

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records*



FIFTH COMMITTEE
66th meeting
held on
Friday, 30 November 1979
at 5.30 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 66th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 107: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE
MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE AND UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER
FORCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (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, 56 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.66
17 December 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 5.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 107: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE AND UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/34/582 and Corr.1, A/34/688; A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Security Council had, that same day, adopted resolution 456 (1979) concerning the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East and he invited comments on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1.

2. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had noted from statements made during the previous meeting that a number of delegations had expressed certain misgivings regarding the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. His delegation wished to reaffirm its position regarding the financing of those forces: firstly, it thought that the presence of those forces in the Middle East had been made necessary by Israel's lack of respect for United Nations resolutions calling for Israel's complete withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories; secondly, draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 made no distinction between the aggressor and the victims of aggression and his delegation thought that the financial consequences of the presence of those forces should be borne by the aggressor; moreover, the acquisition of territories by force was inadmissible and the aggressor should, therefore, bear the costs incurred as a result of its aggression; finally, his delegation refused, on principle, to contribute to the financing of the United Nations forces under the procedure provided for in draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27. For all of those reasons, his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and would not contribute to the financing of UNEF and UNDOF.

3. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, in conformity with its position which it had already stated before the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Fifth Committee, his delegation would not be taking part in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27.

4. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that Israel had supported the operations of UNEF and UNDOF since those forces had first been established and, the previous July, his country had declared itself in favour of a one-year renewal of the mandate of those forces. However, because of opposition from certain quarters, the mandate of UNEF had expired before a decision could be taken. At the time, Israel had expressed regret that UNEF was no longer able to carry on its mandate.

5. He wished to thank the officers and men of both forces for the devotion with which they were carrying out their task in the Middle East. He also thought that States Members of the United Nations could not avoid financing the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East without violating the Charter. Although wishing to express certain reservations regarding the question of UNEF, he would vote for draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and, in conclusion, he wished, once again, to categorically reject certain allegations that had been made against Israel.

/...

6. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that his delegation wished to thank the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 for the contribution that they had made to the question of the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. His delegation would support draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and wished to emphasize the necessarily temporary nature of those forces.

7. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that the figures "456" and "30" should be inserted in the two spaces that had been left blank in the second preambular paragraph of part B and in section III of part B of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27.

8. At the request of the representative of Iraq, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1.

9. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate vote was taken on part A of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, 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.

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

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Democratic Yemen, Madagascar, Mauritania.

10. Part A of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1 was adopted by 73 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.

11. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a separate vote was taken on part B of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico,

/...

Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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.

Against: Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

12. Part B of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1 was adopted by 78 votes to 2, with 14 abstentions.

13. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1 as a whole would be put to the vote.

14. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he saw no need to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1 as a whole since parts A and B basically constituted two separate drafts.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that parts A and B formed one single draft resolution and had been issued as such in document A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1. He therefore invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1 as a whole.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, 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.

Against: Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic

/...

Republic, Hungary, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

16. Draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 and Corr.1 as a whole was adopted by 78 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

17. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27 but that neither the Moroccan delegation or the United Nations could congratulate themselves on the adoption of such resolutions, since the duty of States towards the Organization was to institute a reign of peace and equality and to preserve the territorial integrity of Member States, including the Arab States. The primary task was to re-establish a real peace in the Middle East by compelling Israel to renounce its ambitions and to put an end to its attacks on the Arab countries.

18. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados) said that, if his delegation had not been absent during the voting on part A of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27, it would have voted for the adoption of part A.

19. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said he was surprised and distressed that some delegations continued to invoke political arguments against Israel in the Fifth Committee, which was responsible for consideration of budgetary and administrative questions only. His delegation had already indicated that it was not Israel which had submitted the question of the Middle East conflict to the United Nations, since Israel had always maintained that a bilateral solution between the parties concerned would be the best way of settling the dispute. His delegation wished to emphasize that the insidious arguments put forward by some delegations at the present meeting had nothing whatever to do with the important questions before the Fifth Committee, including the question of the financing of the peace-keeping forces in the Middle East.

20. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic), exercising his right of reply, noted that once again the Israeli delegation was claiming to respect United Nations resolutions although everyone knew that Israel was posing a threat to international peace and security by refusing to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. Despite the various United Nations resolutions, Israel continued to occupy Arab territories, to oppress the population of those territories, and to force them to live in refugee camps. The Zionist entity was pursuing the worst kind of colonialist and imperialist policy ever known, and demonstrating a racism no less marked than that shown by the Hitler régime and the South African régime.

21. Yet the Zionist representative claimed that the question of the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East was a merely technical question, while he was asking Member States to defend the aggression carried out by his own country. The Israeli Government knew perfectly well that the financing of the forces in question was a heavy financial burden for Member States. Those resources were not being devoted to activities of construction or development, economic projects, the fight against disease, assistance to children, or help in case of natural disasters. On the contrary, they were permitting Israel to pursue its aggressive policy against the Arab countries.

/...

(Mr. Hamzah, Syrian Arab Republic)

22. If Israel respected United Nations resolutions, as it claimed to, it would have withdrawn from the occupied Arab territories and would have recognized the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

23. Mr. AL-TAKRITI (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was normal that the Zionist representative should welcome draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27, since it helped to protect the interests of his country. The Zionist representative had invoked the United Nations Charter, but nobody had ever heard it said that Israel had implemented even a single one of the very many resolutions that the United Nations had adopted on the question.

24. Iraq's position was based on the following principles: first of all, it was the aggressor who should bear the consequences of the aggression. Secondly, the financing of United Nations forces constituted recognition of and support for that aggression. Lastly, in so far as some paragraphs of the draft resolution referred to consolidation and strengthening of the forces, his delegation had a number of doubts about the aims of the draft resolution. If, as the sponsors claimed, the United Nations forces had succeeded in ending the war in the Middle East, the budget for the forces should be reduced, not increased. His delegation therefore feared that the forces might be used for other ends than those for which they had been established. That was why it had voted against draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.27.

25. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he had no intention of engaging in a sterile political debate on the question of the Middle East, which was beyond the scope of the item under consideration. The insidious statements by the representatives of Syria and Iraq were out of order, and the hate expressed towards Israel deserved no reply. The Israeli delegation totally rejected the unfounded allegations of those representatives. Everyone knew who had chosen war and who preferred peace.

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

United Nations International School (A/34/7/Add.11, A/C.5/34/36)

26. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) drew attention to the special situation of the United Nations International School, which, while operating under the laws of the State of New York, had the purpose of helping to realize the aims of the Organization. From the outset the school had had to provide an international education, which involved a very varied curriculum, with instruction in various languages, for the benefit of pupils from very different social and cultural backgrounds. The composition of the school, which had pupils from 115 countries and teachers from 40 countries, testified to its quality and at the same time to the special difficulties it had to face. The school's curriculum could be said to compare very favourably with those of outstanding educational institutions around the world. Moreover, the International Baccalaureate required from pupils an educational achievement that would earn them access to the most renowned universities. Lastly, and above all, the pupils were brought up in the spirit of the United Nations.

/...

27. However, in order to attain those results, the school had had to bear a substantial financial burden. It had an accumulated deficit of \$1.3 million, on which it had to pay an annual interest charge equivalent to the cost of a teacher for one year. The deficit was not the result of poor management. It had a number of causes, the first being that the school had to have a teacher/pupil ratio of 1 to 11, whereas a ratio of 1 to 20 was considered satisfactory in national school systems. The high ratio was justified by the very nature of the education provided by the school, by the heterogeneous student population, and by the fact that most pupils entered the school after their education had already begun, and therefore had to be given supplementary instruction in order to be properly integrated into the school. Moreover, there were seven teaching languages, which added to the school's costs.

28. The deficit was also attributable to the bursary programme to help needy parents. That was a traditional policy of the Board of Trustees. In addition, fee remissions had previously been granted to parents who did not benefit from the education grant. Unhappily, the Board of Trustees had had to end those automatic fee remissions. The bursary programme itself was now threatened, as it represented a cost which was not directly related to the school's scholastic programme.

29. Because of those budgetary constraints, the school had not been able to undertake the restructuring of its classroom and student facilities that had become necessary by reason of its high enrolment. In the circumstances the Board of Trustees had had to bring that deplorable situation to the attention of the Organization. The school needed financial aid to eliminate the deficit and to supplement its endowment fund, so that it could earn enough through its investments to finance the bursary programme, to undertake the necessary restructuring of the facilities and attend to the long-term maintenance of the building.

30. It might be asked whether the school could not raise the financial means from other sources. The response to fund-raising appeals had become poorer and poorer over the years. That was because potential donors considered that the school should first be protected and sustained by the United Nations itself. The only other option would be to add to income through an increase of fees. In 1979, for example, the school fees had been raised by \$200. But there was a limit to what could be done by raising fees. If the fees became too high many staff members, including many General Service staff, many American parents of lower income groups and members of the diplomatic community would no longer be able to send their children to the International School, which would be truly deplorable.

31. If the school did not receive the financial aid it needed, it would have to give up some of the features of its international educational programme. That situation must be avoided.

32. Mr. AL-TAKRITI (Iraq) said that the documents of the International School had not yet been issued in Arabic.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.