



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 57th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Rules governing compensation to members of commissions, committees or similar bodies in the event of death, injury or illness attributable to service with the United Nations

AGENDA ITEM 104: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
(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.5/34/SR.57
14 December 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Rules governing compensation to members of commissions, committees or similar bodies in the event of death, injury or illness attributable to service with the United Nations (A/34/7/Add.8; A/C.5/34/9)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, after considering the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/34/9), the Advisory Committee had held further consultations with the representatives of the Secretary-General; the results of those consultations were reflected in the Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.8), which proposed a number of changes to the original text of the rules submitted by the Secretary-General. The changes proposed affected article 1 (Applicability) and article 2 (Principles of award). The revised text of the rules proposed by the Advisory Committee was to be found in paragraph 4 of its report. In paragraph 5 the Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General to promulgate the rules as amended, subject to the interpretations in paragraphs 5 (a) and (b). In paragraph 6 the Advisory Committee further recommended that the Secretary-General should examine the feasibility of providing insurance coverage for members of commissions, committees or similar bodies to meet the cost of medical or dental treatment. There was no indication as to when the Secretary-General was expected to submit a report; instead the Advisory Committee left it to the Secretary-General to review the matter and report on it as he saw fit.

2. Mr. TOMIKAWA (Japan) said that the proposals of the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/34/9, as amended by the Advisory Committee, were satisfactory; he therefore supported the recommendations in paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.8). With regard to the recommendation in paragraph 6 of that report, his delegation thought it would be sensible to make arrangements enabling members of commissions, committees or similar bodies to opt for a suitable insurance scheme. However, there might be a slight problem in the disparity which would arise between a member covered by an insurance scheme at his own expense, and a member benefiting from an insurance scheme paid for by the United Nations. Nevertheless, he had no objection to the Secretary-General examining the feasibility of providing insurance coverage, as indicated in the report of the Advisory Committee.

3. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he would like to know the date on which the new compensation rules would come into effect.

4. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in paragraph 5 of its report the Advisory Committee provided for promulgation by the Secretary-General of the proposed rules governing compensation. The rules would therefore come into force as soon as that was done.

5. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the recommendations in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/34/7/Add.8).

6. It was so decided.

/...

7. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, but would have abstained if they had been put to the vote. In fact, his delegation was opposed in principle to the idea of remunerating members of expert or intergovernmental organs of the United Nations. In its opinion, it was an honour in itself to be a member or expert serving on an intergovernmental body or any other body of the United Nations, and no financial reward should be expected.

AGENDA ITEM 104: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
(A/C.5/34/L.13 and L.22)

8. Mr. PAL (India) said that the draft decision submitted by India on behalf of members of the Group of 77 (A/C.5/34/L.13) had been issued a fortnight earlier, and had therefore been available to delegations for the purpose of consultation. Unfortunately, no contact had been made with the sponsors of the draft, and the Committee had suddenly been presented, at its current meeting, with a separate draft decision purporting to be an amendment to the draft decision of the Group of 77. The members of the Group of 77 would have considerable difficulty in accepting that text, which they considered to be completely contrary to the views expressed in draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13. The draft decision in question contained a number of specific requests without which the text would be meaningless, namely those contained in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (d) of paragraph 1, which effectively constituted the operative part of the text submitted by the Group of 77. Yet the text issued in document A/C.5/34/L.22 would have the effect of eliminating those very subparagraphs. That text could not, therefore, be considered an amendment to draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13, but rather a new, quite separate draft decision, which should be voted upon as such. For their part, the members of the Group of 77 would not be able to support it, as it was in contradiction with the position of the Group.

9. Mr. GOSS (Australia), introducing document A/C.5/34/L.22, said that, in addition to the nine countries mentioned, Finland and Austria were also sponsors of the amendment, which was supported by all the Western countries. As for the timing of its submission, he would be the first to admit that the 24-hour rule had not been observed; but he hoped that the delegation of India, which had sponsored draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13, would be willing to agree that considerable time and effort were required to produce a text on which general agreement could be reached. At all events, he would assure the representative of India that the delay with which the amendment had been submitted to the Fifth Committee did not signify any Machiavellian design on the part of its sponsors.

10. Three quarters of the draft decision introduced by India on behalf of the Group of 77 were unaffected by amendment A/C.5/34/L.22; moreover, the wording of the proposed new paragraph 1 (c) was largely taken from the original text. The new text would retain the idea of requesting the Secretary-General to draw up a report outlining the basis on which the desirable ranges were currently established; it would invite him to give his own views and suggestions on the matter, and to present the factual data and tables which the Committee would require in discussing the

/...

(Mr. Goss, Australia)

question at the thirty-fifth session; and, finally, it would retain the request that the Secretary-General should present the requisite information at least six weeks before the commencement date of the next regular session of the General Assembly, to enable members of the Committee to consider it in advance.

11. It was apparent, therefore, that the sponsors of amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 considered that the draft decision introduced by the representative of India contained a number of positive provisions which they were anxious to preserve. Nevertheless, there was a basic difference between the draft decision of the Group of 77 and the amendment; in the latter text, the Secretary-General was merely requested to study all aspects of the question, whereas the draft decision prejudged the conclusion to be derived from the study, by requesting the Secretary-General to provide statistical backing for conclusions already reached.

12. There were a number of reasons why the Western countries had not proposed negotiations on the amendment in question. The first was the programme of work. The United Nations had a biennial budget, which meant that, in years when a budget was submitted, personnel questions were relegated to second place, whereas in non-budget years, the Fifth Committee had enough time to consider personnel questions in detail. 1979 was a budget year, and not one in which much time could be devoted to personnel questions. It was also a year in which special attention was paid to pension matters. As a result, any draft decision requiring major changes to personnel policy could not be examined and discussed with the necessary degree of attention. Secondly, the request to the Secretary-General to study the matter made clear that, if the Committee was to take an informed decision, it required additional data, and must also have considered the views of the Secretary-General. In fact, any subsequent discussion would be much more fruitful if that information was available to the Committee. Thirdly, his delegation considered that to indicate in advance the conclusions which any study should reach would tend to suppress any other conclusions to which the Secretary-General's reflections might lead. Finally, the basic question of the composition of the Secretariat was extremely controversial and the source of numerous differences of opinion, both among the delegations supporting draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 and those supporting amendment A/C.5/34/L.22. It would probably be best not to waste the Committee's time by embarking on such a discussion, since everyone was well aware that the proper time to resolve the issue was not now but next year.

13. Amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was a genuine attempt at compromise in tackling the question, since it made a serious endeavour to respond to the concerns voiced by the Group of 77 and to arrange for a study which would make a positive contribution to any discussions held the following year. It did not state that no change would be made in the present system for determining desirable ranges, nor did it say that a change must be made; it left open any decision on the subject till the next session, which would be the right time to decide upon the substance of the question.

14. If the draft decision submitted by India was to be adopted as it stood, it could be expected to give rise not merely to disagreement but also to heated controversy. It would then be all the more difficult to work towards a reasonable solution, whereas the chances of reaching an agreement next year, after discussions conducted in an atmosphere free of passion, would be much greater if a better mood could be created by adopting amendment A/C.5/34/L.22.

/...

(Mr. Goss, Australia)

15. In conclusion, since amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 expressly requested the Secretary-General to take into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee at the present session, the Committee should have confidence in the Secretary-General, and also in the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services, who would certainly have the courage to prepare an objective and impartial report that would aid the Committee in its discussions the following year. His delegation therefore urged the Committee to support the compromise solution in amendment A/C.5/34/L.22.

16. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that there was an error in the French and Arabic texts of draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13: In paragraph 1 (e) of the French text, after the words "une évaluation" the word "indicative" should be replaced by "indiciaire", and, in the Arabic text, the corresponding change should also be made. The reason was that the word "indiciaire" had been the adjective agreed to by the Group of 77 in submitting the draft decision.

17. Mr. PAL (India) felt that, in the English version of the same document, the adjective "indicative" was quite appropriate.

18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the French and Arabic versions should reflect the change indicated by the representative of Morocco. He also stated that, before it took a decision, the Committee would probably require time to study carefully document A/C.5/34/L.22, as it had just been submitted. Informal consultations with the Legal Counsel had indicated that the proposal could in fact be considered as an amendment to the original draft decision in document A/C.5/34/L.13.

19. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) felt that amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was diametrically opposed in its intentions to the draft decision put forward by the Group of 77. On that point, he sought the formal opinion of the Legal Counsel. If it transpired that document A/C.5/34/L.22 did legally constitute a new proposal, then his delegation would want the Committee to vote first on the original draft decision (A/C.5/34/L.13).

20. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) expressed whole-hearted support for the comments made by the representative of Chad.

21. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said he hoped that the long delay in submitting amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 had indeed been caused, not by a lack of courtesy on the part of its sponsors, but by simple practical reasons, as the representative of Australia had explained. It was none the less wrong to claim that the draft was in the interests of the member countries of the Group of 77. The latter, in full awareness of their own interests, had given the matter ample consideration before proposing the text in document A/C.5/34/L.13.

22. His delegation wanted to know whether amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 represented the final expression of the views of the Member States which opposed the draft decision of the Group of 77. If that was the case, his delegation was ready to proceed immediately to a vote.

23. Mr. TOJIKAWA (Japan) agreed with the Chairman that the Committee should give itself time to reflect before deciding what action to take on amendment A/C.5/34/L.22.

/...

24. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said the argument that amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 amplified draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 did not stand up to examination; in fact, the amendment completely undermined the draft decision, while the latter actually met the concerns voiced by the sponsors of the amendment. It had also been argued that the draft decision of the Group of 77 prejudged the outcome of the studies that it had asked the Secretary-General to undertake. However, in paragraph 1 (c), the Secretary-General was requested to provide an outline of any possible additional criteria which might also be utilized in determining a system of desirable ranges. The Secretary-General thus had every opportunity to examine any solution which he might consider appropriate.

25. Mr. PAL (India) said that, in his view, the proposal in document A/C.5/34/L.22 was not a true amendment to draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13. It was astonishing that so much time had been needed to produce a text that had the support of only a dozen countries whereas the draft decision, which expressed the common wishes of 119 Member States, had been issued two weeks earlier.

26. There was no doubt that the representation of Member States in the Secretariat was totally unsatisfactory and should be rectified as soon as possible, whether the Committee adopted draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 or document A/C.5/34/L.22. It was no less obvious that any study that the Secretariat might undertake on the subject would challenge the present system. The apparent cause of the inability to reach an understanding was the extent of the changes to be made. Yet, the Group of 77 had striven to propose a compromise text, although it could have recommended its own solution and requested the Secretary-General to implement it.

27. It had been implied that the draft decision of the Group of 77 was to some extent mistrustful of the Secretary-General. Nothing could be farther from the truth, although it was a fact that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 33/143 concerning the composition of the Secretariat had had no impact on the proposed programme budget. The sponsors of the draft decision had felt it necessary to provide the Secretary-General with more precise guidelines on the matter.

28. Amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 merely made provision for the Secretary-General to conduct a study on the composition of the Secretariat, "taking into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee at the thirty-fourth session". But the differences in views expressed in the course of the discussion had been numerous, and the Secretary-General should be given more precise instructions. The delegation of India would be ready to accept amendments to its text but could not agree to amendment A/C.5/34/L.22, which failed to deal with any specific problems, offered no solution, and seemed to make the issue even more obscure.

29. It had also been said that, since the thirty-fourth session was devoted to a consideration of the proposed programme budget, it would have made more sense to postpone discussion of personnel questions to the following session. That was to imply that the member countries of the Group of 77 had scant regard for the priorities set for the work of the Committee. It was precisely because they thought it was wrong to tackle the substance of the discussion at the present session that they had submitted a draft wherein the Secretary-General was simply requested to make a study.

30. In view of the fact that amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 amounted to a counter-proposal, his delegation called on the Committee to vote first of all on draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13.

31. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) expressed total agreement with the opinion expressed by the representative of Australia and said that in the minds of its sponsors amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 represented a sincere effort at compromise. Since no consensus appeared to be likely on the matter, the best thing to do would be to proceed directly to a vote. For its part, the delegation of the United Kingdom considered that document A/C.5/34/L.22 was simply an amendment to the draft decision of the Group of 77 and should therefore be put first to the vote.

32. Mr. P. FALL (Senegal) said that in his view a draft decision on the composition of the Secretariat could be submitted in a budget year. The aim of the sponsors of the draft had been, in fact, to prepare for the discussion that would take place at the following session. Moreover, their intentions were very clear: the study they requested the Secretary-General to undertake would relate to a situation that they considered damaging for some Member States. From that viewpoint, the draft decision was on the timid side, and it had been in a spirit of compromise that the Group of 77 had merely expressed its most modest requirements.

33. Mr. AL-TAKRITI (Iraq) shared the view of the delegations of India, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Republic of Cameroon that amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was totally contrary to the spirit of the draft decision of the Group of 77. In the opinion of his delegation, the Committee had before it two different proposals and it should vote first on draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13.

34. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) said he could not accept the view of the Australian delegation with regard to document A/C.5/34/L.22. A careful examination of the document clearly showed that it completely emasculated the Indian draft decision. He therefore supported the Indian proposal that document A/C.5/34/L.13 should be put to the vote as soon as possible.

35. Mr. GOSS (Australia) said that it was his understanding that the sponsors of the draft decision attached great importance to the establishment of guidelines for the studies; they considered that those guidelines should be established at once and not during the following year. A question of judgement was involved, and it was for that reason that a group of countries had proposed an amendment.

36. The amendment was truly a compromise solution. Some delegations were opposed to the very principle of the study. The purpose of the amendment was to request the Secretary-General to provide the Committee with information which would give it better background on the question at the following session. Two weeks had been spent on reaching that compromise solution.

37. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) asked the sponsors of document A/C.5/34/L.22 whether they sincerely believed that their text was a draft amendment and not a counter-proposal. A careful reading of rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly showed that it was in effect a counter-proposal.

38. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although it did not wish to impose its views on anyone, his delegation firmly believed that document A/C.5/34/L.22 was an amendment to the draft decision submitted by India, inasmuch as it would modify in a very specific fashion certain provisions of the draft decision. To refuse to recognize document A/C.5/34/L.22 as an amendment would be to contravene the provisions of the rules of procedure concerning the nature of such texts.

39. Mr. SUY (Legal Counsel) drew attention to the technical definition of an amendment in rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly; that rule said that "A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of the proposal". Document A/C.5/34/L.22 seemed to fit that description, since it proposed a deletion and an addition to the original draft decision. It was actually a group of amendments, but there was nothing against several amendments being submitted in a single document. The word "merely" in rule 90 of the rules of procedure should not be taken to mean that an amendment could not deal with the substance of the original proposal. The amendment procedure had in fact been designed to enable substantive changes to be made to a proposal. The text in document A/C.5/34/L.22 therefore appeared to constitute a genuine amendment to draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13.

40. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) pointed out that the Legal Counsel had confined himself to technical considerations and relied mainly on the fact that document A/C.5/34/L.22 contained the words "delete" and "insert". The fact remained that, as far as the substance was concerned, the document constituted a counter-proposal.

41. Mr. PAL (India) proposed that the Committee should decide whether document A/C.5/34/L.22 was an amendment or not. His delegation requested that, if the Committee decided that the document was not an amendment, draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13, which had been submitted first, should be voted on first.

42. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) supported the Indian proposal.

43. Mr. VAN NOUHUYS (Netherlands) said that the Commission was attaching too much importance to legal and technical considerations. Whatever the legal status of document A/C.5/34/L.22 might be, it represented the views of a group of countries that was much larger than the list of sponsors might lead one to believe. The procedure the Committee followed could to a large extent determine the nature of the debate on the question at the following session. If the Committee took up the more far-reaching Indian proposal first, it would be precluding debate on the more moderate proposal in document A/C.5/34/L.22. If, however, document A/C.5/34/L.22 was considered first, there was nothing to prevent the sponsors of draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 from attaining their objectives. Apart from any legal or technical consideration, if the Member States representing the Group of 77 allowed the Committee to take up draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 first, they would be making a very constructive gesture which would facilitate consideration of the question, both at the current session and at the following session.

44. If, as the Indian delegation had proposed, the Committee voted on whether or not document A/C.5/34/L.22 constituted an amendment and if it decided that it was not an amendment, his delegation would request that, under the provision of the rules of procedure which stipulated that proposals should be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted, document A/C.5/34/L.22 should be put to the vote first, unless the Committee decided otherwise.

45. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that the Legal Counsel had made it clear that under rule 90 of the rules of procedure, document A/C.5/34/L.22 was an amendment. It was unfortunate that certain groups tried, when certain provisions of the rules of procedure did not suit them, to prevent their application and change the rules of the game. Document A/C.5/34/L.22 was indisputably a draft amendment and should be treated as such by the Committee.
46. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) appealed to the Indian delegation to withdraw its procedural motion. In the past the Fifth Committee had repeatedly consulted the Legal Counsel and been guided by his opinion. It was pointless to try to settle a legal matter by a majority vote.
47. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) supported the Indian procedural motion.
48. Mr. GOSS (Australia) said that the countries which could not support the Indian draft decision, and particularly the conclusions which the sponsors of the draft decision wished the studies to produce, had had no alternative but to submit a draft amendment. If the Indian delegation was really sure that its draft decision would receive a majority of the votes, it should withdraw its procedural motion in order to make it possible for a real judgement to be made on the substance of draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22.
49. Mr. PAL (India) said he had asked the Committee to vote on whether or not document A/C.5/34/L.22 was an amendment because the Member States representing the Group of 77 were convinced that it was a new draft decision. Rule 89 of the rules of procedure made it clear that if a proposal was to be considered an amendment, the addition, deletion or change proposed in it had to refer to part of the original proposal. Document A/C.5/34/L.22 did not refer to only part of draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 but changed it completely. Nevertheless, in order not to jeopardize the constructive climate of the debate, his delegation agreed to withdraw its procedural motion for the Committee to vote on whether document A/C.5/34/L.22 was an amendment.
50. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) asked that draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 should be put to the vote forthwith, since the Indian representative had withdrawn his procedural motion.
51. Mr. GOLOVKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was dated 22 November and had not been distributed until just before the meeting; the relevant provisions of the rules of procedure stipulated that, as a general rule, all proposals should be distributed to all delegations not later than the day before they were voted on.
52. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the discussion on draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 had been going on for more than an hour and that that was sufficient to indicate that the Committee had tacitly agreed to waive the rule to which the Ukrainian representative had referred.
53. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that initially no delegation had objected to the Committee considering and voting on the proposals in documents A/C.5/34/L.13 and A/C.5/34/L.22 at the current meeting. The turn the discussion was taking appeared to be indicative of bad faith on the part of some delegations.

54. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 had been distributed more than a fortnight earlier while draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 had been distributed only recently. Nevertheless, the latter document was quite a simple one, and he therefore proposed, if he heard no objections, to put it to the vote.

55. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) reminded the Committee that the Group of 77 was in fact comprised of 119 States. Unless draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was voted on by secret ballot, a number of delegations would be inclined to vote, one way or the other, on the basis of group solidarity, which would make the result of the vote a foregone conclusion. In his view, the text of draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 left open a great many options and gave the Secretary-General wide latitude with regard to the criteria which "might be utilized in determining the system of desirable ranges or representation"; a vote against it would certainly not contribute to strengthening unity among States Members of the United Nations.

56. The CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of rule 128 of the rules of procedure, announced the beginning of voting on draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22.

57. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22, in the belief that it in no way served the interests of the Organization and was designed solely to prevent a majority of Member States from requesting and obtaining certain information.

58. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) considered that, when all was said and done, draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was a counter-proposal whose purpose was to render draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 meaningless and to prevent the submission to the Fifth Committee of the technical studies and views requested of the Secretary-General in the latter document. It was a manoeuvre to block any changes within the United Nations, and that was why his delegation would vote against the draft amendment.

59. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) said that his delegation would vote against draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 for procedural reasons connected with the manner of its submission and because it was too far removed in substance from the proposal of India. Furthermore, his delegation wished to place on record that it deplored the stand taken by one of the sponsors of document A/C.5/34/L.22.

60. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) said that his delegation would vote against the proposal in document A/C.5/34/L.22 as it was designed solely to make the Indian draft decision meaningless. He associated himself with the representative of Egypt in deploring the attitude adopted by one of the sponsors of draft A/C.5/34/L.22. The Group of 77 voted, not to demonstrate the force of numbers but with the interests of the developing countries and, above all, the interests of the United Nations, in mind.

61. Mr. BROTDININGRAT (Indonesia) reminded the Committee that the Group of 77, before submitting draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13, had proposed negotiations with interested delegations, but the sponsors of draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 had not seen fit at the time to respond to that proposal. His delegation would vote against the draft amendment.

62. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13. His delegation would have preferred the Committee to adopt by consensus a proposal requesting that studies be made on the determination of desirable ranges; draft proposal A/C.5/34/L.22 might have served that purpose if negotiations on it had been possible inasmuch as it was designed to achieve the same result as A/C.5/34/L.13. His delegation would therefore also vote in favour of document A/C.5/34/L.22 with a view to obtaining as broad a consensus as possible.

63. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) said that he regretted that it had not been possible to have negotiations on draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22; its sponsors had not considered it necessary to negotiate on draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 with the Group of 77, and no last-minute changes could be acceptable. His delegation would therefore vote against draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22, whose sponsors did not seem prepared to accept any movement towards better balance in the composition of the Secretariat.

64. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would vote against draft proposal A/C.5/34/L.22 which, in its view, was not an amendment to draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 but was in fact designed to change its meaning radically. He rejected the suggestion that a secret ballot would enable some members of the Group of 77 to express themselves more freely; draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 had been carefully considered and prepared and was unanimously acceptable to the States members of the Group of 77. The way in which document A/C.5/34/L.22 had been submitted seemed to have been intended solely to demonstrate the right of objection which its sponsors were seeking to exercise in the Committee and elsewhere.

65. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation respected the views which had been expressed by the sponsors of document A/C.5/34/L.22. Its vote on that proposal would be consistent with the arguments which it had advanced in its first statement on the question of desirable ranges, and they coincided with those of the States of the Group of 77. Its vote would reflect not so much his delegation's solidarity with the Group of 77, but its adherence to the position which it had earlier taken, the more so as the proposal in document A/C.5/34/L.22 was diametrically opposed to draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13.

66. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would prefer the two draft proposals before the Committee to be deferred until the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. Since, however, a vote had been requested, his delegation would vote in favour of document A/C.5/34/L.22, because it did not seek to lay down preconceived conclusions for the studies to be carried out by the Secretary-General.

67. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation would vote against draft proposal A/C.5/34/L.22, not under the influence of an automatic majority, but as a matter of conscience, because it considered that draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 was more likely to achieve the objective sought. His delegation regretted that for some years any decision taken by the Group of 77 had been characterized as either a mechanical or an irresponsible vote.

68. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) said that his delegation would have been very glad if draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 had been the subject of consultations between all the

/...

(Mr. Ziniel, Ghana)

delegations concerned. Instead of that, another document (A/C.5/34/L.22) had been submitted which was designed purely and simply to invalidate draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13, and his delegation would therefore vote against it.

69. A recorded vote was requested on draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Abstaining: Burma.

70. Draft amendment A/C.5/34/L.22 was rejected by 83 votes to 31, with 1 abstention.

71. A recorded vote was requested on draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago,

/...

Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Greece, Ivory Coast.

72. Draft decision A/C.5/34/L.13 was adopted by 86 votes to 29, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.