

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTY-FIRST SESSION
Official Records*



FIFTH COMMITTEE
46th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 10 December 1986
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 46th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 117: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 140: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (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 DC2-750, 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.5/41/SR.46
15 December 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 117: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/41/L.20 and L.24)

1. The CHAIRMAN introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/41/L.24, which had been prepared after informal consultations based on a previous draft (A/C.5/41/L.20). Having announced a small number of revisions, to bring the text more into line with what had been agreed during the consultations, he said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the new text, as revised, by consensus. The draft would then become part of the omnibus resolution on personnel questions for the current session.
2. It was so decided.
3. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark), explaining the position of the Nordic delegations (those of Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and his own country), paid tribute to the spirit of co-operation shown by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.20, whose acceptance of draft resolution C in document A/C.5/41/L.21 as the basis for a solution had made the consensus possible.
4. The Nordic delegations had only very reluctantly accepted the statement, in the first preambular paragraph, that the General Assembly was "reaffirming" resolution 34/219: although they had voted for that resolution as a whole, in a preceding separate vote they had voted against section I. They would much have preferred to use the word "recalling".
5. In paragraph 2 of the draft, the Secretary-General was requested to present proposals to the forty-second session of the General Assembly "with a view to reaching a decision". The Nordic delegations understood that it would be for the General Assembly to decide at that time what decision it wished to take.
6. Mr. HERIJANTO (Indonesia) said that his delegation had attached special importance to agenda item 117 because the General Assembly, in resolutions 35/210 and 40/258 A, had decided that the question of desirable ranges would be reviewed at the forty-first session. The decision now taken by the Committee, however, would create certain imbalances. Despite a number of rounds of discussion and displays of great flexibility by some delegations, it had not been possible to reach agreement on desirable ranges. The study on the matter provided by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/41/6) was thorough, and delegations had had plenty of time to study it. Negotiations at the forty-second session would be harder, but the problem could not be further delayed because in 1988 the Committee was due to concentrate once again on the scale of assessments. His delegation had thus gone along with paragraph 1 of the draft resolution just adopted on the understanding that, work on the programme budget notwithstanding, the General Assembly would not merely consider but take a decision on the Secretary General's proposals as requested in paragraph 2 of the draft.

(Mr. Herijanto, Indonesia)

7. He also clarified that in his delegation's eyes, the "views expressed by Member States during the current session" mentioned in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution included those set forth in document A/C.541/L.20.
8. Mr. WESTPHAL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation's concerns had not been fully addressed in the draft; he alluded to its position at the thirty-fourth session, when the Fifth Committee had voted on section I of resolution 34/219. It did not agree with the idea that the weight of the contribution factor in the calculation of desirable ranges should be reduced. Parity between the contribution and membership factors was no goal of his delegation. He hoped it would not become the goal of the General Assembly in future years.
9. Mr. ZHANG Wanhai (China) said that his delegation was not entirely satisfied with the draft resolution. Under the terms of resolution 35/210, the General Assembly ought to have taken a specific decision on desirable ranges at the current session. His delegation had made several concessions in order to avoid an impasse; it held that, at the forty-second session, the General Assembly must finally take a decision on the question. There was no reason to allow the issue to drag on.
10. If a realistic solution was to be found, the Fifth Committee needed ample time to discuss the matter. He therefore suggested that, at the forty-second session, the question of desirable ranges should be the first item taken up by the Fifth Committee; so that delegations would have ample time to study the problem comprehensively, he called for the Secretary-General's report on the subject to be distributed to Member States at least one month before the opening of the session.
11. Mr. ROY (India) endorsed the views expressed by the Indonesian and Chinese representatives. It was unfortunate that circumstances had prevented a thorough examination of the question at the current session. At its forty-second session, the General Assembly must take a decision to guide the Secretary-General for the following half decade at least. Care must also be taken that there would be enough time to discuss personnel issues at the following session, by taking the item up early and making the question of desirable ranges the first issue to be considered under that item.
12. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said he was pleased that the decision had been adopted without a vote, and thanked the sponsors of the earlier resolution (A/C.5/41/L.20) for their co-operation and flexibility. Deferring a final decision on the question of desirable ranges to the following session would benefit all concerned, for by the forty-second session delegations would know the number of posts on which the calculations needed to be based.
13. His delegation had reservations about the first preambular paragraph of the draft just adopted. It did not believe that it was constructive to reaffirm a decision which had caused deep divisions among Member States. As far as his delegation was concerned, the concept of parity between the membership and contribution factors was an evolving one. All three factors should be reviewed in

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

detail, and the specific weight assigned to the population factor should be regarded as an item subject to negotiation. Once the notion of parity or balance had been defined, movement towards it could begin, but such movement should be a gradual process. His delegation also felt that assigning the posts apportioned by population to individual States instead of regions would create anomalies; no more than 40 States would receive any worthwhile adjustment from such a measure. Under any new scale of desirable ranges similar to those proposed, many countries would face excessive variations in their levels of representation in the Secretariat. Machinery would have to be established to mitigate those variations. Finally since no progress had been made in the past 12 months in improving the status of the un- and underrepresented countries, it hardly made sense to establish lower desirable ranges for those countries instead of recruiting more staff from them.

14. Mr. NTAKIBIRORA (Burundi) said that the Committee could have worked more calmly and reached a more balanced agreement had it not been for the pressure and constraints imposed by some delegations. His delegation was dissatisfied with the first preambular paragraph of the draft just adopted, and would have preferred a specific reference to section I of General Assembly resolution 34/219, which actually established the notion of parity between the contribution and membership factors. He knew that efforts were being made to change the democratic decision-making process in the General Assembly. Until the position did change, however, all resolutions adopted by the Assembly, whether by consensus or by vote, were of equal legal standing.

15. The draft resolution now adopted asked the Secretary-General to submit updated calculations taking into account the views expressed at the current session. Those views should be taken to include document A/C.5/41/L.20 as orally revised at the 45th meeting. As for paragraph 2, his delegation agreed with those of India, Indonesia and China that the General Assembly must at its forty-second session take a decision which would hold good for at least five years.

16. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he agreed with the views expressed by Burundi, and like others, deplored the failure to take a decision on parity. Algeria had, however, supported the compromise draft resolution, on the understanding that the first preambular paragraph reaffirmed all parts of General Assembly resolution 34/219 and that it, together with paragraphs 1 (b) and 2, constituted a call for the establishment of the principle of parity as a way of redressing the current inequitable system of desirable ranges.

17. Mr. EDON (Benin) said that his delegation had, in a spirit of compromise, supported a draft resolution which it found unsatisfactory in many respects. Benin would have preferred a clear reference to section I of General Assembly resolution 34/219 in the first preambular paragraph and would have liked to see a final decision taken on desirable ranges in paragraph 2, rather than the vague deferral of a decision.

18. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) observed that the reference in the draft resolution just adopted to the concept of parity conveyed the intent of General Assembly

(Mr. Devreux, Belgium)

resolution 35/210 while at the same time leaving the General Assembly free to take its own decision on desirable ranges at its forty-second session. The movement towards parity was a general trend which Member States could take into account, bearing in mind the general context at the time a decision was taken.

19. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) said that he fully endorsed the views of those who had regretted that no progress had been made on the question of desirable ranges, and his delegation had accepted the compromise draft resolution on the understanding that a decision would be taken at the next session.

20. Not enough time had been given to the issue at the current session. He therefore proposed that next time desirable ranges should be taken up early in the General Assembly. In order to permit a detailed examination of the question, the relevant documents should be issued at least four weeks before its consideration.

21. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus, the draft resolution did not satisfy Guinea. If anything, the deferral of a decision complicated matters. There was no real consensus on the two crucial issues of desirable ranges or the scale of assessments. He wondered, moreover, whether the General Assembly would have time at its forty-second session for a discussion of both desirable ranges and the proposed programme budget for the next biennium.

22. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) said that he deeply regretted that Member States had failed to implement the various previous resolutions on desirable ranges by not settling the issue. Uganda was not fully satisfied with the draft resolution that had just been adopted. It hoped that the updated calculations requested in paragraph 1 would show a real departure from the current figures and that a decision would be reached the following year.

23. Mr. VAHER (Canada), while paying tribute to the delegations which had been most active in achieving a welcome consensus, observed that the draft resolution did not address all Canada's concerns regarding desirable ranges.

24. He agreed with the Nordic countries and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding the difficulty posed by the reaffirmation in the first preambular paragraph of a draft resolution which had been unacceptable in part to a number of States, and hoped that such a formulation did not establish a precedent. The issue of desirable ranges had been discussed along with many other difficult issues during the current session, and Canada anticipated that the following year the discussions would take place in a better atmosphere.

25. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to be able to join the consensus after long and difficult negotiations skilfully conducted by the Chairman. The decision taken in the draft resolution was the only logical approach to the problematical question of desirable ranges. The many uncertainties throughout the Organization made it impossible to settle the matter rationally until those uncertainties were first resolved. His delegation hoped that there would be no unnecessary delay in that regard.

(Mr. Kramer, United States)

26. While understanding the views of other States concerning parity between the membership and contribution factors, his delegation continued to hold that parity was not an agreed principle but only a concept shared by some States. It was willing to take the concept into account at the next session, but others must also take the United States position into account if progress was to be made.

27. His delegation had reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 34/219 in the first preambular paragraph, even though the United States and 32 others had at the time voted against section I on desirable ranges. His delegation had done so because that General Assembly resolution had been adopted by consensus and because section I had merely called for a report, which had been duly produced and decided upon.

28. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation had joined the consensus because of the importance it attached to personnel questions, but regretted that a decision had to be deferred on desirable ranges because some delegations had chosen to question a fundamental underlying principle. The concept of parity was an established principle. Kenya therefore understood paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution as reaffirming the need to move towards that established principle in an orderly fashion; and also took paragraph 2 to refer to a final decision. Furthermore, its position was that all resolutions adopted by the General Assembly had the same force and standing, and it found it surprising that some delegations had sought to dissociate themselves from certain provisions of an adopted resolution.

29. Mr. JOSHI (Nepal) said that he, like others, was disappointed that the Committee had again not taken the decision mandated by General Assembly resolution 35/210. The question must be given priority at the next session and delegations must take a flexible and a more realistic approach.

30. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the question of desirable ranges had to be taken up early in the forty-second session, even though it was a budget year, and that it would be essential to give it enough time. His delegation's own views were best reflected in draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.20, as amended the previous day, and especially in paragraph 1.

31. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the draft resolution, even though it would have preferred the first preambular paragraph to recall rather than reaffirm General Assembly resolution 34/219, since the United Kingdom had voted against part of that resolution.

32. His delegation saw no particular magic in the concept of parity and certainly did not view it as an accepted principle. Much more attractive was the concept of a balanced application of all factors relevant to the calculation of desirable ranges. Indeed, the appeal of the concept of parity declined every time another resolution on the scale of assessments introduced new discount factors for certain countries. His delegation noted an unhappy parallel between the draft resolutions adopted on the two questions: most Member States were seeking the highest possible

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

desirable ranges and at the same time the lowest possible rates of contribution. The United Kingdom would continue to look unfavourably on the concept of parity unless the basis for calculating the scale of assessments became more technical and objective.

33. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) regretted that a more balanced resolution had not been adopted. Especially with regard to parity, the concept of the movement towards its establishment should have been better defined in paragraph 1 (b) and a time-frame for the achievement of that goal identified.

34. Mr. BOUR (France) observed that, like all compromises, the draft resolution just adopted did not fully satisfy anyone. France endorsed the comments of the Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium and the United Kingdom regarding the first preambular paragraph. It understood paragraph 1 as a request to the Secretary-General to make new proposals on methods of calculation and understood the objective of paragraph 1 (b) to be a gradual movement towards a concept of parity. He hoped the excellent climate just created would carry over to the consideration of the question at the forty-second session.

35. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation looked forward to receiving the report of the Secretary-General on the question, and trusted it would reflect greater parity.

36. Mr. ODUJEMI (Nigeria) observed that the concept of parity had come to stay, with all due respect for the views of those who had problems with it, but that it could be best achieved gradually. Perhaps it was good that no decision had been taken on desirable ranges because there were so many uncertainties involved - it was not even known, for instance, how many posts would be available. The opportunity must not be missed, however, at the next session.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.20 as orally revised were withdrawing the draft resolution, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.24, on the understanding that the Secretary-General would take into account the positions reflected in the revised draft resolution.

38. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) sought assurances that the Secretary-General's report on desirable ranges would be available to delegations six weeks before that subject was considered at the forty-second session.

39. Mr. NEGRE (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) said that the Secretary-General's report would indeed be available by the requested deadline.

40. Mr. EDON (Benin) agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the Committee should take up the question of desirable ranges early in the forty-second session in order to allow due time for the taking of decisions.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that the organization of the Committee's work for the forty-second session would have to be determined at that session. However, the

(The Chairman)

view expressed by the representatives of Pakistan and Benin would surely be taken into account then.

42. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) suggested that, in preparing the report on desirable ranges, the Secretariat might include references to the views expressed by Committee members during informal consultations as well as those stated formally. Such information would make it easier for small delegations to stay apprised of all developments relating to the question.

43. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Secretariat would be guided in its preparation of the report by General Assembly decisions, bearing in mind their spirit and intent and the legal climate in which they had been adopted.

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 117.

AGENDA ITEM 140: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.5/41/L.23)

45. The CHAIRMAN introduced the draft report of the Committee on the current financial crisis of the United Nations (A/C.5/41/L.23), and drew attention to two changes to be made in the text. The words "at its forty-second session" should be added at the end of the first sentence of paragraph 16. In addition, the phrase "would be provided" in the final sentence of paragraph 23 should be revised to read "will be provided", in order to make it clear that the Special Committee on decolonization would in fact be provided with verbatim records.

46. During the informal consultations on the draft report before the Committee, a number of delegations had indicated that paragraph 15, which was intended to reflect the thrust of paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21, adopted by the Committee at its 45th meeting, did not fully express their concern at the current recruitment freeze. The representative of Japan had consequently submitted a revised text for paragraph 15, with which he himself had no difficulty.

47. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) proposed that paragraph 15 of document A/C.5/41/L.23 should be revised to read:

"The Committee regretted the increase in the number of unrepresented and underrepresented Member States resulting from the suspension of recruitment of external candidates, including most of the successful candidates in the 1985 national competitive examinations. It was the view of the Committee that the Secretary-General should recruit these successful candidates as soon as possible and that the freeze on recruitment of external candidates should be lifted at the earliest possible date. The Secretary-General should make every effort to achieve, to the extent possible, an improvement in recruitment from unrepresented and underrepresented Member States and explore alternatives to the recruitment-freeze policy and report thereon no later than 21 March 1987."

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

48. Although the new wording did not strictly adhere to that of paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21, it was intended to reflect the Committee's concern about the impact of the recruitment freeze.

49. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) noted that the Japanese amendment had been submitted only in English and said it should have been submitted in the other official languages, including Arabic. He hoped that a precedent had not been set. He wished to know why the revised text retained the deadline of 21 March 1987, since it was conceivable that the Secretary-General's report might be available earlier. Finally, the phrase "the Secretary-General should", which appeared twice in the proposed amendment, should be revised to "the Secretary-General is requested to".

50. The CHAIRMAN explained that the date of 21 March 1987 had been retained from paragraph 7 of draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21.

51. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed support for the Japanese proposal, which was rational and based on a spirit of realism. However, he proposed that an additional sentence should be inserted after the second sentence in the Japanese amendment to read: "Subject to approval of the report of the Group of 18, the freeze should be lifted simultaneously with the implementation of the Group's recommendations."

52. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that members were, in effect, reopening the debate on paragraph 15. It should be borne in mind that the decision to freeze recruitment lay within the competence of the Secretary-General, who had been compelled to take that step in view of the difficult situation faced by the Organization, a situation for which Member States were responsible. The Committee could not ask the Secretary-General to backtrack on the measures already adopted. Accordingly, paragraph 15 should be deleted. If delegations insisted on expressing their views on recruitment, perhaps the first sentence alone of the proposed amendment could be retained. The report of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts had not yet been adopted by the General Assembly, in view of which it would be difficult to make specific references to it.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was becoming embroiled in complications over paragraph 15. Draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21 had already been adopted and would shortly be endorsed by the Assembly, so that paragraphs 6 and 7 of that resolution would provide a legislative basis for action by the Secretariat. Accordingly, two references to unrepresented and underrepresented Member States in paragraph 15 would not add anything of substance. In view of the difficulties some delegations had over the proposed amendments to the paragraph, it would be preferable for members to display a spirit of compromise and accept paragraph 15 as originally worded in document A/C.5/41/L.23.

54. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation had sought to make a constructive proposal by submitting its amendment, not to complicate the Committee's work. With regard to the procedural aspects of the matter, informal consultations had been held at which it had been agreed that a single paragraph would be drafted to

/...

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

reflect paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21. In fact, paragraph 15, as proposed by the Chairman, did not reflect the content of those paragraphs. There should be a specific reference to the provisions of those two paragraphs in the Fifth Committee's report. At the very least, his delegation wished to amend the first sentence of paragraph 15 to read: "... resulting from the suspension of recruitment of external candidates, including most of the successful candidates in the 1985 national competitive examinations. The Secretary-General is requested to recruit the successful candidates as soon as possible."

55. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take it that the original amendment to paragraph 15 proposed by the delegation of Japan had been withdrawn.

56. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation would prefer the deletion of paragraph 15, as proposed by the representative of Algeria. The Committee would do better to avoid any amendments, since if the Japanese amendment was accepted, other delegations would be encouraged to put forward their own proposals. For example, the 1985 competitive examination had not been held in Kenya, so that his delegation did not view it as desirable to give priority to those candidates. Further, rather than saying that those candidates should be recruited as soon as possible, it would be better to say that they should be recruited as soon as the financial situation permitted.

57. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) agreed with the representatives of Algeria and Kenya. Paragraph 15 as originally drafted amply reflected the concerns expressed by delegations. Although it would be preferable to delete it entirely if it was to be retained, perhaps a reference could be made to the adoption of draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21, and to the fact that paragraphs 6 and 7 thereof were relevant.

58. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that in view of the situation the best approach would be simply to delete paragraph 15.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that there was a minor error in paragraph 15 as originally drafted, the first sentence of which should read: "... the number of unrepresented or underrepresented Member States". He appealed to delegations to accept the paragraph as contained in document A/C.5/41/L.23. If there was no serious objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraph 15 as it stood.

60. It was so decided.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Netherlands had proposed an amendment to paragraph 28 of document A/C.5/41/L.23, to read:

"28. The extension of economy measures in 1987 should be such as to ensure that those programmes which suffered disproportionately in 1986, such as the human rights programmes, should not again so suffer in 1987. In this respect,

/...

(The Chairman)

it was pointed out that the provision of summary records to the Commission on Human Rights and its subsidiary machinery should be maintained as far as possible."

62. Mr. EDON (Benin) said that he did not understand why special mention should be made of human rights bodies, since other programmes had also suffered. The amendment should be redrafted accordingly.

63. Mr. RALLIS (Greece) said that his delegation supported the Netherlands proposal.

64. Mr. VAN DEN HOUT (Netherlands) said that although other bodies had been affected in terms of summary records coverage, it was an incontrovertible fact that human rights bodies had been disproportionately affected in 1986. They should not suffer similarly in 1987. Since the Netherlands amendment was a simple statement of fact, he trusted that it could be adopted without objection.

65. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation agreed with the representative of the Netherlands. Human rights programmes constituted a modest part of the budget and had suffered disproportionately in 1986, in view of which the Netherlands amendment was fully justified.

66. Mr. KHAN (Saudi Arabia) said that he understood that the issue under discussion had been resolved during the extensive informal consultations, and at that time it had been felt that the Netherlands amendment might upset the balance the Committee had achieved in formulating paragraphs 18 and 19; since a specific reference was made to human rights bodies in paragraph 19, a second selective reference to such bodies in paragraph 28 would open up a Pandora's box of proposals regarding other bodies that should be mentioned. There was a valid legal basis deriving from General Assembly resolution 41/117 D for referring to the four Committees mentioned in paragraph 18, but proposed that the new paragraph 28 did not have the same legal basis. It would be better to keep paragraph 28 as agreed upon in informal consultations.

67. Mr. LADJOUI (Algeria) said that he felt that the legal basis explained by the representative of Saudi Arabia was quite clear. Human rights programmes were very important and must be mentioned in the draft report, but it would be difficult to change paragraph 28 completely; perhaps there could be a paragraph 28 bis referring to human rights programmes and other activities such as the construction of facilities at Addis Ababa and Bangkok and activities relating to ECA.

68. Mr. NGAIZA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation agreed with the representative of Saudi Arabia. He suggested that in the second sentence of the Netherlands proposal, the words "In this respect, it was" should be changed to "The Committee also", and that that sentence should be made the second sentence of paragraph 19.

69. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that he supported the Netherlands amendment. He believed that the draft report as currently formulated was a fundamentally sound document and a blend of many different viewpoints, but that in one area, that of human rights activities, it did not accurately or fully reflect the views expressed by delegations in informal consultations. Several delegations had referred to the need for summary records for human rights bodies, and to the disproportionate cuts in human rights activities in 1986. Summary records formed an integral part of the programme output of the Commission on Human Rights, and the specific commitment by the Secretariat regarding the provision of summary records for the three human rights treaty bodies and the Commission on Human Rights should be reflected in the draft report. The Netherlands amendment reflected the views expressed in informal consultations by Member States and the Secretariat.

70. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) suggested that to avoid lengthy discussions, delegations should agree in a spirit of mutual acceptance of each other's views to leave Paragraph 28 as it stood. All their concerns were covered in that paragraph.

71. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation could add little to the convincing arguments of the representative of Saudi Arabia. It was the perception of some delegations that the human rights field had suffered disproportionately from budget cuts in 1986, but other delegations felt that other areas had suffered more, and the question could be discussed indefinitely. The question of summary records for human rights bodies was adequately reflected in the draft report; a whole paragraph, paragraph 19, was devoted to it. It was clear that summary records would be provided for human rights bodies on the basis of General Assembly resolution 41/121, and that the important role of disseminating information in the field of human rights would be fully protected. His delegation believed that the amendments proposed to paragraph 28 added nothing to the existing paragraph. It could support the Chairman's suggestion which took into account various points of view and was a middle course for achieving agreement.

72. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might be able to find a solution on the basis of the Tanzanian proposal.

73. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that it was vitally important that the Committee avoid giving the impression that certain items were more important to some delegations than others. There was no difference between the Netherlands amendment and the Tanzanian amendment, since the first sentence of the Netherlands amendment was almost identical to the existing version of paragraph 28. The concerns of those delegations which wished to amend paragraph 28 were covered in paragraph 20 of the draft report. While he fully sympathized with the sentiment behind the proposed amendment to paragraph 28, he felt that unless it was a fact that human rights bodies had been the bodies most severely affected by the economy measures in 1986, it was not fair to single them out.

74. Mr. GREGG (Australia) said that he supported the Tanzanian amendment, which would close the "Pandora's box". Paragraph 19 dealt only with human rights treaty bodies, thereby excluding the Commission on Human Rights; the intention of the Netherlands representative was to meet that need, so if the second sentence of his amendment was moved to paragraph 19 that would be a good solution.

75. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that he would have supported the Netherlands amendment if he had been given an opportunity to comment on it. He could support the Tanzanian amendment in place of the Netherlands amendment, since it adequately met his concerns.
76. Mr. EDON (Benin) said that his delegation had difficulty with the idea of favouring one body over another; many other areas of activity could be mentioned in paragraph 28. In a spirit of compromise his delegation could support the Tanzanian amendment.
77. Mr. BOUR (France) said that his delegation fully shared the concerns of the Netherlands delegation and had supported its amendment. However, it did not wish to reopen the debate on the subject, and felt that the Tanzanian amendment was an excellent compromise solution.
78. Mr. KHAN (Saudi Arabia) said that a question of principle was involved. The Committee had had extensive informal consultations about paragraphs 18, 19 and 20, and paragraphs 18 and 19 had been formulated with a view to achieving a balance on the basis of the relevant General Assembly resolutions. The inclusion of an amendment which reflected only a view of the Fifth Committee could upset that balance. He felt that the concerns of those delegations which felt that certain bodies might not be receiving sufficient summary record coverage were met by paragraph 20, which had been submitted by the United States delegation to offset paragraph 18. It would be difficult to include further recommendations without including in paragraph 18 or elsewhere a reference to other issues of concern to certain delegations. He hoped that paragraph 28 would be retained as it stood.
79. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that paragraph 19 referred to human rights treaty bodies and did not mention the Commission on Human Rights; if summary records for the Commission were abolished, or the language of paragraph 20 was used, the Committee would be silencing an important body. He therefore urged the Committee to support the Tanzanian amendment in a spirit of compromise.
80. The CHAIRMAN said that the Tanzanian amendment did not yet seem to have met with the general agreement of the Committee. He suggested that in order to meet the concerns of delegations, the words "and that the Economic and Social Council had similarly decided that summary records be provided to the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities" should be added at the end of paragraph 19; that would be a factual statement which would not neglect any of the views expressed.
81. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that suggestion.
82. It was so decided.
83. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to paragraph 24 of the Committee's draft report, asked how many sessions the group of consultant experts to carry out a study on the climatic and potential physical effects of

(Mr. Vislykh, USSR)

nuclear war, including nuclear winter, would hold in 1987. The proposed modifications to the calendar of conferences for 1987 and the provision of verbatim and summary records (A/C.5/41/CRP.3) had been reproduced as an annex to the Committee's report, and his delegation suggested that, in order to avoid confusion, the annex should be either appended as an annex to the Secretary-General's report (A/41/901) or reissued as a separate document.

84. Mr. SCHLAFF (Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination) said that the General Assembly had decided that the group of consultant experts to carry out a study on the climatic and potential physical effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, would hold two sessions in 1987: a one-week session from 23 to 27 March 1987 and a two-week session in November/December 1987.

85. The CHAIRMAN said that the annex to the Committee's report had been included only for information. When the Fifth Committee adopted its draft report to the Assembly, it would be adopting only paragraphs 1 to 30 and not the annex. However, the annex could be included as an annex to the Secretary-General's report (A/41/901). He sought the views of members on the matter.

86. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that, since the annex was only a reissued conference room paper, his delegation would have no objection to leaving it in the Committee's report. He noted that, according to paragraph 1 (f) of the annex, the group of consultant experts to carry out a study on the climatic and potential physical effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter, would hold an organizational session for five days in March. In the view of his delegation, that amount of time was excessive since not even the General Assembly held five-day organizational sessions.

87. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that it would be logical to include the annex in the Secretary-General's report (A/41/901), and that document A/41/850 should also be annexed to that report.

88. The CHAIRMAN asked whether any delegation objected to the suggestion that the annex to the Committee's draft report should be appended to the Secretary-General's report (A/41/901).

89. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) asked how the Committee could propose to attach the annex to the Secretary-General's report, since it was not part of that report. Moreover, the Secretary-General's report had already been issued.

90. The CHAIRMAN asked whether any delegation had strong objections to removing the annex from the Committee's report.

91. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that he strongly objected to the retention of the annex in the report of the Fifth Committee.

92. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to include the annex to the Committee's draft report as an annex to the Secretary-General's report (A/41/901).

93. It was so decided.

94. Mr. YONIS (Iraq), referring to paragraph 18 of the Committee's draft report, asked whether summary records would be provided to the four bodies mentioned in that paragraph in all the official languages of the United Nations.

95. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the General Assembly had decided to provide summary records to the four bodies mentioned in paragraph 18, those summary records would be provided in the official languages of the United Nations.

96. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), referring to paragraph 28 of the draft report, inquired whether the Secretary-General had clearly proposed that the same economy measures as had been taken in 1986 should be continued in 1987, and whether that would affect the plans to expand the facilities of the regional commissions at Addis Ababa and Bangkok.

97. Mr. BOUR (France) said that his delegation shared the concern of the representative of Algeria. There was apparently a discrepancy between the English and French texts of paragraph 28. The latter implied that in 1987 the same measures would be implemented as in 1986, which contradicted the spirit of the paragraph. The French text needed to be brought into line with the English.

98. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, when the Committee had begun its consideration of the Secretary-General's report (A/41/901), he had indicated that in 1987 the Organization would most probably be faced with a deficit of \$85 million. The Secretary-General had proposed to monitor the economic measures by consulting with the representatives of the relevant intergovernmental bodies, which would be best able to say how their programmes of work suffered as a result of the economy measures. In addition, in early 1987, a study would be issued which would indicate the programmes which had suffered most from the economy measures implemented in 1986. The Secretary-General had consistently pointed out that the negative impact of the economy measures on programmes could not be avoided.

99. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) asked whether extension of economy measures in 1987 (para. 28) had been proposed to the Committee. It was unclear whether, by economy measures, it was meant that construction would be stopped at the regional commissions in Bangkok and Addis Ababa. The 1987 budget implications of those construction projects and the intergovernmental bodies to be consulted by the Secretary-General should be specified.

100. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) agreed that the English and French texts of paragraph 28 did not correspond exactly and might have led to confusion. The \$85 million in savings proposed by the Secretary-General had taken into account suspension of work in Bangkok and

(Mr. Ruedas)

Addis Ababa. In Bangkok, the work sites had been enclosed so that construction would not be affected by the rains. In Addis Ababa, work had progressed on technical specifications up until late summer. The Controller would be in a better position to respond to the Algerian representative's questions on the programme budget implications.

101. Mr. FORAN (Controller), referring to paragraph 26 of the draft report and paragraph 3 of document A/41/901, said the Fifth Committee had not recommended revisions in the approved budget for 1986-1987. Payments of assessed contributions were not expected to bring in more than \$650 million of the approved appropriations of \$735 million. Therefore, without budget revisions, \$85 million would have to be saved, because there were simply no reserves to cover the shortfall.

102. Mr. LADJOUI (Algeria) said he had probably interpreted budget revisions differently. As he understood it, if construction in Addis Ababa and Bangkok were halted, it would amount to a de facto revision that had not been brought before the General Assembly. Once again, he would appreciate knowing which intergovernmental body would be consulted if a decision were made to realize savings on those projects.

103. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that although he had not been present during the informal consultations on document A/41/901, it had been his impression that the two construction projects in question had been discussed fully. The final appropriations for 1987 would, however, be decided by the Fifth Committee.

104. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said the wording in paragraph 29 did not convey the full picture and suggested insertion of a sentence to read: "However, savings of \$100,000 would have to be foregone."

105. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had suggested that the words "and ACABQ" should be added in paragraph 27, after the words "Committee for Programme and Co-ordination".

106. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) proposed that the words "in accordance with their respective mandates" should be added after the reference to CPC and ACABQ in paragraph 27 of the draft report.

107. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendments to paragraph 27 proposed by the Chairman of ACABQ and the representative of Argentina.

108. It was so decided.

109. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had also suggested the addition of a new paragraph, to be inserted after paragraph 17, which would read:

/...

(The Chairman)

"The Committee noted that any proposals to shorten the 1987 sessions of ACABQ should take into account fully the statement by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee at the forty-second meeting of the Fifth Committee."

If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to include the proposed new paragraph and to renumber the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

110. It was so decided.

111. The draft report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 140 (A/C.5/41/L.23), as orally revised, was adopted.

112. Mr. KAM (Panama), speaking on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, expressed profound concern over the Secretary-General's proposal to hold the 1987 sessions of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal on the Law of the Sea in New York. Jamaica was the seat of the International Sea-Bed Authority, and even at a time of financial crisis, the role of developing countries in international organizations should not be affected. Moreover, a decision of the competent intergovernmental bodies should be taken into account before changing the venue for any meeting. In its resolution 41/34 of 5 November, the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the Preparatory Commission should meet in Kingston. If necessary, the Latin American and Caribbean Group would pursue the matter both in the plenary Assembly and in other forums.

113. Mr. INZKO (Austria) said his country had joined the consensus on the draft report on the understanding that the Committee on Conferences would be consulted before any changes in the calendar of meetings were made. It was unfortunate that there had been no decision on the venue of the Conference on International Negotiable Instruments under the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). Austria also regretted that a proposal to reinstate the supply of drinking water in conference rooms (para. 29) would be submitted to the plenary Assembly.

114. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said his delegation supported Panama's statement that intergovernmental bodies should be consulted on economy measures. Algeria also agreed that measures should be formulated in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Activities concerning Africa and the Palestinian people had already been affected by economy measures in 1986 and should not suffer again in 1987. The Algerian delegation did not support paragraph 29 of the draft report.

115. Miss ARCHINI (Italy) said that Italy had reservations concerning paragraph 15 as it stood. That paragraph should have reflected paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A in document A/C.5/41/L.21, which the Committee had adopted at an earlier meeting. Her delegation regretted the failure to mention candidates who had been successful in the 1985 national competitive examinations, because the Organization had a moral duty towards the young candidates involved.

116. Mr. WESTPHAL (Federal Republic of Germany) said his delegation would have supported the proposal by the Netherlands had the Chairman not offered a satisfactory solution to avoid adverse consequences to human rights programmes. His delegation was likewise not satisfied with the wording of paragraph 15 and believed that Japan's proposal would have been preferable. It very much regretted the decision of the Fifth Committee to refer the decision on drinking water in conference rooms to the General Assembly.

117. Mr. KHAN (Saudi Arabia) welcomed the inclusion of paragraph 18 in document A/C.5/41/L.23 and stressed that the four bodies mentioned in that paragraph must be provided with summary records, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 41/177 D, which had been adopted unanimously. Further justification for the inclusion of that paragraph was provided by the statement, in paragraph 5 of document A/41/901, to the effect that economy measures would be continued "unless the Assembly should direct otherwise" and the statements in paragraphs 12 and 28 of document A/C.5/41/L.23 to the effect that "programmes, once approved by legislative bodies should, in principle, be implemented" and that "programmes which suffered disproportionately in 1986 should not again so suffer in 1987". His delegation hoped that the Secretary-General would take full account of those references before implementing any of the proposed measures and reserved the right to pursue the subject in the plenary Assembly or other relevant bodies if necessary.

118. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that the nature of the task assigned to the Fifth Committee, namely the clarification of technical questions relating to the current financial crisis, had been insufficiently precise, to the extent that his delegation still had no clear picture of major steps to be taken by the Secretary-General in 1987. A very regrettable precedent had been established by the lack of respect accorded to the agreement reached at the end of informal consultations among members of the Committee. His delegation had specific reservations with regard to paragraphs 15, 25, 26, and 29 of the draft report, and its participation in the consensus adoption of that report should not be interpreted as prejudging its position in the plenary Assembly.

119. Miss DURRANT (Jamaica) expressed regret that agenda item 140 had been considered by the Committee only during the final stages of the current session. While her delegation fully supported the efforts of the Secretary-General to achieve economies, it did not believe that the current financial crisis should be used as an excuse to undermine decisions taken by plenipotentiary bodies. Her delegation wished to associate itself with the remarks on that subject made by the representative of Panama. Paragraphs 21 and 22 of document A/C.5/41/L.23 addressed the concerns raised by her delegation, which expected those and the other technical findings of the Committee to be fully taken into account in action to implement the Secretary-General's proposals. In particular, the decision of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority with regard to its programme of meetings should be fully respected. Her delegation supported the views of the representative of Austria with respect to paragraph 14 of document A/C.5/41/L.23 and shared the views expressed by many other delegations with regard to paragraph 29.

120. Mrs. PERKOVIC (Yugoslavia) expressed full support for the views expressed by the representatives of Algeria, Panama and Jamaica. Her delegation welcomed the inclusion of paragraph 18 in the draft report but regretted the inclusion of paragraph 29.

121. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus adoption of the draft report on the understanding that paragraph 18 of that report should not be interpreted as anything other than a simple statement of fact. His delegation strongly objected to paragraph 29, which provided a glaring example of the deplorable standards maintained by the Organization.

122. Mr. BOUR (France) expressed the hope that the reference in paragraph 27 of the French text of document A/C.5/41/L.23 to the "Secrétaire" would be amended to read "Secrétaire général". Despite joining in the consensus adoption of the draft report, his delegation would have preferred that the amendment proposed by the representative of Japan to paragraph 15, as well as that proposed by the representative of the Netherlands to paragraph 28, should have been incorporated. It shared the reservations expressed by the representative of Austria with regard to the proposal of the Secretary-General to convene the Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments in New York, contrary to the rule whereby it should meet at the seat of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. It hoped that, in accordance with paragraph 14 of document A/C.5/41/L.23, the Committee on Conferences would be consulted on any such adjustment.

123. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the representative of Saudi Arabia with respect to paragraph 18.

124. Mr. DANUS (Chile) said that his delegation, while fully associating itself with the contents of paragraph 9, deplored the inclusion of paragraph 29 in the draft report.

125. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 140.

126. After an exchange of courtesies, including expressions of appreciation on the occasion of his retirement to Mr. Patricio Ruedas, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had concluded its work for the forty-first session.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.