



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL
A/C.5/SR.1515
2 November 1972
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Twenty-seventh Session

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED
AND FIFTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 30 October 1972, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. OGISO Japan
Rapporteur: Mr. PASHKEVICH Byelorussian Soviet
Socialist Republic

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

CONTENTS

- Budget estimates for the financial year 1973 (continued)
 - Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.608) of the First Committee concerning international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space and the preparation of an international treaty concerning the moon
 - Form of presentation of the United Nations budget and the duration of the budget cycle (continued)
- Joint Inspection Unit
 - Question of the continuation of the Joint Inspection Unit (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the four working languages (English, French, Russian or Spanish), preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. Corrections should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and also incorporated in one copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 2 NOVEMBER 1972, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 7 NOVEMBER 1972.

The co-operation of participants in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1973 (A/8706, vols. I, II and III, A/8708 and Corr.1, A/8708/Add.2; A/C.5/1436, 1442, 1443; A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.2)
(continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.608) of the First Committee concerning international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space and the preparation of an international treaty concerning the Moon (A/C.5/1454)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/1454) of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.608) adopted by the First Committee on 20 October 1971. The Secretary-General estimated that should the draft resolution be adopted by the General Assembly, an additional appropriation in the amount of \$77,300 would be required under a new chapter in section 20 (Special expenses) of the budget for 1973.

Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had reviewed the statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1454) relating to a programme of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space. Those financial implications flowed from paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.608, in which the First Committee endorsed, *inter alia*, the United Nations programme on space applications for 1973. The Advisory Committee had been informed that the 1973 programme was broadly comparable to the one for 1972, but included two new items of expenditure: a summer school on remote sensing of natural resources and travel and subsistence for instructors and preparation of material. The appropriation for 1972 was \$65,000, but for the reasons given by the Secretary-General in paragraph 20.7 of the supplementary estimates for 1972 (A/8834), only \$43,400 would be required. The amount of \$77,300 requested for 1973 was identical to the amount indicated by the Secretary-General to the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space when it was considering the work programme (A/AC.105/102, para. 16).

The programme planned for 1973 was still tentative in several respects. Moreover, some participants might not be able to attend the panel meetings. Also the Secretary-General could look into the possibility of making some economies on travel costs by using excursion fares. For those reasons, the Advisory Committee was recommending a reduction of \$7,300 in the appropriation request. The Fifth

Committee might therefore wish to inform the General Assembly that should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/L.608, an additional amount of \$70,000 would be required under section 20 of the budget estimates for 1973.

Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) said he regretted that the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction in the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General for international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space because it was a very important programme which had considerable economic impact, particularly for the developing countries.

Mr. AIRALDI (Argentina) shared the view of the Austrian representative with regard to the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee.

Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) requested a vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/L.608 was approved by 75 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should ask the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it endorse draft resolution A/C.1/L.608, which had been adopted by the First Committee in its report on agenda items 28 and 29 (A/8720), an additional appropriation of \$70,000 would be required under a new chapter II of section 20 of the budget for 1973.

Form of presentation of the United Nations budget and the duration of the budget cycle (A/8703, A/8739; A/C.5/1429 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1453; A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1, L.1085, L.1088; A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.3 and Corr.1; E/5186/Rev.1) (continued)

Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had reviewed the financial implications of the establishment of a small planning, programming and evaluation group in the Office of Financial Services to assist in formulating the biennial programme and budget (A/C.5/1453).

The Advisory Committee agreed that after applying a 40 per cent reduction for delayed recruitment in the case of the Professional posts, and a 20 per cent reduction for delayed recruitment to the General Service post, the appropriation

/...

(Mr. Rhodes)

required for 1973 would be \$61,900. The breakdown of those costs by section was given in paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1453). On a full-year basis costs under sections 3 (Salaries and wages) and 4 (Common staff costs) would amount to approximately \$91,500. The income from staff assessment under income section 1 would come to approximately \$10,790. Thus, the continuing net cost subsequent to 1973 would be about \$80,000 per annum if the present salary range remained unchanged.

The Advisory Committee had been informed by the Secretary-General that he would endeavour to meet the costs in 1973 from within the amounts recommended by the Advisory Committee in its first report on the budget estimates for 1973 (A/8708). Consequently, should the General Assembly approve the Secretary-General's proposal to establish the group, no additional appropriations would be required under sections 3, 4 and 8 of the budget for 1973.

The Advisory Committee was not yet in a position to say whether there would be a need to enlarge the manning table by adding the three established posts requested by the Secretary-General. In that connexion, the members of the Committee would recall that in its first report on the budget estimates for 1973 (A/8708), the Advisory Committee had questioned the logic of creating new established posts at a time when so many existing posts remained unfilled. Those considerations also applied in the present instance and the Advisory Committee would revert to that matter later in the session when some of the present uncertainties would have been removed. He had in mind, in particular, the results of the AMS survey of the Office of Financial Services, the impact of the recruitment freeze and the policy of voluntary restraint in financial matters and the outcome of decisions yet to be taken by other Committees of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1) submitted by Austria, Ghana, Iran and the Philippines and the amendments contained in documents A/C.5/L.1085 and L.1088.

Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 for the efforts they had made to incorporate the views expressed in the Committee. Most delegations, while they recognized the need to adopt a new form of presentation of the budget, felt that it should be perfected over

(Mr. Gontha, Indonesia)

the years with experience. In that respect, his delegation shared the concern of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.1085. The same concern had led the sponsors of the draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 to assert the need, in paragraph 4, to keep under continuous review the progress achieved in the implementation of the new procedures. That paragraph made it perfectly clear that the new form of presentation which the Committee was to adopt was not definitive and could be modified and perfected in the light of experience. Only on that understanding could his delegation support the draft resolution.

As it had stated in the debate, the adoption of a biennial budget cycle did not seem to his delegation a pre-condition for the adoption of a programme budget. Consequently, there was no need to rush into a decision on the biennial cycle and his delegation would have preferred to retain the present annual cycle for the time being. However, since the majority of delegations seemed to favour the adoption of a biennial cycle, it was prepared to join in that consensus provided the biennial cycle was adopted on an experimental basis. It could therefore support the Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088).

Mr. GOMEZ DELGADILLO (Mexico) said he would vote for the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.1085, but would abstain in the vote on the Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088).

Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) congratulated the sponsors of the revised draft resolution on their efforts to take account of the ideas put forward by many delegations, particularly in paragraph 2, under which the General Assembly would approve the introduction of a biennial budget cycle on an experimental basis. He would therefore support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 and the amendments submitted in document A/C.5/L.1085, which substantially improved the text.

Mr. MURRAY (Guyana) noted that the members of the Committee were agreed on the need for a new form of presentation of the budget and a biennial budget cycle but disagreed on whether they should be introduced on a permanent or on an experimental basis. He believed that the decision should be taken in a final way; there should be no hesitation, but a full and total commitment.

/...

(Mr. Murray, Guyana)

Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 therefore appeared to him to be satisfactory as it stood, and he would vote against the first amendment in document A/C.5/L.1085. He considered the second amendment to be superfluous, since the idea embodied in it was already expressed in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. He would vote against the Polish amendment to operative paragraph 2 (A/C.5/L.1088) because, in his view, the biennial cycle and the new form of presentation of the budget were two separate questions that should not be linked. He would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1) as it stood.

Mr. van der GOOT (Netherlands) commended the representative of Austria and the co-sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1) for having produced a balanced text which took account of the views expressed by the various delegations. He agreed with the representative of Guyana that the Committee should take a clear decision on the question. He would therefore vote against the first amendment in document A/C.5/L.1085, which appeared to him to weaken the text unnecessarily, since improvements would be made to the new system as a matter of course in the light of future experience. He would also vote against the second amendment, which repeated an idea already stated in the third preambular paragraph. He would also vote against the Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088), which did not sufficiently take into account the views expressed in the Committee. He also agreed with the representative of Guyana that the new form of presentation of the budget was not linked to the biennial cycle, which was merely a technical aspect of it. He would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 as it stood.

Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that his delegation attached great importance to the new form of presentation of the budget, which should be established on a firm basis. He would vote against the Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088) and against the first of the five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085) because operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution already made it clear that the new form of presentation would be in the nature of an experiment. However, he would have no difficulty in supporting the second of the five-Power amendments.

/...

Mr. BENKIRANE (Morocco) said he believed that a new form of presentation of the budget was needed and welcomed draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1, which he supported as a whole. However, he would vote in favour of the first of the five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085), which he believed was entirely to the point and would not reduce the force of the original text in any way, as some delegations feared that it might.

Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil), replying to the criticisms of the five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085) voiced by some delegations, agreed that it was already implicit in the draft resolution that the new form of presentation would be in the nature of an experiment; the amendment to paragraph 1 would simply make it more explicit. The amendment to paragraph 3 did not, as had been asserted, merely repeat something that was already expressed in the third preambular paragraph, because it would then be the Secretary-General, and not the General Assembly, that was asked to take into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee. However, he would be prepared, as a gesture of conciliation, to withdraw that second amendment.

Mr. SAMBIRA (Burundi) noted that, apart from a few shades of difference, the majority of the Committee favoured the adoption of the new form of presentation of the budget. There was general agreement on the need for a better allocation of resources and a streamlining of United Nations management practices. As the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had very rightly pointed out, "programme budgeting was neither a means of enlarging programmes and budgets, nor a device to reduce them; it was a tool to assist decision-makers in the more rational allocation of scarce resources". His delegation wished to emphasize in that connexion that, when programme budgeting was introduced, account must be taken of the need for better planning of economic and social projects, especially those affecting the developing countries. Care would also have to be taken to ensure that the programmes of UNDP, UNCTAD and the regional economic commissions were not in any way affected.

His delegation supported the adoption of a biennial budget cycle, but wished to make it clear that Burundi would have difficulty in paying its contributions by the appointed date if they were to be receivable in advance. His delegation would support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1. It would also support the first of the five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085).

/...

Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) felt that the insertion of the words "on an experimental basis" in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 would suggest some doubt as to whether the decision taken was a sound one. Since the adoption of the new form of presentation of the budget must be seen to have the unquestionable support of the members of the Committee, his delegation was unwilling to agree to the first of the five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085); it would be willing to agree to the second amendment, on the understanding that the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 should then be deleted. With regard to the biennial budget cycle, the words "on an experimental basis" in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution could if necessary be retained. Lastly, if the third preambular paragraph was deleted, his delegation would propose that it should be replaced by the following text: "Bearing in mind the guidelines set forth in General Assembly resolution 2748 (XXV) of 17 December 1970".

Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) said he believed that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 should be adopted as it stood, since the text had been drawn up in consultation with all delegations and was therefore the result of a genuine consensus.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia) said that he was prepared to support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1. Its only weakness was the inclusion in paragraph 2, without any reason, of the words "on an experimental basis", and his delegation would accordingly vote in favour of the Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088). Similarly, adoption of the first of the five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085) would reduce the force of the decision taken by the Committee. As the representative of the Netherlands had very rightly pointed out, inasmuch as there was general agreement on the need for a new structure, the basis of that structure should not be weakened at the very outset. With regard to the second of the five-Power amendments, it was true, as the representative of Brazil had pointed out, that the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 and the second five-Power amendment were not mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, his delegation could not endorse that amendment, since the Secretary-General, when implementing the new reform, would obviously take into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee. For those reasons, his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1, together with the Polish amendment.

/...

Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, while he appreciated the cogency of the arguments advanced by certain delegations which felt that the decision taken by the Fifth Committee should not leave room for any ambiguity, he wished to point out that the proposed new system of programme budgeting was, by its nature, different from any that might have been tried at the national level. It must be borne in mind that not all the problems involved in adopting such a reform had been given thorough consideration. His delegation therefore believed that the two five-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1085) were perfectly reasonable and did reflect the tenor of the Committee's discussions on the question. The Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088), on the other hand, was unrealistic, and he would vote against it.

Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) found the Polish amendment completely unacceptable, particularly since during the debate on the adoption of a biennial budgetary cycle a number of delegations had expressed the fear that, if the reform was introduced, it would no longer be possible to set a ceiling on the amount of the Organization's budget. Other delegations had more or less intimated that the adoption of a biennial budget would imply that the Secretary-General could no longer submit supplementary estimates. In view of that uncertainty, his delegation felt that it was indispensable to retain the words "on an experimental basis" in paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1.

Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said he felt the Polish amendment was premature; he hoped that the Polish delegation would not insist on having the amendment put to the vote.

Mr. NAGGAGA (Uganda) supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1 as amended by the five-Power proposal (A/C.5/L.1085).

The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Pakistan if he wished his proposal to be put to the vote.

Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that if the second of the five-Power amendments submitted (A/C.5/L.1085) was rejected, he would agree to withdraw his proposal but, if it was not rejected, he would request a vote on his amendment.

/...

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would hardly be logical to vote on the Pakistan amendment before knowing if and how the draft resolution under consideration would be amended; accordingly, he proposed that the vote should be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that if the vote on the Pakistan amendment was postponed, all the voting on the item would have to be postponed.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Pakistan amendment would alter the balance of the whole draft resolution; accordingly, he hoped that the representative of Pakistan would not insist on a vote on his amendment.

Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) agreed, in a spirit of compromise, to withdraw his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN put the first five-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1085) to the vote.

The first five-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1085) was adopted by 49 votes to 32, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088) to the vote.

The Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.1088) was rejected by 64 votes to 16, with 20 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put the second five-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1085) to the vote.

The second five-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1085) was adopted by 51 votes to 27, with 25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN put draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1, as amended, to the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1080/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by 107 votes to none.

/...

JOINT INSPECTION UNIT

(b) QUESTION OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (A/8658, A/8835 and Corr.1; A/C.5/L.1432, 1434, 1437, 1438; A/C.5/L.1081, L.1082/Rev.1, L.1083, L.1084, L.1086/Rev.1, L.1087) (continued)

Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that, in a spirit of compromise, he would withdraw the amendments (A/C.5/L.1083) which his delegation had submitted to the draft resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee (A/8835, annex). He felt that the amendments submitted by the Soviet delegation (A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.1) were in keeping with the views of his delegation since they meant that the Joint Inspection Unit would be continued on an experimental basis. He hoped, however, that the words "subject to the principle of rotation of the membership of the Unit" would be added to the Soviet representative's proposed amendment to paragraph 1. His delegation believed that China should, by right, be a member of the Joint Inspection Unit. The decision to add a Chinese Inspector to the JIU would, moreover, be in accordance with the decisions that had already been taken with regard to the Advisory Committee and the Committee on Contributions.

Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said he would vote in favour of the amendment submitted by the Ghanaian delegation (A/C.5/L.1081) because the adoption of that amendment would be tantamount to implementing the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1714 (LIII). His delegation would have been able to endorse the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084) if they had been worded in another way. He felt, however, that it was not necessary to link the over-all review of the machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination to the question of the continuation of the Joint Inspection Unit. The over-all review of that machinery was indisputably necessary, but proposals on that question should be submitted under agenda item 78. His delegation would therefore vote against the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.1084 if the existing formulation was retained.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia) supported the revised amendment submitted by Argentina, Indonesia and Yugoslavia (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1) because it would mean that the proposed evaluation of the work of the Unit at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly would take place during the Unit's new period of continued existence, if it was to be continued for four years. He could not accept the

/...

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

amendments submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.1) to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. Nor could he accept the amendments submitted by India and Indonesia (A/C.5/L.1087) because he thought that it was extremely important to confirm the Unit's mandate as modified by the Advisory Committee. His delegation welcomed the amendment submitted by the Ghanaian delegation (A/C.5/L.1081) because the reports that the Secretary-General would submit could only enhance the effectiveness of the Joint Inspection Unit; he hoped that the word "succinct" in the new paragraph 7 would be stressed. As for the amendments submitted by the sixteen Powers (A/C.5/L.1084), his delegation felt that only some of them related to the question of the continuation of the Joint Inspection Unit. He expressed the fear that, as they were now worded, those amendments might cause several delegations to abstain in the vote on them. Accordingly, he requested the sponsors of the amendments to reword them and prepare a separate draft resolution on the need to undertake, at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, an over-all review of the machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination as well as an evaluation of the work of the Joint Inspection Unit.

Miss FORCIGNANO (Italy) said she would be willing to accept the amendment submitted by Ghana (A/C.5/L.1081), but she hoped that the word "major" which preceded the word "recommendations" would be deleted. She could not accept the amendments proposed by the Soviet delegation (A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.1). With regard to the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084), her delegation supported, as it had already had occasion to state, the idea of an over-all review of the machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination. That issue should not, however, be tackled under the item being considered, but under item 78, as the representative of Denmark had already suggested, for the Committee was now dealing with the question of the continuation of the Joint Inspection Unit. She supported the amendment submitted by Argentina, Indonesia and Yugoslavia (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1), but could not accept the amendment proposed by India and Indonesia (A/C.5/L.1087).

Mr. de BELDER (Belgium) said that he regretted that the Committee found itself in a situation in which various blocs representing different positions had clashed over the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084). No one had wanted that

(Mr. de Belder, Belgium)

situation to develop, for all delegations agreed that the Joint Inspection Unit should be continued and that an over-all review of the machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination should be undertaken. His delegation felt, however, that a distinction should be made between that over-all review and the question of the future of the Joint Inspection Unit, referred to in some of the amendments submitted by the sixteen Powers, on which the Fifth Committee was being called upon to take a decision. He therefore suggested that a separate vote should be taken on the last of the four paragraphs which the sixteen Powers wished to add to the preamble and on the clause they proposed to add to the text of paragraph 2.

Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that his delegation had already stated that it was prepared to support the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/8835, annex). His delegation would support the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084); they considerably improved the draft resolution, since the authors proposed, *inter alia*, that the General Assembly should review all the machinery for administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination, and that the General Assembly should request the views on the subject of the Secretary-General, the specialized agencies, the Economic and Social Council, the Advisory Committee, and the Joint Inspection Unit itself. The delegation of the Dominican Republic could not accept the amendments proposed by the Soviet delegation (A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.1) and the Pakistan delegation (A/C.5/L.1083), considering that a period of two years was not enough for a true evaluation of the work of the Unit. He would vote for the amendment by Ghana (A/C.5/L.1081), because he considered it most useful to ask the Secretary-General to present annually to the General Assembly a succinct report on the major recommendations of the Unit.

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the sixteen-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084) provided, *inter alia*, for a review by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session of the whole question of the machinery of control, investigation and co-ordination. In that connexion, the Soviet delegation wished to change the second amendment it had proposed (A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.1). As the sixteen Powers were proposing a new operative paragraph 2, the Soviet delegation would withdraw its amendment to the present

/...

/...

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

paragraph 2, and proposed that there should be added, after the new paragraph 2, a new paragraph 3 to read: "Further decides to conduct a preliminary evaluation of the work of the Joint Inspection Unit at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly". The remaining paragraphs would accordingly need renumbering. The new proposal took into account that several delegations thought it would be premature to undertake a general review of the machinery of control, etc., at the twenty-ninth session.

He thanked the representative of Pakistan for the spirit of understanding and co-operation in which he had withdrawn his amendments. The Soviet delegation was prepared to change its first amendment by replacing the words "on the previous basis" by the words "on an experimental basis". He fully supported the amendment proposed by Argentina, Indonesia and Yugoslavia to paragraph 1 (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1)

Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) suggested that the new operative paragraph 2 proposed in document A/C.5/L.1084 should be amended, since the proposal to review the whole machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination was out of place in the consideration of the question of the continuation of the Joint Inspection Unit. He therefore proposed the deletion of the phrase "the machinery of the United Nations and of its system for administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination", together with the words "for this purpose", and the insertion of the words "the work of the Joint Inspection Unit" between the word "review" and the words "at its thirty-first regular session".

Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) proposed that operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee (A/8835, annex) should be amended to read: "Recommends that the other participating organizations in the United Nations system take appropriate action for the continuation of the Unit and the use of its services on the basis set out in the present resolution".

Mr. HSING (China) said that as the Chinese delegation had not been able to follow the work of the Joint Inspection Unit in the past, it was difficult for him to take part in the discussion on the continuation of that body. The Pakistan delegation, and others, had expressed the view that China should take part in the work of the Unit. He thanked those delegations, and hoped that in due time the Fifth Committee would be able to consider the possibility of China's participation in the work of the Unit.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Distr.
GENERALA/8869
1 November 1972

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twenty-seventh session
Agenda items 28, 29 and 73

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE
PREPARATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY CONCERNING THE MOON
BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1973

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution II
recommended by the First Committee (A/8863, para. 12)

Report of the Fifth Committee

Rapporteur: Mr. Oleg PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic)

1. At its 1515th meeting, on 30 October 1972, the Fifth Committee, in compliance with rule 155 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, considered the statement of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1454) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution II recommended by the First Committee (A/8863, para. 12).

2. Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would endorse the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, 1/ as well as the United Nations programme on space applications for 1973 and the guidelines for the programme for 1974.

3. In his statement (A/C.5/1454), the Secretary-General indicated that an additional appropriation in the amount of \$77,300 would be required under a new chapter in section 20 (Special expenses) of the budget for 1973 for the implementation of the programme on space applications in that year. This appropriation would be required for the provision of financial assistance to cover travel and subsistence expenses to participants from developing countries at two panel meetings to be held, one in Latin America and one in Africa, at a summer school on remote sensing of natural resources to be held in France, and at two

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session,
Supplement No. 20 (A/8720).

72-21589

/...