

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 74th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/34/L.52 concerning agenda item 80

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A and B submitted by the First Committee in paragraph 21 of document A/34/29 concerning agenda item 39 (b)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/34/L.53 concerning agenda item 65

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/34/L.55 concerning agenda item 12

Revised estimates under section 28J (Staff training activities)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.42 concerning agenda item 24

/...

---

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

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/34/SR.74  
13 December 1974

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 107: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 101: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

Medium-term planning in the United Nations

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/34/L.52 concerning agenda item 80 (A/C.5/34/57)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General estimated the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.3/34/L.52 to be \$36,900, which included an amount of \$5,400 for temporary assistance. The Advisory Committee believed that the request for temporary assistance could be absorbed within the appropriation already approved for the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and it therefore recommended approval of an amount of \$31,500 only.

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Third Committee be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$31,500 would be required under section 21 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.

3. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A and B submitted by the First Committee in paragraph 21 of document A/34/29 concerning agenda item 39 (b) (A/C.5/34/66)

4. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General estimated that, in connexion with the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean in 1981, an amount of \$40,500 would be required for temporary assistance in the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, an amount of \$12,100 for additional staff in the Department of Public Information and \$15,000 for the publication and distribution of booklets to publicize the conference. The Advisory Committee had concluded that the amounts of \$12,100 and \$15,000 for public information should be absorbed within the appropriation for section 27. It also considered that, given the existing staffing of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, only \$25,000 should be required for temporary assistance.

5. With regard to conference servicing costs, The Secretary-General estimated that an amount of \$809,200 would be required for 1980 and \$686,400 for 1981. For the time being, the Committee should be concerned only with the amount for 1980, which would be included in the consolidated paper on conference servicing costs. The amount for 1981 would be considered at the thirty-fifth session.

6. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolutions

(The Chairman)

recommended by the First Committee be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$25,000 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. Conference servicing costs of \$809,200 would be considered in the context of the consolidated paper on conference servicing costs to be submitted before the end of the session.

7. It was so decided.

8. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to taking a decision on the financial implications of the draft resolutions without a vote on the understanding that all costs arising from the draft resolutions would be met from within the existing appropriations for 1980-1981.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/34/L.53 concerning agenda item 65 (A/C.5/34/68)

9. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General estimated that, in order to prepare the report requested in the draft resolution, \$70,000 would be needed to provide for 14 work-months of consultants, \$5,500 for travel and subsistence of staff, \$31,700 for salaries, travel and subsistence of interpreters, \$12,000 for contractual translation, and \$20,300 for the processing of the report. The Advisory Committee had concluded that the amounts for interpreters and contractual translation, totalling \$43,700, should be included together with the \$20,300 for processing the report under section 29 of the proposed programme budget since they, too, constituted conference servicing costs. Accordingly, the balance to be appropriated in the event that the draft resolution was adopted was \$75,500 under section 19, and conference servicing costs totalling \$64,000 should be included in the consolidated paper.

10. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Second Committee be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$75,500 would be required under section 19 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. Conference servicing costs not exceeding \$64,000 would be considered in the context of the consolidated paper on conference servicing costs to be submitted before the end of the session.

11. It was so decided.

12. Miss MILGROM (Israel) said that, as her delegation had stated in the Second Committee, draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.53 was one-sided and politically motivated, and would not help to improve the living conditions of the Palestinian people or promote the peace process in the area. Her delegation was strongly opposed to the additional appropriation which would be necessary if the draft resolution was adopted.

/...

13. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation supported the additional appropriation, which would not, in any event, be necessary if Israel ceased its occupation of Arab territories and violation of United Nations resolutions.

14. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that, if the Chairman's suggestion had been put to a vote, his delegation would have voted against it. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution in the Second Committee for the reasons stated at that time.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/34/L.55 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/34/70)

15. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee believed that the amount of \$15,400 which the Secretary-General estimated would be needed for travel and subsistence of substantive staff to service a working group to elaborate an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers and their families could be absorbed within the appropriation for section 23, if the travel of the staff to service the working group was arranged in connexion with travel of staff of the Division of Human Rights to New York for the General Assembly. It should not be necessary, therefore, to request any additional appropriation for that purpose. Conference servicing costs of \$198,200 would be considered in the context of the consolidated paper on conference servicing costs to be submitted shortly.

16. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) said that the preparation of a draft convention on the rights of migrant workers and their families was a matter to which his Government attached great importance. He therefore wished to know whether the Advisory Committee's recommendation might hamper the work of the working group in any way. It was possible, for example, that the officials of the Division of Human Rights who would normally travel to Headquarters to attend the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly might not necessarily be those who were best suited to service the working group. If he received assurances from the Secretariat that it was feasible for the same staff to attend the Assembly session and service the Working Group, he would not object to the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

17. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that it was not certain that the staff of the Division of Human Rights normally sent to attend the Assembly session would include the specialists referred to by the representative of Mexico. If it should prove impossible to avoid additional expenditure for travel, the Division would make every effort to absorb the cost from within its existing appropriation.

18. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) suggested that the Committee might proceed as it had in the past. If the Secretary-General should find himself in a difficult position, there was no reason why he could not indicate in the performance report that the recommendation of the Advisory Committee could not be fully implemented. At that time, the Advisory Committee would be able to consider whatever the Secretary-General proposed with the same understanding it had shown in the past.

/...

19. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) said that the suggestion of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee was acceptable to his delegation. He hoped that no problems would arise in arranging for the travel of the necessary experts to service the meetings of the Working Group.

20. Mr. LÖSCHNER (Federal Republic of Germany) said he agreed with the approach suggested by the Advisory Committee. His delegation believed that the problems to be dealt with in the proposed convention were sufficiently covered in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

21. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said his delegation attached great importance to the implementation of the draft resolution. At a time when the international community was redoubling its efforts to ensure respect for human rights, many nationals of developing countries who were migrant workers were facing a variety of problems. The preparation of a draft convention required the assistance of recognized specialists who were capable of grasping the nuances of the current international situation and of producing a legal instrument which would be different from the existing conventions, including those adopted under the auspices of ILO. The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had referred, dealt with only one very particular aspect of the situation faced by migrant workers. He hoped that the working group would be able to carry out its task in favourable circumstances and would not be adversely affected by a lack of resources.

22. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Third Committee be adopted, no additional appropriation would be necessary. Conference servicing costs of \$198,200 would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement to be submitted towards the end of the session.

23. It was so decided.

Revised estimates under section 28J (Staff training activities) (A/C.5/34/49)

24. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending acceptance of the entire amount requested by the Secretary-General for section 28J, or \$73,000.

25. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$73,000 under section 28J was approved in first reading without a vote.

26. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the additional appropriation had been put to a vote, his delegation would have voted against it. The existing appropriation for section 28J was more than adequate.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.42 concerning agenda item 24 (A/C.5/34/71)

27. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in order to provide the Division for Palestinian Rights, the creation of which was proposed in draft resolution A/34/L.42, with the resources necessary to discharge the increased responsibilities assigned to it by the Assembly, the Secretary-General, in his statement contained in document A/C.5/34/71, proposed that two Professional posts, one D-1 and one P-3, should be authorized for the new Division; in addition, two General Service posts would be required. The Advisory Committee had been informed that one P-5, one P-4 and two P-3 staff were currently available to the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights. The Advisory Committee had recommended approval of the Secretary-General's request for the additional posts.

28. In addition, the Secretary-General had made a number of other requests, which would lead to additional appropriations totalling \$466,300, broken down as follows: \$362,900 under section 1, \$43,500 under section 27, \$57,300 under section 28D and \$2,600 under section 29D (A/C.5/34/71, para. 13). The Advisory Committee believed that the amount of \$57,300 proposed under section 28D should be absorbed within the appropriations already provided under that section. It therefore recommended that, if the draft resolution on the question of Palestine (A/34/L.42) was adopted, an additional appropriation of \$409,000 should be approved, to be distributed as follows: \$362,900 under section 1, \$43,500 under section 27 and \$2,600 under section 29D. In addition, an amount of \$36,200 should be included under section 31 (Staff assessment) to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1.

29. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said he would like to hear the views of the representative of the Secretary-General as to whether the reduction of \$57,300 under section 28D, recommended by the Advisory Committee, would prevent the Secretariat from carrying out the tasks entrusted to it, as described in paragraph 8 of document A/C.5/34/71.

30. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that, in preparing the statement on the financial implications of draft resolution A/34/L.42, the Secretariat had tried to take into account all possibilities. He drew attention to the fact that the first element in the proposed appropriation under section 28D (A/C.5/34/71, para. 13) was for accommodation, in an amount of \$34,800. When new staff members were recruited, they needed somewhere to work. If, however, the staff of the new Division for Palestinian Rights was distributed in different locations, the additional appropriation might not be needed, although it would then be more difficult for the staff to function. The amount requested was fairly small, however, and he was sure that without it the Secretariat would still manage to perform its duties.

31. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that, in light of the information provided by the Director of the Budget Division, his delegation would be willing to accept the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

/...

32. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that the allocation of funds within the budget to the so-called Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and to the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights was a misuse of United Nations resources. Those outfits were being exploited as instruments of political warfare against a Member State, in a manner which flagrantly violated the principles of the United Nations Charter, particularly Article 101. It was evident from document A/C.5/34/71 that the proposed budget allocations to those units were estimated in some quarters to be insufficient to cover the increasingly ambitious schemes of the Arab States and their supporters in that regard. Many delegations from various regions had emphasized the need for maximum restraint on a number of occasions in the course of the deliberations of the Fifth Committee. They had also indicated that the budget must not be inflated by the submission of draft resolutions with undue financial implications. Indeed, the Secretary-General had clearly emphasized in his report on the work of the Organization (A/34/1) that many Member States were increasingly concerned at the drain on financial and personnel resources entailed in the continuing upward spiral of international meetings and related activities. None the less, the documents under discussion ignored both the Secretary-General's concern about the continuing proliferation of activities of marginal usefulness and the general trend manifested in the Fifth Committee. Acceptance of the proposal in document A/C.5/34/71 and others like it would shatter any hope that the Secretary-General's estimate of a real increase of 0.8 per cent in the budget for the biennium would prove realistic.

33. The Arab States, not content with having misused the General Assembly for their political warfare against Israel, had proceeded systematically to subvert every organ and body of the Organization. In the wake of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, they had established a Unit on Palestinian Rights within the Secretariat itself, compromising the Secretariat's integrity and misappropriating international funds. Over the past 12 months, the Unit, under the close guidance of the Palestine Committee, had produced a series of so-called "studies" replete with distortions and falsifications of historical facts. Now delegations were being asked to give their consent to a further enlargement and expansion of the Special Unit into a new division of the Secretariat, requiring increased manpower for new posts and additional functions. And, as though the confines of the Secretariat were too limited, the proposal envisaged numerous trips abroad at the expense of the international taxpayer. It would seem that it was the inalienable right of members of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People to be rewarded with almost unlimited travel facilities, on the most questionable of pretexts.

34. The authors of the proposal before the Committee intended not only to continue to exploit the General Assembly and the Secretariat, but also to infiltrate all the organs and subsidiary bodies of the United Nations, including the regional commissions, and to contaminate them with their propaganda. That would adversely affect those organs' proper functions, especially those related to the problems of development in the third world.

35. The amount currently being requested was only a fraction of the total amount, which was expected to reach over \$2 million, as indicated at the beginning of paragraph 13 of document A/C.5/34/71. The estimated cost of approximately

/...



(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

\$1.5 million for conference servicing facilities far exceeded the amount of \$466,300 which the Fifth Committee was being asked to approve at the present time. The "Palestine Committee" and its work represented only one facet of a network of United Nations special committees, special units, special missions/and groups of experts, created and manipulated to serve the same purpose, all of which were becoming an increasing burden on the international taxpayer.

36. Thus, for example, the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, as well as the Security Council Commission established under resolution 446 (1979), which cost the United Nations considerable sums, to a great extent merely overlapped and duplicated the activities of the "Palestine Committee" and of each other. That was not to mention the cost of different missions, groups of experts, and studies, all on the same subject, which were imposed on the United Nations agencies such as ILO, WHO, HABITAT and others. All those costly activities were designed to support the hostile campaign of a group of countries, some of which were among the world's wealthiest oil-producing States.

37. In his opening statement to the Fifth Committee, the Secretary-General had announced his intention to apply a decisive financial policy of restraint and economy, including a commitment to contain the real growth of the budgetary proposals for the next biennium to as close to zero as possible. The financial implications of the document that was now before the Fifth Committee, and others like it, contradicted and nullified that commitment.

38. In view of the objections he had just outlined, his delegation requested a vote on the financial implications stated in document A/C.5/34/71.

39. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that draft resolution A/34/L.42, on the question of Palestine, reflected the views of a great majority of States Members of the United Nations. His delegation supported the statement on financial implications in document A/C.5/34/71. The representative of the Zionist racist entity was trying to open discussion of the question of Palestine in the Fifth Committee. The United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East were required only because of Israel's aggression and its refusal to accept United Nations resolutions. In order really to save money, the international community should apply compulsory sanctions whenever its resolutions were violated. There must be a real peace, which would guarantee the rights of the Palestinians scattered over several countries and their right to return to their homeland. If the Zionist entity was really interested in peace, it should begin, as a State Member of the United Nations, by implementing the resolutions of the Organization.

40. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that the request to the Secretary-General to upgrade the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights by making it into a Division for Palestinian Rights and to provide it with increased resources, including the funding of regional seminars, would involve expenditure of over \$2 million. As his delegation had stated during the general debate in plenary, the United States was strongly opposed to the activities of the "Palestine Committee" and of the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights. The proposal to convert the Special Unit to a Division was outrageous. The expenditure of precious

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

United Nations funds on one-sided propaganda activities could not be justified, certainly not to those who contributed the most to the budget of the Organization and those who benefited the most from that budget. All delegations should oppose the proposal in draft resolution A/34/L.42. The Special Unit on Palestinian Rights and the "Palestine Committee" had contributed nothing to peace in the Middle East or to a compromise or a peaceful settlement of the conflict in that area. Instead, they had only hardened positions and increased ill will and tension in the world. He urged all Members carefully to study the implications of the proposal for the United Nations and its activities. In the strongest terms, he urged delegations to vote against the proposal in document A/C.5/34/71, which the United States could not and would not support.

41. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) said that, in accordance with his country's long-standing position of support for the rights of the Palestinian people, especially the right to self-determination, his delegation would fully support the proposal in document A/C.5/34/71, as amended by ACABQ.

42. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the proposal to strengthen the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights, was extremely important, and should receive the support of all delegations. Although some delegations, including Israel, had used budgetary excuses in order to question the role which the United Nations must play in the Palestinian question, his delegation felt that the action contemplated was timely and was sure that the Committee would support it.

43. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed his delegation's heartfelt appreciation to the United States representative for the noble sentiments he had expressed regarding the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights and for his concern for the Palestinian people.

44. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.42 be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$409,000 would be required in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981: \$362,900 under section 1, \$43,500 under section 27 and \$2,600 under section 29D. In addition, \$36,200 should be provided under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an equal amount under income section 1.

45. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by 79 votes to 11, with 10 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 107: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued) (A/C.5/34/L.35)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON (continued) (A/34/570, A/34/689; A/C.5/34/L.33 and L.34)

46. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had drawn attention in paragraphs 6 and 7 of its report (A/34/689) to the problems facing the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) in connexion with the withholding of contributions. The Advisory Committee had noted that the Secretary-General's estimate was some

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

\$4.6 million over the estimate for the preceding six-month period, and had requested an explanation of the increase. The Advisory Committee had been informed that \$1.3 million related to the estimated increase in the average strength of the Force by 100 men. It had concluded that there was no room for recommending reductions in respect of specific items of expenditure. Nevertheless, it was to be hoped that the Force would continue to be managed with maximum regard for economy. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended approval of an appropriation of \$64,603,000 gross or \$64,060,000 net, the Secretary-General being permitted the flexibility to distribute the reduction as he deemed appropriate.

47. He drew attention to paragraph 15 of the Advisory Committee's report concerning the financial administration of UNIFIL.

48. Mr. KEATING (Ireland) said that the peace-keeping responsibilities of the United Nations were fundamental to the effective implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and concretely demonstrated the will of the world community to maintain international peace and security. His country had always valued the United Nations peace-keeping role, and had contributed troops to almost every peace-keeping operation since it had joined the United Nations. There were currently five peace-keeping operations involving over 10,000 troops, police and observers drawn from 25 Member States. Much planning and effort had recently been devoted to a possible sixth operation in Namibia.

49. In his report on the work of the Organization (A/34/1), the Secretary-General had drawn attention to the problem of financing peace-keeping operations because of the declared policy of some Member States not to contribute their assessed share. That policy was not consistent with the obligations of Member States under the Charter and could undermine the principle of equitable geographical representation in the composition of United Nations peace-keeping forces, because it placed a particularly heavy burden on developing troop-contributing countries.

50. Introducing draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33, he said that under section A it would appropriate to the UNIFIL Special Account a gross amount of \$112,938,000, which had already been authorized and apportioned by earlier General Assembly resolutions. It would further authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for UNIFIL at a rate not to exceed \$10,767,166 gross per month for the period from 19 December 1979 to 18 December 1980, should the Security Council decide to renew UNIFIL's current mandate. That sum would be apportioned among Member States according to the special scale of assessments.

51. Section B proposed a technical change in existing financial regulations 4.3 and 4.4, the purpose of which was to give the Governments of troop-contributing States a more realistic time-frame within which to submit claims to the United Nations. The section was generally based on General Assembly resolution 33/13 F.

52. Section C appealed for voluntary contributions in line with earlier resolutions on the financing of UNIFIL. Referring to paragraph 7 of the Secretary-General's report (A/34/570), he said that the financial burden caused by the policy of withholding by certain Member States fell particularly heavily on the developing troop-contributing countries. Therefore, the final preambular paragraph

/...

(Mr. Keating, Ireland)

of section C pointed out that the continuation of the present situation might militate against the important principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of peace-keeping forces. Section C would establish a UNIFIL Suspense Account separate from the UNIFIL Special Account, for which the Secretary-General would issue a biannual appeal for voluntary contributions. Those contributions would be used solely to reimburse the Governments of troop-contributing States, and the money contributed would be considered as cash advances, to be returned to the donor States when a sufficient number of assessed contributions to the regular UNIFIL Special Account had been received. The proposed UNIFIL Suspense Account would allow a number of Member States to make voluntary contributions without violating their positions of principle; it did not, however, conceal the policy of withholding practised by certain Member States. The UNIFIL Suspense Account might also help to mitigate the serious effects of the policy of withholding and to share more equitably the financial burden of UNIFIL.

53. Introducing draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.34, he said that, as pointed out in document A/34/689, paragraph 7, the UNIFIL Special Account had a surplus balance of income over expenditure amounting to approximately \$122,492. Due to the policy of withholding practised by some Member States, the "income" figure was overstated by 26 per cent. In fact, the surplus was only theoretical and had already been used to meet the expenses of the Force. The purpose of the draft resolution was to suspend temporarily the provisions of financial regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4, and to hold that theoretical surplus in suspense, pending a further decision by the General Assembly. Should the General Assembly not take that action, the theoretical surplus would be used as a credit to reduce the assessments of Member States - including those which were withholding their assessed contributions.

54. Introducing draft resolution A/C/34/L.35, he said that, in the English text, the first word in the final line of the second preambular paragraph should read "therefor". The resolution requested the Secretary-General to study the existing standard rates of reimbursement for UNEF, UNDOF and UNIFIL and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

55. Mr. HAMMOUD (Lebanon) said that peace-keeping was a collective responsibility and one of the main purposes for which the United Nations had been established. All States, without exception, were called upon to co-operate for the establishment and consolidation of peace. Condemnation of aggression was not in itself enough.

56. The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon was carrying out a tremendous task, entrusted to it by the Security Council, namely, the restoration of peace and stability in southern Lebanon. The implementation of that task strengthened the confidence of peoples, particularly the peoples of small countries, in the United Nations and their respect for the Organization. The report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization (A/34/1) made clear the importance of the role being played by UNIFIL in helping to establish peace not only in Lebanon but throughout the Middle East, and he cited in that connexion the Secretary-General's comments on the subject in part IV of that document.

/...

(Mr. Hammoud, Lebanon)

57. He stressed that UNIFIL was working in extremely difficult circumstances and exposed to a variety of dangers and unquestionably merited the necessary material support from all for the implementation of its task. Any failure to provide such material support would weaken the morale of UNIFIL and hinder it in the implementation of its task.

58. It was the duty of the international community as a whole to express its gratitude to those States which had sent their troops to Lebanon in the cause of peace. Cash was cheap when compared with human lives. Furthermore, the funding required for UNIFIL was insignificant in comparison with the amounts spent daily by States throughout the world for the purpose of armament. If the international community wanted peace, it should pay the price for it while that price was still low and before it reached overwhelming proportions. Either there was peace or there was not peace; there was no in-between state.

59. His delegation expressed its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his unremitting efforts and to those States which had sent troops to join UNIFIL. It commended also the Commander, officers and men of the Force for their contribution to the restoration of peace, security and stability to southern Lebanon. They were a living embodiment of the spirit of the Charter and were sacrificing that which was most dear to them, namely their lives, in order that justice and peace might prevail in troubled Lebanon, which was suffering the nightmare of terror and war.

60. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government had continuously support the United Nations peace-keeping efforts, both politically and financially. It was grateful to the troop-contributing countries and would therefore support the three draft resolutions under consideration. His delegation had some reservations, however, regarding the Suspense Account that was to be established. Although the draft resolutions clearly expressed regret at the policy of withholding assessed funds pursued by some Member States and were fully in line with the principle that peace-keeping efforts should continue to be financed by assessments, his delegation did not agree that funds in the Suspense Account should be used to finance the deficit created by withholding. Its positive votes should be understood in that light.

61. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the situation in Lebanon was truly disturbing and not in accord with the United Nations principle of peaceful coexistence among States. When the people of a country like Lebanon, which had always played a vital role in culture and religion, were subjected to suffering and territorial violation, the international community must make every possible effort to assist them. His delegation expressed its sympathy with the statement made by the representative of Lebanon, and felt that the international community must make every effort to provide assistance to Lebanon and strengthen the foundations of peace there. If such action was not taken, the situation would deteriorate. Any outbreak of violence that occurred would reverberate beyond the territory of southern Lebanon to threaten world peace. His delegation therefore was grateful to the troop-contributing countries and to the troops serving in Lebanon which, as the representative of Lebanon had said, were risking their most precious possession - their lives.

/...

(Mr. Lahlou, Morocco)

62. His delegation would support the draft resolutions under consideration and reiterated its respect for the ancient and worthy civilization created in Lebanon by its people.

63. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation supported the draft resolutions under consideration. Its support for draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33, however, in no way altered its basic position that the financing of peace-keeping operations should be based on universal assessments, and that withholding was contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

64. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that peace-keeping operations were an activity of the United Nations which was directly in line with the Charter and the hopes based on it. A number of peace-keeping operations had been organized in various parts of the world throughout the years, with a view to preventing hostilities. United Nations peace-keeping operations could not be a substitute for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and were merely temporary. In some parts of the world, however, peace-keeping operations had acquired apparent permanency mainly because some parties preferred confrontation to negotiation. His country was prepared to co-operate and facilitate the effective functioning of United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Middle East, as it had in the past. It wished to express appreciation to the officers and men of UNIFIL, and especially to Lieutenant-General Siilasvuo, Chief Co-ordinator of the United Nations Peace-keeping Missions in the Middle East. It supported the continued operation of UNIFIL, and hoped that the Committee would approve the allocation requested for it.

65. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly believed in the importance of ensuring adequate financing for United Nations peace-keeping operations, including UNIFIL. It was distressed at the large amount of apparently uncollectable assessed contributions. The troop-contributing countries, which pragmatically demonstrated their attachment to peace and the principles of the Charter, were suffering increasingly for supporting those principles because of the policy pursued by certain countries of withholding payment of the assessments which all should share. His delegation joined in the call to nations in arrears on their payments to reassess their positions and clear their debts to that important peace-keeping effort promptly, as practical evidence of their commitment to peace. His delegation fully supported the draft resolutions under consideration.

66. Mrs. SANDIFER (Portugal) said that her Government had always strongly supported United Nations peace-keeping activities in the Middle East, because it firmly believed that the maintenance of peace in the area was the collective responsibility of all States. It had supported the relevant resolutions and contributed fully to the Special Accounts established for UNEF, UNDOF and UNIFIL.

67. Her delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33, and sincerely hoped that the Force's financial situation would improve. It also hoped that Member States in a position to do so would contribute to the Suspense Account to be established under part C of that draft resolution, so as to alleviate the current situation and facilitate the proper reimbursement of the troop-contributing countries.

/...

68. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had not altered its position on the financing of the peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. It would vote against any resolution involving the international community in financing those forces, the costs of which should be borne entirely by the Zionist and racist aggressor.

69. Mr. AL-TAKRITI (Iraq) said that, although his delegation supported United Nations peace-keeping activities in general and had made voluntary contributions to them, it believed that the United Nations Force in Lebanon would never achieve its goal; the aggression in that area continued, despite its actions. In fact, as long as the area continued to be occupied, the presence of a United Nations peace-keeping force there amounted to tacit recognition of the legitimacy of that aggression. The United Nations resolutions on the subject never referred specifically to the occupation, and placed the victims of aggression on the same footing as the aggressors. His delegation would not support the draft resolutions under consideration because it felt that only the aggressor, and not the international community, should bear the responsibility for its aggressive actions.

70. Mr. WANG Chengwei (China) said that his delegation had clearly stated its position of principle with regard to UNIFIL in the Security Council. His delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33 and would not assume any financial obligation with regard to UNIFIL. Furthermore, his delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.5/34/L.34 and L.35.

71. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation supported the three draft resolutions before the Committee, but wished to place on record its understanding that the operative paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.35 did not preclude consultation with Member States other than those contributing troops to UNDOF and UNIFIL.

72. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country maintained its previously stated position with regard to the question of UNIFIL, and for that reason would not participate in the votes on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.5/34/L.33, L.34 and L.35.

73. The CHAIRMAN announced the beginning of voting on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33. Under rule 128 of the rules of procedure, representatives could speak only in explanation of vote before the vote.

74. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, in keeping with its position of principle on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon. He wished to reaffirm his Government's position that all expenditure arising from efforts to eliminate the consequences of the armed aggression of Israel against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor. His Government had not participated in financing the establishment and operation of UNIFIL, nor would it contribute to such expenditure in future.

/...

(Mr. Vislykh. USSR)

75. If it adopted the draft resolution, the Fifth Committee would be approving expenditure for UNIFIL for the period after December 1979, despite the fact that the Security Council had not yet extended the mandate of the Force. His delegation could not endorse such a practice. However, in view of the limited time left to the Fifth Committee to complete its work, his delegation would not stand in the way of its adopting draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33, on the understanding that such action did not set a precedent for the future.

76. Mr. RICHTER (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation firmly believed that expenses for UNIFIL should be financed by the aggressor alone. His Government had not contributed towards UNIFIL expenditure in the past and it would not do so in the future.

77. Mr. MINCHEV (Bulgaria) said that, consistent with his delegation's long-standing position, he would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33. His Government would not participate in the financing of UNIFIL.

78. Mr. GUBCSI (Hungary) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, in keeping with its position of principle on the issue. It had not contributed towards financing UNIFIL and it would not do so in the future.

79. Mr. MAKOSSO (Congo) said that his delegation would not participate in the vote or in the financing of UNIFIL.

80. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Democratic Yemen, Mauritania.

81. Draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.33 was adopted by 85 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions.

/...



82. Mr. AGOSSOU (Benin), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had not participated in the vote because of its position of principle on the question. It would not contribute towards the financing of UNIFIL.

83. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because of its position of principle with regard to the financing of that particular peace-keeping operation.

84. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.34.

85. Draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.34 was adopted by 85 votes to 13, with 3 abstentions.

86. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.35.

87. Draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.35 was adopted by 86 votes to 12, with 3 abstentions.

88. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.35 because it believed that the existing standard rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing States were already excessive and that any increase would be inappropriate and unwarranted.

89. Mr. TOUGOU (Mongolia) said his delegation had voted against the three draft resolutions because of its position of principle with regard to the financing of UNIFIL. The entire cost of UNIFIL should be borne by the aggressor. His Government would not assume any obligation in that connexion.

90. Mr. MORET (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted against the three draft resolutions. His delegation's position was based on the principle that the aggressor should bear the expense of peace-keeping operations in the Middle East.

91. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that, had he been present during the voting on the draft resolutions, he would have voted in favour of all three.

92. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of members to paragraph 15 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/34/689), in which the Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's proposal for continuation of the Special Account for UNIFIL for future periods of UNIFIL's mandate. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee approved the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

93. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 101: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT  
(continued)

Medium-term planning in the United Nations (A/C.5/34/L.38)

94. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.38 and said that the following countries should be added to the list of sponsors: Argentina, Austria, Japan, United Kingdom, Zaire.

95. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.38 by consensus.

96. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.