

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records*



FIFTH COMMITTEE

66th meeting

held on

Monday, 13 December 1982

at 10.30 a.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 66th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ABRAŚZEWSKI (Poland)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 103: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.23 concerning agenda item 65

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.13/Rev.2 concerning agenda item 65

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.36 concerning agenda item 66

Revised estimates under sections 1 and 29

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/37/L.40 concerning agenda item 27

Proposed changes in the top echelon: revised estimates under sections 1, 2, 3, 23, 27 and 28

AGENDA ITEM 110: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued)

* 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.5/37/SR.66
17 December 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 103: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.23 concerning agenda item 65 (A/C.5/37/88)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) observed that the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), to issue identification cards to all Palestine refugees. In the statement contained in document A/C.5/37/88, the Secretary-General informed the General Assembly that he expected that the financial implications of issuing identification cards to Palestine refugees registered with UNRWA would be met by that Agency. However, the Secretary-General also pointed out that paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/37/L.23 would apply to a large number of refugees who were not registered with UNRWA and that, therefore, extensive financial implications would arise. Accordingly, the Secretary-General felt that, as a first step, guidelines should be developed for the issuance of the identification cards and that the co-operation of the host countries where refugees were residing would be very important in that regard.
2. The Secretary-General envisaged that a team of four Professional staff members and one General Service staff member would travel to the Middle East to investigate the modalities for developing the guidelines and for defining eligibility requirements. Travel, subsistence and general operating expenses for the team were estimated at \$40,000.
3. The Advisory Committee accepted the Secretary-General's request and recommended an appropriation of \$40,000 under section 1 of the programme budget.
4. He pointed out that paragraphs 6 and 7 of document A/C.5/37/88 dealt with follow-up action to be taken in the light of the team's findings. Paragraph 6 indicated that, to the extent that the Secretary-General could commence the process of issuing identification cards before the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, he would seek the Advisory Committee's concurrence in committing funds for that purpose. Paragraph 7 provided a very rough estimate of \$10 million for that operation.
5. After exchanging views with the representatives of the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee had concluded that the Secretary-General should report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session on all the administrative and financial implications relating to the implementation of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The Advisory Committee believed that the General Assembly would need to examine the report of the Secretary-General before authorizing additional funds for implementing paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. Therefore, the Secretary-General would not need to seek the concurrence of the Advisory Committee referred to in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/37/88.

/...

6. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation found the course just outlined by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to be reasonable: the Advisory Committee should not be asked to share responsibility for authorizing the waste of United Nations resources to the extent foreseen by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/37/88. As his delegation had indicated during the discussion of that issue in the Special Political Committee, given the financial crisis already facing the United Nations, an additional fiscal burden of no less than \$10 million could indeed "break the camel's back". In his delegation's opinion, neither the concept nor the actual undertaking proposed by the Secretary-General was warranted, and his delegation would therefore vote against the administrative and financial implications submitted in document A/C.5/37/88.

7. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) observed that his delegation's views on the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/37/L.23 had been expressed in full during the relevant debate. In accordance with those views, his delegation would vote against the administrative and financial implications currently before the Committee.

8. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/37/L.23, an additional appropriation of \$40,000 would be required under section 1 of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

9. The delegation of the United States had requested that a vote should be taken.

10. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Chile, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Jamaica, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay.

11. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by 59 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

/...

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.13/Rev.2 concerning agenda item 65 (A/C.5/37/89)

12. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) observed that the question of the University of Jerusalem for Palestine refugees had been on the General Assembly's agenda at previous sessions. The draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.13/Rev.2 requested the Secretary-General to continue conducting a feasibility study for establishing the University of Jerusalem.

13. Accordingly, the Secretary-General indicated in the statement contained in document A/C.5/37/89 that he intended to establish a small group of academics and university administrators of high international standing, which would travel to the Middle East and would visit various cities. The group would be accompanied by a senior United Nations official who would act as both the secretary and a member of the team. The amount requested for that purpose was \$123,900 to cover consultants' fees, travel, subsistence and general operating expenses.

14. The Advisory Committee had inquired into the expenditure of the \$42,500 the General Assembly had appropriated under that item the previous year and had been informed by the representative of the Secretary-General that \$32,000 had already been spent. Since the balance of \$10,500 would be applied to expenses for 1983, the Advisory Committee recommended that an additional appropriation of \$110,000 should be approved under section 1 of the programme budget.

15. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, since his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/37/L.13/Rev.2 in the Special Political Committee, it would also vote against the administrative and financial implications contained in document A/C.5/37/89.

16. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that, despite the Advisory Committee's amendment of the financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/37/L.13/Rev.2, his delegation believed that the funds requested for the feasibility study in question were both inappropriate and unrealistic in terms of the regular budget of the United Nations. His delegation therefore opposed those appropriations and would vote against the statement submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/37/89.

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/37/L.13/Rev.2, an additional appropriation of \$110,000 would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

18. A vote was taken on the Chairman's suggestion.

19. The suggestion was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

20. Mrs. INCERA (Costa Rica) said that, had her delegation been present during the voting on the administrative and financial implications contained in documents A/C.5/37/88 and A/C.5/37/89, it would have voted in favour of them.

21. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting on the administrative and financial implications contained in documents A/C.5/37/88 and A/C.5/37/89, it would have voted in favour of them.

22. Mr. HAMZA (Sudan) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting on the administrative and financial implications contained in documents A/C.5/37/88 and A/C.5/37/89, it would have voted in favour of them.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.36 concerning agenda item 66 (A/C.5/37/91)

23. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) observed that, in resolution 36/148, the General Assembly had established the Group of Governmental Experts on International Co-operation to Avert New Flows of Refugees. The draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/37/L.36 would have the General Assembly decide to enlarge the Group from 17 to 24 members. The Secretary-General estimated the conference-servicing costs of the draft resolution at \$136,600 and the travel and subsistence costs for some members of the Group at \$15,000.

24. The Advisory Committee still maintained the position described in its report at the previous session and therefore did not recommend an additional appropriation of \$15,000 under section 2 of the programme budget.

25. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/37/L.36, conference-servicing requirements would arise which were estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$136,600. The actual additional appropriations that might be required in that respect would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted at a later stage during the current session.

26. It was so decided.

27. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation appreciated the Advisory Committee's attitude towards the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee and was pleased that it had no immediate financial implications. His delegation had joined in adopting the Chairman's suggestion on the understanding that the Secretary-General would absorb the additional conference-servicing costs within the resources already available.

Revised estimates under sections 1 and 29 (A/C.5/37/64)

28. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that, at the thirty-sixth session, the Fifth Committee had, on

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, recommended appropriations of \$695,100 under section 1, \$246,200 under section 27 and \$560,700 under section 28 for non-conference activities related to draft resolutions A/36/L.32 and L.33 on the question of Palestine (adopted as resolutions 36/120 B and C). The main activity called for by draft resolution L.32 had been the organization of three regional seminars in 1982. The report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/37/64 gave a performance report on the three seminars held in 1982 and information on additional resources requested for a further three seminars in 1983 and for the implementation of other provisions of the resolution. The Secretary-General had submitted estimates totalling \$2,467,500 of which \$1,801,400 were for standard conference-servicing requirements estimated on a full-cost basis and would be considered later, in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements. Of the remaining balance of \$666,100, an additional appropriation of \$374,200 was requested under section 1 and an additional appropriation of \$291,900 under section 29.

29. The Advisory Committee had concluded that, since one of the 1982 seminars had been held in New York, that had meant a saving of about \$268,000 which would therefore be available to help finance the seminars in 1983. The amount requested under section 1 should therefore be revised accordingly. Of the amount requested under section 29, \$13,000 was for general temporary assistance at Headquarters and the remaining \$10,800 for general temporary assistance at seminar locations other than Headquarters.

30. The Advisory Committee believed that the \$13,000 for Headquarters could be absorbed, which would also make the additional appropriation of \$2,100 in respect of staff assessment (para. 9) unnecessary. It approved the request for \$10,800 for general local temporary assistance. It considered an appropriation of \$200,000 to be sufficient to cover additional travel and subsistence requirements, as compared with the figure of \$268,100 given in the Secretary-General's report. As a result, the Advisory Committee was recommending an appropriation of \$100,000 under section 1 and an appropriation of \$210,800 under section 29, making a total of \$310,800.

31. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation was opposed to spending United Nations resources on activities such as those described in document A/C.5/37/64, which did nothing to solve the question of Palestine and simply gave participants a chance to enjoy themselves at United Nations expense. His delegation's position on the substantive activities of the Committee on the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People had already been stated elsewhere. His delegation was convinced that expenditures of over \$2 million were absolutely unwarranted for such purposes.

32. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, reiterated his delegation's longstanding opposition to the appropriation of United Nations resources for seminars on the question of Palestine. Such seminars were simply propaganda vehicles and the expenditure involved was totally unjustified. His delegation would therefore vote against the revised estimates.

/...

33. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would vote for the Advisory Committee's recommendations. The regional seminars on the question of Palestine were very useful for alerting international public opinion to what was a very important issue and one for which the United Nations bore responsibility. The United States delegation had claimed that such seminars simply gave participants a chance to enjoy themselves and did nothing to solve the question of Palestine. If that delegation could suggest any other way of solving the question, his delegation for one would be prepared to try it. In the meantime, efforts to alert and inform international public opinion must continue. The 1982 seminars had already had an effect not only on international public opinion but also on Israeli public opinion and he hoped that the seminars to be held in 1983 would prove even more successful.

34. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should approve an additional appropriation of \$310,800, apportioned in the following way: \$100,000 under section 1 and \$210,800 under section 29 of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. The additional appropriation of \$1,801,400 proposed for standard conference-servicing requirements would be considered later, in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

35. At the request of the representative of the United States, a vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

36. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for additional appropriations of \$100,000 under section 1 and \$210,800 under section 29 for the biennium 1982-1983 was approved by 81 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.

37. Mr. TRAORE (Togo) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the recommendation.

38. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his Government's position on the question of Palestinian rights was well known. His Government was not opposed to the proposed seminars per se. The United Nations had established regional conference centres in all parts of the world, however, and there was no reason why the proposed seminars should not be held in those centres. If the decision to hold them elsewhere was motivated by the desire for publicity, the United Nations information centres could be used for that purpose.

39. Mrs. de HEDERVARY (Belgium) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Canada. Were the seminars in question to be held in locations where the United Nations had regional centres, her delegation would have voted differently.

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/37/L.40 concerning agenda item 27 (A/C.5/37/85)

40. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that it was his understanding that the question of the United Nations Conference for the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, referred to in draft resolution A/37/L.40, was still under consideration in the plenary Assembly. For

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

instance, a final decision had yet to be taken on the venue for the Conference. He therefore proposed that the decision on the financial implications of draft resolution A/37/L.40 should be deferred until a decision had been taken on the draft resolution as a whole in the plenary Assembly.

41. Mr. GRODSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he too had been informed that consultations on draft resolution A/37/L.40 were still under way. Since the outcome of those consultations would affect the financial implications, he endorsed the United Kingdom proposal.

42. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) asked why the Committee on Conferences had not been convened to assist both the Fifth Committee and the plenary Assembly in their consideration of what was a highly complex issue.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to defer its consideration of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/37/L.40.

44. It was so decided.

Proposed changes in the top echelon: revised estimates under sections 1, 2, 3, 23, 27 and 28 (A/C.5/37/62; A/37/7/Add.19)

45. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) suggested that, since the Advisory Committee's report (A/37/7/Add.19) had only just been issued, the Committee should defer its consideration of the item in question.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Fifth Committee decided to defer its consideration of proposed changes in the top echelon: revised estimates under sections 1, 2, 3, 27 and 28.

47. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 110: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (A/C.5/37/L.44/Rev.1)

48. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/37/L.44/Rev.1 in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Fifth Committee and co-ordinator of the informal consultations on the draft resolution, said that, in guiding the informal consultations, he had been strongly convinced that a resolution acceptable to all Member States was essential in order to defuse the climate of conflict surrounding the question of the scale of assessments. The issue was far too important for it to be resolved by a resolution on which a vote had to be taken: a consensus resolution was needed to ensure that Member States fulfilled their commitments to the financing of the United Nations and its activities.

49. It was on that basis that intensive informal consultations had taken place and it was thanks to the spirit of compromise and co-operation of all participants

(Mr. Kuyama, Japan)

that a resolution had been drafted that enjoyed general support. He earnestly hoped that the draft resolution would be taken in that spirit and that the Committee would adopt it by consensus.

50. The following correction should be made to paragraph 4 (a): in the third line, the words "among other" should read "among others", and should be set off by commas. Also in connection with that subparagraph, he understood from the consultations that exchange rates were expected to reflect some element of inflation.

51. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that although there had been extensive informal consultations, not every delegation had taken part in them and he believed that all members of the Committee should have a chance to reflect on the draft resolution now before them. His delegation had not been able to study the draft adequately but, after hurried consultations with its own authorities, had three suggestions to make.

52. The first suggestion concerned the incorrect statement in the sixth preambular paragraph that Member States were obliged under the Charter to bear the expenses of the Organization as apportioned by the General Assembly according to the capacity to pay. The error could be rectified either by replacing the reference to the Charter with a reference to General Assembly resolution 14 (I) or by deleting the words "according to the capacity to pay". He would prefer the latter.

53. The second suggestion concerned the use of the word "is" in paragraph 1, which his delegation would prefer to see changed to "ought to be". The third suggestion concerned paragraph 2 (a). His delegation believed that the advisory role of the Committee on Contributions required that it should present proposals for methods which the General Assembly "could" use, rather than "should" use, in determining future scales of assessments.

54. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the drafting of the resolution had been open to any delegation wishing to participate. He believed that the first suggestion made by the representative of the United States was well founded, but the error could be rectified simply by removing the words "under the Charter". However, he would find it difficult to accept the other two suggestions.

55. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) agreed to the amendment proposed by Morocco to the sixth preambular paragraph. He withdrew his suggestions for amendments to paragraphs 1 and 2 (a).

56. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/37/L.44/Rev.1, as orally revised, by consensus.

57. It was so decided.

58. Mr. GRODSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution as a whole, though it had reservations about certain

/...

(Mr. Grodsky, USSR)

provisions. It welcomed the fact that the draft resolution confirmed the principle that the General Assembly should distribute the cost of meeting the Organization's expenditures among Member States in accordance with their capacity to pay and that the methodology to be used should be based on statistics for Member States' national incomes expressed in current prices. That methodology had been tested by time and enabled scientifically comparable statistics for all Member States to be used to effect a just distribution of costs in accordance with capacity to pay.

59. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus, if there had been a vote on the draft resolution it would have abstained because it considered that the text did not reflect sufficiently the desirability of recognizing the independent expert status of the Committee on Contributions. In addition, his delegation had been given to understand that document A/C.5/37/L.44 would be the final text and it was not happy with the informal procedure whereby a revised version had been produced at short notice.

60. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that, with reference to the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, his delegation continued to have full confidence in the integrity of the Committee on Contributions.

61. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that although his delegation had joined the consensus, it would have abstained in any vote on the draft resolution because of certain difficulties with the drafting of the operative paragraphs. For example, paragraph 1 referred to Member States' "real capacity to pay", whereas the sixth preambular paragraph spoke simply of "the capacity to pay". Paragraph 2 said that the Committee on Contributions might extend its sessions as necessary; it did not prescribe any limit. Similarly, paragraph 3 invited the Secretary-General to provide the Committee on Contributions with the facilities it required to carry out its work and with necessary supplementary assistance, again without prescribing limits. Finally, his delegation had been unable to understand the meaning of paragraph 4 and gathered that there were different opinions as to its significance. Despite those reservations, his delegation had not wished to block consensus on what had been a very difficult problem.

62. Mr. GEPP (Brazil) said his delegation had been able to join the consensus because the draft resolution incorporated many of its ideas. He hoped that the Committee on Contributions had now solved the problem of the scale of assessments for the three years until the next such operation, since it had effectively accomplished the tasks set by General Assembly resolution 36/231 A.

63. The CHAIRMAN said he thought all would agree that item 110 had proven very difficult but had been brought to the most satisfactory possible conclusion with the co-operation of all delegations, thanks in particular to the efforts of the representatives of Morocco and Japan. It was his understanding that draft resolutions A/C.5/37/L.20/Rev.1 and L.21 on the same subject had been overtaken by events and required no further action. Consideration of item 110 was thus concluded and the Rapporteur would report to the General Assembly in due course.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.