



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 69th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

CONTENTS

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.42/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 39

AGENDA ITEM 122: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 123: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room 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.69  
30 December 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.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.42/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 39 (A/C.5/40/95)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that since the 68th meeting he had held in-depth consultations to consider all the options raised in the discussion of the financial implications of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1. As a result, the representative of Argentina was no longer insisting on her proposal. He proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that if it adopted draft resolution A/40/L.41/Rev.1, the conference-servicing costs estimated on a full-cost basis, would amount to \$1,011,800, already provided for in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs. The Secretary-General could obtain the additional \$835,000 required from the trust fund or, if possible, through redeployment.
2. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) welcomed the consensus arrived at during the consultations and commended the Chairman for his efforts. However, he wished to make his delegation's position clear. At the previous meeting, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had said that the Fifth Committee should not question the right of the Secretary-General to make a proposal to the General Assembly. His delegation did not question that right but considered that the reference in paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/40/95 to the Secretary-General's understanding that certain funds would be made available was a point of information and not a proposal.
3. The Chairman's proposal was adopted by consensus.
4. Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) said that his delegation was not opposed to the adoption of the proposal by consensus, but wished to explain his delegation's position with regard to document A/C.5/40/95. It was justifiable and reasonable to have recourse to extrabudgetary sources of funding for humanitarian causes. In the present case, however, the project to be financed related to the functioning of the Organization and it was difficult for his delegation to accept that resources should be used to implement it that were not clearly defined. He agreed with the delegation of Argentina that the United Nations itself should finance the implementation of the decision concerning the Organization's administrative and financial functioning.
5. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation would have preferred the necessary funds to have been appropriated in the next programme budget and from within existing resources. If the proposal had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained because it had not received the necessary assurances that the Secretary-General would be free to use funds as he wished. He hoped that the Secretary-General would reconsider his position and make the necessary funds available to implement the project.

6. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus with enthusiasm.
7. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) was pleased that the financial implications of such an important question should have been adopted by consensus. He hoped that the Secretary-General would ensure that expenses for the important work of the Group of High-level Inter-Governmental Experts would be met from the regular budget. The question of improving the administrative and financial functioning of the Organization was an extremely important one and it was the collective responsibility of Member States to participate in its financing.
8. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation was pleased to join in the consensus which the Chairman had so delicately negotiated on behalf of the Committee. Extrabudgetary resources enabled crucial activities to be implemented. However, the activities to be undertaken in pursuance of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1 should not depend on the availability of such resources. Nor should the procedure just adopted constitute a precedent for any linking of General Assembly mandates with the availability of extrabudgetary resources for the activities mandated.
9. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation had taken pleasure in joining in the consensus. The draft resolution made provision for the attainment of greater efficiency in the financing and administration of the Organization. It opened up new perspectives for the Organization and deserved the support of all Member States.
10. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that the consensus decision reflected the interests of all Member States.
11. Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina) agreed that the decision was in the interests of all Member States and of the Organization. In that spirit, it was her delegation's position of principle that the expenses incurred in establishing the Group were the collective responsibility of all Member States. Unfortunately, that position had not been the subject of consensus and therefore her delegation had not insisted on its being considered. Nevertheless, she hoped that the Secretary-General would make every effort to ensure the financing of the Group from the regular budget.
12. Mr. TAKASU (Japan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/40/L.42/Rev.1, said that from the beginning of the lengthy informal consultations it had been their desire that the draft resolution should meet with the widest possible approval of Member States, both with regard to its substance and its financial aspects. He was most gratified that under the guidance of the Chairman a decision had been adopted without a vote. He realized how difficult it had been for many delegations to accept the consensus and he therefore especially appreciated the spirit of flexibility and co-operation shown by the delegations of Argentina, Algeria and Brazil, among others.

AGENDA ITEM 122: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued) (A/40/11 and Add.1)

13. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said that the extensive informal consultations held on agenda item 122 had been relatively unsatisfactory, since they had yielded no draft resolution that the Committee might have adopted by consensus. He nevertheless believed that they would enable the Committee to approach the subject of the scale of assessments more successfully at the forty-first session.
14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 71 of the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/40/11), concerning the scale of assessments for the financial years 1986, 1987 and 1988. A recorded vote had been requested.
15. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation was opposed to the implementation of the proposed scale of assessments for the reasons it had set out at the 12th meeting. It was unfortunate that further negotiations on the scale had been impossible, and he urged the Committee on Contributions to seek to ensure that paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 39/247 B was fully implemented.
16. Mr. HERIJANTO (Indonesia) said that his delegation had always appreciated the efforts of the Committee on Contributions to be fair. However, as the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions had noted, there were some anomalies in the data used to calculate assessments; in particular, data that would enable that Committee to take into account the high level of indebtedness of certain countries were lacking. His delegation also had doubts with regard to data that had been used in determining the cut-off point for identifying countries eligible for relief. Consequently, it would abstain in the vote.
17. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) expressed strong objection to the constant and unjust increases in the scales of assessments in recent years, including the scale currently before the Committee. General Assembly resolution 39/247 B had constituted a turning point in the efforts to correct serious imbalances existing within the scale, particularly in the case of countries which were dependent for income on a single non-renewable natural resource. Yet the Committee on Contributions had disregarded that resolution and aggravated those imbalances. That Committee must adopt a more serious approach to its work; otherwise, Kuwait would be forced to take steps with regard to the payment of its contribution in 1986. Because it did not believe that the Committee on Contributions had properly fulfilled its mandate, his delegation would vote against the proposed scale of assessments.
18. Miss MORALES (Philippines) said that the Philippines would always honour its financial commitments to the United Nations; nevertheless, she regretted that her country's assessment did not truly reflect its capacity to pay, given the economic difficulties which had beset the Philippines during the preceding four years. The Government of the Philippines would find it difficult to explain to the Philippine people why the country had to increase its financial contributions towards its international obligations while the standard of living in the country had declined. Consequently, her delegation would vote against the proposed scale of assessments.

19. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said he would vote against the proposed scale of assessments because it was unfair that the efforts of debtor countries to meet their international obligations should be punished while certain Powers, and particularly certain permanent members of the Security Council, were not treated in a similar fashion. He hoped that the situation would be reviewed and that the implementation of the proposed scale of assessments would be postponed until ways of remedying such unfairness were found.

20. Mr. HASHIM (Bahrain) said that his delegation could not accept the proposed scale of assessments for the reasons cited at the 13th meeting, and would therefore vote against it.

21. Mr. RAHMA (Oman) said that the proposed scale of assessments was unfair: his country's assessment had been determined on the basis of criteria that were unrelated to the country's economic realities. Oman needed its income for national economic development; moreover, that was derived from a resource that was being depleted. His delegation would abstain in the vote as an expression of its opposition to the scale.

22. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that, although his delegation was not fully satisfied with the proposed scale of assessments, it would vote in favour of it. He nevertheless hoped that the Committee on Contributions would take note of his delegation's views concerning the mitigation process and endeavour to improve the methodology it used in calculating future scales.

23. Mr. ALPER (Turkey) said that his delegation's views regarding the importance of a unified set of data and methods for calculating the assessments of Member States had been expressed many times. Unfortunately, he could not support the scale recommended by the Committee on Contributions, and he hoped that that Committee would take a more just approach in devising future scales. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution proposed by the Committee on Contributions.

24. Mr. DAMIT (Brunei Darussalam) said that, in joining the United Nations, his country had accepted all conditions of membership and would always honour its commitments. However, his delegation regretted the fact that the proposed scale of assessments could not be adopted by consensus, in keeping with the Secretary-General's request, as it was only then that it could be truly meaningful. Furthermore, despite the fact that Brunei Darussalam was only a year old, the Committee on Contributions had increased its assessment. In that connection he wished to draw attention to the fact that Brunei Darussalam relied solely on oil, a non-renewable source, for its income, and was in fact faced with a number of development problems which placed it in a particularly vulnerable position. He expressed the hope that those factors would be taken into consideration in the future, and said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the proposed scale of assessments.

25. Mr. MASSOUD (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation continued to believe that the proposed scale of assessments was unfair; the assessment of the United Arab Emirates had been increased without any consideration given to the country's stage of development. He would therefore vote against the proposed scale.

26. Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed scale of assessments as a matter of principle, even though the scale did not fully accommodate the concerns of his country. In view of the painstaking work of the Committee on Contributions, it was incumbent on the Fifth Committee to support the proposed scale.

27. Mr. PANESSO (Colombia) said it was unfortunate that the proposed scale of assessments could not be adopted by consensus. While his delegation respected the work and personal integrity of the members of the Committee on Contributions, it disagreed with the results of their efforts and would consequently vote against the proposed scale, which was inconsistent in its treatment of different countries.

28. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in paragraph 71 of the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/40/11).

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bahrain, Colombia, Ecuador, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Portugal, Qatar, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

29. The draft resolution contained in paragraph 71 of the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/40/11) was adopted by 80 votes to 13, with 25 abstentions.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited any member of the Committee who wished to do so to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.
31. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the ten member States of the European Community and recalling that they had had substantive reservations regarding General Assembly resolution 39/247 B at the time of its adoption, observed that few delegations, to judge from the debate, had been satisfied with the application by the Committee on Contributions of the guidelines set out in that resolution. The proposed scale of assessments, based on a methodology for assessing real capacity to pay that in itself lacked objectivity and technical exactitude, left much to be desired. The ten States concerned had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.
32. Mr. MOJTAHED (Iran) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the proposed scale of assessments did not reflect the true performance of national economies or make sufficient allowance for adverse economic trends. The assessed contributions of developed countries had been lowered while those of developing countries had been raised. No generally applicable procedure had been used to assess the impact of inflation; and the scale of assessments failed to give sufficient consideration to deteriorating market conditions or to development expenses in the OPEC countries whose economies depended on a single resource. Furthermore, Iran's own assessed contribution had been based on aggregate GNP and per capita income data which did not reflect, either directly or indirectly, the billions of dollars in economic losses and destruction due to the imposed war, as well as the recent natural calamities and heavy refugee influxes.
33. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the hope that the Committee on Contributions would pursue its efforts to devise a fair and universally acceptable scale of assessments. It should continue to give full weight to the fundamental principle of real capacity to pay, but should also consider the adverse conditions affecting that capacity in the developing countries. The low per capita income allowance formula should be made to reflect price changes, and the scheme for control of excessive variations in individual rates of assessment between two successive scales should be further refined.
34. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was ready to assume its own financial responsibilities under the Charter, because for the moment real capacity to pay was the most appropriate criterion, and because it fully supported the guidelines outlined in General Assembly resolution 39/247 B.
35. His delegation had reservations, however, regarding the manner in which the Committee on Contributions had implemented that General Assembly resolution: the assessed contributions of the petroleum-exporting countries had been raised while those of other countries whose economic situation did not warrant it had been lowered. Other socio-economic factors besides national income should, moreover, enter into the calculation of real capacity to pay, particularly the inequality in development between developing and developed countries, the particular development needs of developing countries, the concept of accumulated wealth, and the question of foreign debt. The same criteria could not possibly be applied to developing and

(Mr. Ladjouzi, Algeria)

developed countries. Algeria also had serious reservations in principle about the relief burden distribution formula. It hoped that the Committee on Contributions would move rapidly to implement General Assembly resolution 39/247 B, whose balanced formulations satisfied virtually all delegations.

36. Mrs. ARCHINI (Italy) said that her delegation objected to the proposed scale of assessments for several reasons. The choices made by the Committee on Contributions on the redistribution of the burden of relief seemed to discriminate against economically disadvantaged countries which were above the \$2,200 per capita income limit. Furthermore, although Italy doubted whether the incorporation into the methodology of indicators related to indebtedness was advisable at all, it felt that the Committee should have used also the indicator of the ratio between debt service and exports.

37. With regard to Italy's own assessed contribution, the criteria used to calculate capacity to pay had resulted in a serious distortion of Italy's real capacity, particularly in relation to that of other industrialized countries and/or members of the European Community, and a consequent unjustified increase in Italy's rate of assessment.

38. Her delegation deemed, further, that the 10-year term for the calculation of contributions should be reduced, in the interests of having more realistic data.

39. Italy had abstained rather than voting against the draft resolution, out of solidarity with the other members of the European Community.

40. Mr. ROSLI (Malaysia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because the proposed scale of assessments did not reflect real capacity to pay. The rates of assessment for the Group of 77 had generally been raised, while those for countries with centrally planned economies had generally been lowered. Malaysia regretted that short-term indicators had not been taken into account and that unreliable national income statistics and an unsatisfactory conversion rate of exchange for countries with multiple exchange rate systems had been used by the Committee on Contributions in calculating capacity to pay.

41. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, which represented a first serious effort by the Committee on Contributions to implement the guidelines in General Assembly resolution 39/247 B. The Committee on Contributions had, by its own admission, resorted to ad hoc solutions to implement paragraphs 1 (c) and 1 (e) of that resolution; and it had regrettably raised the assessed contributions of many countries - particularly developing countries - even as their capacity to pay was declining. Yet Mexico was confident that the Committee would, as indicated in paragraphs 12 and 18 of its report, give priority and devote further study to incorporating into its methodology additional economic indicators, based on reliable statistics, regarding indebtedness, international reserves and terms of trade. Only thus would the current inequities of the scale of assessments be redressed.

42. Miss COHEN-ORANTES (Guatemala) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but that, as a Latin American developing country, it did not favour the reduction of the rates of assessment of some highly developed countries at the expense of struggling developing countries. It would follow the efforts of the Committee on Contributions to devise a methodology that would better reflect real capacity to pay.
43. Mr. DITZ (Austria) observed that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it was common knowledge that the informal consultations on the new methodology had failed because of the insistence on reaffirming General Assembly resolution 39/247 B. The result had been a scale of assessments which 38 countries could not support. That should be a lesson for the future: General Assembly resolution 39/247 B should in future be viewed with due caution.
44. Mr. SWEISI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it was convinced that future scales of assessment must take into account the difficult circumstances of States whose national income depended on depletable resources.
45. Mr. FAKHROD (Qatar) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it found the increase in Qatar's assessed contribution unacceptable. The Committee on Contributions must in future devise a fairer scale of assessments.
46. Mr. TAKASU (Japan), recalling that his delegation had stated its position on the new scale of assessments at the Committee's 12th meeting, said that it had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because of the reservations expressed at that time, particularly regarding the use of an over-complicated methodology that relied on non-comparable statistical data, different accounting methods and different exchange-rate systems, and did not adequately reflect the different status of Member States.
47. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because a methodology based almost solely on the indicator of national income was inadequate. It would continue to insist on a fundamental improvement of the data base and on the application of readily comparable additional data in the calculation of the rates of assessment. The increasing reliance on the mitigation process was ample proof of the deficiencies of the current method of calculating each State's real capacity to pay.
48. Miss NIPATAKUSOL (Thailand) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite its concern over the developing countries' increased rate of assessment, because it was confident that the Committee on Contributions would devise a fair scale of assessments. It had done so also in response to the Secretary-General's urgent appeal of 10 October 1985 in which the scale of assessments had been cited as one of three fundamental points on which agreement was required in order to permit the financing of the Organization's activities (A/C.5/40/SR.11, para. 2).

49. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because of its reservations regarding the guidelines followed by the Committee on Contributions. In that connection, he referred to the statement on the question made in the plenary Assembly by the Swedish Foreign Minister.

50. Mr. YONIS (Iraq) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but hoped that in future the Committee on Contributions would effect the minor changes in the scale of assessments that would make it possible to adopt such a resolution by consensus.

51. Iraq took exception to the inaccuracies in the statement of the representative of Iran regarding the reasons for the deterioration of that country's economy.

52. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution not because it objected to its own assessed contribution but because it had serious reservations about the current methodology for determining the scale of assessments. It wondered, in particular, whether a scale based on capacity to pay, which resulted in widely divergent assessments for Member States, was appropriate for an organization based on the sovereign equality of its members.

53. In the course of the negotiations on the item, his delegation had tried to be as flexible as possible in order to facilitate consensus, and there had been at least three draft resolutions prepared for consideration which it could have accepted. Not many other countries had come to the negotiations with the same spirit of compromise. Still more disturbing was the unwillingness of many delegations to accept the possibility that the views of the United States should be considered by the Committee on Contributions. His delegation had, instead, hoped to be able to demonstrate to the United States Congress that there was serious interest within the United Nations in accommodating the United States view on vital questions of budgetary importance such as the scale of assessments. It hoped that other delegations would reconsider their negative attitude and join the United States the following year in meaningful steps to promote the future financial health of the Organization.

54. Mr. THORSTEINSSON (Iceland), noting that his delegation had abstained with regret in the vote on the draft resolution, recalled the intention of the Committee on Contributions to review in detail the comparative study of alternative methodologies for assessment, mentioned in paragraph 64 of its report, and said that it looked forward to a report on the matter at the next session.

55. Mr. ZIDUEMBA (Burkina Faso) said that, had his delegation been present at the time of the vote, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

56. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), commending the Committee on Contributions for work well done, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was convinced that, while the methodology for determining the scale of assessment could be improved, the basic principle underlying that scale must remain real capacity to pay.

57. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) said that he had abstained in the vote not because he objected to his country's rate of assessment - which, as always, it accepted - but in view of the conflicting instructions, often inspired more by national self-interest than a sense of responsibility towards the United Nations, that had crept into resolutions on the scale of assessments over the past few years, preventing the Committee on Contributions from establishing a logical, methodologically sound and equitable scale. He regretted that it had again proven impossible to agree on a consensus text, a fact which reflected that such attitudes were still prevalent.

58. Mr. ROY (India) said that, like others, he had gone along with the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions in spite of reservations about their general acceptability. His delegation supported the views expressed by the representative of Sweden, particularly with regard to apportioning the expenses of the Organization more evenly in order to make it less dependent on the contributions of any single Member State. He welcomed the comparative study on methodologies for assessment used by the United Nations and 28 other organizations which the Committee on Contributions planned to review in detail at its next session, and he looked forward to the results of that review.

59. Mr. ALI (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) said that he had listened with great interest to the general debate on agenda item 122 and also to the explanations of vote just given by delegations. He would inform the Committee on Contributions of the critical observations and concerns expressed by the Fifth Committee, which would be duly taken into account.

AGENDA ITEM 123: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/40/L.16)

60. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.16, said that the draft had been arranged in three sections, on the basis of an agreement reached during informal consultations to submit an omnibus resolution at the fortieth session dealing with all personnel questions.

61. Section A of the draft related to the composition of the Secretariat and reaffirmed previous resolutions of the General Assembly on personnel questions, in particular resolution 39/245. It also expressed concern that the targets set in the 1983-1985 medium-term plan of recruitment had not been achieved. Paragraph 8 of section A dealt with the introduction of after-service health insurance coverage for a number of former locally-recruited staff. At the end of that paragraph, he proposed the addition of the following words: "on the understanding that the Secretary-General will present to the General Assembly the financial implications of reformulating the scheme to make it comparable to other schemes of the common system at its forty-first session".

62. Section B concerned the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat. During informal consultations, the general feeling had been that the current session should be an occasion to highlight the issue in an appropriate manner not only in view of the efforts being undertaken to improve the representation of women in the Secretariat but also to mark the end of the United

(Mr. Oduyemi, Nigeria)

Nations Decade for Women and to reflect the outcome of the World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women, held at Nairobi.

63. Lastly, section C concerned respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and related organizations, which had in the past been the subject of a separate resolution. The incorporation of such a section in the present draft in no way diminished the importance which attached to that issue.

64. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) wished to propose a slight amendment to section C, paragraph 3. He suggested that the words "international officials" should be replaced by the words "international or local officials" or "United Nations officials". His delegation felt strongly about a number of the cases which were described in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/40/25) referred to in section C, paragraph 1, of the draft resolution.

65. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that he had no objection to the proposed amendment but would prefer to use the wording "United Nations officials" so as to be consistent with the language in section C, paragraph 2, of the draft.

66. Mr. KUTTNER (United States of America) requested further information about the health insurance coverage proposed under section A, paragraph 8.

67. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said that the Secretariat welcomed the provisions in that paragraph, particularly as orally revised. After-service health insurance coverage for former locally-recruited staff who had participated in the medical expense assistance plan in appendix E to the Staff Rules of the United Nations would, in fact, be introduced in respect of only a small number of people, approximately 100, in field offices who would otherwise remain without the normal health insurance coverage provided to staff on retirement. The annual cost of the scheme was estimated at \$40,000. After the completion of preparatory work and subject to the availability of funds, it was hoped that the scheme could be put into effect within about six months, at a cost of some \$20,000 for 1986. As indicated in the oral amendment to the draft resolution, the financial implications of reformulating the present scheme would be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

68. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that section A, paragraph 6, of the draft resolution should be corrected to read that the Advisory Committee's comments on the proposal to introduce a competitive examination at the P-3 level on an experimental basis were to be found in document A/40/7/Add.13. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.16, as orally revised, without a vote.

69. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.