



UN LIBRARY

NOV 9 1980

UN/SA COLLECTION

FIFTH COMMITTEE  
24th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 24 October 1980  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 94: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (continued)

- (a) ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGETS OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL  
ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE  
AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued)
- (b) IMPACT OF INFLATION ON THE BUDGETS OF THE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED  
NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 96: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES  
(continued)

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

1. The CHAIRMAN noted with satisfaction that the Committee had so far started its meetings on time and said that he hoped it would continue to do so.

AGENDA ITEM 94: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY  
(continued) (A/34/684, A/35/481 and Add.1; A/C.5/33/47)

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGETS OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) IMPACT OF INFLATION ON THE BUDGETS OF THE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

2. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that the Advisory Committee had been correct to mention in paragraphs 53 to 55 of its report (A/35/481) the concern expressed by the Director-General of UNESCO over a number of actions taken by the General Assembly in areas within the competence of UNESCO. The question was one of internal co-ordination within the United Nations system and it was only natural that the Advisory Committee should draw the attention of the General Assembly to the views of UNESCO concerning the division of responsibilities within the system. His delegation regretted only that the Advisory Committee had not gone further and had not taken a position on the matter from the budgetary and administrative standpoints. The matter fell clearly within the Advisory Committee's sphere of competence, as defined, in particular, in paragraph 5 of resolution 33/142, by which the General Assembly had requested the Advisory Committee to give greater emphasis to budgetary developments in individual organizations which were of potential interest to other organizations and to supplement its annual reports with reports on specific problems common to the United Nations system. He concurred with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee that the question raised in the Committee's report had administrative and budgetary co-ordination aspects and that the Advisory Committee had not only a right but an obligation to report on those matters to the General Assembly.

3. From a more general point of view, it was neither practicable nor desirable to create a dichotomy - which could only be counter-productive - between the responsibilities of ACABQ and those of CPC. What was needed instead was practical co-ordination of the efforts of all bodies involved in the co-ordination process.

4. Mr. DIENE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the problem raised by the Director-General had been recognized by the UNESCO General Conference, which had appealed to its Member States to ensure that the positions which their representatives took in the specialized agencies and the United Nations were better co-ordinated.

5. UNESCO did not dispute the central role of the General Assembly, or the role of the United Nations Secretariat; the issue that had been raised did not mean that

/...

(Mr. Diene, UNESCO)

there was a conflict between the latter and the secretariats of the specialized agencies in their respective spheres of competence. The only position which all the secretariats had on substantive issues were those expressed by Member States and adopted by intergovernmental organs.

6. The observations of the Director-General deserved careful study. What was advocated was a return to the vision embodied in the Charter of a United Nations system constituting a family of organizations, in which the same State belonged to the United Nations and UNESCO. The General Assembly seemed to have recognized the relevance of the Director-General's observations by adopting a moratorium on the establishment of new subsidiary bodies. He hoped that the Fifth Committee would carefully study the observations of the Director-General that had been included in the Advisory Committee's report.

7. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) said that administrative and budgetary co-ordination among the organizations of the United Nations system was a matter of crucial importance. His delegation had been one of the members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to seek clarification with regard to trends in extrabudgetary resources in relation to the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. There could be no administrative and budgetary co-ordination unless information on such resources was available, which alone made it possible to ascertain the real structure and scope of activities. The matter was all the more urgent that the level of extrabudgetary resources exceeded the level of the regular budget.

8. Co-ordination among the organizations of the United Nations system necessarily meant co-ordination in their plans and programmes and in the utilization of regular budget and extrabudgetary resources. A failure to co-ordinate in the latter area could distort the programme priorities set by the General Assembly with regard to project orientation and implementation, especially when posts previously financed from extrabudgetary resources were transferred to the regular budget without a corresponding transfer of functions.

9. Co-ordination was not an end in itself; its aim should be to minimize duplication and to maximize the effectiveness of the administrative and budgetary activities of the entire United Nations system. A uniform method for calculating the impact of inflation on the budgets of the system was also needed.

10. Mr. DENIS (France), referring to the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/33/47), reaffirmed his delegation's opposition to the principle of full budgeting. According to the Secretariat, full budgeting had two advantages: it reduced the need to submit supplementary estimates and provided a better guarantee of the full implementation of approved programmes. In fact, however, revised appropriations had represented no less than six per cent of initial appropriations approved between 1966 and 1976. As to the claims made concerning programme implementation, it was common knowledge that many programmes had to be abandoned owing to lack of funds. His delegation favoured instead the practice of semi-full budgeting. The main consideration in that regard was that inflation should be taken into account in the same manner by all the organizations.

/...

(Mr. Denis, France)

11. He did not understand the Secretary-General's contention in paragraph 16 of his report that objects of expenditure covered different items in different organizations. In point of fact, the objects of expenditure covered such items as staff costs, overheads and travel in all the organizations.

12. He wished to know how inflation was taken into account in the regular budget of the United Nations. Noting that different rates of inflation were used according to object of expenditure, he asked the Director of the Budget Division to explain that practice.

13. Turning to the report of the Advisory Committee (A/35/481), he noted the reference in paragraph 53 to the concern expressed by the Director-General of UNESCO over the tendency of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Economic and Social Council to step up to an exaggerated degree their requests for all kinds of contributions and reports, dealing in some instances with problems of secondary importance or matters that had already been abundantly discussed. That was an important matter of principle and his delegation believed that Member States and the various secretariats must stop passing the buck. A secretariat had an executive function to perform and it was the duty of a secretariat, when Member States were about to take a decision, to warn them of any duplication that might result.

14. He found the Advisory Committee's report to be a little too descriptive, and believed that the Fifth Committee was entitled to expect ACABQ to take a stand on issues of administrative and budgetary co-ordination. The main point was to determine what co-ordination actually meant. In the light of the figures provided by the Advisory Committee, one of the successes achieved in efforts to ensure co-ordination had been the synchronization of the budgetary periods of the organizations of the United Nations system. Unfortunately, in almost every other area, the results had been negative. With respect to the financing of technical co-operation activities from the regular budgets, the establishment of posts, budgetary growth in the specialized agencies, the calculation of scales of assessment and, what was even more surprising, working capital funds, it was clear that, for the same budgetary period, rates of growth varied considerably from organization to organization. That was a source of serious concern to his delegation.

15. The real question was whether, discounting the lip-service traditionally paid to the notion of co-ordination, the various parties concerned truly shared a desire to achieve that goal. In that connexion, his delegation reaffirmed the need to strengthen the role of the bodies which played a leading role in that area, namely ACC, CPC and ACABQ, which, it was to be hoped, would put forward specific views in future on the question of co-ordination.

16. Mr. OREBI (of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), referring to the comments made at the preceding meeting by the representative of the United States, said that the agreements between specialized agencies on joint action were not only desirable but essential since, among other advantages, they made it possible to avoid overlapping and duplication between agencies. The working

/...

relations between FAO and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) was an excellent example in point. Thus in 1979, of seven projects financed by the Fund, five had been prepared with the help of the FAO Investment Centre.

17. In response to a comment by the representative of Italy, who had expressed regret that the Advisory Committee had not included in its report the figure for the extrabudgetary funds available to the United Nations system as a whole, he said that the amount of extrabudgetary funds expected to be available to FAO for the biennium 1980-1981 was \$581 million, whereas the administrative budget was nearly \$272 million.

18. Finally, in response to a question by the representative of the Philippines, he said that FAO calculated the contributions of its Member States on the basis of the scale of assessments established by the United Nations, although of course there were some minor adjustments to take account of the fact that some Member States of the United Nations did not yet belong to FAO.

19. Mr. FALL (Senegal) expressed surprise at the reactions aroused by the observations of the Director-General of UNESCO, and said that the Committee's discussion might be the result of a misunderstanding. The truth of the matter was that, as indicated in paragraph 53 of document A/35/481, the Director-General had drawn attention to "a number of disquieting tendencies" that he had noted. In particular the Director-General regretted the duplication of effort in the United Nations, which was establishing new forums for discussion and decision-making in areas of activity already covered by United Nations specialized agencies. At the very least, the specialized agencies were entitled to express their views on decisions that they were asked to implement. It should also be noted that it was clear, particularly in paragraph 55 of the same document, that the Director-General in no way sought to question the primacy of the General Assembly.

20. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said he wished to make clear to the FAO representative that his earlier comments had not been directed at any particular specialized agency. It was very difficult for the members of the Committee to find the information they needed in the documents, particularly as to the total extrabudgetary funds available to the United Nations system; therefore they had to turn to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which should submit to the Committee a report on the subject that was both straightforward and comprehensive.

21. Mr. METELITS (United States of America) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Senegal and FAO, and emphasized the need to establish effective co-ordination between the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

22. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the observations of the Director-General of UNESCO reported in paragraphs 53 to 55 of document A/35/481 - which clearly emphasized the leading role of the General Assembly - reflected the misgivings felt by several delegations. The Director-General's views should be given a fair hearing, and there should be recognition of the need to strengthen co-ordination in the United Nations system.

/...

23. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the General Assembly, in the resolution on medium-term planning in the United Nations it had adopted at the thirty-fourth session had also recognized the need to improve co-ordination between organizations. However, as it had recalled in that resolution, co-ordination did not necessarily require system-wide synchronization of planning periods, and it seemed desirable to maintain a certain flexibility.

AGENDA ITEM 96: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES (continued) (A/35/32 and Add.1; A/C.5/35/12, A/C.5/35/34; A/C.5/35/L.5, L.6, L.3, L.9, L.10/Rev.1, L.11/Rev.2, L.12, L.14/Rev.2, L.15/Rev.1, L.16 and L.17)

24. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said he wished to reply to the representative of Somalia, who at the preceding meeting had pointed out a contradiction between paragraph 2 of the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, which asked all the subsidiary bodies in respect of which an exception would be made to keep their requirements for summary records whenever possible to a reasonable minimum, and the statement of financial implications of those exceptions (submitted by the Secretariat in document A/C.5/35/34), which had been estimated on a full cost basis. The Secretariat was not in a position to estimate what that "reasonable minimum" might be, since the question of having summary records was left entirely to the discretion of Member States. Therefore he could only give the most objective information available to him, which was the total cost of providing summary records for the number of meetings envisaged. In fact, no additional appropriation was being requested, since a consolidated statement of conference servicing costs would be submitted to the Fifth Committee at a later stage.

25. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand), introducing document A/C.5/35/L.14/Rev.2, said that no consensus had been achieved either on the question of guideline 11 on the submission of national or technical papers or reports in paragraph 70 of the report of the Committee on Conferences, or on annex III to that report. Moreover, since some delegations believed that guideline 11 could not be divorced from section C, as a whole, on the control and limitation of documentation, it had been agreed to ask the Committee on Conferences to re-examine the whole of section C of the directives (directives 9 to 13), entitled "Control and limitation of documentation", and to submit a report on the question to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

26. The CHAIRMAN read out the proposed amendment in paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/35/L.14/Rev.2, and expressed the hope that with that change it would be possible for the document to be adopted by consensus.

27. Mr. FALL (Senegal), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, said that they accepted the subamendment proposed by the Austrian delegation (A/C.5/35/L.16), which would add after the first sentence of paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 the phrase "subject to review at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly on the basis of recommendations of the Committee on Conferences and in the light of experience gained". The sponsors had agreed to the subamendment in order to give the Committee on Conferences the

/...

(Mr. Fall, Senegal)

opportunity of submitting recommendations, which should not, however, be based on technical considerations.

28. The sponsors also accepted the subamendment submitted by the delegation of Sri Lanka (A/C.5/35/L.17), which proposed the addition to paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 of a new subparagraph (f) reading "Preparatory meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, when preparing for the Conference on the Indian Ocean envisaged in General Assembly resolution 34/80 B."

29. He said that Mozambique and Sri Lanka should be added to the sponsors of the proposed amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, and asked the Chairman, under rule 117 of the rules of procedure, to declare the closure of the debate on the subject and to proceed to a vote.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 117 of the rules of procedure he could permit two representatives to speak against the closure of the debate.

31. Mr. PAPPENDORF (United States of America) said that at the preceding meetings he had asked to speak on the subject, because he believed it was essential, before voting on the proposed amendment, to consider the financial implications of the many exceptions it was proposed to make regarding the provision of summary records.

32. The Senegalese proposal to close the debate on the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 was adopted by 76 votes to 5, with 28 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 126 of the rules of procedure and referred the Committee to the amendments contained in document A/C.5/35/L.14/Rev.2. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendments by consensus.

34. It was so decided.

35. The CHAIRMAN referred the Committee to the amendments contained in document A/C.5/35/L.10/Rev.1. There was an error in paragraph 2, which should read: "Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution" instead of "Operative paragraph of the draft resolution". If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendments by consensus.

36. It was so decided.

37. The CHAIRMAN referred the Committee to amendment A/C.5/35/L.15/Rev.1.

38. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that he would support the amendment, since it incorporated a number of subamendments proposed by him.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendment by consensus.

40. It was so decided.

/...

41. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.9.

42. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation, mindful of the need to economize, would not have considered requesting amendments to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 34/50. All the same, it felt that the exceptions requested by the sponsors of amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 were justified. It attached the highest importance to the work of the bodies referred to in that document, although it did not wish to establish any hierarchy among the various subsidiary organs of the Assembly. Accordingly, his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.9 and the amendment thereto in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 and would have voted against amendment A/C.5/35/L.12 if it had been put to the vote. The Upper Volta welcomed the acceptance by the sponsors of amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 of the subamendment proposed by the Austrian delegation (A/C.5/35/L.16).

43. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) pointed out that if amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 was incorporated in draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.9, the letter A would have to be inserted between the preamble and the operative part.

44. Mr. VISNYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, under rule 90 of the rules of procedure, all the proposed amendments should be voted on before the draft resolution itself. The Committee should therefore vote first on amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, then on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.9.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that he took the Soviet representative's point. He invited the Committee to vote on amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, as revised by its sponsors, who had incorporated the Austrian delegation's subamendment (A/C.5/35/L.16) and the Sri Lanka delegation's subamendment (A/C.5/35/L.17). He recalled that the Soviet representative had requested separate votes on the first part of paragraph 2 (c) (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law) and on paragraph 2 (e) (Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization).

46. The first part of paragraph 2 (c) was adopted by 86 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.

47. Mr. FARBER (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that decisions concerning exceptions to the rule set forth in General Assembly resolution 34/50 should be taken not by the Fifth Committee but by the Committee on Conferences. That was why his delegation had voted against the reinstatement of summary records for the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and would do likewise with regard to the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations. That position should in no way be interpreted as meaning that his delegation was seeking to establish a hierarchy among the various subsidiary organs of the General Assembly.

48. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate vote was taken on paragraph 2 (e).

49. Paragraph 2 (e) was adopted by 80 votes to 19, with 13 abstentions.

/...



50. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 as a whole, as amended.
51. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation had requested that the amendment should be voted on paragraph by paragraph.
52. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on paragraph 1 of amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2.
53. Paragraph 1 was adopted by 113 votes to none.
54. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on paragraph 2.
55. Mr. FAUTEUX (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 34/50 and had therefore voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the amendment. It regretted, however, the large number of exceptions proposed in paragraph 2 of the amendment, and was afraid that those exceptions might undermine the progress made in the implementation of resolution 34/50. They were also likely to constitute a regrettable precedent for further proposals, such as the subamendment proposed by the Sri Lanka delegation. The position of the Canadian delegation was based solely on administrative and budgetary considerations and should not be interpreted as a lack of appreciation for the work of the bodies in question.
56. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that the exceptions requested in paragraph 2 were incompatible with the efforts by the General Assembly to realize savings and limit the volume of documentation. The Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services and Special Assignments had informed the Committee that the implementation of resolution 34/50 had led to substantial savings, and that there were fewer delays in the issuance of documents. There was the danger that if summary records were reinstated for many of the subsidiary organs whose records had been discontinued, that achievement would be seriously undermined.
57. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama), speaking on a point of order, said that the Chairman had invoked rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and that, consequently, comments on the financial implications of the amendment being put to the vote were out of order.
58. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was listening to explanations of vote. He could limit their length, but not dictate their content.
59. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had requested a vote on the proposals to reinstate summary records for the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization because it was convinced that those two organs had other ways and means of reporting their work in the field of international law. On the other hand, his delegation was not against the reinstatement of summary records for the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, the United Nations Council for Namibia, the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on

/...

(Mr. Vislykh, USSR)

the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the Special Committee against Apartheid and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, given the scope of the tasks assigned to those bodies. The decision to reinstate those summary records should not be regarded as a precedent and should not open the door to a plethora of exceptions. In any event, it was to be hoped that those bodies would keep their requirements for summary records to the strict minimum. Inasmuch as the Soviet proposal to exclude from the exceptions UNCITRAL and the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations had been rejected, his delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote on paragraph 2 of amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that he would conduct a separate vote on paragraph 2 of the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2.

61. Paragraph 2 was adopted by 86 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

62. Miss GUIMARÃES (Brazil), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 2 of the amendment on the understanding that the exceptions for which provision was made in that paragraph would be subject to further review on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences and in the light of experience gained. The decision to authorize exceptions to the rule on the elimination of summary records should not have the effect of instituting a procedure by which to overturn previous decisions of the General Assembly, nor should it be considered as setting a precedent for authorizing the reinstatement of summary records for all the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly.

63. Given the well-known position of her country with respect to Namibia, the struggle against apartheid, and the exercise of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, her delegation felt perfectly free to express its concern at the increasing expenditure of the Organization. As a developing country which was unjustly penalized by the scale of assessments at a time when it had to face serious balance-of-payments difficulties, Brazil hoped that, when the time came to review the decision which had just been adopted, the imperative need to control United Nations expenditure would be taken into account.

64. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) expressed the view that the procedure followed in reinstating summary records violated the provisions of General Assembly resolution 34/50. His delegation had therefore planned to vote against paragraph 2 of the amendment (A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2). Finally, it had abstained in the light of the adoption of the Austrian subamendment, which called for a further review by the General Assembly at its next session of the exceptions authorized for certain organs, on the basis of the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences.

65. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 2 of the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 because it feared that the decision to make exceptions to the rule on the elimination of summary records for certain bodies would be a prelude to further exceptions and that that would have the effect of nullifying the decisions of the General Assembly on the control and limitation of documentation.

/...

66. Mrs. MUSTONEN (Finland) said that the abstention of her delegation in the vote on paragraph 2 of the amendment (A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.1) did not prejudice its position with respect to the work of the organs mentioned in that paragraph. The problem was that her delegation could not accept the procedure used to make exceptions to the measures taken the previous year by the General Assembly to control and limit documentation.

67. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that her delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 2 of the amendment in the light of the Austrian subamendment.

68. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) clarified that his delegation's vote against paragraph 2 of the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, and in particular against subparagraph (c) dealing with UNCITRAL, was not a value judgement on the importance of the work of those bodies. Nor did it mean that his delegation was opposed in principle to the reinstatement of summary records. On the contrary, it was convinced that in some cases there might be advantage in reinstating records. His delegation had cast its vote purely on administrative and budgetary grounds. It took the view that any reinstatement of summary records should take place only after careful consideration by the appropriate body, namely the Committee on Conferences, and not as the result of a hasty decision by the Fifth Committee.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put to the vote the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 as a whole, as revised by the subamendments contained in documents A/C.5/35/L.16 and L.17.

70. The amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2, as revised, was adopted by 87 votes to 6, with 20 abstentions.

71. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that her delegation had been able to vote in favour of the amendment because the Austrian subamendment to paragraph 2 met the concerns expressed as to the role of the Committee on Conferences in respect of the reinstatement of summary records. Her delegation regretted that in considering the amendment in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 the Fifth Committee had been unable to fulfil its terms of reference in respect of budgetary control.

72. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2. It reiterated the hope that the implementation of the provisions of resolution 34/50 would have a positive effect on the budget, as well as expediting distribution of substantive documents.

73. Mr. FARMER (Australia) said that his delegation, which had voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the amendment but against paragraph 2, had abstained in the vote on the amendment as a whole in the light of the Austrian subamendment. It was indeed desirable that the Committee on Conferences should be invited to decide on future requests for exceptions to the rule on the elimination of summary records. His delegation feared, however, that the recommendation addressed to the organs concerned to keep their requirements for summary records to a minimum was unlikely to have much effect.

74. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) explained that his delegation had been unable to vote in favour of amendment A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 purely and simply because it had been changed by the incorporation of the Austrian subamendment.

75. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the members of the Committee wished to adopt by consensus the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/35/L.9. That text, together with the one in document A/C.5/35/L.11/Rev.2 that had just been adopted, would constitute sections A and B of the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee for adoption by the General Assembly.

76. It was so decided.

77. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in adopting the draft resolution in document A/C.5/35/L.9, the Committee had also approved the calendar of conferences for 1981, subject to any adjustments which might become necessary as a result of action and decisions taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session and any departures not entailing administrative or financial implications.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.