



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 18th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 108: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES

(b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 109: CONTROL AND LIMITATION OF DOCUMENTATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 8: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

(b) SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (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, 566 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.

82-56932 4120S (E)

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/37/SR.18  
28 October 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

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

AGENDA ITEM 108: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued) (A/37/32 and Corr.1, A/37/112 and Add.1; A/C.5/37/2, A/C.5/37/7 and Corr.1, A/C.5/37/11; A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1, L.7, L.8, L.9/Rev.2, L.10-L.18; A/C.5/37/CRP.3)

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES
- (b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 109: CONTROL AND LIMITATION OF DOCUMENTATION (continued) (A/36/167 and Add.1 and 2; A/37/32, chap. V; A/C.5/37/11, A/C.5/37/CRP.1 and 2)

AGENDA ITEM 8: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK (continued)

- (b) SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/37/3, chap. III, sect. A, and chap. IX, sects. C and H)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a printing error in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2, in which the final clause of the second paragraph should not have been underlined.
2. With regard to the procedure to be followed for explanations of votes, the Chair, in an endeavour to satisfy all the members of the Committee, would allow delegations either to explain their votes on all the recommendations and amendments thereto in a single statement, or in separate statements as each recommendation or amendment was taken up.
3. Mr. OUIEDAT (Lebanon) said that, in the light of the revised Soviet amendments (A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2) to recommendation 6 of the Committee on Conferences, his delegation would withdraw its sub-amendment (A/C.5.37/L.16). His delegation would support the Soviet amendment.
4. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana), speaking in explanation of vote on all the recommendations and amendments before the Committee, said that the figures on the number of meetings cancelled were revealing (A/C.5/37/CRP.3). Some 350 of the 1,356 meetings cancelled had been replaced by informal consultations, but it was clear that steps were necessary to reduce the number of meetings. The draft medium-term plan provided an excellent opportunity for Member States to consider the question, although it was, of course, difficult to anticipate the needs of the international community.
5. His delegation supported the proposals contained in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1, which demonstrated a flexible approach. With regard to document A/C.5/37/L.7, his delegation appreciated the rationale for reducing the number of conference days, but could not endorse the approach adopted, since it

/...

(Mr. Ziniel, Ghana)

ignored the fact that the number of conferences was not constant, so that the 1982-1983 period might not provide a satisfactory basis for 1984-1985. Moreover, the Secretary-General was not responsible for the number of conferences; that was clearly the prerogative of Member States. His delegation was thus opposed to the amendment.

6. The revised Soviet amendments to recommendation 6 (A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2) bore witness to a spirit of compromise, although his delegation still had reservations over the first amendments and would vote against it, if a separate vote was taken. Given recent press reports claiming that a United Nations study had remained unpublished, it was important not to create conditions in which valuable research could be suppressed. His delegation would abstain in any vote on the Soviet amendments as a whole.

7. His delegation supported the proposals in documents A/C.5/37/L.10 to L.15.

8. Mr. KABONGO TUNSALA (Zaire) said that his delegation supported all the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences, although it had reservations over their formulation. Recommendation 5, in particular, might be reworded in a more acceptable manner. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.7 lacked clarity, and the explanations of the sponsors would be welcomed.

9. His delegation supported the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.7 and L.11, and would vote in favour of the revised Soviet amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2, as well as the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.10 and L.13. His delegation would require clarification of the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.14 and L.15 before taking any decision on them.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was in the process of voting, so that it was not possible to propose further amendments to the recommendations before it.

11. Mr. KABA (Guinea) said that in principle he supported limiting the volume of documentation. With regard to the number of conferences, it was more important to concentrate on what took place at conferences rather than their number and duration.

12. His delegation supported the aim of the amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1, although the language in which they were couched was unacceptable.

13. With regard to the revised Soviet amendments (A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2), there seemed little justification for choosing a figure of 5 per cent.

14. Mr. KORGA (Togo) said that his delegation could support recommendation 5 of the Committee on Conferences only if the Egyptian amendment thereto, (A/C.5/37/L.12), was adopted. The points raised by other delegations with regard to that recommendation had not been satisfactorily dealt with.

/...

15. Miss CASTILLO (Dominican Republic) said that documents A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1 and L.7 both contained a proposed new paragraph 16 to be added to recommendation 6. It was not clear whether the two paragraphs were mutually exclusive.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that he would request the sponsors of the amendments to clarify that matter.

17. He invited the Committee to vote on the recommendations of the Committee on Conferences one by one.

Recommendations 1 and 2

18. Recommendations 1 and 2 were adopted.

Recommendation 3

19. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to a technical revision.

20. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines), referring to item 107 of the revised draft calendar of conferences (A/C.5/37/7), said that the convening of the Second World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination depended on decisions to be taken in another Committee of the General Assembly on whether the venue was to be Manila and the apportionment of costs.

21. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that proposals on the number of conferences to be held in 1983 would be considered by the Economic and Social Council in November. His delegation supported recommendation 3 of the Committee on Conferences, subject to any decision the Council might take.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft revised calendar of conferences for 1983 had been approved, subject to amendment by the General Assembly.

23. Recommendation 3 was adopted.

Recommendation 4

Amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.10, L.13 and L.18

24. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.10 was adopted.

25. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.13 was adopted.

26. Mr. KRISTIANSEN (Denmark) requested a vote on the first of the Soviet amendments proposed in document A/C.5/37/L.18, which related to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution annexed to recommendation 4.

27. The first amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.18 was adopted by 60 votes to 11, with 28 abstentions.

28. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the wording used in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution represented a judicious choice by the Committee on Conferences and its flexibility would be lost if the second Soviet amendment relating to that paragraph was adopted. He could not support that amendment, although he would not call for a vote on it.

29. The second amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.18 was adopted without a vote.

30. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that, while he understood the Soviet delegation's position, he could not agree with its proposal to delete paragraph 14 of the draft resolution. The paragraph should be retained in order to indicate the importance of acquiring a body of staff who could run special conferences efficiently, for that was in the interests of all delegations. He therefore requested a vote on the third Soviet amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.18.

31. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he foresaw difficulties if the paragraph was interpreted to cover the temporary staff employed to service special conferences, since in that case the General Assembly would, by adopting the recommendation, be asking the Secretariat for a commitment to keep such staff on board.

32. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that his delegation interpreted the paragraph to apply only to established members of the United Nations staff.

33. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that, while he had no objections to the intent of paragraph 14, he felt that the idea should be couched in more carefully chosen language. The Fifth Committee would shortly be taking up agenda items 111 and 112, on personnel questions and the report of the International Civil Service Commission, both of which would entail a discussion of career development for United Nations staff. The Committee could, therefore, adopt the Soviet proposal to delete the paragraph without prejudging the issue of career development for the secretaries of special conferences, since a similar provision could be adopted during its discussion of items 111 and 112.

34. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that the Joint Inspection Unit had attributed past deficiencies in conference organization to a lack of expertise in the secretariats concerned. The point being made in paragraph 14 was, therefore, a valid one. But since the Committee could indeed consider the issue at a later stage, he could agree to the Soviet proposal.

35. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) expressed his delegation's support for the interpretation placed on paragraph 14 by the New Zealand delegation.

36. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that paragraph 14, as it stood, could have financial implications, yet no statement of administrative and financial implications had been submitted to the Committee. It would not be proper, therefore, to retain the paragraph in the draft resolution that the Fifth Committee recommended to the General Assembly for adoption, although the decision to delete it should be taken without prejudice to the Committee's deliberations under any other agenda item.

(Mr. El Safty, Egypt)

37. He had taken no part in the decisions on the first and second Soviet amendments, because those amendments had been submitted after the beginning of the voting process and should not, accordingly, have been accepted.

38. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that the intention of paragraph 14 was not clear; he was inclined to endorse the views of the Egyptian and Pakistan delegations and vote for its deletion.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that he could assure the Committee that the amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.18 had been submitted before the commencement of the voting process. It was his intention always to abide strictly by the rules of procedure.

40. The third amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.18 was adopted by 52 votes to 25, with 34 abstentions.

41. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana), explaining his delegation's position on recommendation 4 as now amended, said that he was encouraged by delegations' evident intention to streamline special conference activities. His delegation was concerned, however, at the conflict between different Secretariat departments that might result from the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the proposed guidelines: the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation already had a mandate to perform many of the functions specified in those paragraphs. Having entered that reservation, he would not insist on putting the issue to a vote.

42. Recommendation 4, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

#### Recommendation 5

##### Amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.12

43. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to the Egyptian amendment (A/C.5/37/L.12), since it would render recommendation 5 meaningless. Obviously, any host Government could decide to make an advance payment but the aim of the recommendation was to give guidance to the Secretary-General on how he should conduct business with host countries.

44. Mr. MACARTNEY (Canada) said that, while his delegation would prefer the wording of the recommendation as it stood, it could agree to the Egyptian amendment on the understanding that the existing practice with regard to advance payments would continue to apply.

45. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that a decision was pending in another committee with regard to the apportionment of additional expenses arising from the holding of meetings and conferences away from established headquarters. It was his understanding that the decision which the Fifth Committee was about to take would be subject to whatever the General Assembly might subsequently decide with respect to that matter.

46. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that he had initially intended to vote against recommendation 5. The Egyptian amendment, however, covered his objections and he would therefore support its adoption.

47. Mr. HADID (Algeria) said that his delegation had originally had difficulties with recommendation 5 but that the amendment proposed by Egypt provided for the necessary degree of flexibility. However, the Committee's earlier decision on the guidelines on Secretariat organization for special conferences rendered the requirement of an advance payment more or less academic. The advance payment referred to in recommendation 5 was intended to cover the cost of a planning and review mission, while under the guidelines just adopted, the Conference Management Committee established within the Secretariat would send a mission to the host country prior to the date when the offer to host the conference was formally accepted. Thus, the costs of any such mission would logically have to be met by the United Nations.

48. Mr. KRISTIANSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 10 members of the European Economic Community, said that the delegations concerned preferred the wording of recommendation 5 as it stood. It was reasonable to expect a host country to make an advance payment, especially in view of the financial emergency which the Organization was facing.

49. Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Egyptian amendment.

50. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that a country could not make an advance payment without the necessary parliamentary approval. His delegation therefore would have preferred to delete recommendation 5 entirely but the Egyptian amendment made it acceptable. Members should avoid linking the question of advance payments with the financial emergency of the United Nations since the failure of host Governments to make advance payments had never been cited as one of the causes of the financial emergency.

51. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) said that the proposed amendment gave States the option to make advance payments if they so desired and thus ensure the respect due to host countries. His delegation therefore would support the Egyptian amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.12.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the United States delegation had requested that the amendment should be put to a vote.

53. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.12 was adopted by 80 votes to 19, with 10 abstentions.

54. Mr. KABONGO TUNSALA (Zaire) said he was pleased that the Egyptian amendment had been adopted since it eliminated the notion of any obligation on the part of the host country to make an advance payment.

55. Mr. KHALAF (Somalia) said that his delegation had mistakenly abstained in the voting. It had intended to vote in favour of the proposed amendment.

56. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment, which gave the recommendation the necessary degree of flexibility. As amended, the recommendation placed the accent on the integrity of States and would afford smaller States a greater opportunity to exercise their right to host United Nations conferences.

57. Recommendation 5, as amended, was adopted.

Recommendation 6

Amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1

58. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation would support the proposed new paragraph 15 although it felt that the wording could have been made clearer. It was his understanding that the words "reasons for non-compliance" referred to the 32-page limit.

59. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that her delegation was, generally speaking, in favour of the proposed new paragraph 16 because it reflected a greater sensitivity to the problem of how to reduce the volume of documentation. She wished to stress, however, that efforts to reduce the volume of documentation should never be to the detriment of the programmes and purposes of the Organization.

60. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that the amendments proposed in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1 were, on the whole, acceptable. However, he had doubts about the usefulness of requesting the Committee on Conferences to make concrete recommendations on the shortening of sessions of subsidiary bodies, since the Economic and Social Council had discussed repeatedly the problem without being able to resolve it.

61. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation did not believe that the exercise which the Committee on Conferences would be asked to carry out by paragraphs 16 and 17 would be of much help in reducing the overall documentation of the United Nations. However, since the sponsors had shown a spirit of compromise and their amendments did not deal with the substantive issues involved, his delegation was prepared to agree to them.

62. Mr. HADID (Algeria) said that his delegation would not oppose the adoption of proposed new paragraph 17. However, it read that paragraph in the light of paragraph 28 of the report of the Committee on Conferences.

63. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados) said that his delegation supported paragraph 14 of recommendation 6 of the Committee on Conferences and foresaw difficulties for some committees if the amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1 were adopted. Accordingly, his delegation requested a vote on those amendments and would oppose them.

64. The amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1 were adopted by 90 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.



Amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.7

65. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.7. The Committee had just adopted an amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1 which would request the Committee on Conferences to examine further the measures listed in paragraph 27 of its report. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.7, on the other hand, would request the Secretary-General to take steps to reduce the number of scheduled conference days. His delegation had doubts about the constitutionality of giving the Secretary-General such authority, which rightfully belonged to Member States.

66. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) observed that the amendment would have the Secretary-General reduce the number of scheduled conference days during the biennium 1984-1985 even though it had not been established that the number of meetings scheduled for the biennium 1982-1983 was excessive. The amendment did not specify the size of the reduction nor the criteria to be used in determining it. Issuing such instructions to the Secretary-General could be detrimental to programmes approved by intergovernmental bodies. For those reasons, his delegation could not support the amendment.

67. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.7 was ill-intentioned, and would put the Secretary-General in a very difficult situation. The aim of the sponsors was obviously to prevent full discussion of the issues affecting the third world and thwart the efforts of the international community to achieve progress. The proposal was at odds with the very principles of the Charter and his delegation would vote against it.

68. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his delegation fully agreed with the view of the sponsors of the amendment that scarce resources should be used carefully and economically. It could not, however, agree to an across-the-board cut in the number of conference days. Member States were sufficiently responsible to be trusted to use the time allotted to them in a reasonable manner; if any difficulties arose, it was the prerogative of the Committee on Conferences to study the matter and take such action as it might deem necessary.

69. Mr. FULLEIRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment because it was for Member States and not the Secretary-General to decide on a reduction in the number of conference days. The amendment would limit the flexibility of the United Nations and hamper its ability to take timely action in response to new developments. Given the dynamic and complex nature of the activities of the Organization, it was wrong to take the level of activities in previous years as a basis for future planning.

70. Mr. NTAMBI (Uganda) said that his delegation had difficulty in supporting the amendment because conferences were one of the main activities of the United Nations and should be seen as a means of enabling it to attain its objectives.

71. Mr. ENODIEN (Nigeria) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment not only because it was rigid but because it prejudged the outcome of the study which the Committee on Conferences would be asked to make as a result of the adoption of the third amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1.

72. Mr. M'TESA (Zambia) said that his delegation saw the need to seek economies but felt that an arbitrary reduction in the number of conference days might hinder the attainment of the objectives which Member States had established. It would therefore vote against the amendment.

73. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that, in the interests of expediting the work of the Committee, the sponsors of the amendment were prepared to withdraw it.

Amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2

74. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas) requested a separate vote on the first amendment, which, given the Committee's adoption of the amendments in document A/C.5/L.6/Rev.1, was redundant. Although she supported its intent, therefore, she would vote against it.

75. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) asked for a separate vote on all three amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2 because of the overlapping with the amendments in document A/C.5/L.6/Rev.1.

76. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) endorsed the request for a separate vote on the first amendment. Even if the figure of 5 per cent was regarded only as a target, it was too arbitrary and might hamper the work of the General Assembly. He also felt that, as in the case of the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.7, the legality of placing such a matter in the hands of the Secretary-General needed some clarification. He would therefore vote against the first amendment. He also supported the Cameroonian request for a separate vote on the remaining amendments.

77. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that he would have preferred the original wording of the second amendment but, after hearing the explanations of the Secretariat, he was ready to agree to the wording in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2. He had misgivings, however, about the Spanish translation of that amendment and would like to hear the views of the Secretariat or the sponsor on the use of the word "el" in the last line.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that any errors in the Spanish text would be corrected.

79. Mrs. KNEŽEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation had some difficulty with the proposed target of 5 per cent; she would therefore vote against the first amendment.

80. The CHAIRMAN said that a recorded vote had been requested on the first of the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, India, Israel, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mali, Mexico, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Abstaining: Austria, Bhutan, Canada, China, Congo, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Guinea, Ireland, Japan, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Senegal, Sweden, Turkey.

81. The first amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2 was rejected by 57 votes to 25, with 21 abstentions.

82. The second amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2 was adopted by 72 votes to none, with 32 abstentions.

83. The third Soviet amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2 was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

84. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that he had abstained from voting on the second amendment. He felt that the point was better made in the Lebanese amendment that had been withdrawn (A/C.5/37/L.16). The third amendment was redundant, since it recapitulated the third amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.6/Rev.1, but since he had voted in favour of that amendment he had also voted in favour of the third amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2.

85. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, although she appreciated the effort at compromise reflected in the second amendment, she was not really satisfied that the Committee had received the hard facts that it needed in order to reach an informed decision. It had been given only the number of words, and not the cost of contractual translation compared with that of in-house translation, and had no way of knowing whether in fact contractual translation was more economical. She had therefore abstained from voting on the second amendment.

86. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the decision previously taken, the amendments in document A/C.5/37/L.9/Rev.2 which had been adopted would become paragraphs 18 and 19 of the draft resolution in recommendation 6.

Amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.11, L.14 and L.15

87. The CHAIRMAN said that the amendments related to the addition of three further Committees to the bodies listed in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution as being entitled to summary records.

88. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that the names of the following countries should appear as sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.11: Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Lebanon, Mexico, Niger, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

89. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had participated in the deliberations of the Committee on Conferences and had agreed to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in recommendation 6 which decided that, for an experimental period of three years, no subsidiary organ of the General Assembly should be entitled to summary records with the exception of the four legal bodies listed. It was opposed to any addition because it believed that the experiment should have a chance to run for the full period in order to determine how important summary records were. He felt that, in the interest of saving resources, the decision in paragraph 3 should stand and the list of exceptions should be kept as short as possible.

90. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) said that in view of the extreme importance of the Special Committee against Apartheid, he would support the proposal in document A/C.5/37/L.11.

91. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that apartheid was a crime against humanity, and asked for his delegation to be included among the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.11.

92. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that the Special Committee against Apartheid should be among the important bodies included in paragraph 3. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean should also be included as proposed in the Sri Lankan amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.14. The Indian Ocean ought to be a zone of peace and the international community should be informed of any deployment of forces there. The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People should also be included in paragraph 3, as proposed in the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.15. His delegation would like to be included among the sponsors of the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.11 and L.15.

93. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that his delegation also wished to join in co-sponsoring the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.11 and L.15 and would vote in favour of the Sri Lankan amendment.

94. Mr. KABA (Guinea), Mr. MEMMI (Tunisia), Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt), Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia), Mr. KORSJA (Togo) and Mr. KHALAF (Somalia) supported all three amendments and wished to be added to the lists of their sponsors.
95. Mrs. KEŽEVIČ (Yugoslavia) said that she would vote in favour of the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.14 and L.15.
96. Mr. NTAMBI (Uganda) said that his delegation's position on the three committees was well known and he would vote in favour of all three amendments.
97. Mr. SANGARE (Mali), Mr. TURPIN (Senegal) and Mr. de SILVA (Sri Lanka) wished to join the sponsors of the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.11 and L.15.
98. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.15. Not only was his delegation opposed in principle to the inclusion of that committee in paragraph 3 but it felt that the addition of any new United Nations organs to the document-producing bodies made a mockery of the amendments recently adopted which had the opposite intent.
99. Miss CASTILLO (Dominican Republic) and Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that, in view of the importance of all three committees, their delegations would vote in favour of the three amendments.
100. Mr. SOUMANA (Niger) said that he would vote in favour of the Sri Lanka amendment and would like to join the sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.15.
101. Mr. OUIEDAT (Lebanon) said that his delegation would like to join the sponsors of the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.14 and L.15.
102. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendments in documents A/C.5/37/L.11, L.14 and L.15.
103. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.11 was adopted by 92 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.
104. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.14 was adopted by 87 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.
105. The amendment in document A/C.5/37/L.15 was adopted by 86 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.
106. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on all three amendments. It had done so in order to reiterate its support of the resolutions adopted in previous years on the control and limitation of documentation, and because of the comments of the Committee on Conferences in paragraph 44 of its report, to the effect that it saw no reason to depart from its earlier recommendation and that although the Assembly might wish, on an ad hoc

(Ms. Mustonen, Finland)

basis, to authorize the provision of summary records to other organs, it was unable to identify criteria which could justify such further exceptions. She emphasized, however, that her delegation's vote should not be regarded as a judgement on the status or the functions of the three important committees referred to in the amendments.

107. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden) associated herself with the statement made by the representative of Finland.

108. The CHAIRMAN asked whether he could assume that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution in recommendation 6, as amended, without a vote.

109. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that he would like a vote to be taken.

110. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution in recommendation 6, as amended.

111. The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 93 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

112. Recommendation 6, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.