

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*

FIFTH COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Monday, 2 December 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHÉ (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 126: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 123: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

- (a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) RESPECT FOR THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (c) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.4 concerning agenda item 75

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 concerning agenda item 84 (g)

/...

* 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 DC.2-750, 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.5/40/SR.51
5 December 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
/...

CONTENTS (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.26 concerning agenda item 79

Programme budget implications of the decision of the Executive Committee contained in document A/C.3/40/L.38 concerning agenda item 105

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

AGENDA ITEM 126: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

- (a) UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/754 and A/40/948; A/C.5/40/L.4)

Draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of the Soviet Union had requested a vote on draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4, parts A and B.
2. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in an explanation of vote before the vote, reiterated his delegation's position that, since UNDOF had been set up as a result of Israeli aggression against the occupied Arab territories, the aggressor State, namely the Zionist entity, should bear full financial responsibility for its operations.
3. Mr. ARAD (Israel), speaking on a point of order, urged the Chairman to remind the Syrian representative that he must refer to Member States by their official title.
4. Mr. YONIS (Iraq), speaking in explanation of vote, reiterated his Government's position that Member States should not have to bear any of the financial burden for UNDOF. The aggressor State alone should pay for its operations. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.
5. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on part A of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Morocco, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yemen.

6. Part A of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4 was adopted by 78 votes to 2, with 18 abstentions.

7. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation's vote in favour of part A of the draft resolution did not mean that it condoned Israel's continuing occupation of Arab territories. Peace-keeping operations should play a temporary role only and the United Nations should go beyond that role to bring about a lasting peace in the Middle East.

8. Mr. MASSOUD (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation had voted for part A of the draft resolution out of solidarity with the international community and support for international peace and security. However, it believed that Israel, as the aggressor State in the Middle East, should bear the cost of UNDOF.

9. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on part B of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bulgaria, Guinea, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Romania, Yemen.

10. Part B of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4 was adopted by 75 votes to 11, with 8 abstentions.

11. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had originally supported the creation of UNDOF, as proposed in Security Council resolution 350 (1974). The Zionist régime's repeated acts of aggression against the Arab countries bordering on Palestine now caused his delegation to question the usefulness of UNDOF, however.
12. Mr. ARAD (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that, while he was proud to be a representative of the Zionist State of Israel, he must ask the representative of Algeria to refer to his country by its proper title.
13. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he challenged the previous speaker to prove the existence of a rule of procedure stipulating that delegations must refer to Member States by their official title. The title he had used was well known in the United Nations and, if the representative of the Zionist entity was proud to belong to that entity, he wondered why he had complained about the use of that title.
14. Resuming his statement, he said that, since UNDOF had proved incapable of halting the Zionist aggression, it was clear that a more appropriate solution was required. Moreover, since such aggression had been identified clearly in resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, Member States should not have to finance UNDOF through assessed contributions. Such funding should, at best, be voluntary, but since the Zionist régime was denying the Palestinian people its right of self-determination, that régime should pay for UNDOF's operations. It was only because his delegation was required to make an assessed contribution towards the financing of UNDOF that it had been unable to vote against the draft resolution.

15. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia), Mr. BROWNE (New Zealand) and Mr. PIERRE (Guyana) announced that, had their delegations been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.4.

AGENDA ITEM 123: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/40/652 and A/40/673 and Corr.1 and Add.1; A/C.5/40/5 and Add.1, A/C.5/40/6 and Corr.1, A/C.5/40/25, 27, 30, 38, 39 and 59)

- (a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (b) RESPECT FOR THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (c) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

16. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) noted that, while the medium-term plan of recruitment, 1983-1985, had produced some positive results, it had not been implemented as envisaged and it was highly unlikely that its goals would be achieved under the existing system of desirable ranges and recruitment policy in general. The achievement of equitable geographical distribution of posts required that all Member States should have representation as close as possible to their mid-points

(Mr. Gitsov, Bulgaria)

and that there should be a fair distribution of posts at the higher levels among and within regional groups. The current system contained in-built obstacles to achieving such a goal. The provision of a 15 per cent limit above the mid-point had enabled certain countries to maintain a level of representation not only close to but in some cases well above the upper limit of their desirable range, and even if countries were brought within their ranges, some would still continue to maintain representation very close to their upper limit, forcing other States to be represented at the lowest level of their range. The current system also enabled some countries to maintain representation at much higher levels than others. It was thus clear that no plan aimed at eliminating the imbalance in the composition of the Secretariat could be implemented until the current system was changed.

17. It had been argued that the present system gave the Secretary-General the necessary flexibility to ensure efficiency. However, as currently applied, the system tended to diminish the ability to promote efficiency on the basis of equitable geographical balance, while depriving the Secretary-General of the possibility of appointing competent candidates from underrepresented countries or countries with representation below their mid-point. The current predominance of permanent contracts also limited the Secretary-General's ability to take quick corrective action.

18. In that situation, the proposals made by JIU in document A/40/673 deserved careful consideration. While the recommendations designed to ensure equitable geographical distribution both quantitatively and qualitatively might seem too specific, they could serve as useful guidelines. The suggestion for five-year renewable contracts as a means of ensuring the services of the most competent and efficient staff and the proposal concerning the ratio of staff on permanent and fixed-term appointments would also be beneficial.

19. His delegation reiterated its view that the recruitment authority of the Office of Personnel Services (OPS) should be strengthened further so that it could play its role fully in the achievement of an equitable geographical balance in the Secretariat.

20. Mr. SHRESTHA (Nepal) said that his delegation supported any measure aimed at improving the efficiency and quality of the Organization's human resources. In the 40 years since the United Nations had been founded, its staff had gained valuable experience and the Secretariat had assumed a genuinely international character by absorbing talented and competent individuals from different regions of the world. It was only natural therefore that the international community should have come to expect a high level of performance and efficiency from it. The real situation was very different, however, and many of the anomalies and defects generally found in national bureaucracies had crept into the Secretariat. The President of the Staff Committee had drawn attention to the steady deterioration in the concept of a career based on merit and fairness, while the Secretary-General had referred to undue interference by Member States in promotions, transfers and reassignments. There was a general feeling of dissatisfaction among staff at the lack of

(Mr. Shrestha, Nepal)

incentives and proper training facilities to enhance their professional expertise, and the absence of a career development system was one of the most serious impediments to boosting the efficiency and morale of Secretariat staff.

21. The Secretariat had a primary role to play in providing fair, impartial and analytical reports to Member States and in implementing the latter's decisions and Member States could not afford to be indifferent to the problems besetting it. His delegation therefore supported fully the Secretary-General's efforts to address anomalies in the Secretariat, including his efforts to ensure a more equitable geographical distribution of posts. If the Secretariat was to be truly representative of all Member States, the Secretary-General must continue to attach the utmost importance to recruiting personnel on the widest possible geographical basis.

22. His delegation appreciated the appointment of a Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat. The United Nations Decade for Women and the Nairobi Conference that had marked its conclusion had helped to change world-wide perceptions of women's political, economic and social roles. The momentum thus created must be used to the full and the slow pace of progress thus far in recruiting women to the Secretariat should not be allowed to continue indefinitely. His delegation therefore supported the Secretary-General's efforts to remedy the glaring disparities in the distribution of women by level, occupation and region in the Secretariat. There was no shortage of qualified women in the developing countries who, given the right opportunities, could make a meaningful contribution to the organization.

23. His delegation considered the competitive examination process to be the most objective and appropriate method for recruiting staff to the Organization, and welcomed its proposed extension to posts at the P-3 level. That process on its own would not bring about the desired improvements in the competence and efficiency of Secretariat staff, however. Fair and just opportunities for promotion and for enhancing professional skills and expertise through an ongoing training programme were also essential. His delegation therefore urged the Secretary-General to pursue the proposed career development system and to implement it fully as soon as possible.

24. Mr. DASHKEVITCH (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the United Nations Secretariat could be truly effective only if recruitment was based on broad geographical distribution, ensuring fair representation at all levels of countries with different political and socio-economic systems. His delegation welcomed recent progress in that area, which had enabled his own country and others, through commendable efforts made within the Secretariat, to reach the lower limit of their desirable range, but still felt that the results were inadequate and that better recruitment machinery was required. The figures and conclusions concerning the medium-term plan of recruitment for 1983-1985 reported by the Joint Inspection Unit in document A/40/673, although not always consistent with the comments of the Secretary-General in document A/40/673/Add.1, deserved serious attention. The Secretary-General's comments were disappointing in that they lacked a critical

(Mr. Dashkevitch, Ukrainian SSR)

approach, stressed certain successes, rejected the JIU recommendations as unworkable and advocated an undefined flexible approach. The fact was that the goals of the plan were not going to be achieved and that many countries, including his own, had still not reached the mid-point of their desirable range because as JIU had pointed out, the category of greatly over-represented States had increased instead of being eliminated. The goal for all States had to be the mid-point range of representation.

25. The medium-term plan had not been implemented because inadequate recruitment machinery had meant that recruitment practices did not conform to recruitment policy. The problem was that OPS did not have real power and did not co-ordinate with other departments, which often handled personnel problems, including recruitment, independently. Frequently, in fact, young experts from underrepresented countries would pass the competitive recruitment examination but never get hired. The role of OPS, especially in recruitment, had to be strengthened, and OPS must be made directly responsible to the Secretary-General for implementing recruitment policies and for reporting on the failures of departments to meet their targets.

26. Another obstacle was the alarming increase in the proportion of permanent as opposed to fixed-term appointments, on the spurious grounds that they were necessary in order to maintain a high-level of competence and devotion. In fact, permanent contracts often created a feeling of invulnerability which only reduced effectiveness, and fewer of them should be given, especially to nationals of over-represented countries. Instead, greater use should be made of five-year fixed-term contracts.

27. The principle of equitable geographical distribution must be strictly observed throughout the Secretariat, but unfortunately, in many units the Eastern European countries were grossly underrepresented and attempts to redress the balance with appropriate candidates had been met with polite refusal by the Secretariat. Not only must such one-sidedness in certain departments be eliminated but the principle of fair representation must also be extended to field posts and the recruitment of experts and consultants. The status and recruitment of women in the Secretariat must also be improved, of course, but within the range established for each State.

28. His delegation was particularly concerned over the activity of the staff unions and associations and their attempts to interfere in matters outside their competence, even to the extent of waging a campaign to make the General Assembly answerable through a tribunal for resisting Staff Council pressure in the matter of salary increases. The Staff Council had far exceeded its mandate as established by the General Assembly and staff rights were not being violated. The Staff Council was in fact undermining the work of the Secretariat, with adverse financial consequences, and his delegation therefore supported the conclusions and recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit concerning personnel questions, particularly the recommendation that the General Assembly should undertake a broad review of the question, with due regard for the views of all interested parties.

(Mr. Dashkevitch, Ukrainian SSR)

29. Lastly, his delegation was opposed to the proposal to extend the competitive examinations to the P-3 level and shared the views expressed on that subject by the representative of the German Democratic Republic and other countries.
30. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) said that he would like clarification regarding the budgetary policy in respect of personnel questions adopted by the Secretary-General.
31. His delegation welcomed the report on the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat (A/C.5/40/30), which deserved careful study and review. It also recognized the difficulties faced in the implementation of the medium-term plan of recruitment, but felt that the main responsibility for that was in the hands of the Office of Personnel Services, which should propose specific ways and means of dealing with the problems involved, especially those of co-ordinating its efforts with the substantive departments.
32. The encouraging experience gained in the use of competitive examinations for recruitment at the P-1 and P-2 levels did not mean that extension of that procedure would have a positive impact on the quality of staff recruited at the P-3 level. His delegation also wondered whether the difficulties faced in external and internal examinations where candidates were allowed to write in any official language had been taken into consideration, and he questioned the fairness of making someone whose mother tongue was not English or French take an examination in competition with candidates whose mother tongue was.
33. His delegation appreciated the efforts made in respect of the recruitment of women (A/C.5/40/39) and wanted clarification regarding what new contacts had been established with bodies and individuals dealing with the status of women and what positive role they could play in furthering the recruitment efforts of the Secretariat.
34. As for the establishment of an ombudsman, his delegation felt that further discussion was required not only with staff representatives but also with the Administrative Tribunal. The new body should not create problems with respect to existing informal grievance procedures or with respect to the length and cost of proceedings before the Administrative Tribunal.
35. Drawing attention to paragraph 25 of document A/40/652, he said his delegation wanted a clear explanation of the situation with respect to the recruitment situation in ESCWA, with its 35 vacant geographical posts in June 1984 and 6 geographical posts open for recruitment as of June 1985. Lastly, he said he regretted the way JIU and ICSC had been accusing each other and questioning each other's motivations in the matter of staff costs and felt that if both bodies were doing the same job that meant that something was wrong and should be rectified.
36. Ms. YIN Shichang (China) said that her delegation was sorry that despite important improvements in the past year, the medium-term plan of recruitment for 1983-1985 was still far from being fully implemented and that there had been no improvement in the past year in filling posts at the D-2 level and above with

(Ms. Yin Shichang, China)

nationals of developing countries. In determining the reason for that, the plan of recruitment itself had to be examined. A more pragmatic plan combined with conscientious efforts stood a better chance of success, and in preparing the next one priority should be assigned to achieving a fair and equitable geographical distribution of posts and improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat. In that connection, the recommendations and comments made in the JIU report (A/40/673), despite the reservations regarding them expressed by the Secretary-General (A/40/673/Add.1), deserved further study.

37. A system of competitive examinations, while useful, must nevertheless take into account the vast differences between Member States. The examinations as currently administered were geared more to certain countries than to others, and they must be improved so as not to exclude many capable candidates. In their current form they could not remedy the problem of inequitable representation, and her delegation could not agree to expanding the system to include recruitment at the P-3 level.

38. Turning to the views expressed in document A/C.5/40/6, she said that it was entirely reasonable to include the population factor in the determination of desirable ranges. The current method used in applying it was just an accounting exercise which had no practical meaning either for regions or individual States. The Secretary-General should be given some flexibility to meet contingencies and special requirements, and the interests of countries with small populations should not be adversely affected by the application of the population factor, but if that factor was not linked to the population of a specific country it was no more than a flexibility factor. It was entirely possible to find a way better to reflect the population factor while keeping in mind all other considerations and interests.

39. The idea of establishing an ombudsman, as discussed in document A/C.5/40/38, appeared feasible and even useful, but serious care must be exercised to avoid duplication with existing bodies and to meet the needs of the economy and streamlined administration.

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.11 concerning agenda item 75 (A/C.5/40/46)

40. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending approval of the Secretary-General's request for an additional appropriation of \$255,700 under section 23, with an additional appropriation of \$39,200 under section 31, to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1. Conference-servicing requirements were estimated at \$380,900; the actual appropriation required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement.

41. 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/SPC/40/L.11, an additional appropriation of \$255,700 would be required under section 23 of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987, with an additional appropriation of \$39,200 under section 31, to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1. Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$380,900. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.
42. Mr. ARAD (Israel) requested a recorded vote on the Chairman's proposal, which his delegation would vote against.
43. A recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

44. The proposal was adopted by 82 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

45. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of the proposal.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 84 (q) (A/C.5/40/47 and Add. 1)

46. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had estimated requirements at \$61,200 if

(Mr. Mselle)

the seminar was held in Vienna and \$75,300 if it was held in Nairobi. The Committee on Conferences had no objection to the holding of the proposed seminar at Vienna, in view of which the Advisory Committee was recommending an additional appropriation of \$61,200 under section 19. Conference-servicing requirements of \$65,400 would arise and would be reflected in the consolidated statement.

47. 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.2/40/L.13, as orally revised, an additional appropriation of \$61,200 would be required under section 19 of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987. Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$65,400. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

48. He further proposed that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that holding the seminar at Vienna would constitute an exception to the terms of paragraph 5 of resolution 31/140 I, which stated that United Nations bodies should meet at their respective established headquarters.

49. Mr. ARAD (Israel) requested a recorded vote on the Chairman's proposals, which his delegation would vote against.

50. A recorded vote was taken on the proposals.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

51. The proposals were adopted by 87 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/40/L.26 concerning agenda item 79 (A/C.5/40/51)

52. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that no additional appropriations were being requested for the time being. Should additional costs arise, additional resources of up to but not exceeding \$35,000 might be required, with the exact amount being reflected in the first performance report for the biennium 1986-1987.

53. 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/SPC/40/L.26, no additional appropriations would be required at the current stage. The Secretary-General would receive authorization for an appropriation of up to but not exceeding \$35,000, to be requested in the context of the first performance report for the biennium 1986-1987.

54. Mr. ARAD (Israel) requested a recorded vote on the Chairman's proposal, which his delegation would vote against.

55. A recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

56. The proposal was adopted by 98 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

57. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that it was not clear to him what the Committee had voted on, since the Advisory Committee had stated that no additional appropriations were required for the time being.
58. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had given the Secretary-General authorization for an appropriation of up to but not exceeding \$35,000, should he need it. The actual amount required would be indicated in the first programme budget performance report.
59. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that it seemed that the Committee was going beyond consideration of the programme budget implications and entering into questions of substance. Since there were no financial implications, there had been no need for a vote.
60. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Algeria that the Committee had not exceeded its competence, but had merely provided for an appropriation of \$35,000, should it be required.

Programme budget implications of the decision of the Executive Committee contained in document A/C.3/40/L.38 concerning agenda item 105 (A/C.5/40/63)

61. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was requesting authorization to meet for an additional five working days. Conference-servicing requirements of up to but not exceeding \$64,000 would be required under section 29B, with the exact amount appearing in the consolidated statement.
62. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that it was not clear to her delegation exactly what the Committee was being asked to approve. Requests for additional appropriations were not generally couched in the terms used in paragraph 11 of document A/C.5/40/63.
63. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that extension of the Executive Committee's session by five working days would give rise to conference-servicing costs of up to \$64,000. The Fifth Committee was not being asked to approve an additional appropriation of up to \$64,000, since it was probable that the amount could be met from existing resources under section 29B.
64. The CHAIRMAN said that the procedure was in keeping with the Committee's normal practice, and that the actual appropriation would be reflected in the consolidated statement.
65. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that when the proposed extension of the Executive Commission's session had first been discussed, there had been indications that it would be possible to absorb the additional costs. His delegation hoped that that would prove to be the case. It was not, however, clear whether there was a specific decision in document A/C.3/40/L.43 endorsing the request of the Executive Committee for an extension of its session. If there was no such request,

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

it seemed that the Committee would be acting on a request made by the High Commissioner for Refugees rather than one submitted by a Main Committee of the General Assembly, in which case his delegation would have reservations.

66. Mr. RWAMBUYA (Budget Division) said that such decisions by the Executive Committee were normally taken without reference to the resources required. The Third Committee, in adopting the draft resolution, had wished to draw attention to the possible need for an additional appropriation.

67. 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.3/40/L.38, no additional appropriations would be required at the current stage. Conference-servicing requirements of up to but not exceeding \$64,000 had been estimated on a full-cost basis. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

68. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that her delegation did not think the proposed extension of the session was justified, and wished the Chairman's proposal to be put to a recorded vote.

69. A recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

70. The proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions.

71. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that, although his delegation supported the work of the High Commissioner for Refugees, it had abstained in the vote since it was not clear whether the additional cost would be absorbed and the procedure followed gave cause for concern.
72. Mr. GUERRERO (Ecuador) said that, had he been present, his delegation would have voted in favour of the Chairman's proposals relating to the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.11 and A/C.2/40/L.13.
73. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of the Chairman's proposals relating to the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/SPC/40/L.11, A/C.2/40/L.13 and A/SPC/40/L.26.
74. The CHAIRMAN urged members of the Committee to make every endeavour to be present during votes, since their absence delayed the Committee's proceedings.
75. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) asked what costs were incurred each time the Committee voted.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.