

Advisory Committee contained in document A/9608/Add.9 concerning the administrative arrangements for the International Trade Centre, on the understanding that the measures adopted would not involve additional expenses under the regular budget, that the Centre's manning table would not be expanded and that the principle of equitable geographical distribution would be strictly applied in the Centre since the staff would have the same rights and privileges as other United Nations staff.

56. Mr. LAVAU (Director of the Budget Division) said that the Secretariat would ensure that the two conditions mentioned by the representative of the USSR would be met.

57. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly take note of the note of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1604) and endorse

the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in its report (A/9608/Add.9).

58. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that, although he had no objection to the proposal by the Chairman, he wished to propose that the Secretary-General should also be requested to submit a report on the question of administrative arrangements for the Centre at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted his proposal and the proposal made by the representative of Brazil.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

1656th meeting

Wednesday, 6 November 1974, at 3 p.m.

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

A/C.5/SR.1656

AGENDA ITEM 79

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (concluded)*

Draft Report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/L.1184)

1. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report of the Committee (A/C.5/L.1184), said that every effort had been made to reflect as fully as possible the views expressed by delegations, the statements of the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions and the decisions reached by the Fifth Committee.

2. Mr. MACGREGOR (United Kingdom) suggested a more concise formulation of paragraph 9 of the draft report.

3. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) pointed out that the language of the paragraph was sufficiently clear and that any rearrangement of the sentences would necessitate an alteration in the content of subsequent paragraphs.

4. Mr. MACGREGOR (United Kingdom) agreed not to press his drafting amendment, but expressed the hope that in future Committee reports would be drafted in more terse language.

5. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had only just received the

text of the draft report, although it was dated 31 October 1974, and had not had an opportunity to read it. It was not the first time that his delegation and others had been compelled to raise the question of the late distribution of documents.

6. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that his delegation shared the concern expressed by the Soviet delegation. Indeed, at the previous session of the General Assembly, it had reminded the Secretariat that there was often a wide discrepancy between the date given on documents and the date when the documents were received by delegations. He suggested that, before a document was placed on the daily agenda for discussion, the Secretary of the Committee should verify that it had in fact been distributed in good time to all delegations.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the suggestion of the representative of Kenya had been duly noted by the Secretariat, which would make every effort to eliminate delays in the distribution of documents.

8. If there was no objection, he would invite the Committee to vote on the draft report (A/C.5/L.1184).

The draft report was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 73

Programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 (continued) (for the previous documents, see the 1651st meeting; A/9008/Add.16, A/C.5/1619, A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1179-1181, A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1185)

* Resumed from the 1647th meeting.

The effect of continuing currency instability and inflation on the budgets of organizations in the United Nations system (continued) (A/9008/Add.16, A/9773, A/C.5/1622, A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1179-1181, A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1185)

9. Mr. MACGREGOR (United Kingdom), referring to the revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1) sponsored by his delegation together with those of Canada and the Netherlands, said that it represented the result of a sincere quest for a compromise. He expressed the hope that it would be accepted by the majority as balanced and reasonable and that the Cuban delegation would not press its own draft resolutions and amendments to a vote.

10. Mr. SERRANO (Cuba) said that his delegation would continue to press for adoption of the revised text of its amendments (A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1) to the revised three-Power draft resolution because the latter was an innocuous statement designed to neutralize the Cuban draft resolutions on investment policy of the organizations in the United Nations system and the financing of the losses experienced by organizations due to inflation and currency instability (A/C.5/L.1179, A/C.5/L.1180 and A/C.5/L.1181).

11. The reference in the first preambular paragraph of the three-Power revised text to Article 17 of the Charter was incomplete inasmuch as that Article referred solely to the normal expenses of the Organization whereas, with inflation and monetary instability, those expenses had become so disproportionately high that they could no longer be described as "normal". Indeed, with the continuing economic crisis, they were unforeseen and unforeseeable. The losses suffered by the United Nations as a result of that crisis and of the economic policies of certain countries which were creating an inflationary price spiral were extraordinary losses, and the Secretary-General, by submitting supplementary estimates, could hope to cover only a very small part of them. Moreover, there were ample precedents for the adoption of urgent measures for special financing—as in the case of the United Nations Emergency Force—and they involved different procedures from those implied in Article 17. For all those reasons, his delegation wished to amend the first preambular paragraph of the three-Power text as specified in paragraph 1 of document A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1

12. The second of the Cuban amendments called for the deletion of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which did not accurately reflect the outcome of the deliberations of the Working Group on Currency Instability. The Working Group had in fact agreed on such alternatives as the absorption of losses and forward exchange transactions, while recognizing that they represented only partial solutions and were insufficient as instruments for eliminating the problem. There were also differences of opinion in the Working Group with regard to the Cuban proposals, but perhaps some compromise could be worked out and they might be acceptable in future.

13. The third amendment was designed to give the Working Group an opportunity to reach such compromise and eventually to submit additional generally acceptable solutions. Inevitably there would be agreement in the Working Group on some points and disagreement on others; it had been on that understanding that his delegation had

agreed to the establishment of the Group on the initiative of the Argentine delegation. The Cuban delegation had fully expected that some Member States represented in the Group would be motivated strictly by their self-interest in seeking solutions and had accordingly proposed at the twenty-eighth session that the problem should be studied not by representatives of Governments, but by a group of independent, technical experts. However, that correct procedure had been opposed precisely on the grounds that the solutions arrived at would not be compatible with the interests of certain Member States. Nevertheless, in a spirit of conciliation, the Cuban delegation was prepared to support the continuation of the Working Group in the hope that it could widen areas of agreement.

14. The fourth amendment was intended to ensure that adoption of the draft resolution did not preclude the adoption of urgent measures during the current session. To depend entirely on supplementary estimates to finance inflation, as proposed in the draft resolution, was to evade the real issue.

15. The fifth amendment would have the effect of eliminating the existing ambiguity in paragraph 7 of the three-Power text, where the words "wherever possible" could open the way to a reduction of the programmes for the developing countries.

16. Finally, the sixth amendment was a rejection of the procedure of submitting supplementary estimates as a solution to the inflation problem and an insistence that alternative solutions should continue to be sought urgently, instead of, as the three-Power text implied, keeping the problems under review indefinitely.

17. Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen), speaking on a point of order, said that there was no interpretation into Arabic.

18. Mr. RUEDAS (Secretary of the Committee) said that he would investigate the matter, noting that there had been difficulties in obtaining sufficient staff to man the Arabic interpretation unit. The Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services had so informed the Arab delegations and appealed for their understanding and co-operation.

19. Mr. MINTCHEV (Bulgaria), introducing the amendment by the Bulgarian delegation (A/C.5/L.1185) to operative paragraph 6 of the three-Power draft resolution, pointed out that the Secretary-General had already presented his views to the Working Group and that it was Member States whose views should be solicited since it was they who bore ultimate responsibility for the financial status of the United Nations. The amendment should be regarded as a complement to the Cuban amendments and its adoption would be without prejudice to any suggestions for partial solutions which might be adopted at the current session.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that he would ask the Deputy Controller to reply to a question raised by the delegation of Italy at the 1652nd meeting concerning the collection of Member States' assessments in currencies other than the United States dollar.

21. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), clarifying his question, said that he wished particularly to know which currencies and in

what amount would be acceptable to the United Nations to cover the needs in countries where its expenditures were made.

22. Mr. ZIEHL (Deputy Controller) explained that the General Assembly, in many resolutions, had authorized the acceptance of payment in currencies other than the United States dollar to the extent that such other currencies were needed for United Nations expenditure. For example, if United Nations expenses were incurred in Italy, the Secretary-General was authorized to accept payment up to the amount of those costs in Italian lire; should the Italian Government choose not to pay in lire, other Governments would be allowed to pay in lire provided there was no infringement of Italian exchange regulations. Payments in currencies other than the United States dollar must be usable without further regulation by the exchange rules of the country concerned. In consultation with the Committee on Contributions, the Secretary-General published a list showing what local currencies were required in substantial amounts, and countries whose currencies were needed were accorded absolute priority to pay up to the amount needed. Moreover, if Member States wished to pay even in relatively small amounts of local currency and the Organization needed that currency, the Treasurer was instructed to accept such payments.

23. Commenting on the revised three-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1), he said that the Secretary-General would welcome clarification concerning the precise meaning of certain paragraphs in order to avoid confusion in the Secretariat in carrying out the proposal.

24. Mr. MONUSHEMULA OMVUANE NTANGU (Zaire) said that the problem under consideration concerned all Members of the United Nations, and in particular third world countries. If it was not solved, it could paralyse the Organization.

25. One means of absorbing additional expenditure would be to include in future budgets reserves and estimates to cover unforeseen expenditure. Since currency instability seemed likely to continue, as noted in paragraph 10 of the statement by the Administrative Committee on Coordination (A/C.5/1622, annex), he endorsed the suggestion in paragraph 12 of that statement that budget estimates should include provision for all foreseeable increases or decreases in prices and salaries. He regretted, however, that no satisfactory solution had been found to the problem of inflation and currency instability as a whole, as noted in paragraph 16 of the statement by ACC.

26. Although the suggestion that responsibility for losses caused by inflation and currency instability should be placed on the developed countries might not seem a very conciliatory step, the developed countries were in fact solely responsible for the current world economic imbalance. Solutions to the problem should, however, be sought by all Member States in a spirit of mutual understanding in the interests of all mankind.

27. Referring to the statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1614) at the 1639th meeting, he said that the estimate of nearly \$60 million required for the biennium in supplementary estimates was a very large amount, reflecting

the gravity of the situation. He attached great importance to the statement of the Secretary-General and wondered to what extent it had been taken into account by the Committee.

28. The draft resolutions before the Committee did not suggest any effective solution, and a new mandate should be given to the Secretary-General to continue studying the problem. The amendment submitted by Bulgaria in document A/C.5/L.1185 was acceptable to his delegation.

29. The CHAIRMAN announced that interpretation into Arabic was now being provided.

30. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 was acceptable to his delegation. He suggested, however, that the words "wherever possible" should be deleted from operative paragraph 7. Commenting on paragraph 5, he said that prompt payment of contributions was the correct way of solving the financial problems of the United Nations.

31. Referring to the amendments submitted by Cuba in document A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1 to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, he said that he had difficulties with the third and fifth amendments, which implied that the mandate of the Working Group would be extended. He had understood that the Working Group was to submit only one report and had not been intended as a standing group. The first amendment was out of order and completely unacceptable to his delegation. The sixth amendment had very dangerous implications. The Working Group had indicated in its report that the problem of how to finance losses caused by inflation and currency instability could be studied for a very long time without any solutions being found; if supplementary estimates to cover those losses were not approved, they would accumulate and imperil the already precarious financial situation of the United Nations. He also expressed apprehension that some Member States might wish to withhold that part of their contributions required to cover additional costs caused by inflation and currency instability. An amount of approximately \$60 million was to be requested for the current biennium, and it must be approved if the United Nations was to continue to operate. Accordingly, he appealed to the representative of Cuba not to press for a vote on the amendments in document A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1.

32. Mr. CARRANCO (Mexico) said that substantial voluntary contributions from developed countries, in keeping with the spirit of détente, would be one possible solution to the financial problems of the United Nations and could cover the losses caused by currency instability and inflation. However, any measure that was not of a global nature would be only a palliative. He would not make a formal proposal to that effect in view of the response by the developed countries in the past to such proposals. The Government of Japan had contributed \$10 million and the United Arab Emirates \$1 million in response to General Assembly resolution 3049 A (XXVII), while the response to the request in General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII) concerning UNEF had been insufficient to meet the requirements. Moreover, out of the \$223 million deposited in the Special Fund for the Special Programme approved by the General Assembly in resolution

3202 (S-VI), in response to a request from the Secretary-General to Ministers for Foreign Affairs in 43 countries, \$163 million had been pledged by non-industrialized countries and \$60 million by industrialized countries. Yet, as the President of the World Bank had said, the situation of the poorest countries was desperate.

33. Although the Committee might consider it unacceptable that the developed countries acting as hosts to organizations in the United Nations system should pay for losses incurred because of currency instability and inflation, it should be even less acceptable that the developing countries should pay when it was those countries which suffered from such losses. It was inconceivable that all Member States should bear the same responsibility for the expenses incurred by the Organization in accordance with a scale of contributions which did not take account of the current situation and in view of the astronomical amount spent for military purposes by the developed countries and the unjust terms of trade imposed on the developing countries. He hoped that the Secretary-General would not make any recommendation that would reduce programmes for the developing countries, for those programmes were essential.

34. The performance report on the programme budget for 1974-1975 should provide more information on the amounts required to cover additional costs incurred because of inflation and currency instability, and should list them separately from the supplementary estimates required for new programmes and other activities. On that occasion, the Committee should be given up-to-date information on the implementation of the suggestion by the Secretary-General contained in paragraph 7 of his report on the financial situation of the United Nations¹ and endorsed by the General Assembly,² that Member States which had derived a windfall benefit from the reduction on their dollar contribution, in accordance with the scale of contributions for 1974-1976, or from the revaluation of their currencies in relation to the United States dollar, might consider making a contribution of the amount of their savings towards the elimination of the Organization's continuing deficit.

35. He would vote on the amendments and draft resolutions before the Committee in the light of those considerations.

36. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) said that she could not accept draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 as it stood. She appreciated the willingness of the sponsors to negotiate, however, and proposed the following amendments in the hope that they would be acceptable to the sponsors: the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted; operative paragraph 5 should be replaced by paragraph 4 of the initial text (A/C.5/L.1177); paragraph 7 should be amended to read:

"Further requests the Secretary-General, in keeping these problems under review, to ensure that the programmes and activities concerning the developing countries are not adversely affected."

¹ Document A/9444, of 11 December 1973.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 30*, p. 134, subpara. (h).

37. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 only if all the amendments to it submitted by the representative of Cuba were accepted by the sponsors. He supported draft resolutions A/C.5/L.1179, A/C.5/L.1180 and A/C.5/L.1181.

38. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 was acceptable on the whole to his delegation, although he could not accept operative paragraph 7 unless the words "wherever possible" were deleted.

39. Commenting on the Cuban amendments (A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1), he said that the sixth amendment was unacceptable to his delegation and that he would vote against it. There was very little hope that other methods would be found of financing losses caused by inflation and currency instability and it was therefore unacceptable to make approval of supplementary estimates dependent on a solution. He also had a minor procedural problem with the fourth amendment.

40. The adoption of draft resolutions A/C.5/L.1180 and A/C.5/L.1181 would change nothing. Operative paragraph 2 of both drafts simply reflected the current practice, and he doubted whether paragraph 1 could be implemented. It would hardly be just that Switzerland, for example, should pay for the losses incurred by the United Nations in Geneva when part of the expenditure was in United States dollars. Accordingly, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the two draft resolutions.

41. In connexion with draft resolution A/C.5/L.1179, he requested clarification as to which currencies were "not crisis". Unless a satisfactory explanation was given, he could not vote in favour of that draft resolution.

42. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said he hoped that his remarks would be taken into account by the sponsors of the various draft resolutions with a view to their arriving at a common text. He welcomed the amendments in document A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1 to the three-Power draft resolution, since they were a clear indication of the Cuban delegation's desire to enter into a dialogue. He also welcomed the oral amendments submitted by the delegation of Colombia, which reflected the views of a number of developing countries.

43. The first three amendments by the Cuban delegation were entirely acceptable to his delegation. However, it favoured the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.5/L.1185) rather than the fourth and sixth Cuban amendments. In the case of operative paragraph 7 of the three-Power draft resolution, either the fifth Cuban amendment or the Colombian oral amendment would be acceptable.

44. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that the Colombian amendments to the three-Power draft resolution, particularly the one to operative paragraph 7, reflected the views of his delegation and, if accepted, would make the draft resolution entirely acceptable. The Working Group on Currency Instability had produced an interesting report; however, there was little point in prolonging its

existence, since it had been unable to advance any new solutions.

45. Mr. DEL CASTILLO (Costa Rica) said that his delegation would vote for the three-Power draft resolution if the Colombian amendments were accepted by the sponsors.

46. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) noted that his delegation had not spoken in the general debate because the remarks it had made at the twenty-eighth session (1622nd meeting) were still valid. At the time, it had been sceptical about endeavours to find a solution within the framework of the Fifth Committee, and it still felt that a much broader approach to the problem was required.

47. His delegation would have no difficulty in supporting draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, which adequately reflected the realities of the situation, although it hoped that the sponsors would find it possible to incorporate the very pertinent amendments proposed by the delegation of Colombia. It could not support the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.5/L.1185), as it stood, since it opposed the deletion of paragraph 6 of the draft resolution; however, if the delegation of Bulgaria saw fit to propose the insertion of the paragraph in document A/C.5/L.1185 as an additional paragraph in the draft resolution, Brazil would reconsider its position. It was unable to support the other draft resolutions for the reasons advanced by the delegation of the Upper Volta.

48. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 were happy to accept the amendments proposed by the delegation of Colombia.

49. Mr. POSSO (Ecuador) said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, with the incorporation of the Colombian amendments, would be satisfactory if the difficulties concerning paragraph 6 could be resolved. He was in favour of the suggestion that the Bulgarian amendment (A/C.5/L.1185) should be added to the draft resolution without replacing paragraph 6.

50. His delegation reserved its position on the draft resolutions submitted by the delegation of Cuba.

51. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that he, too, saw no conflict between the paragraph submitted by the Bulgarian delegation in document A/C.5/L.1185 and paragraph 6 in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1. The substance of the Bulgarian proposal could be reflected in that paragraph by inserting after the words "Working Group" the words "the views expressed during the consideration of the question and other views that may be expressed by or received from Member States".

52. His delegation was opposed to the deletion of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which accurately reflected the facts.

53. Mr. MOUELLE (United Republic of Cameroon) said he took it that the submission of the amendments in document A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1 meant that the delegation

of Cuba had somewhat changed its original thinking. If that were the case, his delegation welcomed the new approach.

54. He expressed his delegation's opposition to the second of those amendments; paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should be expanded, not deleted. The third and fourth amendments were acceptable, but the fifth was redundant. The sixth amendment was totally unacceptable. His delegation's position with regard to the draft resolution was still undecided.

55. Mr. ANI (Nigeria) said that the Cuban amendments distinctly improved the initial text of the draft resolution. However, his delegation could not agree to a decision that would bring the work of the United Nations to a standstill while methods of financing the losses caused by inflation and currency instability were discussed; it therefore appealed to the delegation of Cuba to withdraw the sixth of its amendments.

56. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation would have preferred the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 to be retained; nevertheless, since the sponsors had accepted the Colombian amendments, his delegation would not insist on its view being taken into account. He suggested a small drafting change to the oral amendment introduced by the delegation of Kenya, namely the insertion after the words "question" of the words "during the twenty-ninth session".

57. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the provisions of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1179 were impracticable: the funds at the disposal of the different organizations in the United Nations system were governed by the regulations of those organizations, not those of the United Nations itself. For example, the investment policy to be followed in the case of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund was laid down in article 19 of the Regulations of the Fund. It was therefore difficult to see how the General Assembly could, without previously consulting the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, take a decision concerning the investment of the assets of the Fund. Consequently, he could not support operative paragraphs 2 and 4 of the draft resolution. Furthermore, paragraph 1 appeared to serve no purpose since it was very difficult to determine which currencies were in crisis and which were not.

58. His delegation could not support draft resolutions A/C.5/L.1180 and A/C.5/L.1181. Instead, in the light of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations, the Committee on Contributions should be asked to present proposals concerning the apportionment among Member States of the losses due to currency instability and inflation.

59. Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 accurately reflected the outcome of the discussions in the Working Group on Currency Instability, and his delegation would vote for it.

60. Turning to the amendments in document A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1, he said that his views were similar to those expressed by the representative of the Upper Volta. The sixth amendment was totally unacceptable because the

submission of supplementary estimates was a necessary element of the financial management of the United Nations and was one of many methods which must be used to offset the effects of financial losses due to currency instability. If those amendments were put to the vote, his delegation would vote against the sixth amendment and would abstain on the other amendments.

61. His delegation could support the oral amendment proposed by the delegation of Kenya to paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, as subamended by the delegation of the Philippines. It could also support the Bulgarian amendment in document A/C.5/L.1185, although it hoped that there would be no need to take a vote.

62. In conclusion, he urged delegations to bear in mind, when voting on the draft resolutions, that any decisions taken by the Fifth Committee and endorsed by the General Assembly directly affected the health of the United Nations system.

63. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation was unable to accept the oral amendment proposed by the Kenyan delegation as a substitute for its own amendment in document A/C.5/L.1185, the principal idea of which was to solicit the views of all Member States. After all, only 13 Member States had been represented in the Working Group on Currency Instability. ACC had already focused its attention on the Organization's financial problems, and the next step should be to consult Member States. His delegation could agree to the insertion of its amendment in the three-Power draft resolution as an additional paragraph, although it would not be able to vote for paragraph 6 of that draft resolution.

64. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1 were willing to incorporate the Kenyan amendment, together with the subamendment proposed by the delegation of the Philippines, in operative paragraph 6. That amendment would enable all Member States to submit their views to the Secretary-General, and, consequently, it was difficult to understand the objections of the representative of Bulgaria. It was important that the Secretary-General should consult his colleagues in ACC, in the light of the discussion which had taken place in the Fifth Committee, and that he should report any further recommendations to the Fifth Committee at the thirtieth session. Consequently, the sponsors were not prepared to accept the Bulgarian amendment.

65. Mr. RUEDAS (Secretary of the Committee), speaking with reference to the statement made earlier in the meeting by the representative of Yemen, said that he was now able to explain the situation with regard to interpretation into Arabic. The Department of Conference Services was able to supply five teams of Arabic interpreters at any one time. However, six meetings had required Arabic interpretation on that afternoon, a demand which the Department had been unable to meet in full. Following the observations of the representative of Yemen, the Department had improvised by borrowing interpreters from other teams. He understood that the attention of the Arab delegations had been drawn to the difficulties facing the Secretariat and especially to the fact that Arabic had only recently been added to the official languages, and that it had not been possible to recruit all the staff needed.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

1657th meeting

Thursday, 7 November 1974, at 10.35 a.m.

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

A/C.5/SR.1657

AGENDA ITEM 73

Programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 (continued) (for the previous documents, see the 1651st meeting; A/9008/Add.16, A/C.5/1619, A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1179-1181, A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1185/Rev.1)

The effect of continuing currency instability and inflation on the budgets of organizations in the United Nations system (continued) (A/9008/Add.16, A/9773, A/C.5/1622, A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1179-1181, A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1185/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the following texts were before the Committee for discussion: a new revised text (A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.2) of the three-Power draft resolution, amendments to the earlier text (A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1) of

that draft resolution put forward by the Cuban (A/C.5/L.1182/Rev.1) and Bulgarian (A/C.5/L.1185/Rev.1) delegations. The amendment in A/C.5/L.1185/Rev.1 applied to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.1, not A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.2 as stated incorrectly in the mimeographed version of the amendment which had been circulated. In addition, the Committee had to consider the three draft resolutions submitted by Cuba in documents A/C.5/L.1179, A/C.5/L.1180 and A/C.5/L.1181.

2. Mr. PETROV (Bulgaria) said that since there were additions in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.2, the text of the Bulgarian amendment as contained in document A/C.5/L.1185/Rev.1 beginning with the words "to solicit the views of Member States" was intended to replace the end of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1177/Rev.2 beginning with the words "the views expressed during the consideration".