

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records *



UN/SA COLLECTION

FIFTH COMMITTEE

52nd meeting

held on

Monday, 19 November 1979

at 3 p.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative
and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)

Section 29. Conference and library services (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/34/SR.52
23 November 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)
(A/34/6 and Add.1, A/34/7, A/34/38 (Parts I-V); A/C.5/34/L.14 and L.16;
A/C.5/34/CRP.11)

First reading (continued)

Section 4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had requested an appropriation of \$3,060,300 under section 4 of which the Advisory Committee had recommended approval of the amount of \$2,221,000, representing a reduction of \$839,300. The greater part of the proposed reduction fell within the estimates for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, which totalled \$1,348,500. The Advisory Committee had noted that the Secretary-General's estimates were provisional pending the submission of a progress report at the current session of the General Assembly. The total requirements for the Conference would undoubtedly be affected by the deliberations of the Preparatory Committee. Pending receipt of the Secretary-General's progress report, the Advisory Committee had recommended that an estimate of \$594,600, equivalent to the 1978-1979 appropriation, should be authorized at the current stage. A more detailed explanation was contained in paragraph 4.12 of the Advisory Committee's first report.

2. The estimates for the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women were dealt with in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.10 of that report, from which it could be seen that the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction of \$39,900. The other major reduction recommended was that of \$45,500 in the estimate for travel of staff to service meetings. The reason for that recommendation was set out in paragraph 4.5 of the Advisory Committee's first report.

A. Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions and committees and other recurrent meetings

3. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said he wondered if some appropriate way could be found to draw the attention of the Economic and Social Council to the proposal he had made at an earlier meeting regarding the summer session of that body.

4. Mr. MASDOUKI (Morocco) expressed the support of his delegation for the recommendation contained in paragraph 4.5 of the Advisory Committee's first report; efforts had to be made to improve the productivity of staff in order to reduce the number sent to service meetings.

5. The CHAIRMAN said he was somewhat intrigued to read in paragraph 4.9 of the proposed programme budget that the Secretary-General's estimate for the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) was based on the assumption that the special arrangement approved for an experimental period and due to be reviewed by the General Assembly at its current session would continue during the next

/...

biennium. As he understood it, should the Fifth Committee approve the estimate, it would, by implication, also be approving the continuation of the special arrangement during the biennium 1980-1981. So far as he recalled, no specific recommendation had been made on that subject by CPC. It might be an appropriate opportunity for the Fifth Committee to deal with the matter.

6. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) expressed some puzzlement at the Chairman's conclusion. He said he did not believe that it was the task of the Fifth Committee to conduct the review of the arrangement mentioned in paragraph 4.9 of the proposed programme budget.

7. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had been aware of the problem and had noted that the Secretary-General had based his estimate on the assumption that the special arrangements for payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowance would continue into the biennium 1980-1981. The Fifth Committee could therefore confirm or reject the Secretary-General's assumption.

8. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) observed that, for the sake of consistency, it might be necessary to review the duration of CPC sessions, given that there had been proposals to institute a six-year medium-term plan. A six-week session in the plan year would not provide sufficient time to deal with a six-year plan. The Advisory Committee and the Secretariat should bear that fact in mind. Moreover, the scope of such a plan might well warrant the inclusion of a special budget item for the purpose.

9. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) proposed that a decision on the estimate for the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should be deferred to allow time for more detailed discussion.

10. The CHAIRMAN said he would prefer to proceed with the first reading, the estimate could be revised at a later stage, if necessary.

11. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) requested an explanation of the reasons why it was necessary for two staff members from the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs to attend CPC meetings, and only one from each regional commission. In the opinion of his delegation, one staff member from Vienna should be sufficient.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the appropriate department of the Secretariat would be asked to provide a reply to that question.

13. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria), referring to the estimates for the Committee on Review and Appraisal, welcomed the Secretary-General's decision not to request any appropriations for that Committee pending the decisions of the General Assembly on the new development strategy.

14. Mr. BARAC (Romania), supported by Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) and Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia), requested that the Committee should defer the first reading of those items of the proposed programme budget relating to the Advisory Committee on the

/...

(Mr. Barac, Romania)

Application of Science and Technology to Development and the Committee on Science and Technology for Development pending the outcome of consultations on the implementation of the recommendations and programme of action of the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

15. It was so decided.

B. Special conferences

16. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) asked when the revised estimates for the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women could be expected; it was important that both the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee should receive them in time to consider them before the end of the current session.

17. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee would deal with the revised estimates with the requisite speed, just as soon as it received them from the Secretary-General.

18. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to a report of the Secretary-General (A/34/657) containing the revised estimates which had been issued that day.

19. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) proposed that the first reading of the estimates for the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women should either be deferred or that the Secretary should read out details of the revised estimates.

20. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that the Secretary-General's report would first have to be submitted to the Third Committee. He therefore suggested that the Fifth Committee should approve the estimates requested in the proposed programme budget and then discuss the revised estimates at a later stage.

21. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) asked whether the change in venue of the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders would involve any change in the estimate of \$1,225,000.

22. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that, as with all other conferences held away from Headquarters, the host country would assume the difference between the actual cost and the cost of holding the conference at Headquarters.

23. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia), referring to paragraph 4.44 of the proposed budget, asked why conference servicing costs of \$1,670,600 had been included under section 4 for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy when in fact that amount was to be budgeted for under section 29. He did not understand the reason for that procedure.

24. He also asked whether any Government had offered to act as host to the Conference.

/...

25. Mr. ISELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the conference servicing costs for all conferences were included in section 29 of the budget. All conference servicing costs arising from decisions taken at the current session would be dealt with in the so-called consolidated paper on conference servicing costs. In accordance with the practice of full costing, the Secretariat calculated conference servicing costs as if no personnel were available to service planned conference activities. At the end of the session the total volume of meetings to be serviced during the biennium was costed and the amount which could be absorbed within the approved appropriation was determined. Any additional resources required were then requested in the consolidated paper.

26. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation expected the Secretary-General to cover any net requirement by redeploying resources released through the termination of marginal, ineffective and completed activities. It was his delegation's hope that the cost of all additional conference activities could be absorbed.

27. Mr. VON HARPE (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government was prepared to accommodate the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy in the city of Hamburg.

28. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the estimate for section 4, with the exception of the amounts requested for the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and the Committee on Science and Technology for Development.

29. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General's initial estimates for those two Committees totalled \$173,200. In paragraph 4.5 of its first report, the Advisory Committee had recommended an across-the-board reduction in the estimate for staff travel in the amount of \$45,500, or 8.3 per cent of the Secretary-General's estimate. The request for staff travel for the two Committees was \$40,200. Applying an 8.3 per cent reduction to that amount yielded \$4,000. Subtracting that amount from the total appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee for those two Committees left an amount of \$169,200. That amount should then be subtracted from the total appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee for the section as a whole. Thus, the Chairman was suggesting that the Committee should approve in first reading an appropriation of \$2,051,800 under section 4, and defer until a later stage a decision on the estimates for the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and the Committee on Science and Technology for Development.

30. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation would prefer to defer a decision on the request for travel and subsistence for members of CPC in paragraph 4.11 of the proposed budget until the matter had been discussed further, or, failing that, to have a separate recorded vote on that estimate.

31. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) recalled that the decision to provide travel and subsistence for members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) had been taken in order to enable all members to participate fully in the sessions of that Committee and make a full contribution to its work. The decision had proved to be a wise one and he appealed to the United States representative to withdraw his objection to the appropriation requested.

/...

32. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that, as Chairman of CPC, he was surprised that the United States delegation should question the necessity of providing travel and subsistence for members of CPC. The aim of the decision taken by the Fifth Committee in 1976 had been to enable countries to send high-level representatives from their capitals to Headquarters in order to raise the level of the substantive discussion in CPC. The decision had been taken after a long debate and it had already paid dividends in terms of improvements in the work of CPC.

33. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation's support and appreciation of CPC were not in question. However, as clearly indicated in the proposed budget, the decision taken in 1976 had been a departure from normal practice and had been taken for an experimental period only. His delegation was deeply concerned over budgetary expenditure and felt that the question of the experimental period must be resolved. Accordingly, his delegation would press for a recorded vote on the estimate.

34. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) asked how many delegations had availed themselves of the entitlement to travel and subsistence during the biennium 1978-1979.

35. The CHAIRMAN suggested that a reply to the question asked by the representative of Algeria might be given at a later stage. Obviously, travel and subsistence payments were not made to members of CPC who were stationed in New York.

36. A recorded vote was taken on an appropriation of \$140,400 for travel and subsistence of members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Japan.

/...

37. An appropriation of \$140,400 under section 4 for travel and subsistence of members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was approved in first reading by 90 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

38. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against resolution 31/93 in 1976, and that, consistent with that position, it had voted against the appropriation for travel and subsistence of members of CPC for the biennium 1980-1981.

39. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the appropriation since it believed that every measure should be adopted to improve the work of CPC. The Committee owed a debt of gratitude to the United States delegation because the recorded vote it had requested had revealed that a number of delegations which were proponents of planning had joined the United States delegation in voting against the special arrangement for members of CPC.

40. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$2,051,800 under section 4 was approved in first reading without a vote.

Section 29. Conference and library services (continued)

41. Mr. EL-HOUDERI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.16 on behalf of all the sponsors, which, in addition to those listed at the head of the text, included the following countries: Benin, Chad, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, India, Iran, Malaysia, Mexico, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, and Yugoslavia. The draft text recalled General Assembly resolution 3190 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973 which had made Arabic an official and working language of the General Assembly and its Main Committees, with the object of enabling Arabic speakers and all delegations to benefit from international co-operation, as envisaged in the Charter, and to strengthen intellectual and cultural exchanges among the peoples of the world. The adoption of that resolution had presupposed effective measures to put Arabic on an equal footing with the other official and working languages, by the establishment and development of appropriate Arabic language services. Experience showed, however, that the Secretary-General had not taken the initiative in devising practical implementation measures; he seemed to be waiting for guidance in implementing General Assembly resolution 3190 (XXVIII) and similar texts, such as UNCTAD resolution 115 (V).

42. The draft resolution before the Committee did not propose anything new; it merely asked that specific measures be taken to implement a resolution already adopted, in order to bring the Arabic language services to an equal level with the other languages. That would be to the advantage not only of the Arabic-speaking delegations but of all Member States, since it would introduce greater precision into the work of the General Assembly, obviate needless delay and thereby save money. For example, one factor which hampered the work of the General Assembly was the late issue of documentation because the Arabic language services were not strong enough to cope with the work-load. The reinforcement of the Arabic translation establishment at Headquarters, as specified in paragraph 1 (a) of the

(Mr. El-Houderi, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

text, would immediately provide scope for economies in the United Nations budget. Again, there had been deficiencies in Arabic interpretation in an effort to improve matters, the Secretariat had used the services of temporary staff which had not proved entirely satisfactory. Paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution therefore called for the establishment at Headquarters of an Arabic interpretation unit, that would undoubtedly improve the standard of Arabic language interpretation. Paragraph 2 asked the Secretary-General to report on implementation to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

43. Mr. BROCHARD (France) said that his delegation had always urged the dissemination of documents in all working languages on an equal footing. The draft resolution seemed to be in line with the principles of equity in that respect, and he would therefore support it.

44. Mr. TUNSALA (Zaire) agreed that the draft resolution merely endorsed an existing General Assembly resolution; he approved of it and would vote in favour.

45. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) supported the draft resolution to put Arabic on an equal footing with the other languages. He hoped that once the Secretariat had made the necessary arrangements to carry out the measures defined in the text, there would be an end to delays in documentation caused by waiting until all translations had been completed.

46. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) recalled that Pakistan had been one of the sponsors of General Assembly resolution 3190 (XXVIII), and that at the time of its adoption the Permanent Representative of Pakistan had expressed the hope that the Secretariat would not let technical limitations impede the implementation of the resolution. It was therefore a matter for regret that the Arabic language services were not satisfactory and that the efficiency of the Arabic-speaking delegations had been impaired thereby. He appreciated their patience and goodwill, since if they had insisted on their strict entitlements, the situation would have become very difficult. His delegation was happy to join in sponsoring the present text and trusted that the immediate reinforcement of the Arabic Translation Service and the establishment of an Arabic interpretation unit at Headquarters would solve the many existing problems. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

47. Mr. BLACKLIAN (Barbados) said that his delegation had been impressed by the difficulties which had been mentioned by the Arabic-speaking delegations. He gave his unqualified support to the draft resolution and hoped that the Secretary-General's report at the thirty-fifth session would show that all the problems had been solved.

48. Mr. BAIBA (Upper Volta) said that he would support the draft resolution, should it be put to a vote, and hoped that, if it was adopted, the Secretariat would take it as an indication that the standard of the other languages should be improved as well.

49. Mr. BROTODININGRAT (Indonesia), Mr. BARAC (Romania) and Mr. FALL (Senegal) also expressed full support for the draft resolution.

/...

50. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru), in expressing support for the draft resolution, said that many of the problems which had been discussed were relevant to the Spanish language services as well.

51. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said that he had no difficulty in supporting the draft resolution, which he hoped would improve the Arabic language services.

52. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said he trusted that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

53. Mr. JALIL (Ecuador), recalling that his delegation had spoken in support of General Assembly resolution 3190 (XXVIII), said that there were still problems with the timely preparation of documents and summary records in Arabic. The Secretary-General had reported in document A/C.5/34/20 that there were too few permanent staff in the Arabic language services. In the interests of justice and equity his delegation had accordingly joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. He hoped that the Secretariat would henceforward bear in mind that similar principles should apply to all official and working languages of the General Assembly and Main Committees.

54. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that he supported the draft resolution for the improvement of the Arabic language services, in the hope and belief that any increase in costs would be offset within the appropriation available.

55. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said it was the Secretary-General's understanding of the draft resolution that all strengthening of the existing Arabic language establishment should be done by the addition of further established posts, and that no further attempt should be made to meet work-load requirements through recourse to temporary assistance.

56. As had been indicated in document A/C.5/34/CRP.11, a solution along those lines would require the establishment of 26 translation posts, (22 P-3 and 4 P-2/1), 10 reviser posts (2 P-5 and 8 P-4) and 26 typing posts (1 G-5 and 25 at other General Service levels). The estimated cost of those 62 new posts on a full biennial basis would be \$3,953,000. For the biennium 1980-1981, the application of the standard turnover deduction for new posts would result in a requirement of \$2,231,700 under section 29.A for established posts and related common staff costs. Those estimated requirements would, however, be reduced by \$275,000 owing to savings from the elimination of temporary assistance for the General Assembly provided for in the proposed 1980-1981 budget. Any further savings which might arise from diminished requirements for Arabic temporary assistance for servicing special conferences and meetings would be taken into account in the preparation of the consolidated statement on conference servicing requirements to be submitted during the current session.

57. An additional amount of \$353,000 would be required under section 28.D in respect of common services costs. That amount, which included a non-recurrent sum of \$156,600, comprised \$294,400 for accommodation, \$97,200 for office furniture and equipment and \$79,500 for other expenses including communications.

/...

(Mr. Ruedas)

58. The draft resolution also called for the establishment at Headquarters of an Arabic interpretation unit. Twenty-four interpreters would be required throughout the General Assembly session in order to service the Assembly and its Main Committees at the current level. Since the staffing table for the interpretation unit at Geneva already provided 17 permanent posts on which the General Assembly had first call, seven posts would need to be established (one P-5, three P-4 and three P-3). The full biennial cost of those posts would be \$509,900; however, the application of the turnover factor would result in the need for an appropriation of \$310,500 under section 29.A for the coming biennium. A further amount of \$55,000 would be required under section 28.D for common services costs, including a non-recurrent amount of \$16,800. Any savings under temporary assistance for special conferences and meetings for which Arabic was required would again be taken into account in the preparation of the consolidated statement.

59. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/34/L.16, additional appropriations of \$2,793,300 would be required, under section 29.A (\$2,267,200) and section 28.D (\$526,100). A further provision of \$494,900 would be required for staff assessment under section 31, to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/34/L.16 and referred it to the Advisory Committee for comment.

61. It was so decided.

62. Mr. LOSCHNER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation understood the problems associated with the Arabic language services because of the position of the German language in the United Nations. It was appropriate that Arabic language services should attain a level equal to that of the other language services.

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve a total appropriation of \$182,819,400 in first reading under section 29.

64. At the request of the Soviet representative, a vote was taken on the appropriation under section 29.

65. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$182,819,400 under section 29 was approved in first reading by 93 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

66. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/34/L.14, said that 1978 and 1979 had seen an exceptional number of special sessions and conferences of United Nations bodies. During that two-year period, however, the Secretariat had requested only \$5 million in additional appropriations for conference servicing, or approximately 3 per cent of appropriations approved for such purposes.

67. The Committee had recently approved the calendar of conferences for 1980-1981,

/...

(Mr. Palamarchuk, USSR)

which provided for nine special conferences in 1980, not including the Conference on the Law of the Sea. Appropriations for those conferences had already been included under section 29 of the proposed budget. Member States were seriously concerned at the growth in the number of special conferences and the burden they placed on both delegations and Secretariat resources. Moreover, the Advisory Committee had concluded that the growth of resources under section 29 had been understated by \$3 million and was, in fact, not 0.4 per cent but 2 per cent. There was no reason for resources under section 29 to increase significantly faster than resources under the budget as a whole. In addition, savings could be anticipated from the recent decision to dispense with summary records. His delegation was therefore convinced that the appropriation for section 29 would amply cover any foreseeable requirements of the Secretariat in the forthcoming biennium.

68. His delegation had noted with satisfaction the support by a number of delegations for the idea that no additional appropriations should be requested for conference servicing during the next biennium and that meetings not provided for in the budget should be financed by altering priorities and eliminating obsolete, marginal and ineffective programmes. Many delegations had also spoken in favour of establishing priorities in United Nations conference activities and eliminating unnecessary meetings. The adoption of the draft resolution would stimulate both Member States and the Secretariat in their search for unnecessary and marginal activities in order to release resources for priority measures, as could be seen from the practice of those specialized agencies where the presentation of requests for additional appropriations during the budget period was not permitted.

69. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that he shared the legitimate concern of the Soviet representative in the face of the growing costs of conference servicing. He could not, however, associate himself with the uncompromising language of the operative paragraph, since it was important for the Organization to retain its capacity to face up to unforeseen situations.

70. In order to allow the Organization the flexibility it required to meet the provisions of the Charter, he suggested that the operative paragraph should be amended to read: "Requests the Secretary-General to refrain as far as possible from submitting ..."; in that connexion he noted that the Secretary-General had demonstrated a concern to respond to delegations' views and to limit budget increases to a reasonable level.

71. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that, while the Soviet representative was right to refer to the concern of many delegations for a rationalization of meetings and conferences within the United Nations, the adoption of the draft resolution would be tantamount to nullifying decisions reached in other bodies on the desirability of holding conferences, notably in the economic and social sectors. His delegation could not support the draft resolution.

72. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) said that the developing countries attached great importance to meetings where they could express their views at a world level. Their ability to do so should not be rigidly restricted: his delegation could not, therefore, support the draft resolution.

/...

73. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) commented that, in calling for conferences to be held, Member States inevitably incurred additional expenses. He maintained that more authority should be given to the Committee on Conferences, which could then establish some discipline in the matter. The draft resolution before the Committee would in effect halt any further consideration of the question and pre-empt the authority of the Committee on Conferences.

74. If the draft resolution was put to the vote in its present form, his delegation would abstain; if, however, the amendment suggested by Tunisia was accepted, he would vote in favour of the draft.

75. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) said that the draft resolution, by implication, established a ceiling on conferences and hence required the introduction of quotas. The concept had been introduced in the Committee on Conferences, but had not received the necessary support, a fact which the draft resolution failed to indicate.

76. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that the notion of quotas for conferences continued to give his delegation difficulties. The draft resolution, if adopted, would restrict the ability of Member States to call for conferences even if the necessary political will existed. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

77. Mr. NACGAGA (Uganda) said that his delegation could accept the draft resolution if it was amended along the lines proposed by the Tunisian representative.

78. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, while his delegation supported the exercise of budgetary restraint wherever possible, it felt that the adoption of the draft resolution would close the door on all additional appropriations. Such a decision should be taken only after the General Assembly had reached decisions on other matters of interest to Member States. His delegation could not support the draft resolution before other relevant resolutions and decisions had been adopted.

79. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) commented that the draft resolution attempted to tackle from a budgetary standpoint the problems posed by the large number of major conferences. The Committee could not, however, adopt budgetary constraints and then expect the number of conferences to be tailored to the budget, since conferences were a matter of concern to the international community, regardless of administrative and budgetary considerations. The draft resolution addressed itself to those who had to implement the decisions of the international community, rather than to those intergovernmental bodies that called for conferences to be held. The Secretary-General could not be expected to rearrange priorities for conferences in order to refrain from requesting additional appropriations. It would therefore be inappropriate for the Fifth Committee to adopt the draft resolution, even with the amendment proposed by Tunisia. Instead, the matter should be referred to the Committee on Conferences for discussion and comment.

80. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) stated that his delegation could vote in favour of the draft resolution if the Tunisian amendment were accepted, and suggested that, in keeping with the Tunisian amendment, the second preambular paragraph should be amended to read "Considering it necessary to hold down the growth of budget expenditures ...".

/...

81. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, given the size of the budget appropriation for the Department of Conference Services, any new meeting could be serviced if available resources were better managed. His delegation would have no difficulty in accepting the draft resolution.
82. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of Tunisia and Peru, and stated that his delegation could not support the draft resolution.
83. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was prepared to accept the amendments suggested by the representatives of Tunisia and Turkey. He could not accede, however, to the suggestion by the delegation of Pakistan to refer the matter to the Committee on Conferences.
84. The intention of the draft resolution was clear. He had been surprised at some of the statements, such as that by the representative of Egypt, who had tried to intimidate Committee members with his talk of ceilings and quotas, even though no such concept was mentioned in the draft resolution.
85. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) expressed regret at the words used by the Soviet representative in referring to his (Mr. Ramzy's) statement.
86. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that his delegation found the second preambular paragraph unacceptable, even as amended, and proposed that it should be replaced by the following: "Considering it necessary to manage the resources allocated to United Nations conference activities with the maximum of efficiency,".
87. The Algerian proposal was adopted without objection.
88. At the request of the Kenyan representative, a vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/34/L.14.
89. The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 32 votes to 28, with 37 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.