



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 56th 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 BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND
PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69 concerning
agenda item 69 (c)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.50 concerning
agenda item 67

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30 concerning
agenda item 48

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43, as orally
revised, concerning agenda item 65 (h)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1,
concerning agenda item 61 (b)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.14 concerning
agenda item 134

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.12/Rev.1
concerning agenda item 137

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.10 concerning
agenda item 141

*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.56
11 December 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 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/C.1/40/L.69 concerning agenda item 69 (c) (A/40/7/Add.15; A/C.5/40/52 and Add.1)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.50 concerning agenda item 67 (A/40/7/Add.15; A/C.5/40/53)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30 concerning agenda item 48 (A/40/7/Add.15; A/C.5/40/56)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 65 (h) (A/40/7/Add.15; A/C.5/40/57)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 61 (b) (A/40/7/Add.15; A/C.5/40/62)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of the Advisory Committee contained in document A/40/7/Add.15, said that estimates totalling \$4,726,000 would arise under sections 2B, 27 and 29 from the various draft resolutions on disarmament examined in the report. Conference-servicing requirements amounted to \$3,973,100, and non-conference-servicing requirements had been estimated at \$752,900, to cover ad hoc expert groups, consultants, general temporary assistance, external printing, travel of staff and public information. The Advisory Committee's recommendations were contained in paragraphs 11, 12, 14 and 19 of its report. After having taken account of the resources included in the Secretary-General's initial proposals, which had already been approved by the Fifth Committee in first reading, ACABQ had concluded that there was room for savings. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending a total of \$523,200 for non-conference-servicing costs. Conference-servicing requirements would be reflected in the consolidated statement. The views of ACABQ on the provision of verbatim records for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development were set out in paragraph 6 of its report.

Decision on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69

2. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his Government was concerned over the draft resolution since it believed that new or expanded programmes should be financed through the redeployment of resources, so as to ensure zero real growth. Yet no effort had been made to absorb, under section 2B, the additional direct costs of holding the International Conference. In addition to the direct costs, there were substantial conference-servicing costs, which should be fully absorbed under section 29. Despite the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee, an additional appropriation of \$231,300 was being proposed. It was inconceivable that that amount could not be absorbed in a budget of \$1.7 billion.

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

3. His Government was, moreover, concerned over the convening of the conference itself, since it seriously doubted whether there was any connection between the two issues it sought to link. The prime goal of arms limitation was to promote stability and security, which could themselves create a climate conducive to development. But development was not the immediate aim of disarmament. Further resource transfers were not the most effective means of promoting development, which could only be achieved through the adoption of rational and pragmatic economic policies by the developing countries themselves.
4. His delegation could not endorse the additional costs of the conference and requested a recorded vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendation, in which it would abstain.
5. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that he agreed with the Advisory Committee that the amount of \$77,600 for public information activities should be absorbed under section 27. With regard to the proposal for the provision of \$694,000 for verbatim records, it was his understanding that explicit approval by the General Assembly would be required before such records could be provided. Further, the Advisory Committee had pointed out, in paragraph 6 of its report, that no special conference thus far had had verbatim records. His delegation doubted that the proper procedure was being followed. Paragraph 19 of the Advisory Committee's report mentioned that six editor/reporters would be required instead of the eight originally proposed. The fact that it had been possible to revise the number so drastically suggested that the work-load standards employed were not reliable.
6. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that paragraphs 1 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.69 approved the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference, one of which was the provision of verbatim records. Adoption of the draft resolution implied approval of the request for such records. It was debatable whether any separate authorization from the General Assembly was required.
7. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that it seemed that any approval was implicit rather than explicit. In any event, he wished to know whether the Preparatory Committee had been aware, when making its recommendations, of the likely costs or of the rules on the subject contained in General Assembly resolution 37/14 C.
8. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that document A/C.5/40/52 referred to a special four-page supplement of Development Forum in English, French and Spanish. His delegation wished to know why it was not being issued in the other official languages.
9. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Preparatory Committee for the Conference had been aware of the costs of verbatim records and the rules governing their provision. The supplement to Development Forum would be issued only in English, French and Spanish since the publication itself appeared only in those languages. The reduction in the number of editor/reporters required simply reflected the fact that the proposed number of meetings had been reduced since the preparation of the statement of programme budget implications.

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 resolution A/C.1/40/L.69, an additional appropriation of \$231,300 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987, together with an additional appropriation of \$29,300 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 \$2,551,700. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

11. He further proposed that the Committee should draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that under the terms of existing guidelines approved by the Assembly, conferences were not entitled to receive verbatim records, but that, should the General Assembly explicitly decide to approve the provision of verbatim records for the Conference, the Committee recommended that those records should be produced at United Nations Headquarters.

12. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposals. France had originated the proposal to convene the Conference. It was, however, also concerned to promote financial discipline and accordingly welcomed the views expressed by the Advisory Committee.

13. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposals.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Equatorial Guinea, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

14. The Chairman's proposals were adopted by 98 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

15. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting, because it was concerned over add-ons and doubted that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 37/14 C had been complied with.
16. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposals, but trusted that the verbatim records would be produced at Headquarters.
17. Mr. MOUSSAKI (Congo), Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) and Mr. NTAKIBIRORA (Burundi) said that, had they been present, they would have voted in favour of the proposals.

Decision on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.50

18. 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.1/40/L.50 would give rise to conference-servicing costs calculated, on a full-cost basis, at \$153,900, which would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs to be submitted later in the session.

19. It was so decided.

Decision on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.30

20. 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.1/40/L.30, an additional appropriation of \$119,000 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987, together with an additional appropriation of \$700 under section 31. Conference-servicing requirements had been estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$543,000. The additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

21. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded voted was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar,

Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Italy, Portugal.

22. The proposal was adopted by 101 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

23. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that he had voted against the proposal because of the excessive costs of the proposed group of experts, which would, moreover, duplicate the efforts of other bodies.

24. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that he had voted against the proposal for the same reasons as those given by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Decision on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.43

25. 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.1/40/L.43, as orally revised, an additional appropriation of \$125,700 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987. Adoption of the draft resolution would also give rise to conference-servicing costs calculated, on a full-cost basis, at \$720,500, which would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

26. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that he would vote against the proposal because of the excessive financial implications and because the climatic effects of nuclear war had already been studied extensively by many scientists all over the world.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India,

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Portugal.

28. The proposal was adopted by 99 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

29. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had voted against the proposal both for budgetary and administrative reasons. There was no need to resort to consultants when in-house expertise was available and the proposed study would duplicate existing research.

30. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that he had voted against the proposal because everybody already knew what the effects of nuclear war would be and there was no need for an expensive study on the subject.

Decision on the programme budget implications of draft resolution
A/C.1/40/L.54/Rev.1

31. 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.1/40/L.54/Rev.1, an additional appropriation of \$47,200 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel,

Italy, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: France, Portugal.

33. The proposal was adopted by 103 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

34. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had voted against the proposal because the estimated requirements should be met from extrabudgetary funds.

35. Mr. NODA (Japan) said that he had voted for the proposal because his country attached special importance to the United Nations disarmament fellowship programme, but that he hoped that regular budget funds would be used as economically as possible.

36. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted for the proposal but felt that the costs of the fellowship programme should be maintained at current levels.

37. Miss RAMOS (Honduras) and Mr. MUTSVANGA (Zimbabwe) said that, had they been present during the voting on the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/40/L.43, L.50 and L.69, they would have voted in favour of the Chairman's proposals.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.14 concerning agenda item 134 (A/C.5/40/72).

38. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that conference-servicing requirements arising from the draft resolution had been estimated at \$379,000. They would be reflected in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

39. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America), referring to the three draft resolutions of the Sixth Committee whose programme budget implications were before the Committee, noted with satisfaction that the dates for the sessions of the three Committees involved had not been determined, and asked whether she was correct in assuming that the Committee on Conferences would be asked to consider the most appropriate dates for those sessions.

40. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that he had been informed that the Sixth Committee might decide on the dates that afternoon. Obviously, if it did not do so the dates would have to be set by the Committee on Conferences.

41. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that the Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of the Non-Use of Force in International Relations duplicated the potentially useful work being done by other bodies. That was a singularly inefficient use of resources and her delegation could not support it.

42. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.14 would give rise to conference-servicing requirements calculated, on a full-cost basis, estimated at \$379,000; the actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

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

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Tojo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Norway, Spain, Sweden.

44. The proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 16, with 6 abstentions.

45. Mr. CHIBANDA (Zambia) said that at the time of the voting his attention had been distracted but that he had intended to vote in favour of the proposal.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.12/Rev.1 on agenda item 137 (A/C.5/40/75)

46. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the amount required for conference servicing would be reflected in the consolidated statement on conference-servicing requirements.

47. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.12/Rev.1, estimated conference-servicing requirements, calculated on a full-cost basis, would be \$419,400. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted later in the session.

48. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.10 on agenda item 141 (A/C.5/40/77)

49. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that conference-servicing requirements of \$379,000 would arise and would be reflected in the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

50. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/40/L.10, estimated conference-servicing requirements, calculated on a full-cost basis, would be \$379,000. The actual additional appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

51. It was so decided.

52. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that her delegation expected that, when presenting the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements, the Secretary-General would make every attempt to absorb to the fullest extent possible the conference-servicing costs required for the sessions in question.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.