

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records*



COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY - DO NOT
CIRCULATE

FIFTH COMMITTEE
45th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 11 December 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

DEC 28 1984

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 45th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 117: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM (continued)

- (a) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)
- (b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution VII submitted by the Third Committee in document A/39/702 concerning agenda item 93 (b)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.84 concerning agenda item 80 (c)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.56 concerning agenda item 12

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/39/L.28-L.32 concerning agenda item 31

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.89 concerning agenda item 80 (p)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.13, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 129

/...

*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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.5/39/SR.45
14 December 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

CONTENTS (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 133

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.34 concerning agenda item 77

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 69

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.98 concerning agenda item 80 (b)

Programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report to the General Assembly (A/39/24 (Part II))

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 117: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

(A/39/7/Add.4, A/39/39 and Corr.1; A/C.5/39/18, 26 and 27; A/C.5/39/L.8 and L.16)

(b) REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.5/39/13)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.16, introduced at the 44th meeting, without a vote.

2. It was so decided.

3. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that his delegation was concerned about certain decisions and recommendations of ICSC, in particular those which had resulted in salary increases for United Nations staff totalling tens of millions of dollars. At a time when urgent human needs were going unmet, increases of such magnitude were unacceptable. The preservation of the Commission's independence was essential; but independence must not be an excuse for insulating staff members from world realities.

4. Pending further study of long-service steps with a view to establishing uniformity in the common system, the Committee had decided not to implement the step recommended for United Nations Professional staff. It was important that other organizations should exercise similar restraint and it would also be appropriate for the Secretary-General to defer the granting of a long-service step for General Service employees. Lastly, the incorporation of 20 points of post adjustments into base salary, which was supposed to have been effected on a financially neutral basis, had in fact resulted in higher compensation. ICSC should refine its methods so that future decisions of a similar kind would not result in unwarranted salary increases.

5. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would have voted against draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.16, had there been a vote.

6. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.8 had been withdrawn by the sponsors. He proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the Secretary-General's report on the statute of the International Civil Service Commission (A/C.5/39/13).

7. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution VII submitted by the Third Committee in document A/39/702 concerning agenda item 93 (b) (A/39/7/Add.11; A/C.5/39/64)

8. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report (A/39/7/Add.11), said that the Secretary-General had estimated total requirements for the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women at \$2,232,000, of which \$1,958,200 related to conference-servicing costs. The immediate appropriation requested by the Secretary-General was for \$273,800, including travel and subsistence of staff from New York. As indicated in paragraph 8 of its report, the Advisory Committee had concluded that economies could be made by combining the functions of some of the staff proposed for travel. Accordingly, ACABQ was recommending a reduced appropriation of \$222,200.

9. Mrs. KNEZEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation wished to know what the consequences would be of the reductions proposed by the Advisory Committee in terms of the coverage provided by the Department of Public Information.

10. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said that approximately 18 staff members would be sent instead of 23. More time was required for the Secretariat to determine what the practical effects of that reduction would be.

11. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution VII submitted by the Third Committee in document A/39/702, additional appropriations totalling \$222,200 would be required for the biennium 1984-1985, apportioned in the following way: \$125,000 under section 4; \$18,000 under section 6; \$1,300 under section 10; \$5,200 under section 11; \$5,800 under section 12; \$3,700 under section 13; \$3,200 under section 14; and \$60,000 under section 27. An additional amount of \$9,900 would be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). Conference-servicing requirements estimated at \$1,958,200 on a full-cost basis would arise. The actual appropriation required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the current session.

12. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.84 concerning agenda item 80(c) (A/C.5/39/65)

13. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that the United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships would hold a resumed three-week session at Geneva in January and February 1985. The session would add to the calendar of conferences for 1985, resulting in conference-servicing costs estimated at \$448,600.

14. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.84, conference-servicing requirements would arise which had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$448,600. The actual additional appropriations required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

15. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.56 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/39/71 and Add.1)

16. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that the resolution would authorize the working group on migrant workers to hold an inter-sessional meeting of two weeks' duration in New York. The Secretary-General had indicated, in paragraph 11 of his statement (A/C.5/39/71), that conference-servicing requirements of \$456,400 would arise if the inter-sessional meeting was held in Geneva and the sessional meeting in New York, or of \$537,600 if both sessions were held in New York. In the latter case an amount of \$3,700 would be required for travel of staff from Geneva to New York, but would be absorbed.

17. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and of the Committee on Conferences, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.56, conference-servicing requirements would arise which had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$537,600. The actual additional appropriations required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement. Adoption of the draft resolution would constitute authorization for an exception to be made to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 31/140, section I, paragraph 4.

18. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/39/L.28-L.32 concerning agenda item 31 (A/C.5/39/75)

19. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that the Advisory Committee was recommending an additional appropriation of \$587,500 under section 3A for the biennium 1984-1985.

20. The Chairman proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/39/L.28, L.29, L.30, L.31 and L.32, an additional appropriation of \$587,500 would be required under section 3A of the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985.

21. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that the proposed additional appropriation was unacceptable. First, the United Nations regular budget should not finance the representation of South African national liberation movements at

(Mr. Nygard, United States)

the United Nations. Second, the events listed in paragraph 8 of the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/39/75) involved the travel of so many staff, that his delegation wondered whether the Centre against Apartheid would be able to undertake all of the additional tasks assigned. Third, the United States objected to the practice of providing intergovernmental bodies with block grants. The Special Committee against Apartheid would once again receive \$400,000, with control over disbursements left to itself. The Controller should provide the Fifth Committee with an accounting of the \$400,000 grant provided to the Special Committee at the thirty-eighth session. Lastly, his delegation was opposed to the so-called public information activities referred to in paragraphs 10 and 17 of the statement, since they amounted to propaganda campaigns directed against Member States and thus reflected negatively on the United Nations.

22. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Portugal.

23. The proposal was adopted by 91 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.89 concerning agenda item 80 (p) (A/C.5/39/77)

24. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that adoption of the Second Committee's draft resolution would result in the preparation of two additional reports, as indicated in paragraph 9 of the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/39/77). No additional appropriations would arise.

/...

25. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.89, no additional appropriations would be required for the biennium 1984-1985.

26. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.13, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 129 (A/C.5/39/L.78)

27. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that the draft resolution would authorize the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries to hold a four-week session in April and May 1985. Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated at \$429,300.

28. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.13, as orally revised, conference-servicing requirements would arise which had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$429,300. The actual additional appropriations required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement.

29. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 133 (A/C.5/39/79)

30. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization would hold a four-week session in New York in March 1985. Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated at \$452,700.

31. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.18 and Corr.1, as orally revised, conference-servicing requirements would arise which had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$452,700. The actual additional appropriations required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement.

32. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.34 concerning agenda item 77 (A/C.5/39/81)

33. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that the

(Mr. Mselle)

Secretary-General had estimated requirements at \$54,000. The Advisory Committee had recommended an amount of \$50,000 at the thirty-eighth session, of which an unused balance of \$27,500 remained. Thus an additional amount of \$26,500 for 1985 was requested by the Secretary-General. The Advisory Committee had taken the view that the Secretary-General should commit the necessary funds and report back to the Fifth Committee in the final performance report for the biennium 1984-1985. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was not recommending any additional appropriation for the time being.

34. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that his Government and that of Jordan should seek a common solution to the problem of the proposed canal linking the Mediterranean Sea with the Dead Sea. It should be noted that the canal was only at the feasibility stage, and Israel was very willing to take full account of the legitimate interests of Jordan. The draft resolution thus had no legitimate purpose. He requested a recorded vote and said that his delegation would vote against the programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

35. Mr. NASHASHIBI (Jordan) said that his delegation had already pointed out in the Special Political Committee that Jordan would be seriously affected by the project, which, as part of Israel's nuclear armament policy, included the construction of several nuclear plants in the canal zone. In that connection, he observed that Israel had not ratified the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and added that its decision was in violation of a number of other international agreements in the nuclear field.

36. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.34, no additional appropriations would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985 at the current stage. The Secretary-General would be authorized to commit the necessary funds, not exceeding \$54,000, reporting thereon as appropriate to the General Assembly in the context of the final programme budget performance report for the current biennium.

37. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, observed that actual construction of the canal was not planned for the near future and undertaking a study on the subject was hardly a prudent use of limited resources. The project was a matter of local interest but did not warrant a special study by the United Nations. His delegation would oppose any expenditure of funds for that purpose.

38. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

39. The proposal was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 10 abstentions.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 69 (A/C.5/39/82)

40. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1 requested the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of the Collective Security Provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the Maintenance of International Peace and Security. The Committee would comprise 54 Member States and would have a three-week meeting in New York in 1985, from 29 July to 16 August. The statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/39/82) indicated that conference-servicing requirements would arise which were estimated at \$456,700.

41. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.86/Rev.1, conference-servicing requirements would arise which were estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$456,700. 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. He indicated that a recorded vote had been requested on the proposal.

42. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said his delegation believed that the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee was unnecessary and would involve considerable duplication and overlapping with the work of the main political committees and the Security Council. There was no justification, in his view, for making the requested appropriations.

43. A recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Viet Nam.

44. The proposal was adopted by 75 votes to 16, with 14 abstentions.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.98 concerning agenda item 80 (b) (A/C.5/39/85)

45. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing orally the Advisory Committee's report, said that draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.98 proposed a thorough and systematic review of the implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and recommended the establishment of an Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Committee of the Whole, which would meet in New York from 12 to 30 August 1985 and would report to the General Assembly at the fortieth session. The Secretary-General indicated in paragraph 11 of his statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/39/85) that six consultant work-months and eight Professional work-months would be needed for the proposed activity. No additional appropriations would be required under the programme budget for the current biennium. The estimated costs of conference-servicing amounted to \$319,800.

46. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that, while his delegation was sympathetic to the problems and aspirations of the developing countries, it felt that the Charter did little to promote the strengthening of harmonious economic development and discouraged the capital flow vital for that purpose. His delegation could not, therefore, endorse the financial implications of the draft resolution.

47. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.98, no additional appropriations would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985 at the current stage. Conference-servicing requirements would arise which were estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$319,800. The actual additional appropriations which 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 stage. He indicated that a recorded vote had been requested on the proposal.

48. A recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Finland, Ireland, Israel, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

49. The proposal was adopted by 89 votes to 12, with 9 abstentions.

Programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia in its report to the General Assembly (A/39/24 (Part II))
(A/39/7/Add.13; A/C.5/39/70 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

50. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report (A/39/7/Add.13), said that ACABQ had decided to offer a number of recommendations which, if followed in future, would facilitate the Fifth Committee's consideration of the programme budget implications of recommendations of the Council for Namibia. The Council's programme of work was growing steadily, as were the related financial implications, and it was essential to ensure that documentation was clearly drafted. One of the weaknesses of the Secretary-General's statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/39/70 and Corr.1) was that it did not provide a sufficiently detailed explanation of the principal factors contributing to requests for additional appropriations. The Advisory Committee recommended that such justification, including tables similar to those contained in paragraphs 3 and 5 of its report, should be provided in future statements.

51. The Advisory Committee had been informed that missions were combined whenever possible. However, the Advisory Committee had noted that estimates for travel and subsistence for meetings had been calculated on the basis of 100 per cent attendance and that, for the purpose of costing plenary meetings, it had been assumed that all representatives would travel to the meeting site from New York. The Advisory Committee welcomed the assurance that efforts were being made to consolidate missions whenever possible. At the same time, in order to avoid the possibility of appropriating funds which might not be spent in full, it recommended that previous experience in that regard should be taken into account when calculating future estimates for travel. Past experience could also be used to identify expertise available in local United Nations offices which could be utilized for journalist encounters and survey missions.

52. The Secretary-General's statement indicated that the Council's programme of work for 1985 required additional appropriations totalling \$4,097,000. Conference-servicing requirements would arise which were estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$2,415,800. The table in paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report showed that \$9,949,100 and \$632,500 had been appropriated under sections 3C and 27 respectively, excluding conference-servicing costs under section 29. The 1984 obligation was \$5,384,400 under section 3C and \$589,100 under section 27, resulting in a balance for 1985 of \$4,564,700 and \$43,400 respectively. The Advisory Committee noted that the 1985 full-cost requirements under sections 3C and 27 would total \$8,666,200 against the corresponding 1984 obligation of \$5,973,500, showing an increase of 45 per cent (and not 31 per cent as incorrectly stated in paragraph 4 of the ACABQ report). The Advisory Committee had held two meetings with representatives of the Secretary-General, and had asked for additional information in that regard.

53. The Advisory Committee made several other comments in the body of its report and recommended, for example, that consideration should be given to having the bulk of the public information programme implemented by one organizational unit. Subject to those comments and the observations contained in paragraph 30 of its

(Mr. Mselle)

report, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A to E, additional appropriations amounting to \$4,097,000 would be required. The estimate for conference-servicing requirements would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement for 1985 to be submitted towards the end of the current session.

54. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the 10 member countries of the European Economic Community, said that the delegations of those countries took note of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, but felt that, in the present financial climate, a more judicious approach to the programme of work of the Council for Namibia could have resulted in lower programme budget implications for 1985, without detracting from the attainment of the Council's objectives. They were particularly concerned by the proposed exceptions to resolutions 31/140, 3415 (XXX) and 37/14 C to permit the holding of seminars and regional symposia, and especially a series of plenary meetings in Western Europe during 1985. The venues chosen for meetings held away from Headquarters should, to the extent possible, be cities in which United Nations-owned conference facilities were available. The Ten noted with some disappointment that the Committee on Conferences had decided by a majority to support the request for such exceptions.

55. The Ten also noted that the Council for Namibia, prior to approving its recommendations to the General Assembly, appeared not to have received the statement of programme budget implications of its programme of work, as required by regulation 4.9 of the regulations governing programme planning. Her delegations believed that such information should be supplied in future by the Secretariat.

56. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) noted that each year the Council for Namibia presented a work programme totally divorced from budgetary and administrative reality, and felt that Council members seemed more concerned with defending their privileges than engaging in constructive efforts to promote independence for Namibia. Neither the Advisory Committee nor the Committee on Conferences had been able to alter the Council's budgetary demands. However, it should be borne in mind that no subordinate body of the General Assembly - including the Council for Namibia - could rule by decree.

57. Some of the programmes and conferences devoted to Namibia during the current biennium would make a positive contribution, but his delegation failed to understand how the Namibian people would benefit from the extraordinary plenary meetings to be held in Western Europe, involving travel expenses totalling more than \$1 million for Council members and Secretariat staff. The Council had decreed that it could travel wherever and whenever it saw fit at United Nations expense, and that flagrant violation of General Assembly resolution 31/140 threatened to undermine a critical element of sound management.

58. The Council for Namibia had decided that it should receive a grant of \$1.3 million to disburse among its favourite organizations, but gave no indication as to the programmes or purposes for which those funds would be used. Instead,

/...

(Mr. Nygard, United States)

discretion was left to the South West Africa People's Organization. That represented a serious departure from established United Nations financial rules and regulations, and the Council should be reminded that its special status did not include the right to act as a philanthropic institution.

59. The Council for Namibia had authorized a public information programme intended to "expose and denounce the collusion of the United States of America, certain other Western countries and Israel with the South African racists". His delegation rejected such tendentious references and would carefully analyse all information activities carried out by the Council. Moreover, it could not assume financial responsibility for Council propaganda which slandered the United States. Finally, at a time of so much human suffering on the African continent, it believed that the Council for Namibia should begin to look beyond its own interests.

60. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community concerning the programme budget implications in document A/C.5/39/70. Successive British Governments had made determined efforts to help bring Namibia to independence at the earliest possible date and his delegation shared the widespread disappointment that Security Council resolution 435 (1978) had not yet been implemented. However, the justice of the cause should not absolve the Committee from carefully examining proposals for the expenditure of United Nations funds which were intended to assist that cause.

61. He expressed concern regarding the late submission of document A/C.5/39/70 and said that it was unclear from the information provided exactly what was being requested for the Council for Namibia and how the requests compared to sums requested in previous years. The report by ACABQ (A/39/7/Add.13) clarified many aspects of the Council's intended work programme. The estimate of requirements was no less than \$4.1 million over and above the approximately \$10 million already appropriated for the biennium 1984-1985, and the details of the proposals reflected a general tendency to increase expenditures without justification being offered. The requests showed no restraint at all. Furthermore, they would require exceptions to General Assembly resolutions 31/140, 3415 (XXX) and 37/14 C, and exceptions appeared to be the rule for the Council. Furthermore, the Council, in arriving at its recommendations, in particular its plans for meetings away from Headquarters, had not had before it a statement of programme budget implications, which meant that it had taken decisions without knowledge of their associated costs, an action which contravened regulation 4.9 of the Regulations Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation. He requested an explanation for that apparent exception to normal procedures.

62. The emphasis on travel which was reflected in document A/C.5/39/70 could give the wrong impression unless the results of that travel were such as to justify the high costs. His delegation had serious doubts about the tangible benefits of holding so many Council meetings and Council-sponsored events away from Headquarters. If meetings must be held away from Headquarters, surely they should

/...

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

be held at a United Nations duty station where the costs would be lower, full facilities assured and survey missions unnecessary. He wondered what effect the Secretary-General's recent reduction in travel funds had had on the Council's activities. He recalled that the additional cost of holding the Council's 1984 plenary meetings at Bangkok had been over \$.5 million, and doubted whether the Namibian people had significantly benefited by the decision to hold those meetings away from Headquarters. He wondered what the additional cost of holding the 1985 meetings in Western Europe would be and what benefit could be expected.

63. Noting that the Department of Public Information (DPI) planned to spend 80 per cent more in 1985 than it had in 1984 on information activities relating to Namibia, he expressed surprise that in view of the size of its overall budget, DPI had made no attempt to absorb the extra costs.

64. The proposed sharp increase in the Council's elaborate work programme could only increase concern at the way in which the Council's programme had developed over the years, particularly with regard to travel away from Headquarters. Expense-paid trips for the Council and its entourage did not assist the Namibian people or improve the image of the United Nations. His delegation would consider it a step in the right direction if the Council's 1985 plenary meetings were held at its Headquarters in New York.

65. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation had consistently supported efforts to achieve the early independence of Namibia by peaceful means and recognized that the Council for Namibia made a substantial contribution to that end by drawing world attention to the seriousness of the plight of the Namibian people. However, from the standpoint of sound financial control and management, document A/C.5/39/70 lacked the information which delegations required to analyse the significance of the proposals contained therein. At a time when the principle of maximum restraint was being applied elsewhere in the United Nations, budgetary requests from the Council should be held at reasonable levels. The programme budget implications of the recommendations of the Council (A/C.5/39/70) and the report of the ACABQ thereon (A/39/7/Add.13) should have been submitted earlier, and his delegation believed that the former text hardly would have been comprehensible without the latter document. While it was true that some of the additional funds had been requested as a result of specific decisions taken by the Council, the requests generally were excessive and not fully justified, and he expressed his delegation's particular concern with regard to the increases requested for staff travel, conference servicing, temporary assistance and information activities relating to Namibia. Moreover, the inclusion in a grant to SWAPO of an allowance for inflation was a departure from United Nations practice regarding grants, which were not indexed to inflation. His delegation shared the hope of ACABQ that the programme of work would be implemented efficiently and with a view to achieving the objectives of the Council as economically as possible.

66. His delegation hoped that future submissions concerning the work programme of the Council would take into account all the relevant factors.

/...

67. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) expressed satisfaction that the report of ACABQ (A/39/7/Add.13) sought to clarify certain points which remained obscure in document A/C.5/39/70. His delegation had problems, not with the goal of independence for Namibia, but with the manner in which the funds appropriated for the Council were being expended. Document A/C.5/39/70 showed a clear lack of restraint at a time when some activities should in fact have been curtailed.

68. His delegation objected to the allocation of \$1 million from the United Nations regular budget to the United Nations Fund for Namibia because, firstly, there was no indication as to what use would be made of the funds and the Committee therefore could not determine whether the expenditure was justified and, secondly, the Fund was engaged in operational activities which, in principle, should be financed from voluntary contributions. Block grants such as the one to SWAPO represented a serious departure from established United Nations financial rules and regulations, and such departures had become all too common. His delegation was also disturbed by continued departures from General Assembly resolution 31/140. At the very least, if the Council met away from Headquarters, it should meet at a United Nations duty station, where conference facilities were available. Paragraph 47 of document A/C.5/39/70 provided an example of the over-ambitious nature of the work programme.

69. The Council, like any other subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, must uphold the principles laid down by the General Assembly. He trusted that the recommendations of ACABQ would encourage the Council to take a closer look at the matter.

70. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) emphasized that Namibia was a unique responsibility of the United Nations and that the Council's budget was a reflection of the history of its independence struggle, which had been under way for so long. It was surprising to hear complaints that the budget of the Council was excessive. The Council had been established to facilitate the efforts of the United Nations in support of the independence of Namibia, and the cost of achieving that goal was difficult to measure in financial terms.

71. With regard to comments made concerning travel by Council members away from Headquarters, he pointed out that because South Africa had refused to allow the Council to establish its headquarters at Windhoek, certain Governments, as a reflection of the importance which they attached to the Namibian cause, invited the Council to meet in their countries and the Council, which had the duty to promote the Namibian cause throughout the world, deemed it advisable to accept such invitations. The objections raised to the fact that such invitations necessitated exceptions to General Assembly resolutions were unfortunate; it was not a question of authorizing pleasure outings, but of enabling the Council fully to assume its responsibilities vis-à-vis Namibia. Moreover, given the unique situation of Namibia, the expenses of the Council in a given year should not necessarily be dictated by past outlays.

(Mr. Tommo Monthe, Cameroon)

72. Delegations that objected to the level of appropriations for information activities concerning Namibia should bear in mind that South Africa and other countries which impeded independence for Namibia spent huge sums to achieve their propaganda objectives. The international community could not sit back and relax in the face of South Africa's dilatory tactics. Delegations should bear in mind that if truly serious efforts were made to implement Security Council resolution 435 (1978), there would be no need for further appropriations for Namibia once it attained independence.

73. Mr. DE CLERCK (Belgium) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia (A/C.5/39/70). His delegation was a member of the Council and had always supported United Nations efforts to bring about the early independence of Namibia. However, the Council did not require the excessive amounts requested in the document to achieve that objective, and the exceptions to the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 31/140, 37/14 C and 3415 (XXX) were unwarranted. The representative of Ireland had clearly expressed his delegation's view in her statement on behalf of States members of the European Economic Community.

74. His delegation endorsed the remarks by the United Kingdom representative concerning the lack of justification for the sizeable increase in the appropriations requested for the Council. It had expressed serious reservations concerning the proposed increased appropriations for 1984 and, because it was convinced that many of the expenditures proposed for 1985 would not contribute much to the Namibian cause, wished to express even more vehement objections to the proposals in document A/C.5/39/70. His delegation would not vote against those proposals because, as a member of the Council, it wished to continue participating in its activities and was dedicated to the cause of the Namibian people.

75. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that since Namibia was a unique responsibility of the United Nations, and since the Council for Namibia must do its utmost to promote the independence of the Namibian people, it was strange that some delegations argued so vehemently against an ambitious programme of work for the Council and the exceptions which would be required to the provisions of certain General Assembly resolutions. The question of Namibia was not a financial issue, but a matter of political will, and if all Member States truly wished to see Namibia become independent, that goal would be attained. The requested appropriations were insignificant when viewed against the background of the activities of transnational corporations and their ruthless exploitation of the people and resources of Namibia. If the United Nations did nothing to defend the cause of the Namibian people now, it would have to spend much more to do so later.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.