

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records\*

UN LIBRARY

MAR 19 1979



UN/SA COLLECTION

FIFTH COMMITTEE

75th meeting

held on

Monday, 10 December 1979

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 75th 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 resolutions contained in documents A/34/L.45 to 49 and L.50/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 27

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee in documents A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, L.19/Rev.1, L.20/Rev.1, L.21, L.30, L.34, L.36, L.39/Rev.1 and L.40 concerning agenda items 35, 41, 42, 45 and 121

\* 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.75  
14 December 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

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 resolutions contained in documents A/34/L.45 to 49 and L.50/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 27 (A/C.5/34/82)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to paragraphs 44 and 45 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/34/82) in which estimated expenditure under the various draft resolutions before the Committee was set at \$1,775,778. Of that sum, \$810,700 had already been included in the programme budget proposals under sections 3.C.1, 3.C.2 and 27. A further amount of \$116,478 under section 29 related to full conference servicing costs; actual costs would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference servicing costs to be submitted near the end of the session.
2. The remaining sum of \$648,000 required under section 3.C.1 comprised \$500,000 as an allocation to the United Nations Fund for Namibia, called for in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.49; \$100,000 as an allocation in connexion with the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia in accordance with draft resolution A/34/L.50/Rev.1, paragraph 8; \$31,100 for the maintenance of the SWAPO office in New York; and \$16,900 for additional requirements under other items. The additional sum required to maintain the SWAPO office included an amount of \$15,100 to cover inflation during 1980, since the other items had been costed at 1979 rates. Other elements of the increase related to additional provision for salaries, travel and rent.
3. The Advisory Committee believed there was no need for the General Assembly to appropriate the \$16,900 requested for additional requirements, since the Council's work programme had not yet been finalized. In that context he pointed out that during 1979, only four missions had been undertaken out of the nine planned by the Council; six were planned for 1980. Similarly, of the 50 contacts planned with information media and non-governmental organizations, only 25 had taken place; for 1980, 25 were planned.
4. The Advisory Committee trusted that the long-standing practice of including two Secretariat members in the representation of Namibia in international conferences would be kept under review so that the degree of support was consistent with actual requirements. It also trusted that efforts would continue to obtain a waiver of the Council's membership dues for its participation in FAO and ILO. Such a waiver had already been granted by UNESCO.
5. ACABQ recommended that the Fifth Committee inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolutions contained in documents A/34/L.45, L.46, L.47, L.48, L.49 and L.50/Rev.1, an additional appropriation of \$631,100 would be required under section 3.C of the 1980-1981 programme budget. Requirements for conference services under section 29 would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement on conference servicing costs to be submitted towards the close of the session.

6. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) asked whether the Council for Namibia had any specific proposals for spending the \$100,000 to be provided for the International Year of Solidarity in accordance with operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/34/L.50/Rev.1, and asked further whether the allocation of \$500,000 to the United Nations Fund for Namibia under operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.49 would indeed be a "temporary measure", as stated in paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/34/82), or would in fact be an outright grant.

7. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Council for Namibia had not yet established its work programme, so that he could not provide further details of how the amount requested in connexion with the International Year of Solidarity would be used.

8. The word "temporary" used of the grant to the United Nations Fund for Namibia was taken from operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/34/L.49. The Secretariat could not be sure what the General Assembly intended: however, the Secretariat's omission of a corresponding amount of \$500,000 from the income sections of the budget indicated that it did not assume that the money would be repaid, at least during the forthcoming biennium.

9. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) expressed support for the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

10. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) called for a vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

11. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (para. 5 above) was approved by 80 votes to 6.

12. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States and the United Kingdom, said that those delegations had voted against the recommendation of ACABQ because they believed it would be wrong for the General Assembly to approve funds that were not for precisely defined and clearly explained activities. They did not believe that the Assembly should give money, in the form of an outright and unconditional grant, to a fund which ought to be financed solely by voluntary contributions and over which it exercised no direct control. Finally, they had doubts concerning the financing of any outside organization, however worthy, from the regular budget of the United Nations.

13. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados), Mr. MBAZDA (Central African Republic), Mr. BIBA (Gabon) and Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) stated that they had been absent when the vote was taken; had they been present, they would all have voted in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee in documents A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, L.19/Rev.1, L.20/Rev.1, L.21, L.30, L.34, L.36, L.39/Rev.1 and L.40 concerning agenda items 35, 41, 42, 45 and 121 (A/34/7/Add.15; A/C.5/34/58 to 65 and 69)

14. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of the Advisory Committee (A/34/7/Add.15), said that the Secretary-General estimated substantive requirements under the various draft resolutions at a total of \$926,900 under section 2.B of the proposed programme budget. The Secretary-General also estimated conference servicing costs, on a full-cost basis, at \$3,778,500, of which \$2,629,400 related to 1980 and \$1,149,100 to 1981.

15. As indicated in paragraphs 6 and 7 of its report, the Advisory Committee recommended a reduction of \$792,000 in conference servicing costs relating to the Committee on Disarmament, since some of the expenditure proposed by the Secretary-General in his report was not in accordance with the directives given by the General Assembly in resolution 2836 (XVI), which the Advisory Committee assumed to take precedence over the rules of procedure of any subsidiary body.

The Advisory Committee had also made recommendations in paragraphs 5, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 17 of its report, the effect of which would be to reduce the amount of \$926,900 requested by the Secretary-General for substantive activities by \$169,000, leaving a total requirement for substantive support of \$757,900.

16. In view of the recommendation in paragraph 7 of its report, the Advisory Committee considered that conference servicing costs in 1980 arising out of the various draft resolutions should not exceed \$1,939,400; the costs for 1981, which should not exceed \$1,047,100, would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement on conference servicing costs to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

17. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of members to paragraphs 18 and 19 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/34/7/Add.15).

18. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation was grateful to ACABQ for having acted with great dispatch on the requests of the Secretary-General, although it would have preferred to have had more time to examine the implications of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He noted that in the statement of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/34/63, three research assistants at the P-4 level and one General Service post had been requested for the study on the relationship between disarmament and development and that the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction of one P-4 post for 20 months and one General Service post for 10 months. Before his delegation could take a decision on the recommended reductions, it would like to have some information from the Secretariat department concerned regarding the consequences of the reduction in terms of the ability of the Secretariat to carry out its work in connexion with the study.

19. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) said that, as the Spanish version of document A/34/7/Add.15 had been circulated only a few minutes earlier, his delegation had not been able to study it properly; nevertheless, in order to expedite the Committee's work, it would refrain from requesting more time for the perusal of that document.

20. He now wished to refer specifically to paragraph 12 of document A/34/7/Add.15 on the administrative and financial implications of the draft decision concerning the study on a comprehensive nuclear test ban contained in document A/C.1/34/L.40. The draft decision in question had been sponsored by his delegation, in the light of a recommendation by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies, a body consisting of 28 highly qualified experts. The conclusion of an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban was an essential step towards halting the nuclear arms race. Before recommending the study, the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies had carefully followed certain criteria, such as the urgency and timeliness of the study, the need to avoid duplication, the availability of financial resources, and whether the subject of the study could effectively be dealt with under United Nations auspices. It was important to note that the study on a comprehensive nuclear test ban was the only one that had been recommended by the Advisory Board. His delegation was therefore very concerned about the extremely stringent ACABQ recommendation for a reduction of \$25,000 out of a total estimated cost of \$51,000.

21. Accordingly, his delegation would appreciate it if an official of the Centre for Disarmament would inform the Fifth Committee whether, in the judgement of the Centre, the remaining amount of \$26,000 would be sufficient to allow for completion of the study in compliance with the decision taken by the First Committee, as a matter of the highest priority. After hearing the reply of the Secretariat, his delegation would be able to make a specific proposal.

22. Mr. SWEGER (Sweden) said that his delegation shared the concern of the delegation of Pakistan at the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning the study on the relationship between disarmament and development. Before a decision was taken, he would like to hear the comments of the Secretariat concerning the extent to which the recommended reduction would impair ability to carry out the study.

23. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) said that at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly the Egyptian delegation had sponsored a proposal designed to strengthen the Centre for Disarmament. His delegation had taken that position because it had felt that, in the wake of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, and bearing in mind the large volume of work generated by that session, the strengthening of the Centre for Disarmament was justifiable. However, in reading through the various statements of financial implications of draft resolutions and decisions on disarmament questions, he noted that the Centre for Disarmament was recommending what seemed to him to be a very liberal use of consultants for a study commissioned by the General Assembly. Though not against the use of consultants when necessary, his delegation would welcome some clarification from a representative of the substantive department in the Secretariat as to why the Centre for Disarmament, even though it had recently been strengthened, was unable

(Mr. Ramzy, Egypt)

to discharge the various duties assigned to it as a result of the General Assembly's resolutions and decisions.

24. Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that his delegation shared the concern of others regarding the recommended reduction in the estimate for the study on the relationship between disarmament and development.

25. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the Committee was being obliged to work under difficult conditions, which prevented it from adequately studying the documents on which it was supposed to take decisions. Accordingly, he suggested that the Chairman should consider scheduling fewer meetings even if they had to be longer ones, in order to allow delegations to have the minimum time necessary to study the financial implications of draft resolutions and related recommendations.

26. His delegation agreed with the delegation of Sweden and others who had expressed concern regarding the reduction recommended in connexion with the study on the relationship between disarmament and development. Without a specific undertaking on the part of the Secretariat as to its ability to carry out the study satisfactorily, his delegation would have to propose a vote on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

27. Mr. MÄRTENSON (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament) said that the study on the relationship between disarmament and development was a major undertaking in which many Member States had a special interest. It was worth pointing out that some \$600,000 in voluntary funds had been contributed to the international disarmament fund for development and that 21 other related research projects had been commissioned and financed by Governments. Those preparing the study on the relationship between disarmament and development would have to condense the results of a total of 45 original research studies, amounting to approximately 5,000 pages. The temporary assistance requested was for very specific purposes, including research in the three main areas of the study.

28. He could understand the views of the Egyptian representative regarding the resources available to the Centre for Disarmament, but he had to stress that during 1980 the Centre for Disarmament would be faced with the heaviest workload it had ever had. During the current session, the General Assembly had adopted 39 resolutions and one decision that would create work for the Centre. The Centre would be involved in more than 40 major conferences in 1980 and six major study groups would be carried over from 1979; in addition, five new expert groups had been created. The Centre for Disarmament would also be extending its contacts with non-governmental organizations and with peace research centres and similar institutions. No requests for established posts had been submitted, since the Centre believed that it should not increase its permanent staff; however, it did require some temporary assistance.

29. With regard to the comprehensive nuclear test ban study, he said that the Secretariat would require four consultants in that highly technical area, because work on the study must begin in January if it was to be completed in time for

/...

(Mr. Mårtenson)

the 1980 spring session of the Committee on Disarmament. Referring to the terms of reference for the study, he stressed that it would be a very voluminous and thorough piece of research.

30. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) thanked the Assistant Secretary-General for his statement. It was his understanding that there was a deadline for the study requested by the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies and that the study could not be ready in time unless the Centre for Disarmament was granted the necessary resources to enable it promptly to recruit the temporary assistance requested. His delegation therefore proposed that the Secretary-General's estimates in documents A/C.5/34/62 and 63 should be reinstated. In other words, the amounts of \$26,000 and \$167,700 recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 18 of document A/34/7/Add.15 should be replaced by \$51,000 and \$258,500, respectively.

31. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Fifth Committee and ACABQ found themselves in a difficult situation as the end of the session approached. It was difficult to tell who was to be blamed for the delays which had made it necessary for the Fifth Committee to deal with so many questions at the last minute. Although the Fifth Committee itself was partly at fault, there was no doubt that the other Committees and the Secretariat were also responsible. Nevertheless, at the present stage there was no point in determining who was to blame; rather, the Committee must simply try to cope during the few days remaining to it.

32. The documents that the Fifth Committee was now considering all dealt with very important questions, to which his delegation attached the highest importance. He was certain that the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee in document A/34/7/Add.15 in no way indicated that the members of the Advisory Committee underestimated the significance of disarmament questions. At the same time, the Advisory Committee had, as was its duty, showed concern for the rational expenditure of funds for the various types of studies that had been proposed, the number of which was increasing year by year. It seemed to him that the Advisory Committee had taken into account the fact that, in accordance with the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the Centre for Disarmament had been strengthened and that the Centre should therefore be able to carry out much of the work to be done in connexion with the studies without detriment to their quality. He appealed to all delegations to understand the recommendations of the Advisory Committee in the spirit in which they had been made and not try to go against the judgement of the Advisory Committee. Considering the total amount provided for in the budget of the Centre for Disarmament, he was sure that the Secretary-General could find \$25,000 for the study on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, to which the Mexican representative had referred.

33. Mr. RASOELISOLOFOMANANA (Madagascar) said that, while his delegation appreciated the efforts of the Advisory Committee, it could not support the reductions recommended in document A/34/7/Add.15 in respect of the work of the Centre for Disarmament, and would therefore support the Mexican proposal which would ensure that the Centre had sufficient funds to carry out its activities.

/...

34. Mr. SWEGER (Sweden) said that, having heard the comments of the Assistant Secretary-General, his delegation was even more convinced of the importance of making the necessary resources available to the Centre to enable it to meet the demands of its heavy workload and especially of the important studies on a comprehensive nuclear test ban and on the relationship between disarmament and development. Considerable resources had already been invested in the latter, and his delegation felt that it would be highly detrimental to the completion of the study if funds were to be reduced at the present stage.

35. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that the Assistant Secretary-General's replies confirmed his delegation's view that the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee, particularly as they concerned the study on the relationship between disarmament and development, would have an adverse effect. His delegation had already expressed its support for the studies in the course of the deliberations of the First Committee and had nominated government experts to take part in the work. While in normal circumstances, his delegation was reluctant not to bow to the superior technical wisdom of the Advisory Committee, there were certain policy issues on which it would prefer to err on the side of liberality in order not to damage work of great importance to the Organization, such as that of the Centre for Disarmament. It would therefore support the Mexican proposal.

36. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) expressed the support of his delegation for the Mexican proposal and for the extremely important activities of the Centre for Disarmament. He said that his delegation also attached great value to the composition of the Centre and hoped that its staff would be made more broadly representative.

37. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Mr. KRYEZIU (Yugoslavia), Mr. JALIL (Ecuador), and Mrs. DIAZ DE PORTILLO (Venezuela) expressed the support of their respective delegations for the Mexican proposal.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Mexican proposal to reinstate the amounts estimated by the Secretary-General in respect of draft decision A/C.1/34/L.40 (\$51,000) and draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.34 (\$258,500).

39. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on the Mexican proposal.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

/...



Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan.

40. The Mexican proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 12, with 8 abstentions.

41. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) requested a separate vote on the appropriation required should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution concerning agenda item 121 submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1.

42. In explanation of vote before the vote, he said that his delegation was totally opposed to any appropriation for the study on so-called Israeli nuclear armament. Together with the estimated costs for conference servicing of \$101,900, the Organization was being asked to spend more than a quarter of a million dollars and, once again, the Secretariat and the specialized agencies would see their effectiveness greatly impaired as a result of politicization, and would have to waste time and money complying with anti-Israel resolutions adopted by the General Assembly thanks to the automatic majority that the Arab States could command. The Centre for Disarmament, though a new body, had already proved to be an effective instrument for the dissemination of objective information on the dangers of the arms race, but it was being asked to divert its efforts from objective studies to serve the political, partisan activities of certain Arab States. Arab petrodollars would ensure that articles appeared in the press around the world and those conducting the study would have to analyse that so-called "proof" of Israeli activities, to the detriment of their other work.

43. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) explained that his delegation would vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommended appropriation should the General Assembly decide to adopt the draft resolution in question. Given the situation in the Middle East and the threat posed to international peace and security, the proposed study was extremely important. The international community was well aware of the activities of Israel and its collaboration with South Africa for the purposes of obtaining nuclear weapons. Since prevention was better than cure, the study would help in providing objective information on the situation. As for the use of petrodollars, everyone was aware of the fact that the oil-producing Arab countries were using the revenue for their own economic and social development and to assist fraternal developing countries. It was virtually the whole of the international community, not the Arab countries alone, that were calling for the study to be undertaken. Recent events had confirmed the Israeli Government's intransigent attitude towards a just peace; Israel had to realize that the international community was turning its back on it and that it would soon be outlawed by the community of nations.

44. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation approved the estimate for the study and accordingly would cast an affirmative vote. He endorsed the views expressed by the representative of Tunisia and wondered why the Zionist racist entity was so concerned about the proposed study, which was merely intended to reveal the facts.

/...

45. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would be in favour of an appropriation of \$160,000 should the General Assembly decide to adopt the draft resolution in question. Members of the Committee should pay no attention whatsoever to the statement made by the representative of Israel. It was a well-known fact that Israel owed its existence to resort to force and wished to acquire every possible means of destruction, including nuclear weapons, in order to guarantee its presence in the region. The study would undoubtedly prove that it already possessed such weapons.

46. Mr. AL-TAKRITI (Iraq) said that the study called for in draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 was of vital importance to a major function of the United Nations, namely the maintenance of international peace and security. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by Israel could not fail to complicate the already unstable situation in the Middle East resulting from the Zionist entity's acts of aggression against neighbouring States, and its occupation of Palestine and of parts of three other States, in total disregard for numerous United Nations resolutions. In that it was assisted by international imperialism, headed by the United States of America, which had provided every kind of support. The Zionist entity currently possessed the capacity to produce three nuclear bombs every two years and, since it had not ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty, its nuclear facilities, like its collaboration with the South African racist régime in the nuclear field, were not subject to any monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency. It had consistently claimed that it would never be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the region, yet it had done that very thing thanks to the United States Sixth Fleet.

47. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 had been adopted in the First Committee by a majority of 90, and he appealed to representatives to support the appropriations necessary to implement it, as a contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security and a condemnation of aggression, thereby sparing the Middle East region from a war of total destruction. The representative of Israel had falsely alleged that the draft resolution was political in nature and had been adopted thanks to the Arab majority. The fact was that Israeli possession of nuclear weapons was part and parcel of the disarmament issue and a matter of concern to the whole international community.

48. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, an additional appropriation of \$160,000 would be required under section 2.B of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.

49. At the request of the representative of Tunisia, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia,

/...

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

50. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by 81 votes to 8, with 21 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1, A/C.1/34/L.19/Rev.1, A/C.1/34/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.1/34/L.21, A/C.1/34/L.30, A/C.1/34/L.34, A/C.1/34/L.36, A/C.1/34/L.39/Rev.1 and A/C.1/34/L.40 an additional appropriation of \$873,700 would be required under section 2.B of the proposed programme budget and that related conference servicing costs of \$1,939,400 would be reflected in the consolidated paper on conference servicing costs to be submitted at the current session.

52. It was so decided.

53. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had not objected to the Chairman's suggestion that the financial implications of the draft resolutions on disarmament be approved without a vote. If the matter had been put to the vote, however, his delegation would have abstained. While some of the activities called for in the draft resolutions would find favour with his delegation, there were others which it could not support. His delegation was, moreover, concerned over two very serious developments affecting the work of the Fifth Committee. The first was the casual approach which some delegations were taking in seeking to reverse recommendations of the Advisory Committee, perhaps in response to prodding from the Secretariat. His delegation did not minimize the importance which some delegations attached to special subjects, but all delegations had a serious responsibility to avoid being led by special interests in the Secretariat. Given the size of the total amount budgeted for disarmament activities, his delegation could not believe that the minor reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee would make much of a difference. The second matter of concern to his delegation was the hasty manner in which the Committee was being forced to consider items, which was not conducive to sound decision-making. It was not proper, moreover, to require the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to introduce the report of that body prior to its distribution to members.

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

54. The Administrative Management Service should be asked to carry out the study called for under draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.30. His delegation believed that a greater number of disarmament activities could be financed from the amount already requested by the Secretary-General. It reserved its position on the level of the budget for the biennium 1980-1981 as a whole.

55. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) said that, in keeping with its belief that the maintenance of international peace and security was the *raison d'être* of the United Nations, his delegation had supported the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee in its report (A/34/7/Add.15). It was, however, nonplussed by the multiplicity of studies requested in the various draft resolutions, and the attendant costs, especially the \$36,000 for the travel and subsistence of experts and the consultant's fees in connexion with a study on the nuclear capability of South Africa. His delegation had doubts as to the usefulness of using the limited resources of the Organization to finance such a study, especially since ample evidence already existed of the steps taken by South Africa towards becoming a nuclear Power. Moreover, given South Africa's demonstrated intransigence, it was doubtful whether such a study would lead to practical results.

56. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation regretted that some delegations had preferred to put the Secretary-General's estimates, rather than the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, to the vote. As his delegation had stated on numerous occasions, the Advisory Committee was a most important subsidiary body and was in the best position to study financial matters objectively and recommend the appropriate course of action. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee had already been overturned by the Fifth Committee more than once at the current session, and that was deplorable. His delegation would have liked whole-heartedly to support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. However, in view of the fact that those well-founded recommendations were to be overturned, his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the Mexican proposal.

57. He wished to draw attention to a serious situation in which members of the Secretariat took it upon themselves to lobby delegations in order to ensure that reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee were not accepted by the Fifth Committee. The Secretariat must strictly abide by the Staff Rules, and must refrain from putting any pressure whatsoever on delegations or from stating their dissatisfaction with decisions of Main Committees or the Advisory Committee.

58. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation had stated his position on the substance of draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.12/Rev.1 in the First Committee. The allegations made by some delegations at the current meeting demonstrated their Governments' pathological obsession with Israel. The representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Iraq had not hesitated to use obscene language in referring to his country and people. Those two States refused to reconcile themselves to the inalienable rights of the Jewish people, including their right to an independent sovereign State. Their attitude was indicative of the policy of some Arab States towards the minorities in their midst, which left no room for non-Arab or non-Moslem States in the region. It was for that reason that Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic could not

/...

(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

tolerate the right of Israel to exist and suppressed the rights of all ethnic, national and religious minorities within their territory. Instead of displaying his talent in the use of obscene language, the Syrian representative would have done better to explain his country's shameful role in the invasion and occupation of Lebanon. The occupation of that country was designed to realize the long-standing Syrian objective of incorporating Lebanon into a "Greater Syria". As long as his country continued to intervene in the affairs of Lebanon, the Syrian representative was scarcely qualified to raise his voice in a discussion of disarmament. Similarly, the Iraqi representative would have done better to explain his country's action in crushing the Kurdish minority. Iraq had a notoriously ugly record with regard to its own minorities and activities in the Middle East. It had persistently refused to recognize Israel's right to exist, and for three decades had been totally hostile to Israel. Since the beginning of the current peace process, Iraq had taken the lead among the rejectionist Arab States. As the biggest importer of military hardware in the third world, Iraq had disqualified itself from having any voice in disarmament affairs.

59. Mr. DAHER (Jordan), exercising his delegation's right of reply, said that Israel's feelings of guilt had made it impossible for it to vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. The conduct of armed bands in occupied Palestine was notorious, and he challenged the Government of Israel to assert that its policies since joining the United Nations had been consistent with the views of the other Member States. Ironically, Israel continued to oppose the right of peoples to self-determination.

60. The representative of Israel had sought to intimidate members by stating that the Committee was being asked to approve an estimate of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. It should be recalled, however, that Israel's nuclear weapons cost far more than the amount requested for the proposed study.

61. The Israeli representative had also shed crocodile tears over Lebanon and the presence of Syrian troops in that country. However, there were other forums for the discussion of such matters. The Fifth Committee dealt with technical matters only.

62. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, observed that it had been intimated that some delegations took lightly their participation in the Committee's work. In addition, doubt had been cast on the integrity of some delegations by the allegation that Secretariat officials had undermined the good judgement which all members had a duty to exercise. His delegation categorically rejected such assertions. Mexico had consistently demonstrated a constructive spirit in all its statements in the United Nations from its very inception, and could not tolerate any suggestion calling into question the seriousness and integrity of its participation in the Organization.

63. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representatives of the Zionist racist entity had attacked his country, repeating the myths and fabrications which it spread about in other forums. The Syrian Arab Republic was a Moslem country which believed firmly in religious liberty for the adherents of all faiths. The Koran taught respect for

/...

(Mr. Hamzah, Syrian Arab Republic)

all revealed religions and made no distinctions between Moslems, Christians and Jews. In Israel, however, there was not a single Cabinet minister who was not Jewish. Israel maintained that the Jews were the élite of mankind.

64. The Syrian presence in Lebanon was in accordance with decisions taken by the Arab States and in response to the wishes of the legitimate Government of Lebanon. The Syrian Arab Republic and Lebanon were both Arab countries, and Israel had no right to interfere in their bilateral affairs.

65. The representative of Israel had shed crocodile tears over condemnations of the Zionist entity. However, the Syrian delegation was not alone in condemning the racist entity: virtually the entire international community had done so, and, indeed, there was hardly a single resolution of a United Nations body which mentioned Israel without condemning it. The representative of the Zionist racist entity should be well aware that his country had been admitted to membership in the United Nations only after committing itself to respect the principles of the Organization. That had occurred many years earlier and for reasons which did not reflect the will of the world's peoples at that time. Given Israel's flouting the resolutions of the United Nations, if it had not already become a Member of the United Nations, it would not be able even to aspire to membership at the current time, and despite Israel's opposition, the day would come when the United Nations would be able to silence those who defied its resolutions.

66. Mr. AL-TAKRITI (Iraq) said that the racist Zionist representative had accused the Arab States of being racist. In fact, every time a representative of the Zionist entity spoke in the United Nations he repeated the same old song. The Israeli representative had apparently not read the General Assembly resolution condemning his country and describing it as racist.

67. As to Israel's right to exist, he wondered why the representatives of Israel spoke of a right to exist, while overlooking the Palestinian people whose territory Israel occupied. The lies repeated by the representatives of Israel in the General Assembly were only a violent reaction to the many resolutions adopted by the international community exposing the real nature of the Zionist entity. The representatives of a régime which had expelled an entire people from their homeland, killing many millions of Arab martyrs, evidently had no shame in addressing the international community, which clearly saw through it.

68. Mr. SWEGER (Sweden), referring to allegations which had been made concerning the motives for the action taken with respect to several of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, said that his delegation attached great importance to the Advisory Committee and was usually able to support its recommendations. Occasionally, however, the Advisory Committee proposed reductions which could hamper the implementation of resolutions to which his delegation attached great importance. Delegations in the Fifth Committee were concerned with both the substance and financial implications of draft resolutions. His delegation freely went along with the Advisory Committee's recommendations when they were warranted. He was surprised that anyone should suggest that its attitude was determined by any other consideration.

69. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation was greatly concerned over the work of the press officers in the Fifth Committee, who were apparently unable to report accurately the views expressed by members at its meetings. The press release for the 74th meeting, in particular, gave a completely inaccurate and biased view of the proceedings of the Committee. It was essential for the Department of Public Information to ensure that events in the Committee were truly and fairly reflected in press releases and, if it was unable to do so, to take the necessary measures to rectify the situation.

The meeting rose at 1.35 p.m.