

37. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of New Zealand had made a serious error of interpretation when he had claimed at the 1668th meeting that the representative of the Soviet Union, in his statement on personnel questions, had accused the Secretariat and individual countries and delegations of patronage and nepotism. The Soviet representative had simply cited facts contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat concerning the over-representation of certain countries and regions and the under-representation of other countries and regions and the unconvincing reasons given in the report for that abnormal situation, which was in violation of the provisions of the Charter and various General Assembly decisions. The representative of New Zealand had said that different countries in Eastern Europe were represented at different levels in the Secretariat; he had omitted to say that the region of Eastern Europe as a whole was under-represented. As of 30 June 1974, 278 nationals of countries in Eastern Europe had been employed in the Secretariat, while the minimum of the desirable range was 354. That situation

should be taken into consideration by the Secretariat in its recruitment policy, and his delegation had accordingly proposed measures to that effect. If account had been taken of the level of representation, it would have been seen that over-represented countries were even more over-represented than appeared from the figures and under-represented countries even more under-represented.

38. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) thanked the representative of the Soviet Union for his assurance that his statement to the effect that the main reasons for the failure to comply with the provisions of Article 101 of the Charter were attempts by Western countries to influence the composition of the Secretariat did not imply patronage. He suggested that any indication to that effect should be deleted from the records and report of the Committee.

39. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) requested information on the financial implications of holding night meetings.

The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.

1670th meeting

Friday, 22 November 1974, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

A/C.5/SR.1670

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Dipp Gómez (Dominican Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/9836/Rev.1 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 88* (A/C.5/1623)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in its report (A/9836/Rev.1, para. 11) concerning participation in the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in Their Relations with International Organizations, to be held in 1975. The Secretary-General in his note on the subject (A/C.5/1623) considered that the adoption of the draft resolution would involve a supplementary appropriation of \$446,000 for 1975 under section 25 of the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975.

2. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee felt that the cost of printing the post-session documentation was very high; as the documents would be type-set, they would involve external printing. The possibility of using more economical means should be explored, but the Advisory Committee was not requesting a reduction on that account and accepted the

financial implications as presented by the Secretary-General.

3. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$446,000 would be required under section 25 of the programme budget for 1974-1975. In addition, a supplementary amount of \$68,000 for staff assessment would be required for administrative staff under section 34, offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1.

It was so decided.

4. Miss EMICH (Austria) observed that Austria had offered to act as host for the Conference. In the light of the decision just taken, she confirmed that the Austrian Government would bear the additional costs.

AGENDA ITEM 73

Programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 (*continued*)* (A/9008/Add.16, A/9067 and Add.1, A/9112 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, A/9603, A/9608 and Add.1-10 and Corr.1, A/9608/Add.11, A/9773, A/9792, A/C.5/1540/Rev.1, A/C.5/1593-1595, A/C.5/1596 and Add.1, A/C.5/1597, A/C.5/1599, A/C.5/1602, A/C.5/1604-1607, A/C.5/1611, A/C.5/1614, A/C.5/1615, A/C.5/1616 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1619 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1622, A/C.5/1633, A/C.5/L.1172, A/C.5/L.1188/Rev.1)

* Participation in the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations, to be held in 1975.

* Resumed from the 1668th meeting.

*Installation of mechanical means of voting
(A/9608/Add.2, A/C.5/1594)*

5. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to the proposal made by the Secretary-General in his note (A/C.5/1594) for the installation of an additional voting machine in conference room 2 at Headquarters, at a cost of \$125,000, which would be included in the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977. The Advisory Committee maintained its cautious position on the proposal. It had suggested that before further action was taken on his proposal, the Secretary-General should study the frequency of voting in the Main Committees and he had already begun such a study. Accordingly, the proposal for the installation of another voting machine might be reconsidered in the context of the programme budget for 1976-1977.

6. With regard to the installation of a voting machine in the Assembly Hall at the Palais des Nations at Geneva, the Secretary-General was not proposing any immediate action. The cost of installing a single machine would come to \$250,000 even without the cost of special features required to meet the requirements of the ILO and its tripartite structure. The Advisory Committee therefore agreed with the Secretary-General that before proposing any action, he should explore the matter with the specialized agencies and see how far they were prepared to support the installation financially.

7. With reference to paragraph 6 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/9608/Add.2), he emphasized that the second sentence should be interpreted not as a criticism of the Secretary-General, but as a general warning. Assuming that the Secretary-General felt justified in pursuing his request, it would be better for the Committee to consider it in the context of the programme budget as a whole.

8. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was surprised by the haste with which the Secretariat was pressing for a decision on the installation of another voting machine. The experience of the Main Committees with the two existing machines had been entirely satisfactory and there was no need to install another for the use of the Fifth Committee. The delays in the Committee's work were clearly not attributable to the lack of a voting machine. His delegation therefore supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations concerning the installation of machines both in New York and Geneva.

9. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said he agreed with the Advisory Committee that the Secretary-General should first study the degree of priority to be given to the installation of another voting machine in the context of the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977. The Fifth Committee was not inconvenienced by having to go to conference room 3 for the purpose of voting. Moreover, in exploring the question with the specialized agencies, the Secretary-General, bearing in mind his experience with regard to the utilization of the International Computing Centre by the agencies, should endeavour to extract from them a firm commitment on the utilization of a voting machine in Geneva and the financing of its installation and maintenance.

10. Mr. TIMBRELL (Office of the Assistant Secretary-General for General Services), replying to a query from Mr. CARRASCO (Chile), said that the estimate of the cost of installing another voting machine in New York was based on the actual cost of the machine in use in conference room 3, plus the costs of maintenance during the three-year period since it was installed and cost rises. If another machine were installed in 1975, it could be expected to cost \$125,000. The figure for the installation of a machine in Geneva was based on the one offer received so far of a machine constructed for use by the Congress of UPU. However, the condition of that machine made it doubtful that it could serve the purposes of the United Nations Office at Geneva, and other sources were being explored. The UPU machine had been offered for \$230,000 plus installation. On that basis, the cost for a machine in the Geneva Assembly Hall had been estimated at \$250,000.

11. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), commenting on the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union, said that the proposal for the installation of another voting machine had not been made on the initiative of the Secretariat, but in response to the wishes expressed by delegations in the Economic and Social Council and other bodies and by the Committee itself at the previous session. The Advisory Committee had not recommended its adoption at that time and the Secretariat had been asked to keep the matter under review. Paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's note was something less than a positive recommendation; the language was decidedly restrained and reflected a definite lack of enthusiasm.

12. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) said that her delegation supported the installation of a voting machine at Geneva as a means of expediting the work of the United Nations at that conference centre.

13. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should take note of the Advisory Committee's report (A/9608/Add.2) and concur with the observations and recommendations contained in paragraphs 3 to 6.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 80

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (*continued*):*
(b) Committee on Contributions (A/9659, A/C.5/1631)

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to an election to fill five vacancies on the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1975. Five nominations for appointment or reappointment had been received from the respective Governments: Mr. Silveira da Mota (Brazil), Mr. Matheson (Canada), Mr. Abdel-Ghani (Egypt), Mr. Kiti (Kenya), and Mr. Rhodes (United Kingdom).

At the request of the Chairman, Miss Bastos (Portugal) and Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland) acted as tellers.

* Resumed from the 1651st meeting.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	85
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	85
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	85
Required majority:	43

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Angus J. Matheson	78
Mr. Abdel Hamid Abdel-Ghani	76
Mr. David Silveira da Mota	76
Mr. Japhet G. Kiti	74
Mr. John I. M. Rhodes	74

Mr. Abdel-Ghani (Egypt), Mr. Kiti (Kenya), Mr. Matheson (Canada), Mr. Rhodes (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and Mr. Silveira da Mota (Brazil), having obtained the required majority, the Committee recommended their appointment as members of the Committee on Contributions for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1975.

15. The CHAIRMAN noted that Mr. Cleland and Miss Whalley, retiring members of the Committee on Contributions, had obtained 4 votes each and five other persons had obtained 1 vote each.

16. He proposed that the Rapporteur should be asked to report directly to the General Assembly on the matter.

It was so decided.

17. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil): Mr. GHEIT (Egypt), Mr. MACGREGOR (United Kingdom), Mr. STANBURY (Canada) and Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) thanked the Committee for the confidence shown in the persons elected from their respective countries.

AGENDA ITEM 77

Pattern of conferences (continued)* (A/9589/Rev.1, A/9603 (chap. VI, sect. H), A/9768 and Corr.1, A/9795 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.5/L.1187):

(a) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit (continued)* (A/9795 and Add.1 and 2);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General (continued)* (A/9768 and Corr.1)

18. Mr. STANBURY (Canada), introducing the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1187) before the Committee on behalf of the sponsors, said that the proposed committee on conferences was designed to rationalize the pattern of conferences; it would not be empowered to curtail or augment the activities of any United Nations body. While paragraphs 1 to 4 of section I were essentially routine, paragraph 5 requested the other principal organs of the United Nations to take parallel decisions concerning their own conference programmes. Paragraph 1 of section II stressed the experimental nature of the proposed committee. According to the terms of reference, contained in paragraph 3, the committee's area of activity would not

conflict with the responsibilities and prerogatives of other bodies or of the Main Committees; the few occasions on which the proposed committee would be able to act on behalf of the General Assembly were specified in paragraph 3(c). The quota system, referred to in paragraph 3(d), had been recommended by the Joint Inspection Unit and was intended to develop a more satisfactory conference calendar. Such a system had proved useful in the case of United Nations publications and documentation. The question of co-ordinating the pattern of conferences within the United Nations system, mentioned in paragraph 3(f), involved an appreciation of the complexities resulting from agreements between the specialized agencies and the Organization and fell within the purview of the committee. The details of the committee's operation had not been specified in order to give it flexibility.

19. The sponsors had decided to revise the text slightly. The beginning of paragraph 5 of section I should read "Decides that subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly should not, under ordinary circumstances, create new standing bodies or *ad hoc* sessional or intersessional bodies which require additional resources without the approval...", and in paragraph 3(c) of section II the words "between sessions" should be added after the word "dealing".

20. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation supported the proposed arrangements for the committee on conferences, with some reservations. An 18-member Committee would be too small to ensure the equitable representation functions necessary for correct political balance, particularly in view of the fact that some automatic representation was probably envisaged. Nevertheless, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

21. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) observed that his delegation had expressed support for the establishment of a committee on conferences on the understanding that there were no reserved seats on the committee and that membership would be on the basis of equitable geographic distribution. As the committee was to act on behalf of the General Assembly, it was only fair that it should reflect the political constitution of that body. Whatever distribution was finally decided upon—presumably after consultations—his delegation reserved the right of the African group of countries to revert to the matter of representation if that proved necessary prior to the thirtieth session. As far as the substance was concerned, his delegation had no objections and would support the draft resolution.

22. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) endorsed the position taken by the representative of the Upper Volta. Referring to section II, paragraph 2, he said that it would have been sufficient simply to state the provision concerning the designation of Member States. The additional requirements of seniority and experience might create difficulties for some Governments.

23. Mr. STANBURY (Canada) said that the sponsors had merely wanted to make it clear that representatives should have experience of United Nations conferences; they had not intended to direct Member States what to do. The latter part of the paragraph could, indeed, be omitted.

* Resumed from the 1668th meeting.

24. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation would have no difficulty in supporting the draft resolution, even though it had originally favoured a membership of 15. Referring to section II, paragraph 3 (d), he suggested that the words "on an annual or biennial basis" should be added after the words "quota system".
25. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the draft resolution was quite acceptable. His delegation had originally suggested that a membership of 18 was a minimum. If it was later found that the committee would be more effective with increased representation, his delegation would have no difficulty in agreeing to that when the time came.
26. Mr. EKONG (Nigeria) said that although he would not press for a vote on section II, if the draft resolution were put to the vote, his delegation would have to abstain, because it had very serious reservations about the very concept of a committee on conferences. The appointment of 18 senior representatives to a committee which would act on behalf of the General Assembly on requested departures from the calendar of conferences would be an indefensible waste of manpower and funds. Moreover, the proposal had dangerous implications, inasmuch as the Assembly would be delegating authority to the committee to decide on requests in emergency situations.
27. Mr. SETHI (India) said that the powers outlined in section II, paragraph 3, might not be exhaustive enough; in his view, they did not correspond to the recommendations made by the Joint Inspection Unit. His delegation was, however, prepared to support the draft resolution, which did provide for a certain amount of flexibility, on the understanding that a satisfactory formula could be found for the composition of the committee. It was possible that the previous Committee on Conferences had failed, not because of its limited powers, but because the organization of conferences had not posed many problems. That was no longer the case; indeed the availability of interpreters in itself limited the number of conferences that could be planned.
28. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, but had reservations about section II. It had strong misgivings about the committee possibly superseding the deliberative organs of the United Nations. Moreover, no quota system should be instituted, since international conferences were organized to meet the needs of the international community. With regard to paragraph 3 (e) of section II, he pointed out that no mention was made of any programme to expand conference staff and facilities, even though one of the reasons why international conferences had to be curtailed was the shortage of facilities and of interpretation services. The paragraph should be expanded to make good that omission.
29. Mr. POSSO (Ecuador) said that his delegation had reservations concerning paragraphs 3 (a), (c) and (d) of section II of the draft resolution. First, he doubted whether a committee composed of 18 Member States would allow for the equitable representation of the developing countries. Secondly, provision should be made for the proposed committee on conferences to report to United Nations bodies other than the General Assembly, and principally to the Economic and Social Council. Thirdly, the concept of a "quota" system should be clearly spelled out, on the lines suggested by the representative of the Philippines. Nevertheless, his delegation would support the draft resolution, provided that the amendment suggested by the representative of Morocco was accepted by the sponsors.
30. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia) observed that his delegation had expressed reservations concerning the establishment of the proposed committee on conferences, and in particular concerning its composition. Consequently, in order to ensure more equitable geographical distribution, he proposed that the committee should be composed of 21 Member States.
31. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution because it endowed the proposed committee on conferences with sufficient powers to enable it to work effectively. None the less, there were certain changes that were desirable. He agreed with the representative of the Upper Volta that there should be no reserved seats, and he supported the enlarged composition proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia. He trusted that the consultations referred to in section II, paragraph 3 (c), would include consultations with the Economic and Social Council.
32. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation had had no preconceived ideas regarding the proposal to establish a committee on conferences and had said that it would abide by the view of the majority. It could support the draft resolution, but it would first like the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments to confirm that the establishment of the Committee would have no financial implications.
33. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) drew attention to the fact that the Joint Inspection Unit had proposed certain remedial measures designed to overcome the problem of finding interpreters. He believed that the draft resolution should make explicit reference to that recommendation and accordingly proposed the addition, at the end of section I, of the following paragraph:
- "6. *Endorses* the recommendation regarding interpretation services contained in chapter VII, section 4, of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit, subject to the related comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions".
34. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the point the representative of Brazil was making was probably covered in section I, paragraph 1, of the draft resolution, in which the General Assembly took note with appreciation of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit.
35. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) observed that the mere noting of the report was not sufficient to ensure that the recommendations would be acted upon. If it were, the committee on conferences could be established automatically. It was essential to single out that area of conference services on which action was most urgently required.

36. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation was in favour of establishing the committee on conferences and would be able to support the draft resolution if the sponsors agreed to the Yugoslav proposal concerning the composition of the committee.

37. Mr. STANBURY (Canada) said that he was unable to speak for the other sponsors of the draft resolution; however, his delegation had no objection to the Brazilian proposal concerning the addition of a new paragraph to section I, the Moroccan suggestion regarding the deletion of the final part of paragraph 2 in section II, or the Iranian proposal concerning the expansion of section II, paragraph 3 (e). With regard to the Yugoslav proposal, he reminded members that the size of the proposed committee had been the subject of extensive informal consultations in which some delegations had expressed the view that a membership of 18 was too large and others that it was too small, and that the draft resolution as a whole was the product of much discussion and compromise.

38. Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments) thanked the representative of France for giving him the opportunity to confirm that the proposed committee on conferences would be a standing body and could therefore be serviced without additional financial implications.

39. With regard to the Brazilian proposal, he said that the inspectors had concentrated on the problem of providing interpretation services without delving into the many other difficulties involving précis-writers, revisers, conference

officers, typists and other staff concerned with the preparation and reproduction of documents. That was why the Secretariat welcomed the comprehensive wording of section II, paragraph 4. He was grateful, however, for the suggestion of the representative of Brazil on singling out interpretation services.

40. Mr. SETHI (India) observed that in order to become a fully-fledged interpreter, a person required five years of highly specialized and expensive training and it was difficult to see how the Secretary-General could ensure the required expansion of training facilities. Since, furthermore, the Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services had said that the scarcity of qualified interpreters was not the only problem that his Department faced, he urged the representative of Brazil to withdraw his proposal.

41. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proposals being submitted at the current meeting jeopardized the delicate balance of the draft resolution, which had been achieved after lengthy consultations. He therefore hoped that representatives would show a spirit of compromise and not insist on their proposals being incorporated in the draft resolution. After all, recommendation 4 in chapter VII of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit was not the only one that deserved emphasis. If the Committee was unable to adopt the balanced text before it, the sponsors should be asked to prepare a new one. His delegation was not prepared to accept oral amendments submitted at the last minute.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

1671st meeting

Monday, 25 November 1974, at 3.05 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

A/C.5/SR.1671

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF U THANT, FORMER SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.

1. U TUN NAING (Burma) thanked the members of the Committee for the tribute paid to the memory of U Thant.

AGENDA ITEM 77

Pattern of conferences (*continued*) (A/9589/Rev.1, A/9603 (chap. VI, sect. H), A/9768 and Corr.1, A/9795 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.5/L.1187/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1190):

- (a) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*) (A/9795 and Add.1 and 2);
- (b) Report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/9768 and Corr.1)

2. Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen) said that his delegation was not convinced of the need to establish a committee on conferences. A number of other delegations which regarded such a committee as essential had introduced a draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1187), to which several delegations at the preceding meeting had proposed amendments.

3. His delegation could agree to the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Brazil, since all the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit were important and their implementation could help to ensure that future conferences proceeded smoothly. With regard to the oral amendment proposed by Algeria and Yugoslavia, his delegation felt that it was essential to ensure equitable geographical distribution of the members of the proposed committee on conferences and felt that, if the committee's membership was increased from 18 to 21, the President of the General Assembly could more easily ensure an equitable distribution. If those amendments were not adopted, his