

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY  
FORTIETH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



FIFTH COMMITTEE  
61st meeting  
held on  
Thursday, 12 December 1985  
at 7 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 61st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

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

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

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/40/L.49, as orally  
revised, concerning agenda item 106

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.77 concerning  
agenda item 84 (c)

Revised estimates under sections 28A, E, F, and G (Department of  
Administration and Management)

International Computing Centre: 1986 budget estimates

\*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.61  
19 December 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.35 p.m.

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

Programme budget implications of the recommendations in A/40/24 (Part II) concerning agenda item 34 (continued) (A/C.5/40/87)

1. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland) said that her delegation supported Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and advocated its speedy and unconditional implementation. However, it had reservations about the programme budget implications of the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia in document A/40/24 (Part II), and in particular about the vaguely defined meeting proposals, the frequent departures from the principle embodied in General Assembly resolution 31/140 and the high costs of meetings held away from Headquarters. A more judicious approach to the Council's work programme was needed and more attention should be paid to the effectiveness of programmes, first of all by reconsidering priorities and giving emphasis to activities of direct relevance and benefit to the people of Namibia. The Council's review of its functions and priorities was welcome but its results were not sufficiently reflected in the programme of work for 1986. There was a need for improved co-ordination between the Office of the Commissioner for Namibia and the secretariat of the Council, particularly with regard to the drafting of reports and the planning of missions. The programme budget implications presented in document A/C.5/40/87 were more realistic than those for previous years, and the Council should continue to re-evaluate its work with a view to improving efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

2. 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 the recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia contained in its report in document A/40/24 (Part II), additional appropriations totalling \$3,487,300 would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987, of which \$13,100 would be under section 1, \$213,000 under section 3B, \$2,746,100 under section 3C, \$499,500 under section 27 and \$15,500 under section 29. An additional appropriation of \$72,900 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an equivalent increase under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$1,821,500 for 1986 and \$2,070,300 for 1987. The actual additional appropriations that might be required in that respect would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted before the close of the current session.

3. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that his delegation wished a recorded vote to be taken on the Chairman's proposal.

4. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation was firmly committed to the achievement of independence

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

for Namibia and the speedy implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). It could not, however, accept the programme budget implications described in document A/C.5/40/87. There was a need to draw a distinction between the worthiness of a cause and the practical activities envisaged to support it. The recommendations of the United Nations Council for Namibia, as a whole, were more realistic than those presented at the previous session, but the main impression was still of a constant round of meetings and conferences, of which the main beneficiaries appeared to be their participants and the international travel business. In particular, he failed to see the justification for holding a major international conference in Europe and a special session of the General Assembly within only a few weeks of each other.

5. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that Canada strongly supported the immediate independence of Namibia, but was nevertheless concerned about the unconscionably high projections for financial resources associated with the various activities recommended by the Council. His delegation saw far too many scarce resources being given over to travel, suspected double accounting in some areas and strongly questioned the utility of so many seminars, conferences and other meetings merely to publicize the twentieth anniversary of the termination of South Africa's mandate over Namibia or to intensify the dissemination of information concerning that unfortunate Territory. No amount of conferences and meetings was likely to have a significant impact on those who manipulated Namibia from Pretoria. If that were the case, Namibia would have been free long ago. While his delegation questioned the 50 per cent increase called for with respect to the Fund for Namibia, it would be prepared to support it provided that corresponding savings could be effected from other activities related to Namibia. To the extent that any of those activities were to be increased, they should be financed through voluntary contributions rather than by taxing the already overburdened regular budget of the United Nations. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the recommended appropriation.

6. Mr. GREGG (Australia) said that his country was totally committed to independence for Namibia. However, it could not accept the argument that, because Namibia was a unique responsibility of the United Nations, the normal process of budgetary review should be set aside. The proposed activities in A/40/24 (Part II) appeared extravagant and unnecessary. His delegation was particularly concerned about the proliferation of meetings away from Headquarters, the number and scale of missions of consultation and the size of Council delegations to meetings of international organizations of which Namibia was a member. Considering that the Council would be holding an international conference on Namibia in Europe as well as a special session of the General Assembly, his delegation saw no need to hold another seminar in Latin America in 1986 in addition to the one already held in Guyana in 1985. Furthermore, it was concerned about the increase in the proposed subvention from the United Nations regular budget for the Council's programme. What was originally many years ago to have been a one-off operation, had in 1985 resulted in a proposed increase from \$1 million to \$1.5 million. While efforts had been made to draw up a programme of work based on effectiveness and credibility, and in the process to control expenditure, that exercise had regrettably not been sufficient. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the recommended appropriation.

7. Mr. PIERRE (Guyana) fully supported the proposed work programme of the Council for Namibia, which had been properly tailored to respond to the practical challenges in 1986 to Namibian independence. In the preparation of that work programme, the Council had been scrupulous in its concern to achieve economies and had made the necessary adjustments to improve efficiency and cost-effectiveness. In view of the need to maintain pressure on South Africa to comply with the various United Nations resolutions and decisions on the question of Namibia, his delegation would unequivocally support the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee.

8. Miss EFANGE (Cameroon) said that 1986 would be a year for stock-taking on the issue of Namibia, within the framework of an important international conference and a special session of the General Assembly. Seminars and missions were an essential prelude to such conferences. The work programme of the Council for Namibia should be judged not on the basis of its cost, but rather in terms of its overall political impact.

9. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said it was clear to his delegation that the Council for Namibia had made every effort to reduce unnecessary expenditures in 1986. Member States which supported independence for Namibia should, like his country, participate actively in the work of the Council or at least enable it to play its role effectively, which meant providing it with the necessary resources. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed appropriation.

10. Mrs. KNEŽEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the situation in Namibia 20 years after the United Nations had assumed responsibility for the Territory showed that the forces of neo-colonialism were still deeply rooted in the structure of international relations. It was of paramount importance to give support to the just cause of the Namibian people and to oppose the illegal occupation of Namibia by the South African racist régime.

11. Mr. MARYADI (Indonesia) said that his delegation consistently supported efforts to end the exploitation of Namibia's natural resources by the South Africa apartheid régime. Given the present deterioration of the situation in the Territory, support should be intensified for the Namibian people in their struggle to achieve independence. The Council had to be equipped with the necessary resources to fulfil its mandate and his delegation would therefore support the proposal made by the Chairman on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

12. At the request of the United States representative, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic,

Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, 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, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

13. The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 90 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

14. Mr. BROCHARD (France) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, whereas it had cast a negative vote in respect of the financial implications of the Council's recommendations at the previous session. That was because it had felt it useful to encourage the recent initiative, albeit a timid one, by the Council to exercise budgetary restraint.

15. Mr. NODA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote. It, too, appreciated the Council's recent efforts to introduce the principle of cost-effectiveness into its programme of work but it was still concerned at the large resource requirements for conference servicing, travel, temporary assistance and information activities.

16. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his delegation was particularly sympathetic to the Namibian people in their fight for long overdue independence. However, it still had reservations about the effectiveness of many of the activities which the Organization was called upon to finance, and it had therefore abstained in the vote.

17. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) shared the view that the United Nations had a unique responsibility for Namibia and welcomed the budgetary review carried out at the initiative of the Council itself. As a result, there had been some reorientation of the programme of work towards greater cost-effectiveness, although greater resource concentration was needed, and doubts remained as to the value of a number of the activities proposed in the Council's draft resolutions. His delegation, therefore, had abstained.

18. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that the United Nations did, indeed, have a unique responsibility for Namibia, and that responsibility was total until the achievement

(Mr. Mudho, Kenya)

of independence for the Territory. It was regrettable that a number of delegations had either abstained or cast negative votes on the programme budget implications of the Council's recommendations, since that was bound to give the wrong signal to the one country that everyone recognized as being to blame for the present situation in Namibia. Member States should match their words with deeds.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/40/L.49, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 106 (A/40/7/Add 17; (A/C.5/40/80)

19. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the statement of the Secretary-General covered requirements for an international conference on drug abuse and illicit trafficking to be held in Vienna from 17 to 26 June 1987, for which a number of preparatory activities would be undertaken in the course of 1986. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs would act as the preparatory body for the conference. In the course of considering the Secretary-General's statement, the Advisory Committee had been informed that the estimates had been prepared without the benefit of directives from the Preparatory Committee. The Commission on Narcotic Drugs would meet in 1986 to decide on preparatory activities for the conference. The requirements had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$3,528,200, including \$1,830,600 for conference servicing. Non-conference-servicing requirements were estimated at \$1,697,600. A breakdown of those costs was provided in paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report; there was a possibility of some limited absorption in the initial proposals for 1986-1987. The Secretary-General was requesting an additional amount of \$1,334,600 in non-conference-servicing costs. The Advisory Committee had accepted the request with the exception of \$350,000 for public information activities, which the Committee believed should first be examined by the Preparatory Committee. Furthermore, \$306,000 in extrabudgetary resources was expected to be available and could be used to commence information activities in 1986 pending consideration of the programme of work by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. In conclusion, the Advisory Committee recommended an additional appropriation totalling \$983,800. The specific conference-servicing requirements for the preparatory meetings 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. Conference-servicing costs for the conference in 1987 would be considered at the forty-first session.

20. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that as a co-sponsor to the draft resolution of the Third Committee his delegation hoped that the international conference would be a success. However, its support for the convening of the conference did not mean that it was indifferent to the very substantial costs involved. He supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation to postpone any decision on public information activities pending consideration of that matter by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The current level of the estimates reflected an over-generous interpretation by DPI of the mandate entrusted to it. Information activities should be carried out with an eye to economy, and the objective should be an effective conference, not a media circus. His delegation would like the Commission on Narcotic Drug to review the requirements for additional temporary staff,

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

consultants and travel. It might be premature for the General Assembly to take a decision on the appropriations before the Commission had had an opportunity to perform its function properly as preparatory body for the conference.

21. The proposed international conference was an excellent example of the emergence of a new priority justifying United Nations action. Requirements for the conference should be met through redeployment rather than by adding its costs to the initial budget estimates.

22. Mr. DITZ (Austria) emphasized the importance of ensuring that the conference was well-prepared and cost-efficient.

23. 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.49, as orally revised, additional appropriations totalling \$983,800 would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987, of which \$900,000 would be under section 1, \$8,000 under section 6, \$56,400 under section 8, \$1,600 under section 10, \$4,100 under section 11, \$5,000 under section 12, \$3,300 under section 13, \$2,600 under section 14 and \$2,800 under section 26. An additional appropriation of \$216,600 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an equivalent increase under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$330,800 for 1986 and \$1,499,800 for 1987. The actual additional appropriations that might be required in that respect would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted before the close of the present session in respect of 1986 and at the forty-first session in respect of 1987.

24. The Chairman's proposal was adopted without a vote.

25. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while his delegation was gratified that the estimates for the international conference had been reduced, it considered that the Advisory Committee's recommendations had not gone far enough. If a vote had been taken on the proposal, his delegation would not have supported it. He had not, however, objected to its adoption without a vote.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.77 concerning agenda item 84 (c) (A/C.5/40/85)

26. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that under draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.77, the General Assembly would decide to reconvene the United Nations Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships for the fourth part of its session at Geneva from 20 January to 7 February 1986. The Secretariat had calculated conference-servicing requirements to be \$334,200. Any additional appropriations that might be required would be considered within the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

/...

27. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.77 would give rise to conference-servicing requirements estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$334,200. The actual additional appropriations that might be required in that respect would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted before the close of the session. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt that proposal.

28. It was so decided.

Revised estimates under sections 28A, E, F and G (Department of Administration and Management) (A/40/7/Add.16, A/C.5/40/60 and Corr.1 and A/C.5/40/61)

29. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General's proposals for the reorganization of the Department of Administration and Management would not result in any additional expenditure, and the Advisory Committee therefore accepted them. It also submitted the revised estimates for sections 28A, E and G. With regard to section 28F, the Advisory Committee attached great importance to strengthening the Internal Audit Division and found that the Secretary-General's proposal on that unit conformed to the principle of maximum restraint.

30. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that it appeared from section II of document A/40/7/Add.16 that an additional appropriation of \$11,500 was being made, and requested clarification of that matter.

31. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the amount in question did not represent an additional request, but redeployment with due regard to maximum restraint.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would recall that during its first reading of section 28, it had deferred action on subsections E, F and G, on the understanding that they would be re-examined at a later stage in conjunction with the revised estimates. It had, however, approved in first reading an appropriation of \$1,014,000 for section 28A. The total revised estimates under subsections A, E, F and G as recommended by ACABQ amounted to \$24,226,800. Having already approved in first reading an appropriation of \$1,014,000, the Committee should now take a decision on the remaining appropriations recommended, in an amount of \$23,212,800. It should also take a decision on the additional appropriation of \$41,000 required under section 31, to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1.

33. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee for additional appropriations of \$23,212,800 under section 28 and \$41,000 under section 31, the latter to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1, were approved without a vote.

34. Mr. NODA (Japan) welcomed the Secretary-General's intention to enhance the performance of the United Nations, but was concerned about the late submission of the revised estimates for section 28. The ambitious proposals for the reorganization of the Department of Administration and Management merited thorough consideration.

35. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the approval of the additional appropriations without a vote. It had set forth its position on section 28 as a whole at earlier meetings; it considered expenditure on administration and management to be excessive, but had not opposed the proposed reorganization in the hope that it would enhance the efficiency of the Secretariat.

36. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said it was unclear whether the amount of \$318,500 for the Internal Audit Division was included in the appropriations just approved. When he had joined in the consensus on the section as a whole he had not been aware that the Committee was acting on the proposal for the Internal Audit Division increases, which he had been instructed to vote against.

37. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus because it was convinced of the need to strengthen the Internal Audit Division to allow staff to use modern methods. It was regrettable that it had not been possible to absorb the additional requirements for that purpose, especially in view of the very large total appropriation for the section as a whole. His delegation hoped that the improved operation of the Division would lead to savings in the future and repay the investment made.

38. Mr. MAKHTARI (Yemen) said that the estimate of \$4,917,900 for rental and maintenance of equipment seemed excessive to his delegation.

39. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the sum of \$4,917,900 for maintenance of equipment referred to rental and maintenance of computer equipment for the central computer unit, which was used by the entire Organization.

International Computing Centre: 1986 budget estimates (A/C.5/40/15)

40. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of the sum of \$5,365,500 for the International Computing Centre for 1986. That recommendation had no impact on the resources just approved by the Fifth Committee under section 28E/G.

41. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should recommend that the General Assembly approve the estimates of expenditure submitted for 1986 for the International Computing Centre, in an amount of \$5,365,500. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt that proposal.

42. It was so decided.