



International Atomic Energy Agency

GENERAL CONFERENCE

GC(XXV)/COM.5/OR.25
March 1982*

GENERAL Distr.
ENGLISH

TWENTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION: 21-27 SEPTEMBER 1981

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Neue Hofburg, Vienna,
on Thursday, 24 September 1981, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. DALAL (India)

CONTENTS

<u>Item of the agenda**</u>		<u>Paragraphs</u>
12	The financing of technical assistance	1 - 34
13	Amendment of Article VI.A.2 of the Statute	35 - 61
14	Amendment of Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference	62 - 70

* A provisional version of this document was issued on 13 October 1981.

** GC(XXV)/652.

The composition of delegations attending the session is given in document
GC(XXV)/INF/201/Rev.2.

THE FINANCING OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (GC(XXV)/648; GC(XXV)/COM.5/16)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the matter under consideration had already been discussed at the twenty-third session and that the General Conference had at that time adopted resolution GC(XXIII)/RES/368. In 1980, after examining the report which the Board had submitted at its request, the General Conference had asked the Board to continue to study the matter. The records of the Board's deliberations were now before the Committee in document GC(XXV)/648. The Committee also had before it, in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/16, a draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77.

2. Mr. STROHAL (Yugoslavia) recalled that the developing countries had for a long time been requesting that technical assistance should be financed from the Regular Budget. It was explicitly indicated in the Statute, and in particular in Article II, that the provision of technical assistance was one of the principal tasks of the Agency. He therefore urged the Committee of the Whole to give favourable consideration to the draft resolution.

3. Mr. RAHMOUNI (Algeria) stressed that the Agency had frequently been obliged to reject technical assistance requests or to respond to them with considerable delay because it did not have sufficient funds. It should therefore be able to count on predictable resources. That term, which was contained in the draft resolution, was broad enough to be accepted by all countries. Algeria hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

4. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) recalled that the question of financing technical assistance from the Regular Budget had been under study for many years. It was time to demonstrate that technical assistance was considered to be as important as safeguards. In the early 1970s comparable resources had been available for those two areas, but since then a gap had appeared and had widened dangerously until, at present, the safeguards budget was almost double the amount of the target fixed for technical assistance. That imbalance, which was in itself serious, raised doubts about the Agency's capacity to fulfil its twin objectives.

5. The Group of 77 would like the earlier situation to be restored progressively. Since it had been possible to quadruple the safeguards budget between 1975 and 1980, it should also be possible over a period of three years to bring the resources available for technical assistance to the level of those allotted to safeguards.

6. Mr. MENON (India) considered that, since the provision of technical assistance was the principal function of the Agency, the latter must have adequate resources to fulfil its mission. Technical assistance was very important for the developing countries and it was therefore essential, if the Agency was to meet its statutory obligations, that technical assistance should be financed on a predictable and assured basis, namely from the Regular Budget. It was worth recalling that the value of technical assistance provided by the Agency since its establishment did not exceed \$127 million, which was only a small fraction of the cost of a nuclear power plant.

7. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq) pointed out that for developing countries the main problem was to find a stable and predictable method of financing technical assistance so that the same importance would be attributed to that activity as to safeguards. There was no reason why those two activities should not be financed in the same manner.

8. Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea) observed that, in spite of some recent improvements, the increase in the resources available for technical assistance was far from sufficient. Technical assistance must be financed from the Regular Budget if the Agency was to carry out its statutory task. His delegation therefore supported the draft resolution.

9. Mr. NAHDI (Saudi Arabia) said it was high time that technical assistance was financed from the Regular Budget; the General Conference must take the necessary action to that effect. He endorsed the draft resolution.

10. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) pointed out that the Agency's technical assistance activities were not exactly co-extensive with the promotional activities that were financed from the Regular Budget and a large part of which benefited developing countries. Technical assistance activities were funded from voluntary contributions, and Japan had always made a contribution corresponding to its base rate of assessment. For the Regular Budget, he approved the principle of zero growth, while stressing that promotional activities should not suffer therefrom. The Group of 77 in its draft resolution had requested that the resources available for technical assistance should be financed from the Regular Budget or from equally predictable and assured resources. If technical assistance was financed from the Regular Budget, it might suffer from the consequences of budgetary restrictions. The second part of the request seemed to have already found a response since in the previous year, when setting the target for voluntary contributions in 1981, the Board had also specified indicative figures for the following two years. The Group of 77 was also asking that the resources allocated to technical assistance should be increased so that over a period of three years they would at least equal those appropriated for safeguards. The Japanese delegation considered that request to be unrealistic.

11. Mr. GILLON (Belgium) observed that the resources available for technical assistance had increased much more rapidly than the Regular Budget; that had been possible only because technical assistance was financed separately. Technical assistance and safeguards activities were quite different and it was therefore not necessary that they should be able to draw upon exactly the same resources. Besides, one group of countries had all but ceased to finance the safeguards activities. The same group could assume the responsibility of financing technical assistance so that it would reach the same level as safeguards. Belgium was not in a position to endorse the draft resolution.

12. Mr. TEODORANI FABBRI POZZO (Italy) shared the views expressed by the Japanese and Belgian delegations. If the present trend of budgetary restrictions in international organizations persisted, the proposal of the Group of 77 might backfire.

13. Mr. GABBERT (United States of America) said that he was unable to endorse the draft resolution and suggested that informal consultations be held with a view to modifying the wording.

14. Mr. ASSI (Lebanon) recalled that his delegation's views were well known. It was necessary to improve the effectiveness and continuity of technical assistance, and its implementation should not be dependent on uncertain contributions. Technical assistance should therefore be funded from the Regular Budget, and his delegation endorsed the draft resolution.

15. Mr. HOFFMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said he did not deny that the Agency should have predictable resources for the provision of technical assistance and recalled that his country had always made voluntary contributions corresponding broadly to its share of the assessed budget. Nevertheless, he supported the suggestion made by the United States representative, because it would be difficult for him to endorse the draft resolution as submitted.

16. Mr. COUSINS (Australia) said he hoped that the debate about the means of financing technical assistance would not obscure the very real gains that had been made. The Board's decision to set indicative planning figures had been a major step towards greater stability and predictability and would help to ensure that the resources available for technical assistance increased each year. Australia would in 1982, as in previous years, contribute a share of the target corresponding to its base rate of assessment. Furthermore, it would continue its active support for and participation in the Regional Co-operative Agreement for Research, Development and Training Related to Nuclear Science and Technology (RCA) and would continue to provide bilateral assistance to the countries of its region and to make its nuclear facilities available to the Agency for training activities in accordance with its nuclear technical assistance policy. While Australia would continue to give high priority to technical assistance and contribute to efforts to enhance predictability in that area, it would be necessary for its disbursements to continue to be determined on a voluntary basis. His delegation therefore had certain difficulties with the draft resolution.

17. Mr. DE PEYSTER (France) said that he shared the views expressed by the Belgian and Italian representatives. While the provision of technical assistance was indeed one of the essential activities of the Agency, the present method of financing it was favourable to the countries which received assistance because the target had steadily risen in the past few years. The proposal of the Group of 77 was not acceptable as it stood.

18. Mr. BELLOUKI (Morocco) said that it was essential for the developing countries to develop low-cost energy sources, and especially nuclear power. However, they would not be able to do so without the Agency's assistance. Technical assistance activities needed therefore to be funded from predictable resources, and hence from the Regular Budget.

19. Mr. ROEHNSCH (German Democratic Republic) recalled the well-known stand of his delegation that technical assistance should continue as a matter of principle to be financed from voluntary contributions. He could not, therefore, approve the draft resolution, and considered furthermore that it would be dangerous to establish a link between technical assistance and safeguards.

20. Mr. BIN DA'AR (United Arab Emirates) said that no Member of the Agency seemed to question the importance of technical assistance for developing countries. The resources allocated to technical assistance had steadily increased over the last few years, to be sure, but it was wrong to oppose the incorporation of technical assistance funds in the Regular Budget. If technical assistance was accepted as something of importance for developing countries, there was no reason why it should not be treated in the same way as the other activities of the Agency. He endorsed the draft resolution.

21. Mr. LÓPEZ-MENCHERO y ORDOÑEZ (Spain) supported the technical assistance activities of the Agency and suggested that those activities should take the form of wide-ranging technical co-operation with appropriate funds. As regards the draft resolution under consideration it raised a problem of principle, for its adoption would entail budgetary practices and trends that were based not on clear programme definitions, but on a linkage between two very different concepts - technical assistance and safeguards. Accordingly he associated himself with the representatives who wished to have the wording modified.

22. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia) urged that the question of substance not be confounded with that of form. Nobody questioned that the resources available for technical assistance ought to be increased. With regard to the draft resolution, it was only the first part of operative paragraph (a), calling for technical assistance to be funded through the Regular Budget, which seemed to raise problems since all representatives apparently agreed that technical assistance should be provided with predictable and assured resources.

23. He saw no reason why technical assistance could not be financed from the Regular Budget, since its importance was recognized. Consultations would presumably help to remove the misunderstandings.

24. Mr. KENYERES (Hungary) recalled that his delegation had always stressed the importance of technical assistance. The Hungarian Government had every year made voluntary contributions in amounts broadly corresponding to its base rate of assessment. It had recently approved the principle of setting indicative figures for the target for voluntary contributions two years in advance. It considered that technical assistance should, as a matter of principle, continue to be financed from voluntary contributions. It was essential to avoid establishing a link between the funding of technical assistance and the funding of safeguards, and his delegation was therefore unable to approve the draft resolution.

25. Mr. MORALES PEDRAZA (Cuba) emphasized that his country attached the greatest importance to the Agency's technical assistance activities, from which it had derived considerable benefit. The Cuban Government was, however, aware of the need to face the world economic situation realistically; account must be taken both of the needs of developing countries and of economic imperatives, the most important thing at the moment being to ensure a steady and tangible increase in the resources of the Technical Assistance Fund so that expenditure could be planned on a medium-term basis.

26. Mrs. DAVIDOVÁ (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that her country provided all the technical assistance it could for the developing countries, especially in the area of training. Her Government upheld, in particular, the principle of funding that assistance through voluntary contributions. Funding in non-convertible currencies had in the past yielded highly satisfactory results, so much so that Czechoslovakia had decided on a fivefold increase

in its contribution in national currency. Furthermore, it would not be very logical to establish a link between increases in safeguards expenditure and increases in expenditure on technical assistance. She was thus unable to endorse the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/16.

27. Mr. EL-ZOGHBY (Egypt) said that his country's stand on the financing of technical assistance was well known. That assistance was vital for developing countries and was one of the main *raison d'être* of the Agency; the funds allocated to it ought to be increased substantially and in a manner that would allow dependable planning.

28. Miss PARKIN (United Kingdom) stressed that her country's acceptance of a very substantial increase in the target for voluntary contributions for 1982 was proof of the importance which it attached to technical assistance. Moreover, setting indicative planning figures would make it possible in future to count on assured resources. That being so, operative paragraph (a) of the draft resolution, calling for the funding of technical assistance through the Regular Budget, seemed singularly inappropriate at a time when - precisely for the Regular Budget - the aim was to achieve zero growth. The present system was much more favourable for the development of technical assistance.

29. Mr. NANIOV (Bulgaria) recalled his delegation's view that technical assistance should be funded through voluntary contributions. The effort to link two widely different sectors of activity, far from being a constructive initiative, could only harm the effectiveness of both. Bulgaria could not, therefore, endorse the draft resolution.

30. Mr. AGIOBU-KEMMER (Nigeria) emphasized that technical assistance and safeguards were the two principal activities of the Agency and that it was logical to desire that they should receive the same treatment, especially in the matter of funding. Endeavours were being made to achieve zero real growth in the Agency's budgets; however it had been stressed on several occasions that safeguards

were not in any way suffering from that policy. Why should it not be the same with technical assistance? Moreover, contributions to the Regular Budget were much less subject to fluctuations due to economic instability than voluntary contributions; if technical assistance were financed from the Regular Budget, it would be protected against unpredictable set-backs.

31. Thus, in the final analysis, he was unable to understand why donor countries were so resolutely opposed to any change in the present system. They had always been generous in financing technical assistance, so that its inclusion in the Regular Budget would not basically change the situation from their point of view. Technical assistance was not a gift to developing countries but rather an investment in the nuclear industry, an investment advantageous to donors and recipients alike.

32. The CHAIRMAN observed that discussion of the draft resolution appeared to have been completed and that a number of delegations were in favour of holding informal consultations on the subject in order to arrive at a consensus. He therefore suggested that, if there were no objections, the Committee should postpone a decision on the draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/16.

33. It was so decided.

34. Mr. STROHAL (Yugoslavia) said that as far as he could see operative paragraphs (b) and (c) were acceptable to all; only paragraph (a) presented difficulties for certain delegations. All had therefore recognized the need for a change, and that marked considerable progress beyond the deadlock which had prevailed earlier.

AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE VI.A.2 OF THE STATUTE (GC(XXV)/649, 649/Add.1;
GC(XXV)/COM.5/14)

35. Mr. AGIOBU-KEMMER (Nigeria), introducing the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/14, emphasized that it dealt with a subject which had been under discussion for a very long time. In the past, the General Conference had on several occasions recognized that the representation of Member States on the Board of Governors was not equitable. Although highly convincing arguments had been put forward many times on the subject, it was obviously necessary to repeat them. The world was at present undergoing profound and rapid changes

and the Agency could not act as if nothing had changed. For example, if the Statute had been drafted 200 years before, the United States, which had then been only a colony, would have been among the "outcasts". Its position as a superpower with highly advanced technology was now recognized, but he doubted whether the countries which had gained independence more recently would wait two centuries before their existence was taken into account. The place of the raw-material-producing countries should be duly recognized, as was provided explicitly in the Statute, and it was a familiar fact that more and more developing countries were discovering that they possessed such resources. The structure of the world was changing, and the Statute should also change; it was high time to amend Article VI, and particularly paragraph A.2.

36. He pointed out that the division of the world into eight areas was peculiar to the Agency: other United Nations bodies generally distinguished five areas. Under the Agency's system it was still more evident that Africa, taken as a single area, was placed at a particular disadvantage. It had 26 Member States but only four seats on the Board, i.e. no more than the number of seats designated for Western Europe alone under Article VI.A.1, under the present provisions of which Africa was entitled to only one designated seat. The imbalance was obvious if one remembered that the geographical areas had representation coefficients equal to or higher than 34% with the exception of Latin America (31%) the Middle East and South Asia (22%) and - especially - Africa (20%). It should be possible to raise the representation coefficients of all areas to 34%. It was not a question of reducing the number of seats for other areas but simply of giving those which were at a disadvantage the seats to which they were entitled.

37. Some delegations had objected to increasing the composition of the Board on the grounds that it would make the Board inefficient. He simply wished to recall that at a time when the Agency had had 60 Member States the Board had already had 23 seats, or a ratio of 1 to 3; the Agency's membership had since then increased considerably but the Board had not been expanded to the same extent: far from it. Furthermore, within the United Nations system the Agency's Board was

nowhere near the largest. The Executive Board of UNESCO was much larger, but that did not make it any less efficient. Another solution which could make representation on the Board really equitable would be to undertake a complete redistribution of the seats, but that would be a far more delicate process. The measure proposed in the draft resolution seemed entirely reasonable and was required urgently.

38. Mr. EL-ZOGHBY (Egypt) hoped that the General Conference would adopt a draft resolution which would remedy the existing imbalance in the Board's membership, particularly with regard to the representation of the regions of "Africa" and "the Middle East and South Asia", although all under-represented regions should be considered. It was for that reason that the Egyptian delegation fully supported the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/14.

39. Mr. PULIT (Argentina) considered that the reason why the question of amending Article VI.A.2 had not been resolved was that it had been broached in a partial manner. In view of the importance of the subject, his delegation felt that it should be studied thoroughly, account being taken of the historical evolution of nuclear activities in the world and the Agency's evolution, which were reflected only partially in the draft resolution. Any change in the representation of certain regions ought to take into account the region of "Latin America". Equitable representation of all regions on the Board should be treated in a comprehensive manner.

40. Mr. DIDIER (Brazil), Mr. GALVEZ VILLARROEL (Peru), Mr. PECCI (Paraguay), Mr. PARIS-STEFFENS (Costa Rica), and Mr. DERPSCH BARTSCH (Chile) supported the statement of the Argentine representative.

41. Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea) recalled that his delegation had endorsed all resolutions adopted previously on the subject. Since the item had been before the General Conference since 1977 and had been the subject of long discussions and numerous informal consultations, it was time that positive measures were taken. He therefore supported the draft resolution under consideration.

42. Mr. NAHDI (Saudi Arabia) said it was high time that the General Conference took a decision. Article VI had already been amended twice, and on each occasion the Board had submitted a specific recommendation. The Member States from the regions concerned could not wait indefinitely for the imbalance to be corrected. For that reason his delegation lent its full support to the draft resolution before the Committee.

43. Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq), recalling the resolutions on the subject adopted by the General Conference at its twenty-first and twenty-second sessions, observed that his Government had been disappointed to note that no specific measure had been taken since then. The request that the representation on the Board of the regions of "Africa" and "the Middle East and South Asia" should be strengthened was justified not only by the increase in the number of Member States belonging to those regions but also by the development of their nuclear power programmes. He therefore supported the draft resolution.

44. Mr. SMALL (New Zealand) recalled that many developing Member States had felt for some time that the Board's membership should be enlarged so as to reflect more accurately their share in the Agency's membership. His Government considered that in its existing form Article VI reflected neither the present situation nor the needs of various countries. He hoped that a reasonable and practical formulation could be found which would allow an improvement in the representation of the under-represented regions without affecting the Board's efficiency. With regard to the draft resolution, his delegation had reservations concerning the operative paragraph and hoped that it would be possible to hold further consultations on that point.

45. Mr. MORALES PEDRAZA (Cuba), recalling that the Cuban Government was in favour of fair representation of all regions on the Board, regretted that a single comprehensive solution had not been proposed. His delegation was willing to support any draft resolution which aimed at correcting the present situation, including the representation of the "Latin America" region, so long as the proposed solution was realistic. The draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/14 could serve as a basis for the Board's work at its forthcoming meetings; however,

the Cuban delegation could not approve a solution which did not respect the spirit in which the amendment should be made and which would not benefit the regions concerned to the desired extent.

46. Mr. ASSI (Lebanon) considered it essential, logical and equitable to amend Article VI.A.2 with a view to increasing the representation of the regions of "Africa" and "the Middle East and South Asia" and supported the draft resolution.

47. Mr. ELHOUNI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), observing that the time had come to amend Article VI.A.2 in order to improve the representation of the regions of "Africa" and "the Middle East and South Asia" on the Board, called upon all delegations to approve the draft resolution.

48. Mr. BELLOUKI (Morocco), pointing out that it was logical to draw conclusions from developments in the world and the increase in the number of independent countries, also supported the draft resolution.

49. Mr. GABBERT (United States of America) noted that there was no agreement on amending Article VI.A.2. Several Governments wanted the Board to have more Members, which was understandable, but at the same time wanted it to remain efficient; and that could present problems. If one sought to resolve the matter in terms of representation of regions, the number of countries in each region could quite obviously be taken as a criterion. But that criterion did not suffice; it was also necessary to take into account the state of development of nuclear technology and the production of raw materials in the countries in question. In that sense, his delegation considered that the present composition of the Board was appropriate. It was nevertheless willing to approve a draft resolution whereby the General Conference would request the Board to examine the matter, provided that the Board was asked to bear in mind the need for maintaining efficiency in the conduct of its work. The draft resolution in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/14 could, in his opinion, serve as a good starting point if the operative paragraph was modified.

50. Mr. MENON (India) observed that the recent admission of Zimbabwe aggravated the under-representation of the region of "Africa". His delegation therefore endorsed the draft resolution.

51. Mr. KELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would be willing to endorse the draft resolution if it were not drafted in terms which prejudged the result of the Board's study of the problem. Several delegations had requested that there should be an increase in the number of seats for the regions of "Africa", "the Middle East and South Asia" and "Latin America". The main thing was that the Board should be able to conduct its work in an efficient manner.

52. Mr. BIN DA'AR (United Arab Emirates) expressed the hope that States in the other regions would co-operate with those in the regions concerned with a view to finding a solution which would ensure equitable representation of the regions of "Africa" and "the Middle East and South Asia". He endorsed the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/COM.5/14.

53. Mr. DE PEYSTER (France) recalled that long and delicate negotiations had been necessary in order to arrive at the present version of Article VI in 1973. Although a proposal to amend the Statute might be sound in itself, it must be drafted in terms which took account of the aspirations of everyone, to the extent that those aspirations could reasonably be satisfied. That did not seem to be the case with the draft resolution under consideration, and, for the reasons stated by the United Kingdom representative, his delegation was unable to support the draft resolution.

54. Mr. ISMAIL (Malaysia), underlining the need to apply the principle of equitable geographical distribution, approved the draft resolution.

55. Mr. BUHOARA (Romania) observed that it was in the interest of Member States and of the Agency itself to enable countries from the under-represented regions to participate fully in the taking of decisions on the Agency's activities. He was not convinced by the argument about the efficiency of the Board's work, and doubted whether the Board had been more efficient in the early years of the Agency's existence. Moreover, efficiency was not measured only in terms of the time needed to take a decision. One also had to consider to what extent the decisions taken reflected the views of Member States. His delegation was thus in favour of the draft resolution.

56. Mr. LÓPEZ-MENCHERO y ORDOÑEZ (Spain) said that Spain had been one of the first countries in the Western Europe region to recognize that it was necessary to change the representation of Member States on the Board of Governors. At the twentieth-fourth regular session of the General Conference, Spain had joined in the consensus on the Yugoslav draft resolution which had asked the Board to examine all the consequences of a possible amendment of Article VI.A.2 in the context of the Article as a whole. In any event, care must be taken, in trying to improve the representation, not to impair the efficiency of the Board. The Spanish delegation believed that it would be best to follow the proposal made by the representative of Argentina, supported in particular by the representative of the United States, and undertake a more detailed study of the operative and preambular paragraphs in order to arrive at a text which could be adopted by consensus.

57. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished to recommend adoption of the draft resolution contained in GC(XXV)/COM.5/14.

58. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan), Mr. AGIOBU-KEMMER (Nigeria), Mr. CALISTO VARELA (Ecuador) and Mr. KOREF (Panama) were in favour of adopting the draft resolution.

59. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) supported by Mr. LÓPEZ-MENCHERO y ORDOÑEZ (Spain), Mr. COUSINS (Australia) and Mr. GABBERT (United States of America), said that in its existing form the operative paragraph of the draft resolution prejudged the result of the Board's deliberations. Further consultations on the subject were therefore necessary.

60. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee suspend discussion on the draft resolution.

61. It was so decided.

Mr. Buhoara (Romania) took the Chair.

AMENDMENT OF RULE 86 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE
(GC(XXV)/650, 650/Corr.1, 650/Corr.2)

62. Presenting the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/650, Mr. HADDAD (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the proposed amendment to Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference was a necessary one in

view of the fact that 14 Member States out of 111 had Arabic as their official language, that many international organizations had already adopted Arabic as an official language, and that Arabic was perfectly suited to the requirements of modern science.

63. Speaking on behalf of the Director General, Mr. SIEVERING (Deputy Director General for Administration) presented a report on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution. If Arabic became an official language and a working language of the General Conference, interpretation from and into Arabic would have to be provided at plenary sessions and meetings of the Committee of the Whole and the General Committee. Moreover, under Rule 88 of the Rules of Procedure, the summary records of meetings and all important documents would have to be issued in Arabic. The total costs of those services would amount to approximately US \$276 000 per year (with no account taken of inflation). Furthermore, the initial purchase of essential items such as typewriters and dictionaries would cost about \$16 000.

64. The United Nations organizations which had adopted Arabic as a working language had apparently not followed a uniform practice as far as financing arrangements were concerned. Very frequently, all or part of the costs incurred had been met by the Arab Member States. For example, at the United Nations and the World Health Organization (WHO), the Arab States had borne the costs for an initial period of three years; in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), ten Arab Governments had made voluntary contributions in order to set up an Arabic service. In certain organizations where the Arabic service had been financed under the regular budget since the beginning, the service had been more limited than that for other languages: in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) only part of the correspondence was translated and interpretation facilities were provided only for certain meetings, while at the International Labour Organisation (ILO) the only provisions were for interpretation at certain meetings; however, in those two organizations, the Arabic service was soon to be expanded under the regular budget.

65. Mr. NAHDI (Saudi Arabia), Mr. MAHMOUD (Iraq), Mr. EL-ZOGHBY (Egypt), Mr. ELHOUNI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. ASSI (Lebanon), Mr. BELLOUKI (Morocco), Mr. BIN DA'AR (United Arab Emirates), Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan), Mr. MUR (Jordan), Mr. RAHMOUNI (Algeria) and Mr. ZMERLI (Tunisia) fully supported the statement of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic and the draft resolution which he had presented; their countries were ready to assist the Secretariat in setting up an Arabic service.

66. Mr. LÓPEZ-MENCHERO y ORDOÑEZ (Spain), Mr. MAKSIĆ (Yugoslavia), Mr. DE PEYSTER (France), Mr. CALISTO VARELA (Ecuador), Mr. MORALES PEDRAZA (Cuba), Mr. BRADY ROCHE (Chile), Mr. GALVEZ VILLARROEL (Peru) and Mr. KOREF (Panama) fully supported the Syrian initiative and endorsed the draft resolution for amending Rule 86 of the Rules of Procedure.

67. Miss PARKIN (United Kingdom) wished to have details about how the costs resulting from the decision would be met.

68. Mr. SIEVERING (Deputy Director General for Administration) said he understood that the Arab Member States were ready to make a special financial contribution.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objections, he assumed the Committee wished to recommend the General Conference to adopt the draft resolution contained in document GC(XXV)/650.

70. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

