



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 54th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KUYAMA (Japan)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 119: 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 ITEMS 109 and 110: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution in document A/SPC/38/L.6/Rev.1, as orally revised (International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees)

AGENDA ITEM 17: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS (continued)

(a) APPOINTMENT OF SIX MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

*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.5/38/SR.54
12 December 1983
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 119: 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/38/473, 589; A/C.5/38/L.14)

1. Mrs. CONWAY (Ireland), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.14 on behalf of the 17 sponsors, emphasized that UNIFIL continued to confront very serious financial difficulties, the reason being that a number of Member States were withholding their contributions. The shortfall in the UNIFIL Special Account currently amounted to \$173.9 million, and as a consequence the Organization was falling far behind in its reimbursements to troop-contributing States. That placed an increasingly heavy burden on those countries, particularly the less wealthy ones. Under the Charter, responsibility for maintaining peace was shared collectively by all Member States; the policy of withholding contributions for that purpose was not, therefore, consistent with the provisions of the Charter.

2. Part A, sections I to IV of the draft resolution concerned the appropriation for the UNIFIL Special Account of an amount of \$159,821,666 for the operations of UNIFIL for the period from 19 December 1982 to 18 December 1983. Section V concerned the appropriation for the Special Account of an amount of \$46,964,000 for the period from 19 December 1983 to 18 April 1984. In section VI, the General Assembly would authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for the operation of UNIFIL at a rate not to exceed \$11,741,000 gross per month for the period from 19 April to 18 December 1984, should the Security Council decide to continue the Force and subject to obtaining the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee. Those amounts were based on the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in its report.

3. In section VII, the General Assembly renewed its invitation to Member States to make voluntary contributions to UNIFIL, in particular contributions in cash to the Suspense Account. So far, because of the lack of adequate contributions, that Account had not achieved its purpose of alleviating the financial burden on troop-contributing Governments. Finally, in part B of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to suspend the provisions of regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 of the Financial Regulations in order to prevent the Special Account surplus from being used as a credit to reduce the assessed contributions of Member States, particularly in the case of Member States which were withholding their contributions.

4. Mr. GOGUIKAN (Lebanon) said that, in response to the wishes of the Lebanese Government, the Security Council had decided to renew the mandate of UNIFIL for the period from 19 October 1983 to 19 April 1984. In view of the explosive situation which continued to prevail in southern Lebanon as a result of the foreign occupation, the presence of UNIFIL was more necessary than ever to guarantee the population's security. Moreover, given the confused and deplorable way in which the situation was currently developing in Lebanon, the maintenance of UNIFIL for

(Mr. Goguikan, Lebanon)

the six coming months was particularly important. Any withdrawal of UNIFIL before the Lebanese national army and security services were in a position to assume effective control of the southern part of the country would once again prevent the Lebanese Government from re-establishing its authority and would compromise the efforts being made by certain friendly countries with a view to ensuring a peaceful settlement.

5. The withdrawal of UNIFIL while the foreign occupation was intensifying would be the first step towards the isolation of part of the Lebanese population, a solution which all segments of the nation had firmly rejected on many occasions. He denied the existence of a civil war in Lebanon and denounced the plot fomented for the previous nine years by foreign forces with a view to progressively weakening, dividing and paralysing the country.

6. The financial situation of UNIFIL was all the more worrying in view of the fact that the alarming deficit of the UNIFIL Account, a deficit which amounted to \$173.9 million, in the long run represented a threat to the normal operation of the Force. Under the Charter, responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security in the world was shared collectively by Member States, and Lebanon, a founder Member of the United Nations, had always fulfilled its various obligations in that respect; he therefore launched an urgent appeal to the members of the Fifth Committee to remedy the precarious situation of UNIFIL as quickly as possible by providing for a more effective procedure for the payment of contributions.

7. In conclusion, he paid tribute to the commander of UNIFIL and his troops and expressed his gratitude to those Governments contributing troops to UNIFIL for the generous and unfailing support they continued to provide to his country.

8. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reaffirmed his country's position of principle according to which all costs related to the consequences of the armed aggression against Lebanon must be borne by the aggressor. As a result, his country did not and did not intend to participate in the financing of UNIFIL. His delegation asked that the draft resolution be put to the vote and announced that it would vote against the draft resolution.

9. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his country had already expressed its position in the most unambiguous way in connection with the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.13 concerning the financing of UNDOF.

10. Mr. GUBCSI (Hungary) said that his country would vote against the draft resolution since his Government did not consider itself under any obligation to finance UNIFIL.

11. Mr. MATER (Democratic Yemen) reiterated his Government's position according to which the withdrawal of all Israeli forces and the recognition of the right of the Palestinians to an independent State represented the one and only basis for the settlement of the conflict in Lebanon. As a result, all costs relating to UNIFIL must be borne by the aggressor.

/...

12. Mr. ERDEMBAT (Mongolia) said that his delegation considered on principle that it was for the aggressor alone to bear the financial consequences of its acts. His country would not accept responsibility for any of the financial implications of the draft resolution and would vote against its adoption.

13. Mr. PRODRMOU (Cyprus), reaffirming the importance which his delegation attached to the mission of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East or in any other region of the world, said that his delegation would vote for the adoption of the draft resolution.

14. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, for reasons which it had already explained, his delegation would not take part in the vote.

15. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) paid tribute to the personnel of UNIFIL and to the troop-contributing countries. Israel had already explained its position to the Security Council. He recognized that peace-keeping operations should, by their very nature, be limited in time and could not be a substitute for the peaceful settlement of disputes, but he emphasized that the extended presence of UNIFIL in the Middle East was merely the necessary consequence of the hostility which Israel's neighbouring States had always displayed towards Israel. His delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution.

16. Mr. YONIS (Iraq) said that the aggressor, which in the case in question was the Zionist entity, must alone bear the costs associated with UNIFIL, costs which must under no circumstances be covered by the regular budget. His delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

17. Mr. BOUYOUCHEF (Algeria) said that, for reasons which it had already explained, his delegation would not take part in the vote.

18. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that, in accordance with its established position, his delegation would not take part in the vote.

19. Mr. AL-ERYANY (Yemen) said that it was for the aggressor to bear all costs incurred in connection with UNIFIL and that his delegation would abstain during the vote.

20. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.14.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia,

/...

Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Congo, Cuba, Iraq, Maldives, Yemen.

21. Draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.14 was adopted by 94 votes to 12, with 6 abstentions.

22. Mr. ASHOUR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote because of its view that the aggressor alone should be responsible for the financial consequences of its aggression against the Arab nation. The presence of so-called peace-keeping forces would never provide an equitable solution to the situation created by the Zionist entity.

23. Mr. NGUYEN LUONG (Viet Nam), repeating his Government's position, said that responsibility for the current situation belonged solely to the aggressor and those which upheld the aggressor. Furthermore, the peace-keeping forces had not performed their function but on the contrary had exacerbated the situation and added to insecurity in the region and throughout the world.

24. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel), exercising his right of reply, regretted that some delegations were trying to turn the Fifth Committee into a political forum, thereby concealing their true intention, which was to prevent peace and security from reigning, at long last, in the region. His delegation condemned every such attempt to distract the Committee from its task and rejected all the malicious allegations made against the Government of Israel. Some representatives had implied that Israel should defray all the expenses of UNIFIL. That idea was particularly unjust, since the Government of Israel had always paid its share of UNIFIL expenses, and of all other costs incurred in peace-keeping operations, whether or not it had approved them. The Member States which unilaterally decided not to fulfil their obligations under the Charter would do better to follow Israel's example rather than to give it advice.

AGENDA ITEMS 109 and 110: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution in document A/SPC/38/L.6/Rev.1, as orally revised (International co-operation to avert new flows of refugees) (A/C.5/38/51/Rev.1)

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

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

draft resolution in document A/38/593, part III, concerned the activities of the Group of Governmental Experts established by the General Assembly in its resolution 36/148 and that their funding had already been considered at the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh sessions. The Group had held two sessions, each of one week's duration, in 1983. The estimate of \$72,600 referred to in paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/38/51/Rev.1 was intended to finance the participation of experts from the least developed countries in the sessions which the Group was to hold in New York in 1984. In reply to its questions, the Advisory Committee had been informed that the Secretary-General had based his estimates on the assumption that all the experts from the least developed countries concerned would come to New York from their home countries to participate in the Group's work. However, the Advisory Committee had noted from additional information given by the representatives of the Secretary-General that participants in the Group's sessions in New York in 1983 had included experts from least developed countries who were based in the permanent missions in New York.

26. The Advisory Committee recalled that the Fifth Committee had approved the ACABQ recommendation at the thirty-seventh session to the effect that the Secretary-General should be authorized to permit the necessary expenditures on the understanding that he would include the relevant information in his programme budget performance report for 1982-1983 (A/37/7 and Add.1-24, annex, paras. 60 and 61). As it was impossible to estimate accurately the number of experts who would be coming from their home countries, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the same procedure should be followed in the present case.

27. The amount of \$342,200 mentioned in paragraph 5 referred to conference-servicing costs, which would be included in the consolidated statement on conference servicing for 1984, to be submitted by the Secretary-General later in the session. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was not, for the time being, recommending an additional appropriation to cover the expenditures that would be incurred if the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee was adopted by the General Assembly.

28. Mr. KELLER (United States of America), recalled that his delegation had supported the draft resolution in the Special Political Committee and said that he had no objection to the appropriation requested to cover the travel and subsistence of experts from least developed countries, whose experience was especially valuable in that many of the countries concerned had large refugee populations. However, since those experts seemed to be appointed by the Secretary-General in their personal capacity, it should be noted that the provisions under consideration implied that the travel and subsistence of experts of that category could be charged to the United Nations regular budget.

29. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already stated in detail, in the Special Political Committee, its position on draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.6/Rev.1. In considering the measures proposed to avert new flows of refugees, it was necessary to display the utmost concern for economy. The amounts requested for 1984 were too high; they exceeded \$400,000 and would be sufficient to finance a vast campaign of assistance to refugees. The volume of

/...

(Mr. Khalevinsky, USSR)

documentation provided for was also exaggerated. Generally speaking, the statements of financial implications submitted to the Fifth Committee failed to describe the post-session documentation in sufficient detail for delegations to be able to judge whether the resolutions of the Organization concerning the volume of documentation were being complied with. In practice, the length of such documents was often between 150 and 200 pages, which was far more than the 64 pages stated in document A/C.5/38/51/Rev.1.

30. His delegation assumed that the amount requested by the Secretary-General would be used solely to cover the expenses of experts who came from the capital cities of their own countries and that such an arrangement would be a rare exception to the rule established in resolution 36/148. Because of the need to use as sparingly as possible the financial resources of the regular budget, his delegation considered that the total expenditure for the two sessions of the Group of Governmental Experts scheduled in 1984 could be reduced to the minimum.

31. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/38/L.6/Rev.1, as orally revised, there would be no need for an additional appropriation under the proposed programme budget for 1984-1985. The Secretary-General would be authorized to commit expenditures for the travel of experts from least developed countries and would reflect that expenditure in his programme budget performance report. Conference-servicing requirements on a full-cost basis would amount to \$342,200, which would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement to be submitted before the end of the session.

32. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted his proposal.

33. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 17: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS (continued)

(a) APPOINTMENT OF SIX MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (A/38/101; A/C.5/38/56)

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the term of office of six members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions expired on 31 December 1983. In document A/C.5/38/56, the Secretary-General presented the names of candidates nominated by their respective Governments for appointment or reappointment to fill the vacancies that would arise. After briefly reviewing the rules governing the elections concerned, he invited statements from the Chairmen of the regional groups.

35. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the Group of Western European and other States, said that the members of the Advisory Committee should be chosen according to their qualifications and experience, on as broad a geographical basis as possible. Among the candidates under consideration, four came from countries in

(Ms. Conway, Ireland)

the group over which she presided. Under the gentleman's agreement reached, that group expected to fill two of the vacancies only.

36. Mr. MADAR (Somalia), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that no candidate had been put forward by his group. He nevertheless wished to remind the Committee of the importance of the principle of a balanced geographical distribution of the members of the Advisory Committee.

37. Mr. ALPER (Turkey), speaking on behalf of the Group of Asian States, endorsed the remarks just made. Under the gentleman's agreement, the vacancies should be filled by Latin America (one person), Asia (three persons) and the Western European States (two persons).

38. Mr. RAKAU (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, said that the delegations of those States would abide by the agreement reached.

39. Mr. ARIS de CASTILLA (Guatemala), speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American States, reaffirmed the validity of the informal agreement governing the distribution of vacancies in the Advisory Committee.

The meeting was suspended at 12.10 p.m. and resumed at 1.40 p.m.

40. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Bouyoucef (Algeria), Mrs. Avendaño de Incera (Costa Rica), Ms. Conway (Ireland) Mr. Alper (Turkey) and Mr. Rakau (German Democratic Republic) acted as tellers. A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<u>Number of ballot papers:</u>	147
<u>Invalid ballots:</u>	0
<u>Valid ballots:</u>	147
<u>Abstentions:</u>	0
<u>Number of members voting:</u>	147
<u>Required majority:</u>	74
<u>Number of votes obtained:</u>	
Mr. Takasu	126
Mr. Ma Longde	124
Mr. Guimarães Neto	117
Mr. Roy	101

Mr. Amnéus	91
Mr. Murray	75
Mr. Durand	67
Mr. Garrido	67
Mr. Marron-Gómez	61

41. Mr. Takasu (Japan), Mr. Ma Longde (China), Mr. Guimarães Neto (Brazil), Mr. Roy (India), Mr. Amnéus (Sweden) and Mr. Murray (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) having obtained the required majority, the Committee recommended their appointment as members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1984.

42. The CHAIRMAN congratulated the new members of the Advisory Committee on their election. He thanked the outgoing members for their work and dedication. The Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee would report the results of the ballot directly to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.