



**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba)**

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

**CONTENTS**

**AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIIUM 1986-1987 (continued)**

**Loan to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization**

**Revised estimates under section 2A: News service of the Department of  
Political and Security Council Affairs (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 DC3-730, 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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

**AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)**

Loan to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (A/C.5/41/33)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the General Assembly had authorized a loan of \$24 million to UNIDO. The Secretary-General stated in his report (A/C.5/41/33) that payments made to UNIDO to date totalled \$16 million. According to the terms of repayment agreed with the United Nations, UNIDO should have repaid half that amount, i.e. \$8 million, before the end of 1986. However, due to a difficult financial situation, it would apparently not be able to meet its obligations. The Advisory Committee, which regretted that turn of events, nevertheless believed that UNIDO should make every effort to repay at least part of the loan before the end of the biennium. It therefore recommended that the Assembly should ask the Secretary-General to inform the Director-General of UNIDO that \$8 million should be repaid in 1987, with the balance to be repaid by the end of 1988. An amount of \$8 million should therefore be credited to income section 2 of the United Nations programme budget.

2. Mr. SEGUIS (Philippines) asked what the repercussions on the 1987 budget would be if UNIDO did not succeed in repaying the \$8 million.

3. Mr. van den HOUT (Netherlands) wanted to know whether any new information had been received from UNIDO since the publication of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/41/33), paragraph 10 of which said: "Realistically, ... unless the financial situation of UNIDO improves ... in the next few months, the earliest date at which UNIDO might be expected to have funds available to repay the loan from the United Nations would be the first quarter of 1988."

4. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) thought it was unrealistic to expect UNIDO to repay \$8 million when it had already taken a large number of economy measures. Any additional constraint could only force it to abandon useful activities. It would be advisable, therefore, to consider postponing repayment to 1988.

5. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) asked whether the Director-General of UNIDO had recently provided the Secretary-General with any new information on the agency's financial situation and whether it had started negotiating with him on arrangements for postponing the repayment schedule to the end of 1987, in accordance with paragraphs (b) and (c) of the decision adopted on 23 October 1986 by the Industrial Development Board. In March 1987, the Industrial Development Board would be reverting to the question. It might be opportune to review the situation then, and UNIDO should perhaps be given the possibility of starting repayments in 1987.

6. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) endorsed the comments of the preceding speakers. Morocco was very anxious about the future of UNIDO, whose transformation into a specialized agency it had supported, and believed that it must be given the resources to operate, failing which its very existence might be called into

/...

(Mr. Sefiani, Morocco)

question again. The Industrial Development Board's decision of 23 October 1986 had been adopted by consensus. It would be logical, therefore, to expect the Member States which had supported UNIDO to renew their support. Moreover, the agency had given evidence of effective management since it had used only \$16 million of the \$24 million lent to it.

7. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) commented that it would not be the first time that a loan granted by the Organization had not been repaid. It was, of course, unfortunate that UNIDO should have become a specialized agency in difficult economic times. However, it must be remembered that the financial situation of the United Nations was shaky and that UNIDO had contracted obligations towards the United Nations in accepting the loan.

8. That having been said, and given that UNIDO was apparently not ready to pay back the whole of the loan, his delegation was prepared to accept, as a lesser evil, the Advisory Committee's recommendation, on the understanding that payment of the balance should not be postponed beyond 1 January 1988 and in any case not beyond March 1988. Furthermore, in March 1987 UNIDO should present detailed and specific proposals for repaying the loan. His delegation also expected the agency to make every effort to take all the economy measures needed. Given its own financial crisis, the United Nations should monitor UNIDO's financial situation closely.

9. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that the Committee was faced with the classic situation of robbing Peter to pay Paul. However, since UNIDO had only been a specialized agency for a very short time, the greatest care must be taken over a decision that might jeopardize its viability. He would like the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to indicate what emergency plan was proposed to cope with the situation that would be created if the General Assembly adopted the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

10. Mr. INZKO (Austria) recalled that UNIDO's financial difficulties were caused by factors beyond its control, namely the depreciation of the dollar in relation to the Austrian schilling and the non-payment of certain contributions. The Director-General of UNIDO had taken steps that ought to make it possible to save \$2.9 million in 1986 and \$9.7 million in 1987, but those savings would not be enough to allow UNIDO to meet its obligations to the United Nations in 1986 or 1987. Consequently, his delegation hoped that the Fifth Committee would support the Secretary-General's recommendation in paragraph 11 of his report that income from the repayment of the loan should be credited to income section 2 only in 1988.

11. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) suggested that, in order to take into account the legitimate anxiety aroused by the financial situation of both UNIDO and the United Nations, when the loan agreement was revised a clause should be included providing for the regular monitoring of the situation in that respect.

12. Mr. HADWEN (Canada) supported the ACABQ recommendation and said that he was in favour of giving UNIDO a grace period of one year, in the hope that the agency

(Mr. Hadwen, Canada)

would take measures analogous to those adopted by the United Nations, in particular regarding the recovery of contributions, and would be able to honour the loan agreement. To that end, it would be very useful to set up a reserve fund.

13. Mrs. PERKOVIC (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation could not support the ACABQ recommendation. Given UNIDO's importance to the developing world and its cash flow difficulties, she supported the Secretary-General's recommendation as it appeared in his report.

14. Mr. HARAN (Israel) pointed out that the membership of the Industrial Development Board was not the same as that of the UNIDO General Conference, whereas the membership of the latter was similar to that of the Fifth Committee. While the United Nations had been informed of UNIDO's financial difficulties, he wondered whether the Board itself had been told of the financial problems of the United Nations.

15. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) requested that the Controller should indicate whether the amount of \$8 million corresponding to the unused part of the loan to UNIDO would be included in the revised estimates for income section 2 in the first budget performance report.

16. Ms. EMERSON (Portugal), noting that UNIDO's financial problems were essentially due to the non-payment of contributions, asked whether the agency's Constitution contained provisions similar to those of Article 19 of the United Nations Charter.

17. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) said that his delegation endorsed the conclusions and recommendations in the Secretary-General's report and thought that the risk of UNIDO's failing in its obligation to repay was a matter for concern, though it should not result in the agency's being placed under trusteeship.

18. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the question whether ACABQ had examined the financial situation of UNIDO when the Industrial Development Board recommended the renegotiation of the loan, said that the Advisory Committee had taken account of all the available information, including data supplied by representatives of the Secretary-General. Some of the positions taken by members of the Fifth Committee reflected those of members of the Advisory Committee. Thus, some had stated that the United Nations should avoid granting loans to organizations in difficulties which were subsequently unable to repay them. On the other hand, it was the belief of some that, since UNIDO was a newly established organization, it should be provided with all possible assistance. It was for that reason that ACABQ had formulated the compromise solution under which UNIDO should, despite its serious financial difficulties, do its utmost to repay an amount of \$8 million in 1987, i.e. the amount which should have been repaid before the end of 1986, and to repay the balance by the end of 1988. It was for the Fifth Committee to choose between that course of action and the solution recommended by the Secretary-General.

19. Mr. FORAN (Controller), replying to the questions raised by delegations, said that the loan agreement involved an amount of \$24 million, of which only \$16 million had been paid to UNIDO. The balance of \$8 million would be credited to the account of contributions from Member States for 1987, to be reflected in the report of the Fifth Committee. According to the Secretary-General, it was unrealistic to expect that UNIDO would be able to repay the amount of \$16 million in 1987. The Advisory Committee was suggesting a repayment of \$8 million in 1987 and the repayment of the remaining \$8 million in 1988. In the likely event that UNIDO was not in a position to make that repayment in 1987, the United Nations, which had no financial reserves, would have to effect savings amounting to \$8 million in 1987. UNIDO could not be expected to make a repayment before 1988. The General Conference of UNIDO would not be held until November 1987 and could make the necessary appropriations only at that time, provided that sufficient funds were available.

20. With respect to the additional information obtained since the report of the Secretary-General was prepared, he stated that if UNIDO was required to repay \$8 million in 1987, that would correspond to a 15 per cent reduction in expenditure which, when taken together with the adopted or planned measures to effect savings of 25 per cent, would entail a reduction of the order of 40 per cent. Such a reduction was not realistic.

21. With respect to the monitoring of proceedings at UNIDO meetings the Secretariat was, under the terms of the loan agreement, kept informed each month of the financial situation of UNIDO and would maintain its contacts until the loan was repaid in full.

22. The Constitution of UNIDO contained provisions similar to those of Article 19 of the Charter, whereby Member States were permitted to be two years in arrears in the payment of their contributions. That being the case, the financial situation of UNIDO was hardly likely to improve.

23. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said he believed that UNIDO might reasonably expect to receive during 1987 part of the \$20 million in unpaid contributions for 1986 and of the \$3 million due as a result of the increase in its Working Capital Fund. His delegation therefore supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

24. Mr. SEGUIS (Philippines) proposed that the Fifth Committee should approve the recommendation of the Secretary-General, as set forth in paragraph 11 of document A/C.5/41/33.

25. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) inquired what action had been taken to recover unpaid contributions, which amounted to a considerable sum, and whether the General Conference could not be brought forward.

26. Mr. van den HOUT (Netherlands) seconded the Philippine proposal.

27. Mr. FORAN (Controller), replying to the representative of Japan, said that the shortfall in funds available to UNIDO at the end of 1987 would probably amount

(Mr. Foran)

to \$25 million, to which should be added \$17 million arising from exchange rate losses, a figure which would be valid only if the dollar stopped depreciating against the Austrian schilling. Replying to the representative of the United Kingdom, he stated that the procedure of UNIDO in its attempts to recover unpaid contributions resembled that of the United Nations: it made representations to delegations in Vienna, or locally to Member States. Also, since the General Conference dealt not only with financial questions but also with programmes, it would be difficult to bring the date forward. It would therefore be necessary to hold a special session, which would entail additional expenditure. Moreover, additional appropriations would not necessarily result in the immediate receipt of funds, since the contributions of Member States to the expenditure of the international organizations were provided for in national budgets in accordance with the normal assessment calendar.

28. The CHAIRMAN read out the recommendation of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/41/33, paras. 11 and 12), the adoption of which had been recommended by the representative of the Philippines and seconded by the representative of the Netherlands.

29. Mr. VISLYCH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. To approve the Philippine proposal, however, would be to encourage the specialized agencies to display financial irresponsibility, and his delegation would therefore vote against that proposal.

30. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), noting that withholdings of contributions were becoming ever more frequent, said that it would be unrealistic to adopt the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. He would therefore support the proposal of the representative of the Philippines.

31. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that he would abstain in the vote since the two recommendations submitted for consideration differed only in the level of their expectations as to the likelihood of an improvement in the financial situation of UNIDO. A genuine solution required that the United Nations should co-operate closely with UNIDO to ensure that the latter repaid the sums owing to the United Nations as a matter of priority.

32. Mr. HADWEN (Canada) said that he would abstain in the vote since he also believed that it was necessary to maintain pressure on UNIDO to repay at least part of its debt.

33. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he would vote in favour of the Philippine proposal, which was consistent with the Secretary-General's recommendation and the decision adopted by the Industrial Development Board.

34. Mr. INZKO (Austria) said that he too would vote in favour of the Philippine proposal, since UNIDO was not responsible for the situation confronting it.

35. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) was at a loss to understand how some delegations could refuse to provide the financial resources required by UNIDO and at the same

/...

(Mr. Tommo Monthe, Cameroon)

time insist that UNIDO should repay the loan granted by the United Nations. Noting that the existence of a Programme and Budget Committee had not prevented UNIDO from undergoing financial difficulties, he expressed the opinion that such machinery, even though described as exemplary, should not be established at the United Nations. In order to enable UNIDO to continue to operate, he would vote in favour of the Philippine proposal.

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

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Portugal, Spain.

37. The proposal was adopted by 86 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.

38. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the proposal because it supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee which constituted, in its opinion, an acceptable compromise.

Revised estimates under section 2A: News Service of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs (continued) (A/41/7/Add.7, A/41/328; A/C.5/41/9)

39. Mr. SUTTERLIN (Director of the Representation Unit, Executive Office of the Secretary-General) took note of the questions raised with regard to the mandate of the Secretary-General to establish the News Service and to the usefulness of that Service. In his first report to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had emphasized the importance of preventive diplomacy and the need for a better news

(Mr. Sutterlin)

system in order that he might be able to perform that essential function. Shortly after his election, he had decided that it was necessary to evaluate the quality of the information which he received from the Secretariat under current arrangements. A working group had been established for that purpose. It had reported that the news inputs provided to the Secretary-General on a daily basis were concise but incomplete, since they originated from insufficiently diversified sources and did not therefore meet requirements. It was for that reason that the Secretary-General had decided, as head of the Secretariat, with a view to carrying out the tasks assigned to him under the Charter, to expand and centralize the capacity of the Secretariat to provide him with up-to-date news on events occurring throughout the world which might have some bearing on the maintenance of peace and security. A news service had therefore been established without additional resources and without any request for additional appropriations. It was in that manner that the Service had operated to date. It provided the Secretary-General with news from a whole range of sources to which he would not otherwise have access.

40. On expanding the Service, the Secretary-General had also decided that its efficiency should be reviewed after a certain period. An evaluation had taken place, and had found that the Service was meeting requirements. The conclusions of the evaluation by the Administrative Management Service had been communicated to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, and had been put into effect.

41. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) remarked that delegations had raised questions on the position of the News Service within the Secretariat, its modus operandi and geographical distribution.

42. On the subject of the place occupied by the News Service within the Secretariat, the evaluation team had recommended that the Service should remain a part of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs for two reasons: first, because before the Secretary-General had decided to create the present machinery, the Section for Co-ordination and Political Information had already been engaged in collecting information on political matters for the Secretary-General; second, because the staff of the Department were considered to be experts who could swiftly recognize any threats to peace and security. If the Secretary-General was to carry out the functions attributed to him under Article 99 of the Charter, he needed the kind of information which only experts could provide. The long experience of the staff in the Executive Office of the Secretary-General enabled them to give him useful advice. The role of the Department of Public Information was different, consisting in disseminating information to the general public. DPI was not equipped to gather specialized information for the Secretary-General.

43. The Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations had recommended that information activities should be reviewed, rationalized and co-ordinated. The matter would, therefore, be subject to examination. The structure of the News Service would be reviewed during that examination, and recommendations would be submitted to the General Assembly.



(Mr. Annan)

44. On the question of geographical distribution, the current chief of the Service was Hungarian (P-4). The Service also employed a citizen of the Federal Republic of Germany (P-3) and an Indian national (P-2). As indicated in the Secretary-General's report (A/41/238), monitoring and evaluation were carried out by the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs. The staff member responsible for liaison was Pakistani (D-1). Of the eight news agencies used, two (Tanjug and Xinhua) were agencies of developing countries. As for newspapers, two dailies had been added to the list of newspapers reviewed, namely The Times of India and the Zimbabwean Herald.

45. The Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had recommended a reduction in the number of daily news bulletins from four to two. It had been decided that a reduction to three would be preferable. CPC had also recommended that the value of the daily press reviews should be evaluated. The report of the Secretary-General, in paragraphs 25 and 26, stated that, in view of the number of daily newspapers reviewed, the activity was found to be useful. The News Service needed six staff members (three Professional and three General Service) for 1987, at a cost of \$257,500. The staff members temporarily assigned to the News Service had been reabsorbed within their original services.

46. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), in reply to the question by the representative of Egypt as to whether the opinion of ACABQ had been sought with regard to the transfer of posts referred to in paragraph 42 of the Secretary-General's report (A/41/328), said that the Advisory Committee had not been consulted on that subject. The instructions of the General Assembly required that any transfer of resources from one budget section to another must be brought to the attention either of the Assembly or of the Advisory Committee, to which the former had delegated its authority in the matter. It was for that reason that the Advisory Committee had, in its observations on the reports of the Board of Auditors, recommended that prior concurrence of the Committee should be obtained in any such cases which arose in the future.

47. Mr. BREEZE (United Kingdom) asked what savings might be achieved by reducing the outputs of the News Service to those listed by CPC.

48. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that if the activities of the Service were limited to those recommended by CPC, the staff required could be reduced to six (three Professional and three General Service staff). Salary costs for 1987 would then be \$257,500, and an outlay of \$64,000 for staff assessment would be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1.

49. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said he was pleased that there were plans to review the activities of the News Service in the light of the recommendations by the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts. As the appropriation requested was, nevertheless, higher than what would be needed if the activities were rationalized as his delegation wished, he requested a recorded vote on the proposal for an appropriation of \$288,600.

50. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said he was sorry that there had been no follow-up on the CPC recommendation for a review of the proper position of the Service within the Secretariat. His delegation was, none the less, ready to support the appropriation for 1987 provided that the following conditions were met: (a) the appropriation would be \$257,500, an amount corresponding to a staff of six; (b) the Secretary-General would, as a matter of priority, study the feasibility of reducing the cost of the Service during an overall review of possible economy measures; (c) the Secretary-General would consider the optimum position for the Service within the Secretariat and, if necessary, propose to the Advisory Committee the transfer of the sums appropriated from one section to another. He called for the recommendation currently under study in the Committee to be amended to that effect.

51. Mr. BREEZE (United Kingdom) said that he was still not sure that an appropriation of more than \$288,000 was justified, but had been somewhat reassured by the fact that, as the Director of the Budget Division had stated, the cost of the Service could be reduced and its position in the Secretariat reviewed, accordingly, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

52. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the delegation of the United States had asked for a recorded vote and that the Belgian delegation had proposed that the appropriation requested under section 2A should be cut to \$257,500 and that the amount requested under section 31 should be reduced to \$64,000 on the understanding that the latter amount would be offset by income in the same amount under income section 1.

53. Mr. BREEZE (United Kingdom) asked for clarification regarding the proposal to be put to the vote. Did not the Belgian amendment imply that the location of the Service would be reviewed and that funds might possibly be transferred from one section of the budget to another?

54. Mr. VISLYCH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that during the debate on that issue a proposal had been made to defer a decision pending the receipt of additional information from the Secretariat. The delegation of Pakistan had proposed that the proposals of the Secretary-General as contained in paragraph 5 of document A/C.5/41/9 and the financial implications outlined in paragraph 8 of that document should be approved. His delegation had supported that proposal. Now that the Secretariat had provided the information requested, the Fifth Committee must take a decision on the proposal of Pakistan.

55. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) pointed out that his proposal was not a new one but simply an amendment to the proposal made by the representative of Pakistan, which the Soviet delegation had supported. According to the rules of procedure, the Fifth Committee must take a decision first on the amendment.

56. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment proposed by Belgium.

57. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) asked whether the proposal of Pakistan was a new proposal or an amendment to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

58. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) pointed out that his delegation had proposed that the proposals of the Secretary-General (para. 5 of document A/C.5/41/9) and the additional appropriation of \$288,600 requested for that purpose and approved by the Advisory Committee should be approved.

59. The CHAIRMAN recalled the content of the Secretary-General's proposal and of the amendment proposed by Belgium.

60. Mr. VISLYCH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that to approve the amendment proposed by Belgium would be tantamount to prejudging the results of the review of all news services, which the Secretary-General was to undertake in accordance with the recommendations contained in the report of the Group of Experts. The Fifth Committee was therefore faced with the following alternatives: either it approved the Belgian amendment and took the decision instead of the Secretary-General or it approved the proposals of the Secretary-General, on the understanding that he would report subsequently to the General Assembly on the evaluation of the activities of the News Service. For its part, the Soviet Union did not propose to dictate what course the Secretary-General should follow. Accordingly, it would vote against the Belgian amendment.

61. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) noted that there were two aspects to the amendment proposed by Belgium. The first aspect related to the reduction of the appropriation requested and was, strictly speaking, an amendment, whereas the second part, which related to the conditions on which the appropriation was to be used should be considered a new proposal. He would like that point to be clarified.

62. Mr. NGAIZA (United Republic of Tanzania) asked whether anyone had asked for the Belgian amendment to be put to the vote.

63. The CHAIRMAN recalled that if a delegation opposed a proposal that proposal was put to the vote.

64. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that the amendment proposed by Belgium was a package and his delegation would vote against it.

65. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that, after reading the report on the evaluation of the News Service his delegation had become convinced of the utility of that Service and of the need for the requested appropriation, which the Advisory Committee had approved. A number of measures had already been taken to improve the operation of the Service and the Secretary-General must be given a free hand in the matter. Moreover, if the structural amendments proposed in the second part of the amendment were accepted, that would be tantamount to instructing the Secretary-General how to implement the proposals of the Group of Experts and it was not for the Fifth Committee to do so at that stage. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the amendment proposed by Belgium.

66. Mr. ABOLY (Côte d'Ivoire) pointed out that paragraph 8 was missing in the French version of document A/C.5/41/9.

67. Mr. RYDZKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation supported the proposals of the Secretary-General as approved by the Advisory Committee.

68. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan) pointed out that his delegation endorsed the proposals of the Secretary-General for three reasons. Efforts had been made to improve and rationalize the operation of the News Service as was clear from the evaluation conducted by the Administrative Management Service. Furthermore, the service was an important source of information on international peace and security and preventive diplomacy for the Secretary-General and senior officials. Finally, the Service had endeavoured to give more attention to information from the developing countries. It was therefore inadvisable, at that stage, to prejudge the decisions of the Secretary-General. At the same time, his delegation felt that it was important to ratify proposals which had been approved by the Advisory Committee. Accordingly, it could not support the amendment proposed by Belgium.

69. Mr. JOSHI (Nepal) said that his delegation supported the proposals of the Secretary-General.

70. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that none of the documents before the Fifth Committee proved beyond a doubt that the News Service performed an indispensable function or that it did not overlap with other services. His delegation also had reservations concerning the sources of information the Service used and its elitist nature. However, because of the political dimensions of the problem, it was prepared to approve the Secretary-General's proposals, provided that the Secretary-General took into account the views expressed by Member States on the issue.

71. At the request of the Chairman a recorded vote was held on the Belgian amendment.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Liberia, Maldives, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tojo, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire.

72. The Belgian amendment was rejected by 60 votes to 13, with 27 abstentions.

73. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that members of the Fifth Committee must now take a decision on the proposals of the Secretary-General as contained in paragraph 8 of document A/C.5/41/9.

74. Mr. LADJOUI (Algeria) emphasized the indispensable role of the News Service and the need to secure the participation of as many news agencies as possible, including those of the third world. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the Secretary-General's proposals.

75. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that despite certain reservations, his delegation would vote in favour of the Secretary-General's proposals, for they had been approved by the Advisory Committee.

76. Mr. EDON (Benin) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposals of the Secretary-General, on the understanding that the latter would endeavour to promote broader representation of third world countries on the staff of the News Service.

77. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the proposals contained in document A/C.5/41/9.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, 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: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey.

78. The proposals of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/41/9 were approved by 88 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.