

Against: None.

Abstaining: Benin, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 65 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

119. Mr. WOLDE-AREGAY (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution although it would have preferred the negotiating committee to be established on an *ad hoc* basis and to have fewer members than the number recommended by the representative of Pakistan. His vote in no way prejudged his delegation's position on the findings of the negotiating committee.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.

1772nd meeting

Tuesday, 16 December 1975, at 10.40 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1772

AGENDA ITEM 100

*Pattern of conferences (continued):**

*(b) Report of the Secretary-General (concluded):**

Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (Part II) (A/C.5/L.1288/Add.1)

1. Mr. ABOUL GHEIT (Egypt), Rapporteur, introduced the second part (A/C.5/L.1288/Add.1) of the Committee's draft report, which dealt with the inclusion of Vienna in the pattern of conferences.

The draft report was adopted.

Letter from the Chairman of the Fifth Committee to the President of the Economic and Social Council

2. The CHAIRMAN, recalling that at the 1757th meeting he had informed the Committee about a communication addressed to him by the President of the Economic and Social Council, read out the following draft letter which he planned to send to the latter:

"Thank you for your letter of 11 November 1975 and the attached summary record of the 1981st meeting of the Council. As you requested in your letter, this summary record was brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee when it considered agenda item 100, concerning the pattern of conferences. Members of the Fifth Committee were fully aware of the competence of the Economic and Social Council in setting the dates of its meetings and, accordingly, the Committee left the dates of the Council in the report of the Committee on Conferences unaltered.

"During the discussion I informed the Fifth Committee that, in order to accommodate the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which, it was recommended by the Committee on Conferences, should meet from 15 March to 7 May 1976, the Council had

agreed, in subparagraph (b) of its decision 125 (LIX), to reconsider and, if necessary, alter the dates of the sixtieth session of the Council, consequent on the decision of the General Assembly on the subject."

3. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed that he should send the letter to the President of the Economic and Social Council.

It was so decided.

4. Mr. SETHI (India) reserved his delegation's right to make a statement on the matter at a later meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III (sections F, G and J to L), IV (sections G and H), V (sections A and B), VI (sections A to C, and F and G) and VII (section G)] (A/10003)

5. The CHAIRMAN recalled that certain parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/10003) had been referred to the Fifth Committee by the General Assembly. Some of those parts had been dealt with during consideration of relevant items, the exceptions being those which the Committee was to deal with at the current stage in connexion with agenda item 12.

6. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the relevant sections of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

It was so decided.

7. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wished to reaffirm the positions stated by representatives of the Soviet Union in the relevant United Nations bodies concerning all the questions referred to the Committee for consideration in connexion with agenda item 12.

* Resumed from the 1770th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 96

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 and medium-term plan for the period 1976-1979 (continued) (for the previous documentation, see the 1759th meeting; A/10008/Add.14, 16, 17, 18 and Corr.1, 21, 26, 27 and 28, A/C.5/1715/Rev.1, A/C.5/1730/Add.1, A/C.5/1737 and Corr.1)

Revised estimates under sections 1, 2, 3, 20, 21, 22, 25 and 26, and income sections 1 and 2 (A/10008/Add.28, A/C.5/1725)

8. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in its report (A/10008/Add.28), the Advisory Committee had recommended a total reduction of \$1,218,400 in the revised estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in his report (A/C.5/1725). A summary of those recommendations could be found in paragraph 29 of the Advisory Committee's report.

9. The Advisory Committee had accepted without change the Secretary-General's requests under sections 20 and 21. The bulk of the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee related to sections 1, 22 and 26.

10. Under section 1, the Advisory Committee had been unable to accept the Secretary-General's request for 2 additional posts for the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Affairs. On the basis of the initial estimates as already approved in first reading by the Fifth Committee, the Office would have a total of 15 posts in 1976-1977, including 2 Under-Secretaries-General, 1 D-2 and 2 D-1 posts. In the light of those facts, the Advisory Committee had not seen any justification for the requests for additional posts. In particular, the Advisory Committee indicated that the Secretary-General had not shown how requirements under the relevant section had changed in order to justify the requests.

11. Under section 22, the Secretary-General had submitted revised estimates totalling \$1,516,400. The Advisory Committee had recommended a total reduction of \$79,400. Of that amount, \$57,400 related to the Secretary-General's request under section 22G for assistance towards the establishment and operation of a child day-care centre at Geneva. The Advisory Committee had been troubled by that request, for a number of reasons.

12. First, it had been concerned that a question of that nature should come before the General Assembly through the medium of revised estimates, since it was a new item of expenditure and did not strictly fall within the category of revised estimates. The Advisory Committee was of the view that its inclusion in the revised estimates at so late a date precluded detailed consideration by the General Assembly.

13. Second, the project referred to in the Secretary-General's report did not appear to have been formulated so as to provide for all the potential beneficiaries. The ILO, WHO and the United Nations Office at Geneva were not the only United Nations agencies located there, and the staff of other agencies had the same needs. Consequently, it was not clear how it would be possible to proceed on the basis

of the participation of only two of the specialized agencies. The Advisory Committee felt that, if the possibility of the participation of other agencies had been explored, the objective of making the project self-financing might have been closer to realization.

14. Third, if the project was intended to be self-financing, it was reasonable to expect that it would have been formulated from the outset with that objective in mind. In his report, however, the Secretary-General referred to the "estimated operational deficit". If deficits were expected from the beginning, the project should not have been formulated.

15. Fourth, the Advisory Committee believed that, if the General Assembly decided to participate in any manner in such a project, its participation should not be limited to Geneva but should be extended to the staff of the regional commissions and those at Headquarters. Before endorsing such a request, the Assembly had a right to be informed of the potential number of other such claims for assistance from it. There was nothing in the Secretary-General's report to prevent the Geneva centre from declaring itself insolvent, even after receipt of the assistance requested.

16. Fifth, the project should not be viewed as an undertaking within the context of the International Women's Year. There should be no confusion of issues. The project should be designed to help parents, both men and women.

17. Finally, as stated in paragraph 14 of its report, the Advisory Committee believed that the area in question was one which could be examined by ICSC. Furthermore, the General Assembly would presumably wish to have the views of ICSC because the question had a direct relationship with the subject of conditions of service and the salary system, which were under review by that Commission.

18. Most of the remaining reductions in the revised estimates related to section 26, and were dealt with in paragraphs 22 to 26 of the Advisory Committee's report. With regard to the \$300,000 requested by the Secretary-General for construction at ECA, the Advisory Committee had been informed that the building would not be ready for provisional acceptance by the United Nations until 1976 and that the final amount of \$300,000 would not be payable until some time in 1977. Consequently, the Advisory Committee recommended that the request should be held in abeyance until 1976, when it could be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

19. Information provided to the Advisory Committee indicated that only some \$150,000 of the \$756,000 requested in connexion with UNIDO's move to the Donau-park centre at Vienna would be required in 1976. The Advisory Committee had recommended an appropriation of that amount. The question of requirements in 1977 could be re-examined by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session in the context of such further decisions as it might take with regard to United Nations accommodation at Vienna.

20. The other reductions stemmed from the Advisory Committee's belief that, with economies in various sections,

the amounts requested could be slightly reduced without impairing the Secretary-General's ability to perform the tasks in question.

21. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that his delegation disapproved of the Advisory Committee's observations in paragraph 14 of its report on the child day-care centre at Geneva. However, in view of the reasons given for the rejection of the Secretary-General's request, his delegation would reluctantly accept that part of the report. It might be helpful if the Secretariat, when reporting in 1976 on the conditions of service of women in the Secretariat, referred to the problems related to the establishment of day-care centres in Geneva and New York and possible solutions. He wondered whether the Secretary-General himself could be expected to raise the question with ICSC; if not, his delegation would make a formal proposal on the subject.

22. Mr. LELSKI (Sweden) said that his delegation also disagreed with the Advisory Committee's conclusions concerning the establishment of a day-care centre at Geneva. In the debate on the employment of women in the Secretariat, his delegation had called for the establishment of such centres in both New York and Geneva. It saw nothing discriminatory in the Organization's assisting with the establishment of such facilities, in the first instance, at one place or for only a few agencies, and it supported the establishment of child day-care centres to enable more women to pursue careers in the United Nations. It therefore supported the Australian proposal.

23. Mr. SETHI (India) agreed with the views expressed by the representatives of Australia and Sweden.

24. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the question put by the representative of Australia, said that it was for the General Assembly to invite ICSC to examine the principle involved.

25. Mrs. ABELE-EMICH (Austria) agreed with the views expressed by the representatives of Australia and Sweden concerning paragraph 14 of the Advisory Committee's report. Her delegation felt that the United Nations had an obligation to provide staff members with day-care facilities. Only in that way could the recommendations concerning the employment of women be properly implemented.

26. With regard to paragraph 25 of the Advisory Committee's report, she pointed out that both paragraph 26.3 of the Secretary-General's report and the annex to that report referred only to the accommodation of UNIDO at Vienna.

27. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he had considerable sympathy with the observations contained in the Advisory Committee's report. He was sure that the Secretariat, notably through the Staff Office of CCAQ, would not fail to bring the matter to the attention of ICSC.

28. Referring to paragraphs 22.1 to 22.9 of the Secretary-General's report, he said that his delegation, as it had already stated, would like a clearer insight into the bodies dealing with co-ordination between the organizations of the United Nations system. In the course of the coming year, it would like to know how ACC and its subsidiary bodies

functioned, what their activities were and how much those activities cost. He noted that the CCAQ Staff Office was largely financed by the United Nations, and recalled that he had already commented on the need to share the costs between the regular budget of the Organization and voluntary contributions. He was not convinced that the regular budget should bear one third of the operating costs of the Staff Office, and he requested that that point should be taken into consideration in the next budget. The Fifth Committee was the only forum in which the financial implications of those bodies within the United Nations system that were financed jointly by a number of organizations were regularly discussed. It should not be forgotten that the expenditure of \$126,000, referred to in paragraph 22.9 of the Secretary-General's report, in fact represented an expenditure of \$379,000 for the system as a whole.

29. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said his delegation entirely agreed with the Advisory Committee that the proposal regarding the establishment of a day-care centre at Geneva involved consideration of the basic principle of the common system, for which purpose ICSC had been established. The basis of the common system was that common principles should be applied to all duty stations, without preference. A decision to subsidize the Geneva day-care centre would be contrary to that concept. However, if the Committee wished the proposal to be considered by ICSC, his delegation would not object.

30. While his delegation was not opposed to adequate child-care services for women staff members, it believed that application of the self-help principle would not be unreasonable. Most working women with children were married, which meant that the family income consisted of two salaries and it was reasonable to assume that such couples could afford to pay the normal commercial price for day-care facilities. Working mothers who lived alone could then be subsidized by the better-off members of the staff through a system of graded fees, which would make it unnecessary for the United Nations to subsidize the centre's operations.

31. Mr. LINDSTRØM (Norway) supported the Secretary-General's proposal concerning the establishment of a child-care centre at Geneva. Such a measure would be a good start to the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions. If there was a desire to see more women working, appropriate day-care facilities must be provided. Further proposals of a similar nature should be initiated.

32. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that the Secretary-General's proposal for the provision of assistance for the establishment of child-care facilities at Geneva was valid. It was not often that the United Nations acted in a truly social spirit. However, he was compelled to agree with the Advisory Committee that the proposal had not been examined in sufficient detail, particularly since such an undertaking must fall within the framework of an over-all policy approved by the General Assembly. He could see only advantages in requesting ICSC to make a more thorough study of the proposal.

33. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) said that her delegation fully supported the proposal to establish a day-care centre at

Geneva. The amount of the proposed subsidy was very small compared to the money already raised by the Geneva-based staff. Since the proposal did not concern the entire United Nations system, the only reason for referring it to ICSC appeared to be to delay action on it. The proposal represented a concrete step in favour of female staff members at Geneva and provided an opportunity for delegations to follow up with action their statements at previous meetings in support of greater participation of women in the United Nations.

34. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Austria and Sweden as well as his own, introduced a draft decision which read as follows:

"The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it invite the International Civil Service Commission to study the question of assistance in the provision of day-care facilities for staff of the United Nations, taking into account the observations of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 14 of its report (A/10008/Add.28), and to make proposals thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session".

The Commission's study would embrace all United Nations duty stations.

35. Mr. FELLAH (Algeria) said that, while his delegation was favourably disposed towards the Australian proposal, it had some reservations, inasmuch as the Advisory Committee was of the opinion that any action must come within the framework of an over-all policy adopted by the General Assembly after a review by ICSC.

36. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation concurred with the Advisory Committee and would be willing to agree to the proposal made by the representative of Australia. Nevertheless, he would draw attention to the danger of a proliferation of day-care centres throughout the United Nations system. It was therefore necessary for ICSC to consider the matter from the point of view of the over-all policy of the United Nations system. Moreover, it was all very well to speak about fairness towards women, but very few of the female staff in Geneva came from developing countries. He might feel obliged at the thirty-first session to make a formal request that the Committee should be informed precisely which staff members were participating in the undertaking.

37. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) proposed that the Committee should adopt the proposal made by the Secretary-General in paragraph 22.24 of his report (A/C.5/1725). She had been very disconcerted to hear the Kenyan representative's comments regarding the "danger" of an extension of day-care centres throughout the system.

38. Mr. SETHI (India) said he did not agree with the representative of Kenya that the proposed establishment of a day-care centre at Geneva should be viewed as an exception. His delegation was not in the least concerned at the prospect of such centres at all United Nations duty stations; indeed, it could only rejoice at the idea of the United Nations system's setting an example in that field. Whatever decision the Committee took, it was essential that

it should not be influenced by the fact that most of its members were men.

39. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) was willing to support the draft decision proposed by the representative of Australia, provided that ICSC was invited to "examine the need for", rather than "study assistance in", the provision of day-care facilities.

40. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was astounded at the attempt by the Secretariat to ram through under the section entitled "Administration, management and general services", a proposal relating to staff subsidies, which, as the Advisory Committee had pointed out, properly fell within the framework of salaries, allowances and working conditions. While the matter might merit attention, it should be dealt with under the appropriate section. His delegation therefore supported the Australian proposal, provided that the problem was considered in the context of the question of salaries, allowances and working conditions. The tendency to give a narrow interpretation to the general decisions taken within the framework of the International Women's Year was improper. Those decisions related to women throughout the world, and particularly in developing countries, and his delegation sympathized with the comments made by the representative of Kenya.

41. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation could agree to the Australian proposal. However, it should be reworded to refer to "day-care facilities for children of the staff of the United Nations".

42. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that the provision of day-care facilities seemed a logical sequel to the decision to increase the number of women in the Secretariat. However, the Advisory Committee was quite correct in wishing to place the matter within the context of the United Nations system as a whole. His delegation fully supported the Australian proposal, with the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom representative.

43. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft decision, accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of the Philippines. The sponsors could not accept the United Kingdom amendment, since they believed that the need for day-care facilities had already been established, and they urged the United Kingdom representative not to press his amendment. They would have no strong objection to the Soviet proposal that the study should take place within the context of the question of salaries, allowances and working conditions, on the understanding that the Committee still wanted a separate report on the question to be submitted to the General Assembly at the thirty-first session.

44. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) concurred with that interpretation of his amendment.

45. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's amendment was crucial because, without it, the draft decision would prejudice the question of a subsidy before it had even been examined. It was unlikely that all staff members would need a subsidy. Accordingly, even if ICSC established that there was a need for day-care facilities, the

question of a subsidy from the budgets of organizations in the United Nations system would have to be considered separately.

46. Mr. KIVANÇ (Turkey) moved the closure of the debate.

The motion was adopted.

47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the United Kingdom amendment (see para. 39 above) to the draft decision.

48. Mr. STOTTEMYER (United States of America), explaining his vote before the voting, said that his delegation would support the draft decision, with the amendment proposed by the United Kingdom. While recognizing that there might be a need for day-care facilities, his delegation did not agree that assistance from the budget was necessarily required or was necessarily the best approach.

The United Kingdom amendment was adopted by 45 votes to 16, with 29 abstentions.

49. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) said that, as amended, the draft decision read as follows:

"The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it invite the International Civil Service Commission, in the context of the study on salary, allowances and working conditions, to examine the need for the provision of day-care facilities for children of the staff of the United Nations, taking into account the observations of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 14 of its report (A/10008/Add.28), and to make proposals thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session."

50. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said he wondered, in view of the fact that priorities had already been established for the work of ICSC, whether the Committee would not be burdening that Commission unduly by adopting the draft decision. Unless his delegation received assurances to the contrary, it would abstain from voting.

51. The CHAIRMAN replied that there was no way of providing such assurances at the current stage.

52. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation would cast an affirmative vote on the draft decision, as it had on the United Kingdom amendment. In its view, the United Nations system must be considered in its entirety. It should be clearly understood that his delegation had nothing against the proposal to facilitate working conditions for women but was simply against any selectivity in the matter.

The draft decision, as amended, was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Colombian proposal (see para. 37 above) that the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General under section 22G should be restored in the amount of \$57,400.

54. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that the decision just adopted by the Committee ruled out the possibility of voting on the Colombian proposal.

55. After a brief discussion in which Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta), Mr. SETHI (India), Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines), the CHAIRMAN and Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) participated, the CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to signify by a vote whether it wished the Colombian proposal to be put to the vote.

The Committee decided by 51 votes to 17, with 20 abstentions, not to vote on the Colombian proposal.

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/10008/Add.28, para. 29) that an additional appropriation totaling \$2,020,000 under sections 1, 2, 3, 20, 21, 22, 25 and 26 should be approved.

A total additional appropriation of \$2,020,000 under sections 1, 2, 3, 20, 21, 22, 25 and 26 for the biennium 1976-1977 was approved by 79 votes to 10, with 1 abstention.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the estimates under income sections 1 and 2 in the amounts of \$45,000 and \$220,000, respectively.

It was so decided.

58. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he had voted in favour of the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. It was his understanding that the questions he had raised earlier regarding the status, operations and activities of ACC and its subsidiary bodies, and the costs relating thereto, would be considered by the Secretary-General.

59. Mr. LAVAU (Director of the Budget Division) assured the representative of Belgium that the concerns which he had expressed would be given serious consideration by the Secretariat.

Revised estimates under section 1. International Fund for Agricultural Development (A/10008/Add.18 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1722)

60. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in his report (A/C.5/1722) the Secretary-General had submitted a request for additional funds in the amount of \$111,000 under section 1 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977. That amount was for conference servicing costs for the third session of the Meeting of Interested Countries on the Establishment of an International Fund for Agricultural Development. In paragraph 2 of the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/10008/Add.18 and Corr.1), it was recalled that the General Assembly, by its resolution 3348 (XXIX), had requested the Secretary-General to convene a meeting of interested countries to work out details for an International Fund for Agricultural Development.

61. The initial meetings had taken place in May and October 1975. The additional appropriation of \$111,000 requested by the Secretary-General would be applied in the manner indicated in paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report. As could be seen from that paragraph, provision was made for an expenditure of \$72,000 for interpretation in five languages, including Arabic. However, as indicated in paragraph 6 of the report of the Advisory Committee, the General Assembly had yet to approve the inclusion of Arabic among the official and working languages of the Meeting of Interested Countries, and the related \$20,000 should not have been included in the estimates.

62. The Fifth Committee, in considering a recommendation to the General Assembly, might wish to bear in mind that the Meeting of Interested Countries was an *ad hoc* working group. Accordingly, the Committee might consider whether it wished to apply the same kind of criteria as had been followed when it had decided to recommend the inclusion of Arabic as an official and working language of the World Food Council and whether it was necessary to include additional languages, given the limited number of participants in the Meeting.

63. In paragraph 7 of its report, the Advisory Committee called for economies in the areas of documentation, temporary assistance, overtime and night differential, which would lead to some savings in the estimates requested for those items. In paragraph 8 of its report, the Advisory Committee recommended a reduction of \$42,000 in the estimates proposed by the Secretary-General, from \$111,000 to \$69,000. Should the General Assembly approve the use of Arabic as an official and working language of the Meeting of Interested Countries, the amount of \$69,000 recommended by the Advisory Committee would have to be increased by \$20,000, making a total of \$89,000.

64. Mr. ALKAFF (Democratic Yemen) proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should approve the use of Arabic as an official and working language of the Meeting of Interested Countries on the Establishment of an International Fund for Agricultural Development and that the appropriation for the third session of the Meeting should be increased by an amount of \$20,000, for a total of \$89,000. That proposal reflected the recommendations of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee in their respective reports.

65. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the proposal to include Arabic among the languages to be used at the Meeting of Interested Countries.

66. The revised estimates covered expenditures for servicing the Meeting over and above those which would arise from the inclusion of Arabic among the official and working languages. However, the General Assembly, in its resolution 3348 (XXIX), had not called for those expenditures. The Secretary-General's request was not in keeping with that resolution, and his delegation could not, therefore, support the request.

67. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should approve the use of Arabic as an official and working language of the Meeting of Interested Countries on the Establishment of an International Fund for Agricultural Development and that the appropriation for the third session of the Meeting should be increased by an amount of \$20,000, for a total of \$89,000.

An additional appropriation of \$89,000 under section 1 for the biennium 1976-1977 was approved by 72 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that the estimates just approved would appear under section 1 in second reading.

69. He suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft decision along the following lines:

"The General Assembly, having noted the financial implications indicated by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 8 of its report (A/10008/Add.18 and Corr.1), authorizes the Meeting of Interested Countries on the Establishment of an International Fund for Agricultural Development to include Arabic as an official and working language."

It was so decided.

Revised estimates under section 4. United Nations cartographic conferences, 1976 and 1977 (A/10008/Add.27, A/C.5/1728)

70. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the Advisory Committee's report (A/10008/Add.27) on the additional appropriation of \$160,700 requested in his report (A/C.5/1728) by the Secretary-General under section 4 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 to cover the cost of printing externally the final reports of the four cartographic conferences planned for the coming biennium. In paragraph 2 of the report of the Advisory Committee a breakdown of the estimates was provided. Paragraph 3 indicated that the Advisory Committee had been informed that it had taken approximately three years to print the proceedings of earlier conferences.

71. The Advisory Committee recommended that the request for additional appropriations of \$160,700 under section 4 should be deferred until 1977, when the General Assembly would be in a better position to determine whether the amount would be required. There would be nothing to prevent the Secretary-General from indicating to the Advisory Committee in 1976 that its belief that it would be premature to include in the programme budget for 1976-1977 the cost of printing the proceedings of the conferences to be held in that biennium had proved incorrect; the Advisory Committee could then examine the requirements in the context of the progress report to be submitted in 1976.

72. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that, first, it was unfortunate that an estimate had not been included in

section 4 for the printing of the final reports of the cartographic conferences to be held during the biennium, particularly since it had been known at the time of the formulation of section 4 that those conferences would be held in 1976 and 1977.

73. Secondly, with regard to the Advisory Committee's conclusion that it would be premature to include in the programme budget for 1976-1977 the cost of printing the proceedings of the conferences to be held in that biennium, he wondered whether it could not in fact already be foreseen that the Secretariat would have to submit the reports of the First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas and the report of the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East to the Economic and Social Council at its spring session in 1977.

74. Thirdly, he felt that it would have been more appropriate to indicate in document A/C.5/1728, paragraph 1 (c), that the Third United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, which was scheduled to be held at Athens in 1977, might have been held at one of the established headquarters of the United Nations if the Greek Government had not invited the Conference to meet at Athens. His delegation wondered how General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV), paragraph 10, applied to that Conference; his Government was prepared to consult with the Secretary-General regarding the applicability of that provision.

75. Mrs. REMON (Panama) pointed out that an appropriation had been requested to cover the cost of printing the final report of the First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas, which was to be held at Panama City in March 1976. She felt that the purpose of the Conference would not be well served if it was necessary to wait an unduly long time for its final report.

76. Mr. MILLS (Budget Division), replying to the representative of Greece, said that the Secretariat regretted the oversight as a result of which no estimate had been included in section 4 for the printing of the final reports of the four cartographic conferences to be held in 1976 and 1977.

77. With regard to the timing of the reports and their availability for printing, he said that, in the case of the First United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for the Americas, volume I (report of the Conference) would be available within three months after the Conference and volume II (technical papers) six months after the Conference. Accordingly, if sufficient funds were included in the printing budget, the two publications would be available for the spring 1977 session of the Economic and Social Council. In the case of the Eighth United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East, volume I would be ready for printing by the end of 1976 and volume II by April or May 1977. He had been informed that only volume I of the reports of those conferences would be required for the spring 1977 session of the Economic and Social Council. As to the Third United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, volume I of the report could be submitted for printing by November 1977. It was unlikely that funds would be required to print volumes I and II of the latter report in the biennium 1976-1977.

78. Replying to the third point raised by the representative of Greece, he agreed that the language of all the subparagraphs of paragraph 1 of document A/C.5/1728 could have been clearer. The intention had been to indicate that the conferences would have been held in the cities indicated in parentheses if invitations had not been issued to hold them elsewhere. The venue of a conference was normally the city in which the substantive body servicing the conference was located. Provision had originally been made to hold two of the conferences at Geneva because that had been preferable in view of the over-all pattern of conferences. With respect to the Conference to be held at Athens, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV), paragraph 10, the additional amounts required would have to be negotiated with the Secretariat in due course; they represented the extra costs—essentially for staff travel—of holding the Conference away from Headquarters.

79. With regard to the statement by the representative of Panama, he said that the Secretariat had indeed requested provision for the printing of the final report of the First Conference for the Americas in order that the documents should be available as soon as possible.

80. Mr. RINDORINDO (Indonesia) observed that the Advisory Committee's report indicated that it took approximately three years to publish reports of the type in question, whereas the representative of the Budget Division had indicated that no more than six months would be required in the case of the reports of the conferences to be held in 1976 and 1977. It would not take more than six months to a year to print such documents in developing countries, and he wondered what kind of printing facilities were used. If it was possible to print the documents in question by 1977, then the amount requested by the Secretary-General for that purpose should be included in the programme budget for the biennium.

81. Mr. HART (Australia) said he would like to know why it had taken three years to publish the reports mentioned in paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report; the representative of the Budget Division had merely indicated that in future it would be possible to print reports in a shorter period of time.

82. Mr. KIVANÇ (Turkey) said that, in principle, under the programme budgeting system, budget estimates for programmes, activities and projects which would be implemented in a given budgeting period should be prepared, and the required appropriations should be requested by the Secretary-General, at the beginning of that period. Supplementary appropriations should not be deferred to the second half of the budgeting period; the latter approach could be justified only in the case of unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. He hoped that in the future the Advisory Committee would have time to consider that point.

83. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) agreed with the remarks made by the representative of Turkey.

84. Mr. MILLS (Budget Division) said he regretted that at the moment the Secretariat was not in a position to reply to the points raised by the representatives of Indonesia,

Australia and Turkey. It would endeavour to reply as soon as possible, if the Committee so desired.

85. Mr. FELLAH (Algeria) said that he was extremely puzzled by the Advisory Committee's decision not to recommend acceptance of the request for appropriations for printing and by the explanation which the representative of the Budget Division had given for the delay in printing the reports of earlier conferences. As a result of such delays, the information in the reports was likely to be out of date. He therefore requested clarification of the reasons for the delays.

86. Mr. MILLS (Budget Division) said that the Third United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names was scheduled for August 1977, and its report would be ready for submission in November 1977. Accordingly, the Secretary-General would not press for any provision to be made for the printing of the report of that Conference in the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977. However, at least volume I of the reports of the Conference for the Americas and the Conference for Asia and the Far East would have to be printed.

87. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the delay in printing the reports of cartographic conferences, a decision was not required at the current stage. He therefore supported the conclusions and recommendations of the Advisory Committee in its report.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to take note of the Advisory Committee's report (A/10008/Add.27), in which no appropriation was recommended.

It was so decided.

89. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation objected to the fact that the Advisory Committee

had not recommended an appropriation for the printing of the reports in question. As the representative of Turkey had aptly stated, the budget for the forthcoming biennium should cover all foreseen expenses which would be incurred during the biennium. Accordingly, it should provide for the printing of the conference reports, for it was now clear that all four of them could be printed during the biennium 1976-1977.

90. Mr. HART (Australia) said that his delegation had supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on the understanding that the Secretary-General would explain why it had not been possible for previous reports to be printed on time, so that the Committee could make an objective evaluation of the funds required.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

91. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) said that all the figures required for the second reading of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 could be found in document A/C.5/1737, and the Committee might wish to proceed to the second reading at its following meeting on the basis of that document.

92. Mr. STOTTLEMYER (United States of America) said that document A/C.5/1737, paragraph 1, did not accurately reflect the decision taken by the Committee at its 1770th meeting.

93. The CHAIRMAN said that the necessary change would be made.

94. If there were no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to begin the second reading of the proposed programme budget at its next meeting on the basis of document A/C.5/1737.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

1773rd meeting

Tuesday, 16 December 1975, at 8.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1773

AGENDA ITEM 100

Pattern of conferences (concluded):

(a) Report of the Committee on Conferences (concluded)*

Statement by the Chairman of the Group of 77

1. Mr. RAMAMONJISOA (Madagascar) said that he had not had an opportunity to make a statement when the Committee had considered its draft report on the pattern of conferences. As Chairman of the Group of 77, he had been

* Resumed from the 1770th meeting.

asked to convey to the Committee the Group's wish that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the Department of Conference Services that it consider the possibility of allowing the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to meet for four weeks to enable it to complete its task.

AGENDA ITEM 107

Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)*

* Resumed from the 1770th meeting.