

# 1752nd meeting

Thursday, 27 November 1975, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1752

## AGENDA ITEM 107

### Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/10350 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/10378, A/C.5/L.1262, A/C.5/L.1265)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the document that contained the Secretariat's replies<sup>1</sup> to the questions asked by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 1748th meeting.<sup>2</sup>

2. Mr. AGYEMAN (Ghana) said that his Government had always attached importance to the maintenance of peace, as had been shown by its participation in United Nations operations, whether in the past, in the Congo, or currently, in the Middle East.

3. The United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force were undoubtedly contributing to the maintenance of peace in the Middle East and were considered the most successful operations in the history of the Organization. Although initially established on a temporary basis, it seemed that they would have to continue their mission indefinitely, and his delegation was concerned about the resulting increase in costs. In view of the current stage of negotiations, there was little hope of completing the operations in the near future. On the contrary, their scope was going to broaden, and the contributions of Member States would no doubt become increasingly high. The success of the two Forces ought not to be seen by the parties concerned as a reason for slowing down negotiations aimed at finding a solution which would put an end to United Nations intervention in the region.

4. Given that peace-keeping operations in the Middle East were in progress, nothing should be done to reduce their effectiveness. In compliance with the provisions of resolution 362 (1974), in which the Security Council had expressed its confidence that the Emergency Force would be maintained with maximum efficiency and economy, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in its report (A/10378), recommended a reduction in the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General. His delegation approved the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, and shared the view it expressed in paragraph 47 that the Secretary-General must be allowed the necessary flexibility to reallocate savings among other areas, including those designated by the Committee itself.

5. One factor in particular, namely the Special Account deficit, had a direct influence on the efficiency of the two

Forces. It meant that back pay was owing to the members of the military contingents. If those countries which provided the contingents were not reimbursed as soon as possible, their goodwill might well be exhausted. The principle of collective responsibility required that Member States pay all outstanding contributions in their entirety.

6. Mr. NASON (Ireland) said that his country had participated in most of the peace-keeping operations mounted by the United Nations since it had become a Member. The Irish Government particularly regretted that, for domestic reasons, it had had to withdraw the Irish contingent from UNEF in May 1974, but it regarded its commitment to UNEF as a continuing one even though it was not currently in a position to supply a full contingent.

7. His delegation welcomed the administrative improvements outlined by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. It hoped that the Secretary-General would continue to conduct peace-keeping operations with a maximum of efficiency and economy, as had been called for by the Security Council and the General Assembly, by administering them with the flexibility recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 47 of its report.

8. The estimates submitted by the Secretary-General were reasonable, and his delegation had noted carefully the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. Nevertheless, it wished to point out that savings must not be made at the expense of the troop-contributing countries. The effectiveness of both peace-keeping Forces depended on the facilities and equipment at their disposal. The projected growth of the Forces, to enable them to carry out their new functions, and other factors mentioned by some delegations—the quadrupling in size of the buffer zone and its relocation away from inhabited localities—justified the increased expenditure envisaged by the Secretary-General.

9. His delegation wished to express its satisfaction with the basic method of financing UNEF and UNDOF and to reiterate its firm support for the principle of collective responsibility. At the twenty-ninth session (1677th meeting), it had expressed regret that a number of Member States had refused to bear their assessed share of the costs; it noted with alarm that the so-called “uncollectable” sum had risen from \$3.8 million to its current level of \$10.2 million. Such a situation jeopardized the political basis of the Forces; in particular, by delaying reimbursements to troop-contributing countries, it endangered the broad geographical base of the Forces and especially jeopardized the future participation of smaller countries in peace-keeping operations.

10. His delegation wished to compliment the Secretariat on the progress which had been made in the implementation of previous decisions on reimbursement of pay and

<sup>1</sup> Conference room paper A/C.5/XXX/CRP.9/Add.1 of 26 November 1975.

<sup>2</sup> Conference room paper A/C.5/XXX/CRP.9 of 25 November 1975.

allowances to members of the military contingents. The question ought to be dealt with in the same way in 1975. Furthermore, the countries concerned should be reimbursed for the depreciation costs of the equipment they provided, and their claims relating to the usage factor for personal clothing, gear and equipment of contingent members should be met.

11. In conclusion, he informed the Committee that Ireland was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

12. The CHAIRMAN pointed out an omission in the wording of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262. The list of Security Council resolutions cited in the second preambular paragraph ought to include resolutions 368 (1975) of 17 April 1975 and 371 (1975) of 24 July 1975.

13. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he appreciated the difficulties which the Secretariat had had to overcome in order to provide, in such a short time, the information contained in the conference room paper mentioned by the Chairman,<sup>1</sup> difficulties which could have been avoided if the necessary documents had been produced at the proper time. When the regular budget of the United Nations had risen from \$100 million to \$126 million, the report in which the Secretary-General had provided the necessary explanations had been more than 100 pages long. Financing UNEF and UNDOF involved the sum of almost \$100 million, yet the Committee had only been provided with a meagre document of some 20 pages, from which it emerged that there was insufficient justification for the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General.

14. In the conference room paper, the Secretariat replied to questions put by his delegation at the 1748th meeting.<sup>2</sup> The reply to the question primarily concerned with the formula used for calculating the amortization of equipment, showed that the consultations between the Secretary-General and the Governments concerned about the rate of depreciation of equipment had not been successful, although they had been going on for three years. Since it was a question which directly affected the financing of the two Forces, it should be settled as quickly as possible. With reference to the question concerning over-expenditures, the Secretariat was apparently unwilling to provide the Committee with the relevant report of the Board of Auditors. However, the Advisory Committee had studied the report and his delegation insisted that it should be seen by the Fifth Committee before draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 was put to the vote. Finally, the Secretary-General had not replied to the fundamental point made in the question concerning the amount of deductions made in determining payments to countries which had sent military contingents.

15. Moreover, in view of the fact that in various parts of the document the Secretariat promised to provide information later—information which the Committee still did not have—it could be concluded that the replies given were sketchy or too vague on a number of points. For example, the Secretariat had nothing to say on the question of the discrimination against certain contingents on the part of the Israeli authorities, a problem already referred to by the Polish delegation at the twenty-ninth session (1672nd meeting). His own delegation requested that action should

be taken to eliminate any discrimination against any of the troop contingents.

16. Recalling that, in its resolution 362 (1974), the Security Council had expressed its confidence that the Force would be maintained with maximum efficiency and economy, he said that the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General were not sufficiently justified, even if account was taken of the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee. He requested that section I and paragraphs 1 and 2 of section II of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 should be voted on separately and stated that his delegation intended to abstain in the various votes. It wished to stress that it was not opposed to Portugal's being transferred to another group of countries for the purposes of the scale of contributions to the Special Account, as provided for in section II, paragraph 2, of the draft resolution, on condition that that did not constitute a precedent.

17. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 because Portugal's change of category, which was a response to special circumstances, was fully justified and the sponsors of the draft had taken the Advisory Committee's comments into consideration, especially the recommendations made in paragraphs 46 and 47 of its report.

18. However, his delegation had a reservation to make: the Advisory Committee stated clearly in paragraph 45 of its report that the sum of \$2,840,000 requested by the Secretary-General for "other troop-related costs" without any other explanation, remained subject to a decision of principle by the General Assembly which would determine whether the envisaged costs, i.e., the usage factor for personal clothing, gear and equipment of the members of the contingents and other similar costs, were payable. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 seemed to be anticipating a positive decision by the General Assembly.

19. It was to be hoped that the Secretary-General would be able to maintain the two Forces with maximum economy, in accordance with the wishes of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

20. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) thought that the Committee should give the two Forces the means of carrying out effectively a mission to which all Member States ought to be able to be proud to contribute. The estimates submitted by the Secretary-General were certainly high, but such an operation demanded more than kind words. Thus his delegation approved the Secretary-General's estimates, including the sum of \$2,840,000 requested for "other troop-related costs", subject to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

21. With regard to the question of the proportion of contributions, he thought that the scale established in 1973 on the basis of the principle of collective responsibility and the capacity of each State was fair and did not need to be changed, unless to take account of the special case of Portugal. Although the price of peace might seem high, that of war was even higher.

22. He announced that Australia had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

23. The CHAIRMAN announced that Ethiopia, Kenya and Senegal had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

24. Mr. SETHI (India) said that the Committee did not always have the time to study in all its details the question of the financing of UNEF and UNDOF, since its financial decisions were subject to the political decisions taken by the Security Council. That was why some delegations complained of being inadequately informed—despite the ever scrupulous work of the Advisory Committee—and requested additional information or even announced that they would abstain in the vote on the item. In order to prevent a recurrence of the situation, it might be useful to opt for a special budget cycle adapted to the operational cycle ordinarily chosen by the Security Council in fixing the mandate of the Forces. A budget period running from July to June of the following year would enable the Committee to have sufficient time and information for taking an informed financial decision.

25. Mr. MARPAUNG (Indonesia) said that his Government had always done its utmost to contribute to the efforts made by the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security. The maintenance of a peace-keeping force was a joint undertaking which involved heavy costs and was the responsibility of all Member States. His country, which was contributing troops to UNEF, was also interested in the question of financing. In particular, it was very concerned about the question of reimbursements to troop-contributing countries and thought that a lag of six months constituted an intolerable burden for a developing country.

26. The Indonesian contingent was currently experiencing transport difficulties because the vehicles which it had taken with it to the Middle East two years earlier were currently in very bad condition. The lack of transport was prejudicial to the efficiency of the Force. Accordingly, his delegation supported without reservation the Secretary-General's proposal concerning the supply of matériel and equipment for the Force. It also thought that the Force should be managed with maximum efficiency and economy. The data which the Secretariat had just supplied in reply to the questions put by the representative of the Soviet Union would enable the Committee to assess the efficiency of the management of the Force. In fact, there ought to have been no need to request the data, for it should have been annexed to the report of the Secretary-General (A/10350 and Corr.1). If it had been supplied earlier, the Soviet delegation might perhaps have been able to support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262. Its support was important.

27. His delegation was also worried about the welfare of its contingent: a member of the contingent had to wait several weeks before being transferred from one hospital to another. More attention should also be given to recreation.

28. The problem of payments to cover the usage factor for gear and equipment which Governments were supplying to their contingents should also be settled in a fair manner; it would be wrong for the Governments concerned to have to bear any costs over and above their contributions. Accordingly, his delegation supported without reservation the

recommendations of the Secretary-General, as amended by the Advisory Committee, and in particular the proposals concerning the contingency fund, welfare and troop-related costs.

29. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller), replying to the delegations which had commented that the documentation was incomplete, said that the drawing-up of budget estimates for peace-keeping operations raised quite exceptional difficulties. First, time was needed to receive from the field of operations the information needed for drawing up complete documentation. Moreover, every day brought something new; in the circumstances the Secretariat could only undertake to continue to do its utmost to cope with the exceptional situation resulting from the changes made in the mandate of the Force and the corresponding financial changes those entailed. In addition, while the regular programme budget was structured by programme components and working objectives, which made it possible, in particular, to submit detailed estimates broken down by components, the same was by no means true of peace-keeping operations which constituted a single comprehensive programme that could not be broken down. It was necessary to adopt the form of presentation formerly used for the budget, i.e., by item of expenditure. Moreover, whereas in the case of the regular budget the estimates primarily concerned salaries and wages and the distribution of manpower and resources within programmes, in the case of peace-keeping operations they concerned, for example, purchases of matériel and equipment, which would be made in foreign markets, and the element of uncertainty was indisputably much greater.

30. The representative of the Soviet Union had criticized the Secretary-General for not having made public the reports of the Board of Auditors concerning the auditing of the accounts of the Force. The Board of Auditors had submitted only one report so far, which dealt with the last months of 1973 and had been published in document A/9607.<sup>3</sup> No other official report had been submitted subsequently, the General Assembly having decided, on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, that the Board of Auditors would no longer have to submit any official reports on the auditing of accounts for the first year of the biennium. It would be necessary to wait until the end of the current year for the Board of Auditors to submit a report on the past two years of the Force's operation or, more exactly, on the period from 1 January 1974 to 24 October 1974, then on the period from 25 October 1974 to 24 October 1975. Meanwhile the Board of Auditors had submitted some informal comments and recommendations on a number of questions relating to UNEF and UNDOF, and the Secretariat had described, in annex I to the conference room paper it had prepared, the measures which the Administration had taken in the light of those comments. It would be awkward to reproduce for the Committee the informal comments of the Board of Auditors, and he would first have to obtain the Board's consent. If the Committee thought that it should have a report of the Board of Auditors at the end of each year of operation of the Force, a specific resolution to that effect would be needed. Annex I to the conference room paper

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 7*, chap. IV, paras. 107-112.

had been submitted to the Advisory Committee, which had concluded that it described the situation adequately.

31. The representative of India had asked whether it would be possible to adapt the budget cycle to the operational cycle of the Force. That was unfortunately not possible since the estimates could not be made independently of the decisions of the Security Council concerning the manpower of the Force, the duration of its mandate and so on. All that the Secretariat could do was to make a firm commitment to supply as quickly as possible in future the information which the Committee would need.

32. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he still did not understand why the Secretariat had failed to provide the Committee with the report of the Board of Auditors which had been transmitted to the Advisory Committee. The fact that it was an "informal" report was not an adequate reason. The decision that the Board of Auditors should submit a report only every two years applied to the regular budget; it could not apply to the accounts of the Force, since the budget cycle of the Special Account for the Force did not coincide with that of the Organization. It would be logical to conduct an audit of UNEF at least once during the budget cycle of the Special Account, namely, once a year at the current stage.

33. The Secretariat's reticence merely added to his doubts. He requested the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to indicate what was in the reports—formal or informal—submitted by the External Auditors to the Advisory Committee.

34. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said he did not think that he could add anything to the explanations provided by the Controller. The Advisory Committee, at its spring session, had spoken to the External Auditors and had discussed their comments on the accounts of the Force. The "informal" report of the External Auditors was only two pages in length and contained nothing which, in the view of the Advisory Committee, deserved to be brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee. However, if the representative of the Soviet Union so wished, that report could be provided to him.

35. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the report existed and since some delegations had asked to see it, the Secretariat should have circulated it to members of the Committee, especially as it consisted of only two pages.

36. It was surprising, nevertheless, that the comments of the External Auditors on accounts totalling almost \$80 million could be contained in so slim a document. It could well be that the Committee had a number of questions to put to the External Auditors on how they had conducted the audit, and he insisted that the document should be made available to the Committee, even if that was done after the Committee had taken a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

37. Mr. SETHI (India) said that he had noted the reply of the Controller to his question concerning the possibility of bringing the budget cycle of the Force into line with its

operational cycle. The replies to the questions put by the representative of the Soviet Union suggested that the audit of the Force's accounts had been somewhat perfunctory, and that gave rise to concern. He saw no reason why the Secretariat should not transmit to the Committee the comments of the Board of Auditors on the audit of the accounts of the Force.

38. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should approve the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union, which had been supported by the representative of India, to the effect that the report of the Board of Auditors on the audit of UNEF should be circulated as a conference room paper, on the understanding that the Committee would not be prevented thereby from taking a decision forthwith on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

*It was so decided.*

39. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that an additional change, of a technical nature, should be made in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 as a consequence of the proposal that in future Portugal should be included among the economically less developed Member States for the purpose of the apportionment of the costs of UNEF and UNDOF. The phrase "notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 2 of Assembly resolution 3374 A (XXX) of 30 October 1975" should be added at the end of section II, paragraph 2.

40. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) observed that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 took account of the changing conditions in some countries and noted that the sponsors of the draft wanted to lighten the burden falling on those countries for the financing of UNEF and UNDOF. However, the sponsors of the draft made no distinction between, on the one hand, the State which had committed aggression, was illegally occupying territories and continued to refuse to withdraw from them notwithstanding the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and, on the other, the States which were victims of that aggression and, moreover, all the other Member States for which the financing of the Emergency Force represented a heavy collective burden. Israel, the aggressor State, should bear the full cost of UNEF and UNDOF itself. The failure to draw any distinction between the aggressor State and the States against which aggression had been committed would simply strengthen and prolong the aggression. His delegation would therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262, not because of the amount requested but as a matter of principle.

41. Mr. ALKAFF (Democratic Yemen) recalled that his delegation had already explained its position on 30 October 1975, at the 2389th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, when the Assembly had considered the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee (A/10324, para. 10), which authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for UNEF for the period from 1 to 30 November 1975. He added that UNEF and UNDOF were of a purely temporary nature; yet the Zionists' exploitation of the presence of the peace-keeping force and their refusal to withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories were giving to that force a semi-permanent character which placed a

heavy burden on the United Nations. Democratic Yemen's decision to participate in the financing of UNEF should not be interpreted as meaning that it endorsed Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). His delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

42. Mr. WANG Lien-sheng (China) said that his delegation had stated its position on the question of UNEF and UNDOF at the 2389th plenary meeting of the General Assembly. In accordance with that position, his delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

43. Mr. BENKHAYAL (Libyan Arab Republic) recalled that, at the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth sessions, his delegation had voted against the estimates for UNEF and UNDOF because it believed that the presence of the Forces in Arab territory was unjustified and because it was against the protection afforded to the Zionist aggressor by that presence. On 30 October 1975, in the General Assembly, his delegation had already voted against the draft resolution submitted by the Fifth Committee, which had dealt with one aspect of the question of financing UNEF and UNDOF. It would, again, vote against draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 out of respect for a principle to which the Libyan Arab Republic was firmly attached.

44. Mr. AL-NAKKASH (Iraq) said that Iraq was opposed in principle to the idea of an emergency force in the Middle East and had refrained from participating in the financing of UNEF and would do so again. Furthermore, his delegation would not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262.

45. Mr. BASSAM (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation was convinced that UNEF and UNDOF were needed in the Middle East, for they actively contributed to peace-keeping in the region, and it would vote for the funds required to finance the two Forces.

46. Nevertheless, he very much hoped that the presence of UNEF and UNDOF would soon become unnecessary, because every extension of their mandates enabled the Zionist aggressor to strengthen its hold on the Arab territories. It was imperative that the international community and international organizations should prevail as soon as possible upon the aggressor to withdraw from Palestinian territory. It was only when that condition was fulfilled that peace and security would return to the Middle East and the Organization would no longer be required to bear the extremely heavy burden of financing UNEF and UNDOF.

47. Mr. MOJA (Albania) said that he would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 in accordance with Albania's long-standing position of principle.

48. Mr. SETHI (India) recalled that, at the twenty-ninth session, both in the Fifth Committee (1680th meeting) and in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly, his delegation had stated its position on the general question of financing peace-keeping operations and on the specific question of financing UNEF and UNDOF. Peace-keeping operations in the Middle East were of a special nature and

should be kept as brief as possible. The United Nations should do nothing that might reflect the slightest complacency with respect to the situation in that area or the slightest inclination to see that situation perpetuated.

49. That being so, he would support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262. He was pleased that Portugal came under the provision in section II, paragraph 2(c) of the draft resolution.

50. Mr. NKIELE-ATYPO (Congo) observed that, notwithstanding the decisions of the international community, the Palestinian people continued to rot in wretched conditions in refugee camps, while the Zionists continued to occupy the Arab Territories and to oppose any move towards peace. Although he favoured the presence of the Emergency Force in the Middle East, he would not be able to vote for draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 because it requested the economically less developed countries to carry the financial burden of operations whose purpose was, in short, to encourage genocide in occupied Palestine.

51. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he was unable to support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 because the estimates were too high and were insufficiently substantiated. It was regrettable that the Committee, which had received the estimates at a very late stage and had not received sufficient information concerning them, was therefore unable to take an informed decision regarding such an important matter.

52. The CHAIRMAN, in accordance with the request of the Soviet Union, before putting draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262, as orally amended, to the vote, invited the Committee to vote separately on section I and on paragraphs 1 and 2 of section II of the draft resolution.

*Section I was adopted by 77 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.*

*Section II, paragraph 1 was adopted by 79 votes to 4, with 13 abstentions.*

*Section II, paragraph 2, as orally amended, was adopted by 81 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted by 82 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.*

53. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said he was profoundly astonished at the way certain delegations tried to use the Fifth Committee, which should deal exclusively with budgetary and administrative matters, as a forum for political warfare against Israel at a time when the Middle East conflict was being discussed in the appropriate committees of the General Assembly. It was almost grotesque to demand that Israel should defray the additional costs arising from the new agreement between the Governments of Israel and Egypt. It was not the Israeli Government which had brought the Middle East conflict to the United Nations. Moreover, it had always been the belief of his Government that that conflict could best be solved by bilateral and direct contacts between the parties concerned. It was the Arab countries which for 27 years had involved the United Nations in that conflict.

54. Ever since 1973, Arab leaders had proudly and openly boasted of how they had surprised Israel by launching their co-ordinated attack in the south and in the north on 6 October of that year. Yet Arab delegations continued to brand Israel as the aggressor and to demand that Israel should pay all the costs arising from UNEF, which had been established as a result of the interim agreement between the Governments of Israel and Egypt.

55. Mr. AL-NAKKASH (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee was a technical body and that the attacks made by the representative of Israel against the Arab delegations were out of order.

56. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had just taken a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 and urgently appealed to the members of the Committee to exercise restraint in explaining their votes.

57. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that as long as the United Nations had a responsibility with regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict, all Member States would have to bear the full share of the decisions of the Security Council. Any Member State that did not violate the Charter and was acting contrary to the will of the Organization. Instead of engaging in futile discussions, the Member States should all share in the peace-keeping operations, taking into consideration the interests of all parties concerned, until the conflict was resolved. He assured the Committee that his Government would continuously try to comply to the fullest extent with the arrangements made by countries providing contingents and that it would spare no effort to eliminate any misunderstandings which might arise with the field commanders and the Secretary-General.

58. Mr. GHAFORZAI (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262 despite a number of reservations. His delegation was concerned by the increasing expenditures for UNEF and UNDOF and had intended to request the sponsors of the draft resolution to include in it a separate paragraph which would have expressed the General Assembly's concern over the continuous extension of the Force. He had not, however, made that request because he had not had the time to consult with the sponsors and because such a proposal might have led to a protracted debate when only limited time remained. He hoped, however, that a just and lasting solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict would be found in 1976.

59. Mrs. BASTOS-SANDIFER (Portugal) said that her delegation was pleased to have been able to vote for draft resolution A/C.5/L.1262. The Portuguese Government had always been concerned at the military situation in the Middle East and shared the interest of all Member States in the establishment of a just and lasting peace. It had always supported United Nations efforts aimed at maintaining stability and bringing about conciliation between the parties in conflict. The reason for Portugal's abstention in previous votes on the matter no longer existed, and there was no further cause for her Government either to abstain or to withhold its contributions. Portugal believed in the United Nations and in the principle of collective responsibility and was fully aware of the serious cash situation affecting the UNEF Special Account. Her Government

intended to pay at least a portion of its arrears and her delegation hoped it would be possible to make that payment very shortly.

60. Mr. ABOUL GHEIT (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of Israel had accused Egypt of aggression against Israel in October 1973. He asked the representative of Israel which country was currently occupying Arab territory. Did Egypt occupy territory in Israel? Who was occupying Arab territory in the Golan Heights, the Sinai, Jerusalem and the West Bank and who was building settlements in those Arab territories? Who had expelled the original inhabitants and who stood condemned by the United Nations? Everyone knew the truth. Lies were of no avail.

61. Mr. ABRAHAMSON (Denmark) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. He expressed appreciation for the Committee's overwhelming support for the continuation of UNEF and UNDOF and for the constructive debate which had preceded the adoption of the draft resolution.

62. Mr. EL-AGIB (Sudan) endorsed the view that the Arab States whose territory was occupied by Israel should not participate in the financing of the United Nations forces which enabled Israel to persist in its occupation of Arab territories and repression of Arab peoples. It was just that the aggressor State should pay all the costs, and Israel could reduce those costs by withdrawing from the Arab territories. For those reasons his delegation had voted against the draft resolution.

63. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) endorsed the statements made by the representatives of Iraq and Egypt. Everyone knew who the aggressor was and who was occupying the territory of other countries. Israel vainly asserted that it respected United Nations resolutions, but it complied with none of them.

64. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that the reasons why his delegation had voted for the draft resolution had been explained in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and in other Committees. He noted that the Secretary-General's authority with regard to the financing of UNDOF expired at midnight on 30 November and that the Security Council might take a decision on UNDOF before then. He asked the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management what arrangements were being made about meetings.

65. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that there were two unresolved questions with regard to UNDOF. First, the draft resolution which had just been adopted authorized an appropriation for UNDOF for the period up to 24 October, but the Committee had yet to authorize an appropriation for the period from 25 October to 30 November. Existing resolutions merely authorized the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for that period. The amount involved was approximately \$1.6 million. Secondly, it was not yet known what would happen with regard to the expiry on 30 November of the mandate of UNDOF, authorizing it to remain on the Golan Heights. The Security Council was to meet on the afternoon of 28 November,

while the Committee had scheduled an evening meeting for that date. If the Security Council took a decision to extend the mandate, the Committee would be able to make an appropriate recommendation to the General Assembly. On the other hand, the Security Council might not be able to take a decision on 28 November and might meet on 29 or 30 November. In either case, unless the General Assembly held a plenary meeting on the morning of 29 November, and he had no information that it intended to do so, the Secretary-General would have no authority, after midnight on 30 November, to enter into commitments of any kind.

66. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) suggested that the Committee should concentrate on the possibility of an interim extension of the Secretary-

General's authority to enter into commitments with regard to UNDOF. Perhaps the representative of the Secretary-General could submit a draft resolution to that effect.

67. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) introduced draft decision A/C.5/L.1265.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft decision.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.*

## 1753rd meeting

Friday, 28 November 1975, at 11.20 a.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1753

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Akashi (Japan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 105

**United Nations salary system (continued):\***

(a) Report of the International Civil Service Commission (continued)\* (A/10008/Add.9, A/10030, A/C.5/1700, A/C.5/1703, A/C.5/L.1260);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General (continued)\*

1. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the International Civil Service Commission that a revision of the United Nations salary system had to be considered as a whole. That was why he was surprised to find that the Commission, although it had by no means examined all the aspects of the salary system, was recommending an increase as of 1 January 1976 in the post adjustment paid to staff members without dependants at certain duty stations (A/10030, para. 64 (b)). United Nations salaries were not so low in comparison with the remuneration of civil servants in the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France, for example, that that question deserved to be examined on a priority basis. His delegation opposed the interim measure recommended by the Commission and would vote against the relevant supplementary estimates. The Commission should complete its work before submitting a final recommendation to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

2. Furthermore, his delegation could not approve requests to increase the present staff of the Commission's secretariat by 13 posts. It could, however, approve with certain reservations the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in paragraph 15 of its report (A/10008/Add.9) with respect to

the redeployment to that secretariat of existing posts from agencies in the common system.

3. Finally, his delegation could not approve the revised estimate for the Commission because, in accordance with its position of principle, it was opposed to estimates to cover expenses caused by inflation and the recruitment of additional staff.

*Mr. Thomas (Trinidad and Tobago) took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 96

**Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 and medium-term plan for the period 1976-1979 (continued)\*\* (for the previous A/... and A/C.5/... documents, see the 1734th meeting; A/10008/Add.6 and 11, A/C.5/1682/Add.1 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1708, A/C.5/1709, A/C.5/1714, A/C.5/1722, A/C.5/1723, A/C.5/L.1231/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1239, A/C.5/L.1240, A/C.5/L.1250, A/C.5/L.1266)**

**Consideration of the proposals before the Committee (concluded)\*\* (A/C.5/L.1231/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1239, A/C.5/L.1250, A/C.5/L.1266)**

*Draft decision A/C.5/L.1250*

4. Mr. AKASHI (Japan), introducing on behalf of the sponsors a draft decision (A/C.5/L.1250), said that the sponsors were motivated by a concern to bring some order into the chaos which characterized the structure of the Secretariat, where departments, divisions, services, centres, offices and others, whose names did not necessarily correspond to their size, resources, functions and mutual relations, existed side by side. Already in 1968, the

\* Resumed from the 1751st meeting.

\*\* Resumed from the 1749th meeting.