



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 46th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat
officials serving the General Assembly

Establishment of the Information Systems Unit in the Department of International
Economic and Social Affairs

Arabic language services

AGENDA ITEM 101: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE
MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 93: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE
NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE ON THE FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month 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.

The meeting was called to order at 8.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials serving the General Assembly (A/C.5/35/53)

1. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that the Secretary-General's report on conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials serving the General Assembly (A/C.5/35/53), currently before the Fifth Committee, had been prepared in response to General Assembly resolution 34/233. In that resolution, the General Assembly had as an interim measure, pending a review of the question at the thirty-fifth session, approved "an annual compensation of \$59,000 to the two full-time members of the International Civil Service Commission and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions". In addition, the two Chairmen had received an additional allowance of \$5,000 effective 1 January 1980.
2. The General Assembly, in its resolution 33/116 B, had decided that the compensation of those officials should continue to be reviewed every four years or when the consumer price index in the United States had risen by 10 per cent since the last review, whichever came first.
3. At its preceding session, the Fifth Committee had been informed that by November 1979 the cost of living had increased by 9.13 per cent since the compensation had been revised on 1 January 1979. That meant that the compensation would have remained unchanged until a review was held at the next session, since the 10 per cent threshold would have been reached only after the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly had adjourned. However, in the circumstances, the Fifth Committee had decided to recommend an interim increase of \$4,000 or approximately 7 per cent, which the General Assembly had approved.
4. At the thirty-third session, the General Assembly had examined not only the compensation but also the other conditions of service of those officials. The Secretary-General had therefore assumed, as indicated in paragraph 2 of the report (A/C.5/35/53), that the General Assembly would be seeking a review at the present session of only the level of compensation, including the possible introduction of a procedure to effect adjustments between full reviews.
5. In his 1978 report (A/C.5/33/41), the Secretary-General had noted that no differentiation had been introduced in the compensation according to the dependency status of the officials, as was the case with Secretariat officials. For comparison purposes, the net remuneration of the senior Secretariat officials at the Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General levels had been taken as the respective net base salary and post adjustment at the dependency rates plus the representation allowance. Thus, no account had been taken of the other monetary entitlements available to Secretariat officials, such as installation grant, children's allowance, education grant and related travel, repatriation grant and so forth.

/...

6. While the Secretary-General had made no specific proposals in that respect in his report, he had requested guidance from the Assembly as to the other conditions of service to be applied, bearing in mind the considerable relocation costs incurred by full-time officials, particularly in respect of the education of their children.
7. In its report (A/33/7/Add.19), the Advisory Committee had recommended that the cited entitlements should not be extended to the officials in question. Thus, although the circumstances to which the Secretary-General had referred in 1978 continued to exist, he did not consider that he had a mandate to reopen the question of other conditions of service at the present time, since only two years had elapsed since the comprehensive review.
8. In his current report (A/C.5/35/53), the Secretary-General provided information on past decisions by the General Assembly on the compensation of those officials. The table in paragraph 6 showed the movement of the compensation over the period from January 1975 through November 1980 and the movement of the net remunerations at the levels of Assistant Secretary-General and Under-Secretary-General in New York. It should be noted that the Secretary-General had reiterated his view that the compensation of full-time members of the Commission should not be below that of an Assistant Secretary-General.
9. After the interim increase implemented on 1 January 1980, the ICSC Vice-Chairman's compensation of \$59,000 had corresponded very closely to the net remuneration of an Assistant Secretary-General, which at that time had been \$59,215, consisting of net base salary and post adjustment at the dependency rates and the representation allowance of \$3,000. In the case of the Chairman of ICSC and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the compensation, added to the additional allowance of \$5,000 had corresponded very closely to the \$65,248 payable to an Under-Secretary-General on 1 January 1980.
10. On 1 February 1981, the remuneration of an Assistant Secretary-General and an Under-Secretary-General would increase to \$66,855 and \$73,574 respectively. Taking that into consideration, the Secretary-General suggested that it would be reasonable to increase the annual compensation of the three full-time officials from \$59,000 to \$67,000 with effect from 1 January 1981, while maintaining the additional allowance for the Chairman of ICSC and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee at \$5,000 net per annum.
11. Taking into account the situation which had developed in 1979, and on the assumption that it would be the desire of the Fifth Committee to avoid the need for frequent reviews of the compensation of those officials, the Secretary-General had outlined for the consideration of the Fifth Committee an interim adjustment procedure which might be applied between full reviews. It would be patterned on the lines of the adjustment procedure currently in effect for the members of the International Court of Justice. In addition, the Secretary-General suggested that full reviews might take place every five years, with the next review being at the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

/...

(Mr. Ruedas)

12. The interim adjustment procedure would involve measuring the movement of the New York CPI and would adjust the compensation if the CPI had increased by 5 per cent or more over the preceding one-year period. The procedure would apply only to the annual compensation and not to the additional allowance payable to the two Chairmen. The compensation would be adjusted not by the full percentage of the movement of the CPI but rather by 90 per cent of the movement of the CPI, because the net remuneration of staff members was not adjusted by the full extent of the post-adjustment index movement and because the impact of higher costs was less severe at the higher income levels.

13. The table in paragraph 13 of the report compared the actual progression in pay of those officials with what would have happened if the proposed adjustment procedure had been in effect since January 1975; the movement of the remuneration of an Assistant Secretary-General and an Under-Secretary-General over the same period was also shown. It should be noted that under the post-adjustment system the pay of senior Secretariat officials could be adjusted at any time during the year, whereas it was proposed that for the three officials concerned any adjustments justified by the CPI movement would take place only once a year, in January.

14. Should the General Assembly approve the proposed increase of \$8,000 in the remuneration of those three officials, an additional appropriation of \$24,000 would be required for 1981, broken down into: \$8,000 under section 1 and \$16,000 under section 28 of the budget. The income under section 2 would be increased by \$10,100, representing the reimbursement by the specialized agencies of their share of the expenses of the International Civil Service Commission.

15. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that the Committee had before it a proposal to increase the compensation of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission, with the two Chairmen continuing to receive an additional allowance of \$5,000. In addition, it was proposed that there should be an interim adjustment procedure and that, as a corollary, the reviews should normally be held in future every five years.

16. In the view of his delegation, the increase was reasonable, since it restored the original relativities on the basis of which the General Assembly had approved the rate of compensation of those officials. The proposal for automatic annual adjustment with reviews every five years was also acceptable to his delegation, but it raised more fundamental questions about the appropriateness of the system of compensation and therefore called for closer examination.

17. When the issue had been discussed at the thirty-third session, the United Kingdom delegation had pointed out that the compensation of those officials had to be clearly distinguished from the pay of senior staff members of the Secretariat and that the level of compensation had to be considered in relation to other features of the total package, such as the absence of entitlement to grants and allowances paid to staff members and the lack of provision for interim adjustments between reviews.

(Mr. Stuart, United Kingdom)

18. His delegation's view in 1978 had been that the package then agreed had erred on the side of being less than generous. Events had borne out the correctness of that view, since the General Assembly had needed to take special action in 1979, not warranted by strict reference to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 33/116 B, section VIII, in order to provide interim compensation for the rise in the cost of living. It was only realistic to recognize that the current rate of inflation would not decline rapidly and that a system of automatic adjustment, which existed already for United Nations staff members, would also be appropriate for the officials in question.

19. The system proposed was somewhat less generous than the post-adjustment system, partly because it would operate only once a year, but it was a moderate proposal and at the same time preserved the essential distinction between the system of pay for Professional and higher staff and the remuneration of full-time officials who were not staff members. Given a system of automatic interim adjustments, it made sense to carry out reviews less frequently and the proposal would relieve both the Fifth Committee and the Secretariat of some avoidable work.

20. His delegation therefore supported the proposals of the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/35/53 and hoped that they would be approved by consensus.

21. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that, in section VIII, paragraph 6, of its resolution 33/116 B, the General Assembly had decided that the compensation of full-time officials other than Secretariat officials, serving the General Assembly should continue to be reviewed every four years or when the consumer price index (CPI) in the United States had risen by 10 per cent since the last review, whichever came first.

22. His delegation felt that, if increases in the compensation of those officials were limited to movements in the CPI, that would not fully reflect the social function which the Assembly had had in mind in adopting resolution 33/116 B. As had been pointed out, it was reasonable to expect that inflation in the United States would continue to be higher than 10 per cent for a long time. Furthermore, his delegation felt that, in determining the compensation of those officials, account should be taken of the education grant and the allowance for dependent children, as well as of travel, repatriation and home leave expenses, which were benefits enjoyed by all permanent staff members.

23. It should not be forgotten that in the course of their work the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of ICSC and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had to work with Under-Secretaries-General, Assistant-Secretaries-General and other senior officials. Obviously, if the compensation of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of ICSC and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee was adjusted solely on the basis of movements in the CPI, it would never reach the level of the remuneration received by an Under-Secretary-General or an Assistant Secretary-General.

24. Accordingly, his delegation asked the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services to state whether a report could be submitted to the General Assembly at its

/...

(Mr. Williams, Panama)

thirty-sixth session dealing with the compensation of the officials in question, the possibility of granting them the benefits enjoyed by all permanent staff members of the United Nations Secretariat and the effect that that would have on the United Nations budget, in order to enable the Committee to take a decision on the matter.

25. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that, in its resolution 33/116 B, the General Assembly had decided that salary, entitlements and other forms of remuneration and conditions of service of full-time members of ICSC and of the Chairman of ACABQ should continue to be set by the Assembly outside the common system, since it was essential that those officials should be treated in every way as independent of the secretariats (sect. VIII, para. 3).

26. Throughout the report now before the Committee in document A/C.5/35/53, the Secretary-General had compared the positions of those officials to those of Under-Secretaries-General and Assistant Secretaries-General. The United States Government was opposed to any linking of remuneration for the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of ICSC with the grade levels of the United Nations common system.

27. Although resolution 33/116 B was not yet two years old, the Committee was now being asked to change the system of reviewing the compensation of those officials. His Government was opposed to accelerating the automatic review and proposed that the present quadrennial review should be maintained.

28. At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, compensation for those three officials had been set at \$55,000, plus an additional allowance of \$5,000 for the two Chairmen. At the thirty-fourth session the base compensation had been raised by \$4,000 as an interim measure. Now the Secretary-General was requesting a further increase of \$8,000, which would mean an increase of \$12,000 in two years. His Government could not agree to raising the remuneration for those positions by almost 22 per cent in two years.

29. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that both the United Kingdom and the Panamanian proposals were unexpected. Since the Committee had only the Secretary-General's report in document A/C.5/35/53 as a basis for considering the present item, and since, for obvious reasons, the Advisory Committee had not expressed an opinion in the matter, his delegation would like to study both proposals in greater detail. He accordingly proposed that the delegations of the United Kingdom and Panama should submit them in writing.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the proposal of the USSR delegation.

31. It was so decided.

Establishment of the Information Systems Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (A/35/7/Add.9; A/C.5/35/32 and Corr.1; A/C.5/35/L.26 and L.28)

32. Mr. HANSEN (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination), replying to questions put by the Indonesian representative at

an earlier meeting, and referring to users of the Development Information System who received services free of charge and users who reimbursed the Information Systems Unit for such services, said that, in principle, the users in governments and institutions in developed and developing countries who had asked for information from the System had received the information free during the trial period. The user contribution - if such it could be called - came from the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, which had insisted on using the System for project formulation. The previous year, the Department had contributed 10 per cent of the Information System Unit's budget, a proportion that would be increased in the future in the light of the use made of the System.

33. Regarding paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.26, in which it was recommended that future users should reimburse the Unit for the cost of services, the Indonesian representative had asked whether, if the draft resolution was adopted, it would still be possible to provide users with services at lower rates than those charged by other institutions. In his opinion, adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26 would probably mean the disappearance of the System and the services provided to Member States, so that the question of cost would become irrelevant. The representative of Indonesia had also asked for clarification as to whether adoption of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28 would mean that the Unit could continue to provide the services to users free of charge. He confirmed that the objective was to provide those services free and that extrabudgetary funds would be sought to finance the rest of the Unit's budget. An offer to finance the microfilming of the documents making up the data bank had already been received, which meant that that service could be provided free of charge.

34. The Cameroonian representative had asked whether the terms of reference of the Information Systems Unit also encompassed co-ordination of the work of information-services for development activities. In reply to that question, he said that the terms of reference of the Unit did in fact refer to the need to co-ordinate the information services of the United Nations system in general; if the Unit continued to function, it would pursue its co-ordination tasks and thus facilitate the exchange of information between the different systems.

35. However, it should be pointed out that the co-ordination activities based on those terms of reference were in no way intended to replace the work of the Inter-Organization Board for Information-Systems, whose functions were much broader and covered a variety of sectors, such as administrative and financial systems and central projects. The Information Systems Unit and the Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination, in its function as United Nations co-ordinating centre for the Inter-Organization Board, had actively supported the work of the Board and had co-operated closely with it.

36. The main criterion applied in selecting the material to make up the Development Information System was whether it was of permanent value to development activities and programming. The people responsible for applying that criterion were the programme managers, who carried out the basic evaluation;

/...

(Mr. Hansen)

however, the Information Systems Unit also examined and selected documents at a later stage. It should be stated that fewer reports had been selected for inclusion in the System than had been foreseen in the feasibility study, which indicated the strictness of the selection criteria.

37. He agreed with the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon that it was unfair to provide free services in some cases, and not in others. The dissemination of information was a basic function of international organizations, and all systems similar to that of the United Nations provided free information to both developed and developing Member States. Accordingly, that would also be the objective of the Unit, if its operation was extended. The administrative costs incurred in collecting funds to finance the services rendered by the Unit might perhaps make that course of action inadvisable in terms of the relationship between such costs and the benefits derived therefrom, assuming that such services were maintained at a reasonable level.

38. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that his delegation would find Mr. Hansen's replies very useful when it took a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26 and on draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28. With regard to the second question, he explained that what he wished to know was whether, if draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26 was adopted, the Information Systems Unit would continue to provide services at a cost below that of those provided commercially.

39. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) reiterated a question to which the Secretariat had yet not replied. The report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/35/32) indicated that the data base of the Development Information System contained approximately 3,100 references. However, the data bank, which should serve the developing countries, was filled with data provided by experts. He requested a clarification in connexion with the percentage of such data that was contributed by experts from the developing countries.

40. That question was in fact essential and was statistically important in taking any well-informed decision. During the current session, decisions would have to be taken not only on the administrative and financial aspects, but also on substantive aspects of that question. Since the evaluation report which the Inter-Organization Board had been asked to prepare was not yet available, additional information was needed to supplement the reports of the Advisory Committee and of the Joint Inspection Unit, which had been elaborated at a very early stage in the Unit's operation.

41. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee had long been considering the question of the establishment of an Information Systems Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. The documents submitted contained an accurate, effective evaluation, which should enable the Committee to take a decision without further delay.

42. Year after year, the Committee had decided to authorize the pilot operation of the Development Information System. In so doing, it had invested considerable time and resources, but it must be admitted that the results had been almost nil. The work of the Information Services Unit was a typical example of duplication, and

(Mr. Palamarchuk, USSR)

there was no reason whatsoever for burdening the regular budget with the costs of another information system, when enough existed already. An effort was being made to justify that proposal by arguing that the System dealt with highly specialized data. In its report, the Advisory Committee indicated that the data included in the System were of short-term value, were ordinary documents that could be found in the Dag Hammarskjöld Library and, in some cases, were even newspaper clippings. He wondered what was so special about such data as to warrant asking Member States to finance the information system.

43. The course taken by the Information Systems Unit was a classic example of the situation that arose when initiatives were taken, some funds were obtained to finance them and, later, those responsible for such initiatives proposed that they should be financed from the regular budget. His delegation was opposed to that way of operating, especially in the case in question, since the UNESCO evaluator and the Advisory Committee concurred in affirming that such activities were not worth continuing. Accordingly, his delegation fully supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 of its report (A/35/7/Add.9).

44. Mr. HANSEN (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination), replying to a question from the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon, said that the authors of reports were not classified by nationality, but the distribution of users by country was known: 77 users were from developing countries and 19 were from developed countries. Since ECLA and ECA favoured the establishment of similar information systems, the proportion of authors who prepared the reports used by the System and who were nationals of developing countries could be expected to grow.

45. In connexion with the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union, he merely wished to point out that, for the time being, there was no duplication between the activities of the Information Systems Unit and those of the Dag Hammarskjöld Library, because the Library worked only with documents already published, whereas the Unit used unpublished documents.

46. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) proposed that the Committee should take a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26 and on draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28. However, in accordance with rule 131 of the General Assembly rules of procedure, which authorized the Committee to vote on proposals in an order other than that in which they had been submitted, he proposed that a decision should be taken first on draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28.

47. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had held consultations with the delegation of Morocco and as a result both delegations had agreed to submit several amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26.

48. After an exchange of views between Mr. SADDLER (United States), Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco), Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama), Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) and the CHAIRMAN, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the item after the amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26 had been issued as document A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 and after the Secretariat had reported back on the possibility of redistributing resources in order to finance the Information Systems Unit.

49. It was so decided.

50. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) wished to express his interest in the Secretariat's reply concerning the redistribution of resources, since his delegation had raised that matter previously and had received a negative reply.

Arabic language services (A/C.5/35/82; A/C.5/35/L.19, A/C.5/35/L.30)

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19

51. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the Committee's 40th meeting, the representative of Morocco had introduced draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19 concerning the Arabic language services and that the Committee had decided, in accordance with rule 153 of the General Assembly rules of procedure, to postpone its decision in that connexion until the administrative implications of the draft resolution were known.

52. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) announced that the Central African Republic, Chile, Hungary, Malaysia and Mali had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19.

53. Mr. BROTDININGRAT (Indonesia) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19.

55. It was so decided.

56. Mr. SAGRERA (Spain) welcomed the Committee's adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19, which had a large number of sponsors. Spain had supported resolution 3190 (XXVIII) of 18 December 1973, by which it had been decided to include Arabic among the official and working languages of the General Assembly and its Main Committees. Spain had also supported resolution 34/226 of 20 December 1979, by which the Arabic language establishment had been put on a par with the establishment for all the other official and working languages.

57. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19. It agreed that the Arabic services in the United Nations should be accorded a status similar to that of the other official and working languages by being included among the official and working languages of the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, no later than 1 January 1982, and among the official and working languages of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council no later than 1 January 1983.

58. However, his delegation noted from document A/C.5/35/82 that the measures proposed in document A/C.5/35/L.19 would involve considerable extra costs at Headquarters. Those costs, which would be in the order of \$160,180 in the present biennium, would rise to \$2,057,000 and \$2,571,000 in 1982 and 1983, respectively. His delegation expected that those costs would be offset by savings elsewhere.

Note A/C.5/35/L.30

59. The CHAIRMAN read out the following quotation from paragraph 2 of note A/C.5/35/L.30: "If the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/35/L.19 is adopted, it is suggested that the General Assembly should, at its current session, adopt the rules as revised above, on the understanding that the new texts will be given effect as of the date of the implementation of operative paragraph 1 of the resolution. Corresponding changes in the rules of subsidiary organs of the Assembly that have adopted their own rules of procedure will need to be made by the organs concerned". The Fifth Committee had just adopted draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.19. Therefore, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the proposals contained in paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/35/L.30.

60. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 101: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/35/613 and 668)

61. Mr. KELLEHER (Ireland) said that his country had always valued the peace-keeping role of the United Nations, and for that reason had contributed troops to almost every peace-keeping operation undertaken by the Organization since 1958.

62. Those peace-keeping operations could not be mounted if adequate financial resources were not available. In his report on the work of the Organization (A/35/1), the Secretary-General had expressed his concern at the financial difficulties which the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was confronting. Those difficulties had arisen because some Member States had withheld their contributions to UNIFIL. Such a policy not only contravened the obligation imposed by the Charter on Member States, but transferred the financial burden of the operation to those States which were already contributing troops, equipment and supplies to UNIFIL.

63. A particularly heavy burden had been placed on those developing States which contributed troops. In that way the practice of withholding assessed contributions could undermine the important principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of the United Nations peace-keeping forces.

64. He introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.29 on the financing of UNIFIL. The original sponsors, listed in the draft resolution, had been joined by Australia, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Nepal, Nigeria and Panama.

65. Part A of the draft resolution appropriated to the UNIFIL Special Account an amount of \$129,205,992 gross already authorized and apportioned by earlier resolutions of the General Assembly for the operation of UNIFIL from 19 December 1979 to 18 December 1980. It further authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for UNIFIL at a rate not to exceed \$12,180,500 gross per month for the period from 19 December 1980 to 18 December 1981, should the Security Council decide to renew the present mandate of the Force.

/...

(Mr. Kelleher, Ireland)

66. That amount would be apportioned among Member States according to the special scheme adopted by the General Assembly regarding the apportionment of expenses. That scheme took into account the fact that less developed countries had a relatively limited capacity to contribute towards peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditure, and that the States permanent members of the Security Council had a special responsibility in that regard.

67. He drew the attention of the Committee to section IV of part A of the draft resolution, which renewed the invitation to Member States to make voluntary contributions to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon both in cash and in the form of services and supplies acceptable to the Secretary-General. That section also invited Member States to make voluntary contributions to the Suspense Account established in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/9 D, adopted on the recommendation of the Fifth Committee.

68. In that connexion, paragraph 7 of the report of the Secretary-General on the financing of UNIFIL (A/35/613) indicated that, since some Member States had not paid their assessed contributions, there was a current shortfall in the UNIFIL Special Account of \$84.1 million. According to the same report, it was clear that nearly one quarter of the total amounts apportioned among Member States to finance the costs of UNIFIL for the periods from the inception of the Force on 19 March 1978 to 18 December 1980 would not be received, which posed a very serious problem for the financial management of the Force.

69. As a consequence of the withholding of contributions by some States, the Governments of the troop-contributing States received less than half of the amounts to which they were entitled under the standard rates and practices approved by the General Assembly.

70. Referring to part B of the draft resolution, he observed that it was similar to part B of General Assembly resolution 35/45 B, concerning the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), already adopted by the General Assembly at its current session.

71. As pointed out in paragraph 7 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/35/668), the UNIFIL Special Account had a surplus of \$2,173,113 as at 31 December 1979, but the "surplus" was purely theoretical because it did not take account of the policy of withholding by certain Member States. As a result, the figure for "income", which included assessed contributions, was overstated by some 24 per cent. Moreover, the theoretical surplus had already been used to meet the expenses of UNIFIL.

72. The purpose of part B of the draft resolution was thus to suspend the provisions of financial regulation 5.2 (b) and (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations and deposit the theoretical surplus in the account mentioned in General Assembly resolution 34/9 E, holding it in suspense pending a further decision by the General Assembly. If that action were not to be taken by the General Assembly, the theoretical surplus would be used to reduce the assessments of Member States, including those Member States which were withholding their assessed contributions.

(Mr. Kelleher, Ireland)

73. In conclusion, he recommended that the Fifth Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.29, which he had just introduced.

74. Mr. SAGHIYYAH (Lebanon) said that his delegation had carefully read the Secretary-General's report on the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (A/35/613) and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the same subject (A/35/668). It had also noted that the sum of \$116.4 million in unpaid assessed contributions included \$84.1 million assessed among Member States which had stated that they had no intention of paying for UNIFIL.

75. The attitude of such States was a matter of grave concern to his country, which had always regarded as incontrovertible the principle of "collective responsibility" for peace-keeping forces. In the opinion of his delegation, the situation was particularly unfair for countries which supplied troops, and the United Nations should not ask them to assume the financial burden of the operation of UNIFIL as well.

76. Lebanon had already suffered greatly from the violence in the Middle East, and in particular from a special kind of violence which arose from the way in which the United Nations had handled the problem of Palestine since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II), concerning the partition of Palestine, 33 years earlier. The Member States which had participated in the vote on that resolution, and to which the current tragedy in Lebanon could largely be ascribed, bore a heavy responsibility. For that reason, their support of UNIFIL was certainly a step in the right direction.

77. Of all the peace-keeping operations, that undertaken by UNIFIL was the most urgent and challenging, as well as the largest. Moreover, the function of UNIFIL was not only one of observation but also pursuant to Security Council resolution 425 (1978), one of "assisting the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area ...".

78. On that question, therefore, the political aspect could not be separated from the financial aspect, and his delegation feared that refusal to participate in the financing of UNIFIL might imply an erosion of moral and political support for the Force, which would be very injurious to the latter and would have serious consequences to Lebanon and to peace in the Middle East and elsewhere.

79. The purpose of the establishment of peace-keeping forces was precisely to assist small, peace-loving countries, which could not defend themselves from aggressors. Such was the case of Lebanon, which had therefore accepted UNIFIL in March 1978.

80. For all of the reasons stated, his delegation supported the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.5/35/L.29) and appealed to other delegations to support it. In conclusion, he thanked the Secretary-General and his staff, as well as the officers and troops of UNIFIL and their countries, whose dedication to the principles of the Charter had made possible the establishment of UNIFIL and the continuation of its activities.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 93: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE ON THE FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/C.5/34/44 and Corr.1; A/C.5/35/13; A/C.5/35/L.24)

Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24

81. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the substantive debate on the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24 had been concluded and that it was now time to take action on it.

82. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had requested that the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

83. Mr. GRODSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation had made its position clear when the Fifth Committee had first considered draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24. It wished to state once again that the draft resolution did not reflect the real reasons for the financial emergency of the United Nations, nor did it propose adequate measures for eliminating the Organization's deficit. Furthermore, it contained provisions which, if the draft resolution was adopted, would involve a violation of the existing financial rules. He reaffirmed the need to apply the Financial Regulations of the United Nations and said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24.

84. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that in recognition of the efforts made by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24 to find a solution for the financial emergency of the United Nations, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

85. Mr. LOSCHNER (Federal Republic of Germany) commended the efforts of the Pakistani delegation and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24 to alleviate the financial emergency of the United Nations, which was out of keeping with the dignity of the Organization. The situation, which had brought about a cash deficit in 1980, was due to the fact that some Member States, in violation of Article 17 of the Charter, had withheld payment of their assessed contributions. As a result, the deficit created by a few had to be financed by all.

86. The draft resolution did not claim to solve the underlying causes of the emergency but only presented a number of pragmatic solutions, of limited scope, intended to mitigate the situation to a certain extent. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on it.

87. Mr. PAL (India) said his delegation believed that the financial emergency of the United Nations was the result of political problems. The pragmatic approach of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24, while it did not solve the problem, would help to alleviate the difficulties. Accordingly, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

88. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that the fundamental causes of the financial

/...

(Mr. Houngavou, Benin)

problems of the United Nations were well known and sprang chiefly from the current crisis of world capitalism: inflation and other phenomena of an unjust economic system were the root of the evil, and the responsibility in that respect must be made clear.

89. In the view of his delegation, the draft resolution before the Committee ought to be adopted by consensus because of its moderate and conciliatory character. However, as its sponsors themselves recognized, the solution it proposed was merely partial and provisional; at some point, the international community would have to give serious consideration to the substance of the question. It was regrettable that the small and resource-poor countries which paid their assessments to the United Nations should see their contribution eaten away by an inflation which they had not caused, with no effort being made to remedy it.

90. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the proposals in draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24 because it did not regard them as satisfactory. Even if the measures proposed were to yield considerable revenue, they would be ineffective, since they would not go to the root of the problem, which was the failure of certain Member States to pay their assessed contributions to the regular budget, a fact which must never be lost sight of.

91. In addition, for reasons of principle, the United Kingdom could not support measures whereby all Member States were obliged to pay for the illegal debts of withholders. The proposals for the suspension of financial regulations 5.2 and 7.1, and the establishment of a special account, would have that harmful effect. The United Nations could not continue to exist if some of its Members believed themselves entitled to pay or not to pay their contributions as they pleased.

92. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution in order to support the efforts of its sponsors. However, that did not mean that it was abandoning the global approach which should, in its opinion, be followed in solving the financial problems of the Organization.

93. Mr. MORET ECHEVERRIA (Cuba) said that the draft resolution before the Committee had a noble aim in trying to solve the problem of liquidity through the sale of postage stamps. However, the decision to place the revenue from such sales in a special account was not in accordance with the customary financial procedures; moreover, the draft resolution did not mention the causes of the financial emergency; in the opinion of his delegation, those causes included inflation and monetary instability, which were growing worse every day. The financial emergency of the Organization would not be solved through the measures proposed in document A/C.5/35/L.24, and Cuba would therefore abstain in the vote.

94. At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24.

/...

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Mozambique, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

95. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.24 was adopted by 76 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

96. Mr. FRANSEN (Denmark) speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries in explanation of vote after the voting, said that the Nordic delegations had voted in favour of the draft resolution because they wished to promote a solution of the problem that was plaguing the Organization. However, the draft resolution did not deal with the problem adequately. Under the provisions of the United Nations Charter, Member States had an obligation to accept their collective responsibility for financing peace-keeping operations and for paying their contributions to the regular budget.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.