



Chairman: Mr. E. Olu SANU (Nigeria).

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE
SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8596 CON-
CERNING AGENDA ITEM 48* (A/C.5/1421)**

1. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had noted the statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1421) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee (A/8596, para. 11), and did not quarrel with his estimates of the costs involved. However, having noted that the Secretary-General was prepared to provide the \$16,000 required for consultant services and secretarial staff from within the total credits available to him in 1972, the Advisory Committee considered that, with a little extra effort, he should also be able to absorb the \$7,000 that would be required for the travel and subsistence expenses of the five experts he was to designate. The Committee had therefore concluded that if the General Assembly were to adopt the draft resolution, no additional appropriations would be required in 1972.

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the General Assembly should be informed that, should it adopt the Second Committee's draft resolution, no additional appropriation would be required.

It was so decided.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
OF DRAFT RESOLUTION I SUBMITTED BY THE
THIRD COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8589 CON-
CERNING AGENDA ITEM 49** (A/C.5/1420)**

3. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had examined the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1420) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution I submitted by the Third Committee in its report (A/8589, para. 33), and had no objection to the related costs indicated in paragraph 4. It considered that the total estimate of \$37,000 might be excessive but, in view of the foot-notes in document

* Question of the establishment of an international university: report of the Secretary-General.

** Respect for human rights in armed conflicts:

(a) Report of the Secretary-General;

(b) Protection of journalists engaged in dangerous missions in areas of armed conflict: report of the Secretary-General.

A/C.5/1420, had not recommended any reductions. The Advisory Committee felt that if the amounts referred to in those foot-notes were required, they could be absorbed. It therefore recommended that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$37,000 would be needed in 1972.

4. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution of the Third Committee, an additional appropriation of \$37,000 would be required under section 3, chapter III of the budget estimates for 1972.

It was so decided.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE
SIXTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8570 CON-
CERNING AGENDA ITEM 91*** (A/C.5/1418)**

5. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee agreed that if the General Assembly were to adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee (A/8570, para. 17), an additional appropriation in the amount of \$12,500 would be required under section 12 of the budget estimates for 1972. The Advisory Committee would consider the appropriation required for 1973 when it examined the budget estimates for that year.

6. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee and to the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law. It noted that the draft provided, *inter alia*, for a minimum of 15 fellowships in 1972 and 1973 at the request of Governments of developing countries and hoped that when the Secretary-General submitted his initial budget estimates for 1973 he would be able to report that the provision had been implemented in so far as 1972 was concerned and would include in those estimates the amount required to implement the provision in 1973.

7. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur be asked to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the Sixth Committee's draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$12,500 under section 12 would be required in 1972.

It was so decided.

*** United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law: report of the Secretary-General.

AGENDA ITEM 76

Budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (*continued*) (A/8322, A/8406 and Corr.1 and 3, A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2-27, A/8428 and Corr.1, A/8446 and Add.1, A/C.5/1320/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/C.5/1362, A/C.5/1364, A/C.5/1365, A/C.5/1366 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2, A/C.5/1376, A/C.5/1377, A/C.5/1378 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1380 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1381-1384, A/C.5/1385 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1388 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1389 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1390 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1391, A/C.5/1392, A/C.5/1396, A/C.5/1400, A/C.5/1405-1408, A/C.5/1417, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.3 and Corr.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.8, 13, 14, 16, 22 and 25, E/5038)

Revised estimates under section 17. Activities in 1972 of the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts established under resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights (A/8408/Add.25, A/C.5/1366/Add.2)

8. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had requested (A/C.5/1366/Add.2) an additional appropriation of \$131,400 under section 17. The discussion of the question by the Advisory Committee had revealed that the expenditures of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group established under resolution 2 (XXIII) of the Commission on Human Rights had fallen below the approved appropriations and that economies could be realized in various ways. The Committee had therefore felt that an additional appropriation of \$120,000 would suffice to enable the Working Group to carry out its mandate. Accordingly it had recommended that the Secretary-General's request be reduced by \$11,400.

9. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) said that his delegation would vote against the recommendation.

10. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) said that his delegation hoped that the suggested reductions would have no adverse effect on the very important work being done by the Working Group.

11. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/8408/Add.25, para. 5) for an additional appropriation of \$120,000 under section 17, chapter IX of the budget estimates for 1972.

The recommendation was adopted by 55 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

12. Mr. STEWARD (South Africa) said that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group, was, in the view of his delegation, an illegitimate body. Ever since its establishment, its activities had been constitutionally controversial, and his delegation could not associate itself with the appropriation of funds in furtherance of its illegal activities.

13. In addition to those legal considerations, there were also financial implications to be considered. In recent years, the Organization had given serious consideration to a number of proposals for effecting economies, *inter alia*: avoidance of the proliferation of committees and other

bodies and prevention of overlapping in the activities of different bodies; reduction of documentation; elimination of extensive and generally unproductive tours abroad by the members of various bodies; and reduction in the length and number of sessions of subsidiary bodies. In connexion with the last two points, he wished to draw attention to the fact that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group had proposed to hold two sessions in 1972 of a duration of two weeks and one week respectively and to undertake a five-week field mission to Africa costing \$103,800. With regard to documentation, it was stated in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (see A/8319 and Corr.1, para. 58) that in 1969 the *Ad Hoc* Group had accounted for 2 per cent of the document pages (10,749 pages), 1 per cent of the page-units (4,996,030 units) and 3 per cent of the pages of verbatim records (927 pages) produced by the Organization as a whole. With regard to the proliferation of committees, his delegation was of the opinion that the Working Group did not meet the criterion of necessity. Furthermore, it was obvious that there was considerable overlapping between its activities and those of other bodies—some of which, incidentally, his delegation considered to be equally illegitimate.

14. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), in explanation of his vote, said that, although his delegation fully supported the goals of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group and favoured its continuing its work, it felt that the Working Group's mandate, as formulated in resolution 7 (XXVII) of the Commission on Human Rights was very weak. The resolution merely entrusted the Group with surveying the situation in regions where there were grave manifestations of colonialism and racial discrimination. Moreover, the appropriation requested for the Working Group seemed rather high since it included the travel and subsistence costs of a 15-man staff which was to accompany the Group. In view of the fact that there were only six members in the Working Group itself, there seemed little justification for such a large staff. For those reasons, his delegation had abstained in the vote on the recommendation.

AGENDA ITEMS 83 AND 26

*Publications and documentation of the United Nations (continued)** (A/8319 and Corr.1, A/8362, A/8437, A/8488, A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, A/8540):

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)* (A/8437);
- (b) Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*)* (A/8319 and Corr.1, A/8362);
- (c) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*continued*)* (A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, A/8540)

*Rationalization of the procedures and organization of the General Assembly: report of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly [section IX] (concluded)** (Corr.1, A/8532 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.37 to 39/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.46)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (part I) (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.46)

* Resumed from the 1473rd meeting.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee approved part I (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.46) of its draft report.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 75

Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1971 (concluded)*

Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.20)

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on draft resolutions A and B in paragraph 15 of the draft report (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.20).

17. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) pointed out that, according to paragraph 13, the Committee had already approved the draft resolutions.

18. The CHAIRMAN, in reply, said that paragraph 13 should not have been included in the draft report. The Committee had voted on the total amount of the appropriations involved but it still had to take a formal vote on the draft resolutions themselves.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 57 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 85

Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (concluded) (A/8409, A/8598)

19. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (A/8409) recommended adjustments in benefits with financial implications amounting to \$73.6 million. However, it provided no data to demonstrate the inadequacy of the existing level of benefits. Obviously, the purpose of the recommendation was to use the Fund's accumulated surplus. That was not only administratively and financially unsound, it was also morally unjustifiable. The fact that the Fund had a \$100 million surplus did not justify increasing the benefits it provided. Many other factors should be taken into account, such as, for instance, the level of pensions paid to national civil servants, particularly in those countries where United Nations offices were situated.

20. It was surprising that the question should be taken up so near the end of the General Assembly session. The Joint Staff Pension Board could have consulted the competent bodies: the Special Committee for the Review of the

United Nations Salary System, which had been entrusted with the consideration of all aspects of staff remuneration including the question of pensions, or the International Civil Service Advisory Board (ICSAB). It seemed that an attempt was being made to force the Fifth Committee into hasty decisions. That impression had been heightened by the fact that his delegation had had to request some elementary figures several times before obtaining the desired information and had even then not received full satisfaction.

21. It would be advisable therefore to defer the question of increasing benefits to the twenty-seventh session, bearing in mind the fact that the relevant proposals could be studied in the meanwhile by ICSAB or by the Special Committee. Furthermore, it should be ascertained why the Fund had so large a surplus. It was probably due to the fact that, in addition to the 7 per cent of their salary paid into the Fund by staff members, a contribution of 14 per cent of staff members' salaries was paid into the Fund from the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Such a high contribution might have been justified in the early days of the Pension Fund in order to provide a sound base, but the Fund had since accumulated approximately \$600 million, which was more than three times the size of the Organization's annual budget. Moreover, the Fund received an income of some \$20 million annually from its investments in money markets all over the world. Obviously, there was no longer any reason for the high level of the Organization's contributions to the Pension Fund. In the circumstances a 3 per cent or 4 per cent reduction in contributions might be in order; moreover, it would permit substantial economies without detriment to the Fund or United Nations personnel.

22. In March 1970, an Act had been passed in the United States raising the Government's contribution to pension schemes to 7 per cent. Although the representative of the Pension Fund had not replied to his delegation's question on the level of Government contributions in Switzerland, it was known that, under an Act of 1950, the contributions of the Swiss Government and civil servants had been set at 6 per cent. The Committee had been informed of the levels of contribution to pension funds in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada and Italy. It had not been told the contributions in other countries where the United Nations had offices, such as Ethiopia and Thailand. Such a one-sided approach based only on the highest figures—and even those were below the United Nations level—with no regard for the figures at other duty stations was hard to explain. Clearly there was a need for a comparative study of the level of contributions in the United Nations and those in other countries which had sizable United Nations offices. Since even the Governments of such highly industrialized countries as the United States and Switzerland could not afford to contribute twice as much as their employees to pension funds, the developing countries, which included most of the Member States of the United Nations, could afford it even less. The time had come therefore for the question of improved benefits to be examined by the Special Committee and ICSAB. The Fifth Committee could resume its consideration of the question at the twenty-seventh session in the light of the findings of those bodies and of the comparative study of contribution levels in countries with United Nations offices.

* Resumed from the 1445th meeting.

23. In the meantime, on behalf of the Polish and Soviet delegations, he proposed the following paragraph for inclusion in the report of the Fifth Committee:

“The Fifth Committee requests the Secretary-General, jointly with the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Administration of the Pension Fund, to submit his recommendations concerning possible measures for the reduction of contributions to the Joint Staff Pension Fund.”

24. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that the wording of the Soviet proposal implied that there was some basis for a reduction in United Nations contributions to the Joint Staff Pension Fund. He could accept a form of words which would call upon the Secretary-General, together with ACC and the Administration of the Pension Fund, to state their views on the appropriate level of contributions to the Fund.

25. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the joint Soviet-Polish proposal in no way prejudged the issue, but merely called upon the Secretary-General to comment on possible measures for the reduction of contributions to the Fund. If, having considered the matter, the Secretary-General, ACC and the Pension Fund concluded that a reduction in contributions was inappropriate, they could so indicate to the General Assembly at the twenty-seventh session, setting out the reasons for that conclusion. However, taking into account the Fund's resources of capital and the proposal to increase benefits, there was undoubtedly a possibility that a reduction could be made.

26. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that for the Committee to adopt the Soviet formulation would be tantamount to saying that it could not accept the Pension Board's report. It was clear from the report that, contrary to what had been intimated by the Soviet representative, the Fund did not have excess resources. He proposed that the matter should be put to the vote.

27. Mr. MERIGO AZA (Mexico) supported the United States proposal. To initiate an inquiry such as that suggested by the Soviet representative would entail a proliferation of documentation.

28. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) associated himself with the remarks made by the Mexican representative. A vote should be taken on the draft resolution contained in annex IV of the report of the Joint Staff Pension Board, which in essence had been endorsed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Those two bodies were expert in the matter and the Committee should accept their conclusions.

29. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation endorsed the report of the Advisory Committee (A/8598), in particular its remarks concerning the need to reward United Nations employees with long years of service by providing an appropriate pension.

30. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking also on behalf of the delegation of Poland, said that in view of the opposition to his proposal, he would not press it to a vote.

31. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution contained in annex IV to document A/8409, on the understanding that the Committee's report would contain the proviso that its action was subject to the observations and recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/8598).

The draft resolution was adopted by 58 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

32. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should be requested to report that decision directly to the General Assembly in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 79

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly (*continued*):*
(a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*concluded*)** (A/8351, A/C.5/1369, A/C.5/1386 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed with the elections to fill vacancies in the membership of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. It was necessary for the General Assembly to appoint, at the current session, four persons to fill vacancies occurring in the membership of the Advisory Committee as a result of the expiration, on 31 December 1971, of the terms of office of Mr. Alwan, Mr. Esfandiary, Mr. Naudy and Mr. Rhodes. It was also necessary to fill the additional seat on the Advisory Committee newly created to permit a member from the People's Republic of China to participate in its work. In that connexion, the Government of the People's Republic of China had proposed the appointment of Mr. Hsing Sung-yi. Five persons had been proposed for appointment in respect of those five vacancies (see A/C.5/1386 and Corr.1 and Add.1).

At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Saramo (Finland) and Mr. Mapara (Zambia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	74
<i>Invalid ballots:</i>	0
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	74
<i>Abstentions:</i>	0
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	74
<i>Required majority:</i>	38

<i>Number of votes obtained:</i>	
Mr. Alwan	67
Mr. Esfandiary	55
Mr. Naudy	61
Mr. Rhodes	58
Mr. Hsing Sung-yi	60

Having obtained the required majority, Mr. Mohamed Alwan (Iraq), Mr. Mohsen S. Esfandiary (Iran), Mr. André

* Resumed from the 1474th meeting.

** Resumed from the 1426th meeting.

Naudy (France), Mr. John I. M. Rhodes (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Mr. Hsing Sung-yi (China) were recommended for appointment as members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for three-year terms beginning on 1 January 1972.

34. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should be requested to report directly to the General Assembly on the matter.

It was so decided.

35. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) and Mr. RUIZ DE GAMBOA (Chile) congratulated the members of the Advisory Committee who had been recommended for re-election and warmly welcomed the recommended appointment of the member from the People's Republic of China, who would make a significant contribution to the work of the Advisory Committee.

36. Mr. NAUDY (France) and Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) thanked the Committee for recommending them for re-appointment to the Advisory Committee and extended a welcome to the new member from the People's Republic of China.

37. Mr. HSING Sung-yi (China) said that his delegation was pleased to be able to participate in the work of the Fifth Committee. He would co-operate closely with his fellow-members in the Advisory Committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION II SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8577 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 47* (A/8408/ADD.26, A/C.5/1416 AND CORR.1)

38. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment was an important subject on which the Advisory Committee had considered it necessary to submit a written report (A/8408/Add.26). After reviewing the substance of paragraphs 4 and 5 of that report, he said that in paragraphs 6 to 8 the Advisory Committee discussed the Secretary-General's proposals for post-Conference work, which accounted for some \$200,000 of his total estimate of \$428,800. In paragraph 8, the Advisory Committee noted that draft resolution II submitted by the Second Committee (A/8577, para. 26) had not specifically endorsed the Secretary-General's proposal to carry over a substantial part of the Conference secretariat until the end of 1972, but had merely requested the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for follow-up work. The Advisory Committee was of the opinion that the follow-up work could be done more economically than proposed by the Secretary-General. It questioned the need to retain such a large number of staff for six months after the Conference and was concerned that no action should be taken between the Conference and the twenty-seventh session of the

Assembly which might have the effect of prejudging the Assembly's decision on the recommendations of the Conference, particularly any which might deal with future institutional arrangements for handling environmental problems.

39. Further economies were discussed in paragraphs 9 and 11 of the report, and in paragraph 12 the Advisory Committee, having indicated the areas in which economies could be made without prejudice to the success of the Conference, recommended that the additional expenditure required in 1972 should be reduced from \$428,800 to \$300,000. It had not tried to apportion the reduction between the various headings in the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/1416 and Corr.1) because it felt that the Secretary-General should enjoy a measure of latitude in the matter.

40. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation attached great importance to the question of the human environment. Nevertheless, it considered that the Fifth Committee should eschew any action that might lead to an unnecessary proliferation of bureaucracy. Many of the tasks proposed for the Conference secretariat could be performed by existing specialized agencies including WHO and FAO, as well as by IAEA. The function of the secretariat of the Conference was temporary and if its existence was prolonged, it should confine its activities to ensuring the necessary co-ordination between States interested in the question and existing specialized agencies. Care must be taken to avoid establishing a new permanent body to deal with a subject that could be dealt with by national scientific institutions and existing specialized agencies. His delegation therefore fully endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

41. In conclusion, he said that, in order to avoid confusion with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the officials responsible for activities similar to those of the Secretary-General of the Conference on the Human Environment should be given a title other than secretary-general.

42. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his Government was in favour of developing broad co-operation between all States in such an important matter as the preservation of the human environment. It had supported in principle the proposal that the first world conference on the subject should be convened in Stockholm, and Soviet organizations had already contributed much to the preparatory work for the Conference.

43. In connexion with that preparatory work, he said that his Government had been of the opinion that all countries, with no exceptions whatsoever, should be able to participate in the Conference. However, it was obvious from discussions that had taken place on the question of participation in other forums that some Western countries, in defiance of common sense, were unwilling to allow the German Democratic Republic to participate in the Conference. Such an approach by the Western countries cast doubts on the usefulness of convening the Conference. If the Western countries were really concerned about the need to preserve the human environment but were unable to come to an agreement with other countries concerning the

* United Nations Conference on the Human Environment: report of the Secretary-General.

question of participation, it would be better to postpone the Conference until 1973. In that way, all countries would have an opportunity to reach agreement on the question and thus ensure that the Conference was truly international in character. In paragraph 3 of the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee, the Secretary-General was requested to invite representatives of the specialized agencies and IAEA to participate in the Conference. That was another instance of discrimination, for it meant that States which were not members of the specialized agencies or of the United Nations would be unable to attend the Conference. Account should also be taken of the fact that the third session of UNCTAD was due to be held in 1972. In view of the limited means available to the Organization, it would seem unjustified to hold two such large Conferences in 1972. His delegation was therefore unable to agree that additional funds should be appropriated for the Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 and would vote against any such proposal.

44. Mr. NAUDY (France) endorsed the conclusions reached by the Advisory Committee. The reductions recommended by that Committee would in no way prejudice the success of the Conference. Moreover, the reductions would have the advantage of restraining certain costly bureaucratic developments which would have the effect of prejudging any decision the General Assembly might take on the institutional arrangements for handling environmental problems.

45. Mr. HULTGREN (Sweden) said that his delegation shared the concern of the Fifth Committee that, wherever possible, savings should be made in the regular budget of the Organization. Nevertheless, it did feel that the United Nations—and, indeed, the Swedish Government—had spent considerable sums on the preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Every effort must be made to ensure that the best possible use was made of that investment. His delegation therefore attached considerable importance to the question of follow-up activities. It was important that at its twenty-seventh session the General Assembly should have before it a proper report on the basis of which it would be able to take decisions on the substance of the Conference and on matters of an institutional character. The Secretary-General must have adequate staff to prepare such a report. From his personal experience with the preparations for the Conference, he could say that the extra staff was being requested not with a view to prejudging future institutional arrangements but solely in order that a proper report might be prepared for the General Assembly. The views expressed by the representative of Italy concerning the need to use existing specialized agencies were widely shared by members of the Preparatory Committee. The recommendations to be put to the Conference by the Secretary-General would show that the widest possible use had been made of existing specialized agencies and would probably reflect the need for a co-ordinating unit in the United Nations itself. The Conference would, however, deal with a great deal of material and recommendations relating to areas of concern to several specialized agencies. It was in order to clarify such questions that it was important that a good report should be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session and it was for that reason that the

recommended reduction in post-Conference staff was a matter of concern to his delegation.

46. Despite its concern, his delegation was willing to support the recommendations contained in the relevant report of the Advisory Committee. Nevertheless, its misgivings regarding the possible effects of the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee on the follow-up work after the Stockholm Conference had not been completely allayed. He would like them to be reflected in an appropriate manner in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly on the question. He also hoped that the Secretary-General would bear Sweden's position in mind during the period following the Conference.

47. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation would vote against any allocation of United Nations funds to finance a conference in which all interested States were not guaranteed participation on an equal basis. It was incomprehensible that the German Democratic Republic, a highly developed, industrialized State, should not be invited to attend a meeting designed to promote the preservation of the human environment—an urgent problem which could be tackled only with the co-operation of all countries. In particular, it was essential to ensure the participation of the German Democratic Republic in any measures to control marine pollution in the Baltic. If the Western countries, which had transformed the problem into a political issue, persisted in their efforts to exclude the German Democratic Republic from the proceedings of the Stockholm Conference, it would be better to postpone the Conference until 1973. Only on the basis of international action involving the participation of all States could progress be made towards conserving the human environment.

48. Mr. JEREMIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his country's attitude towards the German Democratic Republic was well known. However, the Fifth Committee was not an appropriate forum in which to initiate a political debate on the matter.

49. His delegation attached great importance to the contents of paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report and wholly supported the Advisory Committee's findings and recommendations.

50. Mr. REFESHAL (Norway) said that his delegation was prepared to endorse the Advisory Committee's recommendations. However, it shared the concern expressed by the delegation of Sweden and wished to join with that delegation in requesting that its position should be duly reflected in the Fifth Committee's report.

51. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) expressed regret that the German Democratic Republic had not been invited to participate in the Stockholm Conference and suggested that the Conference should be postponed until 1973 with a view to ensuring its participation.

52. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the recommendation contained in paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report.

53. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation could not support an appropriation of funds for activities

which involved discriminatory practices; the German Democratic Republic, as a highly developed, industrialized country, should have been invited to participate in the Stockholm Conference. Accordingly, his delegation would maintain the position which it had taken in the Second Committee and would abstain in the vote on the matter.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of a quorum, the Committee could not vote on the question; a vote would be taken at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.