco and Seibersdorf were concerned.

53. A particularly substantial increase, totalling about $213 000, came under the heading of research and services in physical sciences. It was unfortunately typical that the whole of that increase, and even slightly more, could be attributed to the increased allocations for the Division of Research and Laboratories. While he did not doubt the value of that Division’s activities, he felt that the programme had been drawn up without taking into account the Agency’s financial possibilities.

54. His delegation felt that the introduction of a section covering contingent extraordinary expenditures was contrary to the practice of national finance ministries, and was therefore unable to accept the inclusion in the budget of $130 000 for that purpose.

55. In short, feeling that the increases were to a large extent unjustified, his delegation would not support the draft budget unless the Committee was able to make some cuts in it.

56. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was generally satisfied with the draft budget. However, he shared the concern which had been expressed at the continued high rate of increase. The view had often been expressed that the rate should be kept comparable with the growth rate of the national budgets of Member States, and he felt that 10% was probably rather high for many countries. The need for stringent economy should therefore be borne in mind.

57. The suggestion had been made that the Secretariat should in its budget for a given year take into account the possible availability of resources left over from previous years, with particular reference to such matters as the transfer of staff from one Department to another. However, he supported the present proposals for increases in the staff for 1968, especially in so far as safeguards and inspection were concerned.

58. He had no objection to the proposal for an appropriation to cover contingent extraordinary expenditures. Whereas national atomic energy concerns could request from their finance ministries an additional allocation of funds to complete programmes on which they were engaged, the Agency was not in a position to do anything of that kind. A safeguard against misuse of the money was provided by the fact that the Board of Governors must authorize its use.

59. With regard to INIS, there was obviously a general feeling that some caution should be exercised; it was not desirable to initiate another international activity simply for its own sake. The Agency’s main role should be one of co-ordination, since the field of information seemed particularly in need of central direction. There were in existence several national abstracting services and one important regional one, whose work should not be wasted. The Agency should use its position to establish the necessary standards to enable the actual work to be decentralized. Annex III to the draft budget tended to attribute to the INIS project a somewhat more extensive nature than was strictly necessary by implying that existing documentation services were inadequate and should be replaced by INIS. He did not feel that that was true; there was no need for an additional general documentation service, but simply for a co-ordinating body, and possibly an abstracting service to replace Nuclear Science Abstracts.

60. The suggestion that work should be undertaken on the legal aspects of food irradiation was a useful and timely one. He believed, however, that WHO intended to set up a committee on the subject, and therefore felt that the Agency would do well to collaborate with that organization, as well as with FAO.

61. Mr. HOSAKI (Japan) said that his delegation welcomed the proposal to increase the safeguards and inspection staff. Since joining the Agency, Japan had advocated the universal application of safeguards, and would support any proposal tending
towards that end. It was also absolutely necessary to expedite research and development relating to effective safeguards techniques. In view of the limited funds available, he hoped that research contracts would be made use of in the field of safeguards.

62. He agreed that INIS was necessary, but felt that the whole idea of the project should be made clearer during the period when the pilot project was in operation, and would therefore reserve his comments until that time.

63. Mr. AZAD (Iran) said that his delegation in general supported the draft budget, and congratulated the Board of Governors and the various committees on their excellent work in preparing the document.

64. He supported in principle the setting up of INIS, as long as the Agency took the necessary steps to guide its work towards meeting the requirements of developing countries; if that was not done, they would gain little benefit from such a complex project.

65. All delegates were aware of the excellent work which had been done in such a short time by the International Centre for Theoretical Physics. The Centre had already shown its usefulness to developing countries, and any effort by the Agency to encourage it would meet with the support of his delegation.

66. He strongly supported the programme for training in safeguards and the legal aspects of nuclear energy as being of real benefit to developing countries.

67. His delegation was somewhat concerned at the rate of increase between 1966 and 1968 in Sections 8, 9 and 10, Salaries and wages, Common staff costs and Duty travel of staff, but would nevertheless vote for the draft budget as a whole.

68. Mr. PHILIP (South Africa) said that his delegation had consistently emphasized the danger of wasteful expenditure on over-ambitious expansion, and would continue to do so. He therefore sympathized with the speakers who had expressed concern at the increasing burden of contributions to the Agency and to other organizations in the United Nations family.

69. However, he felt that it would be unfair to subject the Agency to special criticism, since in fact its budgetary practices were relatively well controlled and conservative. A major factor in the increase in the draft budget was the world-wide decrease in the value of money, which accounted for about half of the figure of 10% noted by other speakers. It should also be borne in mind that nuclear science was expanding, both geographically and in the range of techniques involved.

70. He was therefore not opposed to the draft budget, but felt that steps should in future be taken to ensure that all increases were reasonable and that each case was judged on its own merits. The first requirement could perhaps be met by suggesting a percentage to serve as a guide for the Director General, but any such figure should of course be flexible and subject to modification in the light of circumstances prevailing at the time. On the second point, he felt that the Agency's machinery for approving the budget was fully adequate, in that any proposal which had passed through the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, the Board of Governors and the Programme, Technical and Budget Committee was likely to have sufficient intrinsic value to be worth adopting.

71. Mr. KENYERES (Hungary) said that his delegation's careful study of the draft budget had led him to take up a position close to those of the delegates of France, Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union with regard to the unwarranted increases, which exceeded the rate of growth of the national income of many Member States, in particular in so far as the Regular Budget was concerned. While the increase in the number of specialists employed by the Agency was to some extent justifiable, there were no grounds for the increases in general administrative staff. His delegation supported the INIS programme in principle, though the national centres in more developed countries should be asked to participate in the work on a cost-free basis, and thus save the Agency money. The question of the International Centre for Theoretical Physics had been the subject of discussion for a number of years, and many Member States felt that field of activity did not come within the Agency's competence; it would therefore be advisable to find a way of transferring control of the Centre to UNESCO. For the reasons he had given, he would be unable to vote in favour of the Budget for 1968.

72. Mr. PRADO (Brazil) said he could support the budget estimates but regretted that the problem of shortage of funds, owing to which technical assistance programmes had had to be curtailed, had not been resolved.

73. Mr. KARLINER (Poland) thanked the Secretariat for preparing the draft budget in such a clear and convenient form; in that respect at least the quality of the Agency's budgets had steadily improved. However, his delegation, which had taken part in preparing the estimates, could not endorse without reservation the proposed 10.4% increase, even though it was primarily the consequence of the proposed new activities. Poland fully agreed with the proposal to establish INIS, and recognized that the Agency would have to extend its safeguards and inspection system and consequently the staff of inspectors. Rising prices were also bound to affect expenditure. But economies were surely feasible under certain administrative headings, apart from those already suggested and endorsed by the
Board, without detriment to the Agency's work. His delegation's criticism of some of the proposed increases was prompted by the belief that greater efficiency could be achieved by improved organization and methods. He hoped that the Director General and the Secretariat would see what more could be done in that respect.

74. Mr. NOVIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted with satisfaction the success achieved by the Agency and the efforts expanded by the staff. But the Agency's activities were not always carried out economically. Accordingly, his delegation shared the view that the proposed budget increase of 10.4% was unjustifiable and would vote against it. That standpoint was borne out by what was happening in other international bodies. For example, the annual increase in the United Nations budget was 7%. Account should also be taken of existing rates of expansion of national economies and domestic budgets, which in most countries, did not exceed 10%. The Agency's proposed estimates had been prepared with considerable reserves in hand; if those reserves were efficiently used for carrying out the Agency's main tasks, that would permit the annual increase to be reduced to 7-8% without detriment to the Agency's activities as a whole. That could be achieved, through the payment of outstanding arrears in Member States' contributions, by cutting expenditure on research in the Agency's own laboratories, by deleting the appropriation section entitled "Contingent extraordinary expenditures" and by reducing certain others.

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as no other delegations were ready to make general statements and as the Secretariat's replies would best be held over until the following meeting, the Committee might proceed with its detailed scrutiny of document GC(XI)/360.

76. It was so agreed.

Introduction (paras 1-25)

77. There was no comment.

Regular Budget estimates (paras 26-75)

78. There was no comment.

Section 1. The General Conference (Table 7 and para. 26)

79. Mr. TACAR (Turkey) said that developing countries should be more adequately represented on the Board's Administrative and Budgetary Committee, which at present consisted entirely of representatives from countries advanced in nuclear energy development.

80. The CHAIRMAN observed that that point did not come within the Committee's terms of reference and would need to be considered in plenary meeting.

Section 3. Panels and committees (Table 9 and paras 28-29)

Mr. TACAR (Turkey) supported the proposal for a panel in 1968 on the legal aspects for food irradiation, which was of considerable interest to his country. Problems relating to irradiated food in international trade were also of concern to the Agency, which ought to convene a committee on the matter in collaboration with other interested bodies, particularly WHO.

Section 4. Special missions (Table 10 and paras 30-31)

82. There was no comment.

Section 5. Seminars, symposia and conferences (Table 11 and paras 32-39)

83. There was no comment.

Section 6. Distribution of information (Table 12 and paras 40-46)

84. There was no comment.

Section 7. Scientific and technical services and laboratory charges (Tables 13 and 14 and paras 47-54)

85. Mr. AZAD (Iran), referring to the Agency's co-operative programmes with FAO (para. 54 and Annex II), suggested that it should consider initiating analogous programmes in collaboration with WHO on health and safety services, as that would be particularly helpful to developing countries.

86. Mr. AFONIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not support the proposed increase in the appropriations for the Seibersdorf Laboratory or for the Monaco Laboratory.

Section 8. Salaries and wages (Tables 15, 16 and 17 and paras 55-66)

87. There was no comment.

Section 9. Common staff costs (Table 18 and paras 67-68)

88. There was no comment.

Section 10. Duty travel of staff (Table 19 and paras 69-71)

89. There was no comment.
Section 11. Representation and hospitality (Table 20 and para. 72)

90. There was no comment.

Section 12. Common services, equipment and supplies (Table 21 and para. 73)

91. There was no comment.

Section 13. Contingent and extraordinary expenditures (Table 22 and paras 74 and 75)

92. Mr. NOVIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he supported the Soviet delegate in opposing inclusion of the section in question.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.