

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*

FIFTH COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Thursday, 12 December 1985
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 60th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

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

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/40/L.35 concerning agenda item 37 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/40/L.23-L.25 concerning agenda item 33

Programme budget implications of the recommendations in document A/40/24 (Part II) concerning agenda item 34

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

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

(c) REVIEW OF THE RATES OF REIMBURSEMENT TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF TROOP-CONTRIBUTING STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

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

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

(b) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued)

(g) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE

*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 IX 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.60
17 December 1985

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

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

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/40/L.35 concerning agenda item 37 (continued) (A/C.5/40/86)

1. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) noting that since the Conference on the Promotion of International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy had now been postponed until March/April 1987, the Secretary-General's request for temporary staff through 1987 would have to be reinstated, asked whether the staff in question had already been recruited.
2. He asked why the request in paragraph 12 of document A/C.5/40/86 for a further \$10,000 for travel by the Chairman had not been included in the initial proposal. He also asked why the \$17,600 requested for travel of the Secretary-General of the Conference and essential staff had been reinstated in paragraph 13. That request had been deleted upon the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. Noting that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had commented on the requirements for temporary posts in 1987, particularly on the number of information officers required, and had noted the undertaking by the Secretariat to reconsider the proposals, he asked whether such reconsideration had taken place and, if so, what had been the result.
3. Mr. RWAMBUYA (Budget Division) said that nearly all the temporary staff had already been recruited. The additional \$10,000 had been requested because the Secretariat had been advised by the Secretary-General of the Conference that the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee would have to visit some capitals for the purpose of consultations. The sum of \$17,600 had been deleted on the understanding that it was not then clear whether the programme would continue beyond 1986. Now that the Conference had been postponed until 1987 the request had been reinstated.
4. The Department of Public Information had indicated that it had been suggested that the matter regarding the information officers should continue to be reviewed but that as of the present time DPI did not believe that any changes were possible; it was, of course, prepared to continue to review the matter.
5. 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/40/L.35, an additional appropriation of \$252,000 would be required under section 4 of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987. An additional appropriation of \$105,800 would be required 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 \$650,900 for 1986 and \$980,400 for 1987. 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 before the end of the session

(The Chairman)

(in so far as the requirements for 1986 were concerned) and at the forty-first session (in so far as the requirements for 1987 were concerned).

6. The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

7. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation wished to place on record its concern at what it had been told regarding the programmatic justification for the number of information officers assigned to the Conference. The recommendation of CPC expressing a lack of conviction concerning such justification had been approved by the Committee by consensus and note had been taken of the undertaking by the Secretariat to reconsider the proposals. It would seem to his delegation that the Secretariat had not given due attention to the views expressed by CPC and the Fifth Committee and his delegation was concerned at the implications of that procedure.

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/40/L.23-L.25 concerning agenda item 33 (A/40/7/Add.18; A/C.5/40/81)

8. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to paragraph 9 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7/Add.18).

9. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, said that the Committee had discussed draft resolution A/40/L.24 and the related programme budget implications statement and had been informed that the proposed programme of work for the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for the period 1986-1987 included a number of seminars, symposia and meetings of non-governmental organizations to be held away from New York, the headquarters of the Committee's substantive secretariat. The Committee had decided to advise the General Assembly that the proposed programme of work involved exceptions to the principle laid down in paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 31/140 and to postpone consideration of the matter until such time as specific dates and venues were proposed.

10. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/40/L.23-L.25, an additional appropriation of \$1,873,000 would be required under sections 1, 27 and 29 of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 to be broken down as follows: \$395,000 under section 1; \$1 million under section 27; and \$478,000 under section 29. An additional appropriation of \$74,500 would be required 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 \$1,736,900 for 1986 and \$2,070,300 for 1987. 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 before the close of the current session (in respect of 1986) and at the forty-first session (in respect of 1987).

11. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) requested a recorded vote.

12. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that his delegation's position on the Palestine question had been fully explained in the plenary Assembly. The activities provided for in draft resolutions A/40/L.23-L.25, in particular those of the Committee referred to in the texts, were part and parcel of a propaganda war which was being waged against Israel. His delegation was strongly opposed to the activities and it would vote against the programme budget implications outlined in document A/C.5/40/L.81.

13. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Chairman's proposal. It believed that the facts were clear and that the activities outlined were a direct result of the continued Israeli occupation of the occupied territories. His delegation would be the first to vote against appropriations for such activities once the Israeli occupation ceased.

14. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, 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.

Against: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden.

15. The proposal was adopted by 86 votes to 10, with 10 absentions.

16. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), Mrs. ASHTON (Bolivia), Mr. KYELEM (Burkina Faso), Mrs. EFANGE (Cameroon), Mr. AZIE (Democratic Yemen), Mr. ABOLY (Ivory Coast), Miss DURRANT (Jamaica), Mr. OULD MALLOUM (Mauritania) and Mr. ZONGWE (Zaire) said that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of the proposal.

17. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that his delegation's position on the matter was well known. His delegation had voted against the proposal because it believed that the Secretariat could have exercised greater budgetary restraint in estimating the resources necessary to carry out the activities provided for in the draft resolutions.

18. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted against the proposal simply because it was not convinced that every effort had been made to achieve economy in estimating the costs of implementing the draft resolutions.

19. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted against the proposal because the statement of programme budget implications reflected a lack of budgetary discipline.

20. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal in order to be consistent with its position of principle. The technical reasons adduced by some delegations to explain their lack of support were very similar to those given in respect of another, sensitive issue.

Programme budget implications of the recommendations in document A/40/24 (Part II) concerning agenda item 34 (A/40/24 (Part II) and Add.1 and Add.2; A/C.5/40/87)

21. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the statement submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly (A/C.5/40/87) dealt with the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A to F on Namibia.

Paragraph 79 of the statement indicated that the total requirements arising in 1986 as a result of the adoption of the draft resolutions were estimated at \$7,927,100. Of that amount, \$1,821,500 represented the total conference-servicing requirements, calculated on a full-cost basis, and would be dealt with within the context of the consolidated statement to be submitted before the close of the current session of the General Assembly. The remaining \$6,105,600 was for non-conference-servicing requirements. Taking into account the amount of \$314,000 in savings and \$2,304,000 in resources already included in the proposed programme budget for 1986-1987, the additional appropriation requested by the Secretary-General totalled \$3,487,300 on a net basis.

22. The Advisory Committee noted that the revised format of the statement facilitated the consideration of the Secretary-General's proposals. As indicated in paragraphs 28 and 29 of the statement, the expenses for the SWAPO Office in New York for 1986 were estimated at \$389,900, including provision for the salary of an additional Deputy Observer of SWAPO. The Advisory Committee had been informed that the 1985 allocation covered the salaries of one Observer, one Deputy Observer and two clerical staff members. The salaries of the Observer and Deputy Observer were equivalent to the provisions for P-4 and P-3 levels respectively. That provision, however, did not include common staff costs. The Advisory Committee had been informed by representatives of the Secretary-General that that request was warranted in view of the increasing participation of SWAPO in United Nations activities.

(Mr. Mselle)

23. Paragraphs 57 and 58 of the statement submitted by the Secretary-General dealt with the proposed special allocation of \$500,000 for co-operation of the Council with non-governmental organizations. The special allocation for 1985 had been \$300,000. The Advisory Committee had been informed that that request reflected the importance which the Council attached to the mobilization of international opinion on the question of Namibia.

24. In paragraphs 63 and 64, it was proposed that the amount allocated to the United Nations Fund for Namibia should be increased from \$1 million to \$1.5 million. That allocation generally financed individual scholarships and group training projects for Namibians. Taking into account the additional information provided to it, the Advisory Committee accepted the proposals set forth in the statement by the Secretary-General and recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted the draft resolutions recommended by the Council for Namibia, additional appropriations totalling \$3,487,300 would be required, comprising \$13,100 under section 1B, \$213,100 under section 3B, \$2,746,100 under section 3C, \$499,500 under section 27, and \$15,500 under section 29. An additional amount of \$72,900 would also be required under section 31, to be offset by a credit of the same amount under income section 1.

25. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, said that the Committee had discussed the previous day the proposed programme of activity of the Council for Namibia and had considered the relevant documentation. It had been informed that verbatim transcripts in English only had been requested for the seminar to be held in Latin America in order to assist the members of the Council and its secretariat in analysing the proceedings. Those transcripts would not be considered official records. The Committee noted that the proposal to hold a seminar and a conference away from Headquarters would be a departure from section I, paragraph 4, of General Assembly resolution 31/140. The Committee had agreed to reconsider the matter at a later stage when specific venues and dates had been proposed and to make an appropriate recommendation in accordance with that resolution. The Committee had no objection to the Council's request for verbatim transcripts in English only for the seminar since the transcripts were not the same as official verbatim records and in view of the limited nature of the request and the fact that the Council had already received similar transcripts in the past.

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

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/844 and 954; A/C.5/40/L.5)

26. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had accepted the Secretary-General's proposals regarding the financing of UNIFIL. He drew attention to paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/954).

27. Ms. BYRNE (Ireland), introducing the draft resolution on the financing of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) (A/C.5/40/L.5) on behalf of its 19 co-sponsors, since joined by Thailand, said that Ireland regarded its participation in the United Nations peace-keeping forces as a practical and effective way of giving effect to the purposes and principles of the Charter. In the current anniversary year, all Member States should look to their responsibilities for maintaining peace and lend their support to the Organization's peace-keeping efforts. The success of the peace-keeping operations would continue to depend on the willingness of Member States to provide the necessary financial and material support. Unfortunately, that support had not always been forthcoming and some Member States continued to withhold their assessed contributions to those operations, thereby placing a disproportionate financial burden on the troop-contributing States, particularly the developing countries among them. Ireland renewed its appeal to the Member States concerned to reconsider that practice.

28. In paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's report (A/40/844), it was estimated that almost 21 per cent of the total costs apportioned to Member States since the inception of UNIFIL must be regarded as uncollectible. No operation could be expected to function efficiently if it was deprived of nearly a quarter of the revenue to which it was entitled. The international community, acting through the Security Council, had demonstrated its faith in United Nations peace-keeping operations in general and UNIFIL in particular. She urged all Member States to support UNIFIL fully by paying their assessed contributions in the interest of assuring the Force's continued financial viability.

29. While the extent to which the troop-contributing countries could continue to absorb an unacceptable proportion of the cost of UNIFIL was not unlimited, they did not wish to see its ability to carry out the operations assigned to it called into question if certain Member States continued to withhold their contributions. The responsibility for providing the necessary funding rested on all Member States and the burden of any shortfall must also be shared by all. She recalled the repeated requests of the Secretary-General that Member States should make voluntary contributions to the UNIFIL account.

30. The draft resolution before the Committee was very similar to the resolutions on the topic adopted by the General Assembly in previous years. The preambular paragraphs of part A recalled the relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly with regard to UNIFIL, and referred to the special scheme adopted by the General Assembly for apportioning the related expenses. The scheme took into account the fact that the capacity to contribute of economically less-developed countries was relatively limited and that the permanent members of the Security Council had a special responsibility in that regard. Sections I and II of part A appropriated to the UNIFIL Special Account an amount of \$93,928,000, already authorized with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee and apportioned under the provisions of General Assembly resolution 39/71 (a), for UNIFIL operations from 19 April 1985 to 18 December 1985. Section III appropriated to the Special Account an amount of \$48,263,000 for the period 19 December 1985 to 18 April 1986 inclusive, to be

(Ms. Byrne, Ireland)

apportioned among Member States in accordance with the special scheme after being offset by income totalling \$836,600. Section IV authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for UNIFIL at a rate not exceeding \$11,957,500 gross per month for the period 19 April to 18 December 1986 inclusive, should the Security Council decide to renew the Force's mandate. That authorization was subject to obtaining the prior concurrence of ACABQ for the actual level of commitments to be entered into for each mandate period that might be approved subsequent to 19 April 1986. The amounts were based on the recommendation in the ACABQ report (A/40/954). The amount referred to in section IV would also be apportioned among Member States in accordance with the special scheme. Section V renewed previous appeals for voluntary contributions to UNIFIL and invited contributions to the Suspense Account established in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/9 D. As indicated in paragraph 8 of his report, the Secretary-General continued to face increasing difficulties in meeting UNIFIL's obligations on a current basis. So far, the Suspense Account had not achieved its purpose of alleviating the financial burden on the troop-contributing States.

31. As indicated in paragraph 7 of the ACABQ report, the UNIFIL Special Account had had a surplus balance of \$8,868,174 at 31 December 1984, representing excess of income over expenditure due to interest and miscellaneous credits. The word "income" in that connection included "assessed contributions", whether or not collectible. As pointed out by the ACABQ, however, because of the withholding of contributions by certain Member States, the so-called "surplus" had in fact already been used to help meet the Force's expenses. The purpose of suspending the provisions of financial regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4, as provided for in part B of the draft resolution, and holding the surplus in suspense was to prevent it from being used as a credit to reduce the assessment of Member States, including those which were withholding their assessed contributions.

32. Mr. BITAR (Lebanon) said that his Government had always regarded the principle of collective responsibility whereby Member States would pay their contributions to the regular budget and to the peace-keeping forces of the United Nations, as incontrovertible. The withholding of contributions was particularly unfair, both to those developing countries which did contribute and to the countries which supplied troops and assumed the financial burden of UNIFIL as well. The purpose of the peace-keeping forces was to assist small peace-loving countries unable to defend themselves from aggressors, as had been the case of Lebanon, which had accepted UNIFIL in March 1978. It had already suffered greatly from the violence in the Middle East, particularly that which had arisen as a result of the way in which the United Nations had handled the problem of Palestine since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 181 (II). The Member States which had participated in the vote on that resolution, to which the current tragedy in Lebanon could largely be ascribed, bore a heavy responsibility.

33. UNIFIL was the largest of the peace-keeping forces and its mission the most urgent and challenging. Its function was not merely to observe but also to assist the Government of Lebanon in ensuring the return of its effective authority in the area, as specified in Security Council resolution 425 (1978). That mandate

(Mr. Bitar, Lebanon)

remained largely unfulfilled, however, because of Israel's continuous defiance of the Security Council and its persistence in a belligerent attitude towards the Force.

34. In an expression of international solidarity, nevertheless, Member States continued to support the operations of UNIFIL in order to allow it to succeed and the will of the international community to prevail. Any erosion of moral and political support could be very harmful to UNIFIL and would have very serious consequences for Lebanon and for peace in the Middle East. His delegation had therefore joined in sponsoring the draft resolution and appealed to all delegations to support it.

35. In conclusion he expressed his Government's gratitude to the Secretary-General and his staff and to the officers, troops and administrators of UNIFIL. He also expressed his Government's appreciation to the countries which had contributed troops.

36. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union did not participate in the financing of UNIFIL because of its position of principle that the consequences of the armed aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor. Since parts A and B of the draft resolution dealt with different problems, he requested that they should be voted on separately. His delegation would vote against both parts.

37. At the request of the representative of Yemen, a recorded vote was taken on part A of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.5.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Maldives, Yemen.

38. Part A of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.5 was adopted by 97 votes to 12, with 4 abstentions.

39. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote because it believed that the cost of United Nations activities in the Middle East should be borne by the Zionist entity and its supporters.

40. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation had been unable to participate in the vote on the financing of UNIFIL for the same reasons as in the case of UNDOF. The financing of peace-keeping forces in the Middle East was the aggressor's responsibility. His delegation hoped that the financial arrangements for all peace-keeping operations could be reviewed at some time in the near future since it had serious doubts both as to the usefulness of those forces and the propriety of financing them from the regular budget. It had not voted against the draft resolution out of respect for the brother Arab delegation which was one of the sponsors.

41. Mr. YONIS (Iraq) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on part A of the draft resolution and would do so also on part B. Its position was that the aggressor alone should bear the financial burden.

42. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because he considered that the Zionist aggressor should pay the expenses of UNIFIL, which was stationed in Lebanon because of Israeli aggression against, and continuing occupation of that country.

43. Mr. EDON (Benin) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution for essentially humanitarian reasons. It considered that UNIFIL ought in fact to be financed by those responsible for the situation.

44. Mr. SWEISI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote because it believed that the financial burden of UNIFIL should be borne by the Zionist entity occupying that Arab territory.

45. At the request of the representative of Yemen, a recorded vote was taken on part B of draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.5.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon,

Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Maldives, Romania, Yemen.

46. Part B of the draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions.

47. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that out of solidarity with Lebanon his country had refrained from participating in the vote, instead of voting against part B. It had reservations regarding the usefulness of UNIFIL, which had been unable to prevent the invasion of Lebanon. If the General Assembly considered that such forces were still necessary, it should reconsider the means of financing them.

48. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted against part B because it considered that the cost of the operations should be borne by the aggressor in the Middle East and its supporters. It was well known that Israel and its supporters did not respect UNIFIL and his delegation therefore doubted its usefulness.

49. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said that his delegation's vote in favour of both parts of the draft resolution should not be interpreted as condoning or accepting the continued Israeli occupation of Lebanon.

50. Mr. ABDELMAHMOUD (Sudan) said that if his delegation had been present during the voting on the draft resolution, it would have voted in favour.

(c) REVIEW OF THE RATES OF REIMBURSEMENT TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF TROOP-CONTRIBUTING STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/40/845, A/40/954; A/C.5/40/L.6)

51. Mr. IGELSTAM (Sweden) introduced the draft resolution on the review of the rates of reimbursement to the Governments of States contributing troops to United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East (A/C.5/40/L.6) on behalf of the co-sponsors, since joined by Samoa. The draft resolution began by recalling the relevant General Assembly decisions concerning rates of reimbursement. The established standard rates of reimbursement were important elements of the system

(Mr. Igelstam, Sweden)

of financing United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Middle East. The rates consisted of average figures, per person per month for all ranks, used as factors to determine the troop costs, which constituted approximately half of the budgets for UNDOF and UNIFIL.

52. The rates of reimbursement were also meant to correspond to certain portions of the troop-contributing countries' national costs for maintaining their troops in the service of the United Nations. Since the latest revision in 1980, those costs had increased significantly, in some cases by more than 40 per cent. That was why in 1984 the Secretary-General had been requested to review the existing rates. In his report (A/40/845), the Secretary-General presented the review requested, which had been extremely well conducted, using methods acceptable to all the troop-contributing States. The review found that in most cases the adverse effects of inflation since 1980 had been offset by the increased value of the United States dollar, which was the currency of reimbursement. The Secretary-General therefore concluded that, for the time being, there was no basis for an adjustment of the rates of reimbursement.

53. As far as increased national costs were concerned, the data contained in the 1980 review had not, unfortunately, permitted a comparison which would allow the escalation to be precisely determined. Changes in national costs could depend not only on inflation and exchange-rate fluctuations but also, for example, on changes in national pay and allowances, equipment, or the composition of units in national contingents. With the data that had been submitted for the most recent review, the Secretary-General had at his disposal information on which to compare national costs in the future.

54. There was, of course, a gap between the lowest and the highest national absorption factors. According to the Secretary-General's review, the gap seemed to have widened since 1980. It was not claimed that there was an immediate relation between the level of the absorption factor and its economic consequences for the States contributing troops. Some countries could endure a high absorption factor while for others a comparatively low factor could create problems. However, the very fact that changes seemed to occur rather quickly was reason for a continuous and close monitoring of the situation. Moreover, as the Secretary-General had repeatedly stated, the shortfall of financial contributions had resulted in a regrettable situation in which payments to the States concerned had never been made on a current basis and in full accordance with the agreed rates. There was a risk that, in future, such circumstances could jeopardize the efficient functioning of peace-keeping operations and further hinder efforts to ensure a wide geographical representation in the composition of peace-keeping forces, thus severely hampering the ability of the United Nations to fulfil its role in maintaining international peace and security.

55. The sponsors of the draft resolution considered that the rates of reimbursement needed close and continuous monitoring. They would, therefore, like the rates to be reviewed more or less automatically by the Secretary-General, as and when changes in exchange rates or inflation so dictated, or when other

(Mr. Igelstam, Sweden)

circumstances affected the absorption factors of two or more of the troop-contributing States.

56. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Secretariat working group had done a great deal of work on the information relating to rates of reimbursement and the Advisory Committee had scrutinized the situation carefully. His delegation still considered, however, that the position in regard to the expenses borne by the United Nations for the maintenance of peace-keeping troops and the reimbursement of the Governments which provided them was not clear-cut. There was a considerable element of increase in those expenditures. His delegation therefore requested a vote on the draft resolution and intended to vote against it.

57. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.6.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Algeria, Benin, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Maldives, Romania, Yemen.

58. The draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.

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

(a) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued) (A/40/101 and Add.2 and A/C.5/40/67)

59. The CHAIRMAN, after briefly recapitulating the voting procedure, said that the Committee had before it a note from the Secretary-General (A/40/101), indicating that, as the terms of office of five of the members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions would expire on 31 December 1985, the General Assembly was called upon to appoint five persons at its fortieth session to fill the resulting vacancies. In another note (A/40/101/Add.2), the Secretary-General stated that he had received notification of the resignation of Mrs. Housholder (United States of America), effective 31 December 1985, from membership on the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Accordingly, the General Assembly would be required at its fortieth session to appoint one person to fill the unexpired portion of the term of office of Mrs. Housholder, namely until 31 December 1987.

60. In document A/C.5/40/L.67), the Secretary-General communicated to the Fifth Committee the names of six persons nominated by their respective Governments for appointment or reappointment to the Advisory Committee. Mr. Al-Masri (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Chebeleu (Romania), Mr. Mselle (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Oduyemi (Nigeria) and Mr. Thomas (Trinidad and Tobago) had been nominated for a three-year term of office beginning 1 January 1986 and Mr. Nygard, (United States of America) had been nominated for a two-year term of office beginning 1 January 1986. Since the number of candidates was equal to the number of vacancies, he took it that the Committee could recommend by acclamation that those candidates should be appointed to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for their respective terms of office beginning on 1 January 1986.

61. It was so decided.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued) (A/40/102/Add.1 and A/C.5/40/83)

62. The CHAIRMAN said that in his note A/40/102/Add.1 the Secretary-General informed the Committee that Mr. Marco Antônio Diniz Brandão had resigned from the membership of the Committee on Contributions. To serve out the rest of his term of office, which ran until 31 December 1986, the Government of Brazil had nominated Mr. Gilberto Vergne Saboia. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend the appointment of Mr. Gilberto Vergne Saboia to the Committee on Contributions for the period in question.

63. It was so decided.

(g) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS AND ALTERNATE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS STAFF PENSION COMMITTEE (A/40/107 and A/C.5/40/71)

64. The CHAIRMAN said that in his note A/40/107, the Secretary-General informed the Committee that the terms of office of three members and three alternate members of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee were expiring on 31 December 1985. Accordingly, it would be necessary for the General Assembly at its fortieth session to elect three members and three alternate members to the Committee to serve for a period of three years beginning on 1 January 1986. In his note A/C.5/40/71 the Secretary-General informed the Fifth Committee that Mr. Holborn (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Kuttner (United States of America), Mr. Majoli (Italy), Mr. Okeyo (Kenya), Mr. Ortega (Mexico) and Mr. Takasu (Japan) had been nominated by their respective Governments for appointment or reappointment. The candidates had informed him that it was their wish that Mr. Kuttner, Mr. Majoli and Mr. Okeyo should be considered for appointment as members and that Mr. Holborn, Mr. Ortega and Mr. Takasu should be considered for appointment as alternate members. Since the number of candidates was equal to the number of vacancies, he took it that the Committee wished to recommend by acclamation that those candidates should be appointed to the United Nations Staff Pension Committee as members and alternate members respectively for a three-year term of office beginning on 1 January 1986.

65. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.