



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 67th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden)

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

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 122: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 117: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 41: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL
FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 115: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)
- Draft report of the Fifth Committee
- AGENDA ITEM 43: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS (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.5/42/SR.67
31 December 1987

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 122: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/42/L.24)

1. Mr. SINGH (Fiji), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced document A/C.5/42/L.24 containing three draft resolutions and a draft decision which were the result of the informal consultations he had been asked by the Committee to chair.
2. Draft resolution A, on the composition of the Secretariat, contained four sections. Section I called for an end to the recruitment freeze at the earliest possible date; recruitment of nationals of underrepresented Member States; and the elaboration and review of career development policies and practices, with particular emphasis on mobility of staff in the Professional category. Section II dealt with the composition of the upper echelons of the Secretariat and called for a review in the context of relevant recommendations of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts. Consensus had been most difficult to achieve on section III, concerning the system of desirable ranges for the distribution of staff in posts subject to geographical distribution. "Informal" informal sessions had been necessary in order to reach a compromise that could serve as a basis for the decision which the General Assembly had requested the Fifth Committee to take in resolution 41/206 C.
3. In draft resolution B on the administration of justice in the Secretariat, the Secretary-General was requested to continue improving the appeals procedure and to review the feasibility of establishing an independent office of Ombudsman in the Secretariat.
4. A consensus had been reached on draft resolution C only as a result of "informal" informal consultations. The draft resolution on the improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat endorsed the work programme set forth by the Secretary-General. It called for an increase in the number of women from developing countries in posts subject to geographical distribution, particularly at the senior levels, and for a greater proportion of women in the Professional category.
5. The one draft decision dealt with amendments to the Staff Rules which were expected to enter into force on 1 January 1988. It was hoped that all of the texts introduced would be adopted by consensus.
6. Mr. IHEME (Nigeria) requested clarification from the Secretariat as to the interpretation of section III of draft resolution A.
7. Mr. NOTTIDGE (Office of Human Resources Management) explained how the membership, population and contribution factors were derived. The sum of the three factors constituted a mid-point from which the upper and lower limits of each range were determined.

8. Mr. IHEME (Niger) said he wondered whether paragraph 1 (d) would have the same meaning if it were turned around to read: "The distribution of the remaining posts among Member States will be based on the contribution factor in proportion to the scale of assessments." His delegation favoured the latter wording.
9. Mr. NOYTTIDGE (Office of Human Resources Management) said that he believed the wording suggested by the Nigerian representative would not alter the original meaning.
10. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) requested an explanation of the fact that, according to information brought to the attention of the Committee, the principle of equitable geographical distribution had not been taken into account in recruitments for 49 posts.
11. The CHAIRMAN said that the Yemeni representative's request would have been more appropriate in consultations than at a time when the Fifth Committee was about to take a decision on the draft resolution.
12. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that his delegation was entitled to a reply from the Secretariat on the matter.
13. Mr. ANNAN (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management) said that he believed the matter raised by the representative of Yemen had been dealt with in earlier debates on the personnel item. It was true that more attention should have been paid to geographical distribution in recruitment for the 49 posts in question. However, the Secretariat had given its firm assurance that it would recruit more women and more nationals of underrepresented countries in 1988 and 1989.
14. Mr. IHEME (Nigeria) said that the rewording of paragraph 1 (d) he had proposed was not merely a drafting change as the Secretariat seemed to believe. In fact, it reversed the parameters for the application of the contribution factor.
15. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that General Assembly resolution 34/219, which was referred to in resolution 41/206, should be mentioned in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A, section III.
16. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that there had never been any controversy over paragraph 1 (d) during the informal consultations. It might be useful to hear the views of the Secretariat on the amendment proposed by the Nigerian delegation.
17. There was no need to mention General Assembly resolution 34/219 in the first preambular paragraph. As the Algerian representative himself had said, the resolution was already reaffirmed in resolution 41/206. Furthermore, the paragraph in the draft resolution ended with a reference to "other relevant resolutions". It would be improper to reopen discussion on a text which had necessitated such delicate negotiations. He urged the Committee to adopt the text as it stood.

18. Mr. NOTTIDGE (Office of Human Resources Management) said that as long as the calculation of the desirable ranges was not altered, a slightly different text would be acceptable. He suggested that the text might be amended to read: "The remaining posts distributed among Member States in proportion to the scale of assessments will constitute the contribution factor."
19. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that in the interest of saving time the draft resolutions should be adopted as they stood. It seemed that the General Assembly resolutions mentioned in the first preambular paragraph had all been adopted by consensus, while the resolution referred to by the Algerian delegation had been put to a vote. The Secretariat's suggested rewording of paragraph 1 (d) was not acceptable. It was too late to reopen negotiations, but the Nigerian proposal greatly clarified the issue without introducing substantive changes. It was to be hoped that the Committee could accept the Nigerian version without further debate.
20. Mr. SOLOVIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not support the Nigerian amendment. Even if no substantive change was involved, a paragraph on the contribution factor should not begin with the words "remaining posts". The paragraph in the draft resolution was identical to paragraph 1 (d) of General Assembly resolution 35/210, which for seven years had served as a basis for calculating the desirable ranges.
21. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that it was a matter of concern that the remaining posts were to be distributed on the basis of the scale of assessments, to the detriment of countries which contributed less. The remaining posts should be apportioned among Member States in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution.
22. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that the Nigerian amendment would entirely change the meaning of the paragraph and the Committee would have to resume a full-scale debate. He urged the Committee to adopt the paragraph as it stood.
23. Mr. KLUFT (Netherlands) agreed that the text should be adopted as it stood. The Nigerian representative had appeared to have a clear understanding of paragraph 1 (d) during the informal consultations. According to the paragraph, desirable ranges would be calculated in the usual manner; only the percentage to be applied would change as agreed in the informal consultations.
24. Mr. IHEME (Nigeria) said that he had participated in informal consultations, but he had not agreed to paragraph 1 (d). It had become clear that the Nigerian proposal and the Secretariat's interpretation went in opposite directions. However, his delegation would withdraw its proposed amendment so that the Committee could proceed with its work.
25. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that it was unacceptable that the remaining posts should be distributed on the basis of the contribution factor, favouring those who paid more at the expense of those who paid less. It would be fully consistent with paragraph 2 of the draft resolution to amend paragraph 1 (d) to give greater prominence to the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the calculation of the desirable ranges was extremely complex and it would be preferable to rely on the judgement of those who had been negotiating for months to arrive at the text contained in section III. In the circumstances, he appealed to the representative of Yemen not to press for an amendment.
27. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that the lengthy negotiations had been conducted in English only, making it difficult for his delegation to accept the text. Moreover, paragraph 1 (d) as it stood was not consistent with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. It was for the Committee to decide whether or not to accept it.
28. Mr. MUDI (Kenya) said that the wording of paragraph 1 (d) deliberately gave preference to the larger contributors. However, in the interest of saving time, it would be better to pursue the matter at a future session.
29. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation agreed in spirit with the Yemeni proposal and hoped that it would be the subject of future discussions. The proposal should be placed on record, along with an explanation of the Yemeni position, which Algeria fully endorsed.
30. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that his delegation did not wish to delay the Committee's work and would simply request that in future, the point it had made should be taken into consideration with a view to ending an unfair practice.
31. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation had serious reservations about paragraph 2 of draft resolution A, section III. In negotiations, the Japanese delegation had singled out the problem of underrepresented countries as the chief concern. It had also emphasized the need for stability, which would not be attained by frequent reviews. It would be wrong and unacceptable to review desirable ranges at the forty-fifth session, on the same cycle as the scale of assessments. Before new ranges were discussed, the current ranges should be made to work. If that paragraph was put to a vote, the Japanese delegation would not be able to support it.
32. Draft resolution A was adopted.
33. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation's position had already been expressed in the statement made by the representative of Czechoslovakia on behalf of the socialist States of Eastern Europe. One of the most important organs under the Charter of the United Nations, the Secretariat must be truly international in character. Its staff must be representative of all Member States and of all economic and social systems, without discrimination. It was not normal that almost one quarter of the Member States were unrepresented or underrepresented. The draft resolution just adopted was very weak and a number of its provisions were ambiguous and open to misinterpretation. The principle reaffirmed in the second preambular paragraph of section II was clearly designed to discriminate against staff members serving fixed-term contracts. That shortcoming should be taken into account in implementing the resolution. Paragraph 2 would likewise result in unequal treatment since permanent

(Mr. Belyaev, Byelorussian SSR)

and fixed-term staff in the upper echelons would be subject to rotation after very different lengths of service.

34. Additional clarification was required on a number of paragraphs in draft resolution C, particularly paragraph 7. His delegation reserved its right in the future to propose that host countries should ensure employment opportunities for the husbands of women recruits and an education for their children. Otherwise, posts in the Secretariat would be reserved de facto for women without families.

35. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that had there been a vote on draft resolution A, his delegation would not have been able to accept paragraph 1 (b) of section III. Parity between the membership and contribution factors had been the very object of the draft resolution, but the weight allotted to it in paragraph 1 (b) did not represent progress. In effect, the section merely deferred a decision on parity until the forty-fifth session. It was also regrettable that the first preambular paragraph made no mention of resolution 34/219, which dealt with parity in detail. The omission could not be justified by the fact that the resolution had been adopted through the democratic process of voting. In a democratic organization, no distinction should be made between resolutions based on how they were adopted. There were inequities in the current system of desirable ranges, based mainly on the extent to which a country participated in the Organization's regular budget. The system should be reviewed in the light of the principles and objectives of the Charter, particularly the principle of the sovereign equality of Member States.

36. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that his delegation questioned the basis for calculating the new desirable ranges. The membership factor would be increased by 8.6 per cent, largely at the expense of the population factor, in complete disregard of General Assembly resolutions 34/219 and 41/206. India could not have supported the resolution in a vote. It was to be hoped that the injustices contained in the draft resolution would be remedied when the matter was reviewed at the forty-fifth session. He would appreciate it if India's reservations could be reflected both in the summary record and in the Committee's report on personnel questions.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the summary record of the meeting would reflect the Indian representative's comments. The report would merely indicate that the delegation had explained its position, in keeping with the standard format of Fifth Committee reports to the plenary Assembly.

38. Mr. BARABANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus out of a desire to address the acute problems affecting the Secretariat. His delegation welcomed in particular section I, paragraph 1, of the draft resolution. It firmly hoped that in the process of reducing posts, the General Assembly's wishes as reflected in resolution 41/213, Part I, paragraph 1 (b), would be respected. It also hoped that all staff members - whether they held permanent or fixed-term contracts - would benefit from increased attention to career development policies (sect. I, para. 4).

(Mr. Barabanov, USSR)

39. The principle of rotation set out in section II should be applicable not only at the Under-Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General levels, but also at the D-2 level. As the number of upper echelon posts grew smaller, each post became more important. The views of Member States should be taken into account when the Secretary-General conducted the review called for in section II, paragraph 3. Periodic reviews of all departments were necessary and consideration should be given to shorter terms of service, where appropriate. The problem of reserving a given post for a particular group of States must be resolved in a future resolution. The views of Member States should be taken into account in the Secretary-General's report on the matter.

40. Mr. BOUR (France) said that, on the whole, the draft resolutions in document A/C.5/42/L.24 represented a highly satisfactory compromise. However, his delegation had reluctantly supported section III, paragraph 2, of draft resolution A. It also questioned the advisability of a review at the forty-fifth session. As the Japanese representative had said, a period of stability was needed, and it would take more than three years to attain a desirable geographical balance in the Secretariat.

41. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that the draft resolutions, like their predecessors, were long, repetitious and thoroughly familiar. The final result did not justify the high cost of negotiating the drafts. In the debate on personnel questions, the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management had distinguished between the respective responsibilities of Member States and the Secretary-General in running the Organization. Member States should not become involved in the day-to-day management of the Secretariat. An excess of complicated and detailed personnel resolutions was impinging on the flexibility needed by the Secretary-General at a time when he was striving to restructure the Organization.

42. A post at the Assistant Secretary-General level already existed to carry out the important functions that had been assigned to the Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat. The Secretary-General should hold firmly to his decision to transfer those functions in July 1988 to the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management.

43. His delegation did not support the concept of parity between the contribution and membership factors. Over the long term, the United Kingdom's range would decline, while its contribution would increase. His delegation likewise saw no point in an early review.

44. Mr. VAN DEN HOUT (Netherlands) said that, while some provisions of the draft resolutions were superfluous, others were positive, such as those on career development and mobility in the Professional category, the administration of justice and the improvement of the status of women.

45. With respect to diverging views on desirable ranges, the concept of democracy evoked by the Indian and Algerian representatives would best be served if the majority showed some understanding for the minority. Member States' concessions - whether they were in relation to the contribution, population or membership

(Mr. Van Den Hout, Netherlands)

factors - must not be underestimated. As the Japanese representative had indicated, it made little sense to review the new ranges at the forty-fifth session or to revise the criteria for the calculation of the ranges after such a short interval. It would be preferable to wait until underrepresented countries could derive maximum benefit from the latest set of ranges.

46. Ms. YIN Shichang (China) said that the draft resolutions should be viewed in a positive light even if they did not satisfy everyone fully. The extent to which delegations had compromised should not be overlooked. It was to be hoped that the Committee would conduct its future work in a similar spirit of give and take.

47. Miss ABBAS (Pakistan) said that the weight of the population factor should be 7.2 per cent, as stipulated in the relevant resolution, rather than the 5 per cent indicated in section III, paragraph 1 (c). The move towards parity between the contribution and membership factors, however small, was encouraging, but should not have been at the expense of the population factor. None the less, the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus was important because action on the matter had already been deferred.

48. Draft resolutions B and C were adopted.

49. Ms. NIEMANN (Canada) said that it was unfortunate that the Committee had been unable to agree on provisions on working languages. It was also unfortunate that draft resolution A, section I, did not address delegations' concerns over difficult employment conditions of General Service staff.

50. Canada's interest in global equality issues was well known. In 1985, the final year of the United Nations Decade for Women, Canada had been among the many delegations to welcome the appointment of a Co-ordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women in the Secretariat. At the time, Member States believed that they had ensured the Office all the necessary support to carry out its work programme. They had also believed, mistakenly, that the Office of the Co-ordinator would continue to function until completion of the work programme. However, the Co-ordinator's functions were to be transferred at a time when one third of the activities in the work programme had not been implemented. Canada could not agree with that decision and, apparently, neither could the Third Committee. The Co-ordinator's term must be extended for a period sufficient to ensure the implementation of the programme of activities.

51. Canada interpreted paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution C to mean that the Secretary-General should reconsider his proposal in paragraph 32 of his report (document A/C.5/42/24), that he should take into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee and in other intergovernmental bodies, and that he should bear in mind the need to complete the work programme on time.

52. In reviewing the situation and taking the measures called for in paragraph 2, the Secretary-General should be guided by the preamble to the resolution. Particular attention should be paid to Article 8 of the Charter of the United Nations, the 24 General Assembly resolutions on the improvement of the status of

(Ms. Niemann, Canada)

women in the Secretariat, the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women and recommendation 46 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts. The Secretary-General should also bear in mind his own designation of the advancement of women as a priority in the biennium 1988-1989. There was only one conclusion to be drawn: that the Office and its five staff members, including the Co-ordinator, must be maintained until all 16 main objectives of the work programme were achieved, and the Organization was, at last, in compliance with its own Charter.

53. The draft decision contained in document A/C.5/42/L.24 was adopted.

54. Mr. ANNAN (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources Management) said that he had noted Member States' interest in the question of career development, particularly with respect to General Assembly resolution 41/213. Career development was a matter of growing importance at a time when the Secretariat was decreasing in size. The question would be carefully studied, but there would not be sufficient time to prepare a full report by the forty-third session. However, some general indications might be provided to the Committee in 1988.

55. The incorporation of the population factor into the desirable ranges would reduce the Secretary-General's flexibility. As more Member States fell within their prescribed ranges, it would be increasingly difficult to justify the appointment of nationals of Member States beyond their upper limits.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that the Fifth Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 122 on personnel questions. He would request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly. As the representative of Kenya had requested in the enlarged Bureau, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management would repeat his statement on document A/C.5/42/L.22 concerning the Department of Public Information (DPI) for the record.

57. Mr. AHTISAARI (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the number 39 referred to centrally planned, or core, programmes. The core programmes would be supplemented by other programmes, which meant there would be no curtailment of programmes, as the representative of Kenya had feared. The Under-Secretary-General for Public Information had undertaken to improve the quantity, quality and coverage of the anti-apartheid programmes. The objective of the multi-media approach about which the representative of Kenya had asked was better co-ordination.

58. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation was satisfied by the Department's reassurances. He assumed that "regional units" in the second sentence of paragraph 11 of document A/C.5/42/L.22 included the anti-apartheid radio programmes.

The meeting was suspended at 9.35 p.m. and resumed at 11 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 117: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)
(A/C.5/42/L.25)

59. Mr. MILLS-LUTTERODT (Ghana), introducing the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.5/42/L.25 on behalf of Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Ireland and Morocco, said that two new paragraphs should be inserted in draft resolution A after paragraph 9 and that paragraph 10 should be renumbered accordingly. The text of the paragraphs was as follows:

"10. Decides to suspend financial regulations 4.3, 4.4 and 5.2 (d) in respect of surpluses arising at the end of the financial period 1985-1987.

"11. Decides further that, should the situation regarding unpaid assessments improve in future, the General Assembly would, at that time, decide on the disposition of the amounts held in suspense (or portions thereof)."

60. The draft resolutions were essentially the same as those which had been adopted on that item at the forty-first session. However, the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A contained an important change in that the amount of the short-term deficit - \$350 million - was marginally smaller than it had been in 1986. Otherwise the preamble remained unchanged. A few changes had been made in the operative paragraphs to reflect recent developments. He drew attention in particular to paragraphs 1, 5, 6, 7 and 9.

61. During his consultations with delegations it had been noted that recent developments would appear to have made the Negotiating Committee of marginal use but that, since the financial emergency persisted, it would be inappropriate to disband the Committee. It might be possible, before the next session of the Assembly, to engage in consultations leading to a revitalization of the Negotiating Committee so that the Committee could deal fully with the underlying problems and come up with recommendations for an agreed solution to the financial difficulties.

62. With reference to draft resolution B, he said that the total net revenue from sales of the issue of the special postage stamps was expected to reach \$300,000 by 31 January 1988 when the stamps were to be withdrawn.

63. The revisions made to draft resolution A were consistent with the oral recommendations made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee at the Fifth Committee's 56th meeting.

64. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that, although his delegation had sponsored similar draft resolutions in previous years, it had been unable to sponsor the ones currently before the Committee for two reasons: the introduction, at the eleventh hour, of the new paragraph 10, which proposed the suspension of some of the financial regulations, and the provision in the new paragraph 11 that, should the situation improve in future the General Assembly would, at that time, decide on the disposition of the surpluses. It was clear that such surpluses would have to be surrendered to the States which had not received them at the proper time. His delegation nevertheless wholeheartedly supported paragraph 5 of draft resolution A and it would not oppose the adoption by consensus of the two draft resolutions.

65. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) proposed that the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A should be replaced by the following text: "Taking into account the views expressed by Member States in the Fifth Committee during the forty-second session of the General Assembly."
66. Mr. MELTKE (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had serious reservations concerning the new paragraphs 10 and 11. It would, however, be able to go along with them if the end of paragraph 11 could be amended to read: "... the General Assembly would, at that time, decide on the repayment of the amounts held in suspense (or portions thereof) to the Member States".
67. The CHAIRMAN said that, after consulting with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, he proposed that the amendment to the new paragraph 11 should be revised to read as follows:

"11. Decides further that, should the situation regarding unpaid assessments improve in future, the General Assembly would, at that time, decide to return to Member States the amounts held in suspense (or portions thereof)."

68. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.5/42/L.25, as orally revised by the representative of Ghana and as orally amended by the representatives of Yemen and the German Democratic Republic, without a vote.
69. It was so decided.
70. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of item 117 and he asked the Rapporteur to report on it directly to the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 41: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS; REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.4/42/L.16 and L.23)

Draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.23

71. Mr. GOMEZ (Controller) said that the Secretariat, if it were asked for its interpretation of paragraph 10 (a) of draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.23, would take it to mean that the Secretary-General was instructed to proceed with the necessary work within the funds available in the construction-in-progress account so as to be in a position to return to the Advisory Committee and the General Assembly in due course with the technical and financial information required to substantiate further resource allocations for both projects already approved by the Assembly.
72. The CHAIRMAN said that, after having obtained a legal opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs, he was in a position to state that paragraph 10 (a) provided guidelines for the Secretary-General for proceeding with the construction of United Nations conference facilities. Those guidelines stated that the General Assembly had had before it recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental

(The Chairman)

Experts and had also had before it and read the Secretary-General's report A/C.5/42/4 giving his views on the matter. The Assembly, after reading those documents, was inviting the Secretary-General to proceed as requested on the two projects it had approved in resolution 41/213, section I, paragraph 1 (a), with the added proviso that no additional appropriation would be required in that regard for the biennium 1988-1989.

73. The meaning of the words "takes note" in paragraph 10 (a) of the draft resolution was to be determined in the light of their ordinary meaning in such a context, and their object and purpose. As was the case with all legal instruments, the interpretation of any term depended initially on the wording and, if any uncertainty persisted, on the circumstances of the drafting of the text and ultimately, of course, on the intention of the body adopting the instrument. In the case of the draft resolution in question, the words "takes note" meant that the General Assembly had read the Secretary-General's report and taken cognizance of it, without expressing either approval or disapproval. The interpretation of the paragraph, in short, would be the one just formulated by the Controller.

74. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) said that it was his delegation's understanding that, as drafted, paragraph 10 (a) reaffirmed, and certainly in no way prejudiced, section I, paragraph 1 (a), of General Assembly resolution 41/213 in which the Assembly had already taken a decision on the two construction projects in question.

75. The CHAIRMAN, in answer to a request by Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen), said that the full text of his statement on the legal opinion he had obtained would be made available to interested delegations.

76. Draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.23 was adopted without a vote.

77. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community in explanation of their position on the draft resolution just adopted, said that they welcomed the fact that it had been possible to reach a consensus, since the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213 was always likely to be as controversial as the initial agreement on the resolution itself had been. However, while opinions in the Committee might differ on the quality of such implementation so far, the Twelve would have welcomed some recognition in the draft resolution of the efforts by the Secretary-General and his staff to proceed with the reform process, particularly in the current difficult financial circumstances. They wished formally to express their own recognition of those efforts and to encourage their continuance.

78. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that if paragraph 10 (a) of the draft resolution had been put to a vote, his delegation would have voted against it.

79. Mr. EL AMRANI (Morocco) said that his delegation wished to state that it fully supported the Secretary-General's efforts to implement General Assembly resolution 41/213.

Draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.16

80. The CHAIRMAN, introducing draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.16, which had been proposed by the Chair and dealt with the renaming of the Joint Inspection Unit, observed that he had not had the time to undertake the necessary consultations on that draft resolution and was therefore not going to ask the Committee to take action on it.

81. The Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 41.

AGENDA ITEM 115: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/42/L.9 (Parts I, II, III, IV and IV/Corr.1))

82. Mr. ABOLY-BI-KOUASSI (Côte d'Ivoire), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report of the Committee contained in document A/C.5/42/L.9, said that it comprised four parts. Part I gave the amounts which had been approved in first reading under the various sections of the budget. He recalled that the Committee was recommending a gross appropriation of \$1,769,586,300 and an estimate for income (other than income derived from staff assessment) of \$66,310,300. The net expenditure for the biennium 1988-1989 was thus estimated at \$1,703,276,000. The Committee was also recommending that the Working Capital Fund should be at the level of \$100 million. The figure to be inserted in the first line of paragraph 3 was \$271,019,900. The report would be issued in final form under the symbol A/42/910, when it would contain all the necessary references to meeting and paragraph numbers.

83. The CHAIRMAN recalled that when the Committee had approved the budget in first reading, adoption of several sections of the proposed programme budget had been subject to a number of understandings. Following the discussions that had taken place both formally and informally, those understandings had been dealt with and the Committee could now proceed with its second reading of the budget.

84. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) pointed out that, during the first reading of the proposed programme budget, votes had been requested under several sections. Some Member States who had been unable to participate in the voting had asked that their positions be reflected in the official records. Unfortunately, the report of the Committee to the General Assembly did not reflect those positions.

85. The CHAIRMAN said that it was customary to reproduce in the Committee's report to the General Assembly details of the recorded votes taken in the Committee. Statements made by delegations regarding how they would have voted had they been present for a particular vote were reflected in the summary records of the meeting in question but were not reproduced in the report. Much additional research would be required if that procedure were to be changed, particularly since the summary records tended to be issued with some delay towards the end of the session. However, a number of special subjects were to be taken up in plenary and delegations would have an opportunity to state their position at that time.

Paragraphs 40 and 41 (A/C.5/42/L.9 (Part II))

86. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the total estimates for each budget section included the amounts approved by the Committee in first reading and the revised estimates which reflected, inter alia, decisions of the Economic and Social Council and the effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation.

87. Mr. BARABANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not prevent the proposed programme budget from being adopted without a vote in second reading. However, it wished to express its reservations concerning the manner in which the recosting had been carried out and the fact that the Secretariat and the Fifth Committee had not taken any steps to absorb any of the increased costs attributable to changes in rates of exchange and inflation. His delegation would make specific proposals in that connection later on.

88. Mr. HARAN (Israel) requested a non-recorded vote on section 14 (Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia).

89. An appropriation of \$32,599,900 under section 14 was approved in second reading by 82 votes to 2.

90. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that, for the reasons already stated during the first reading of the budget, his delegation had voted against the appropriation.

91. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the appropriations set forth in paragraphs 40 and 41 in second reading without a vote.

92. It was so decided.

Paragraphs 42-67 (A/C.5/42/L.9 (Part III))

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraphs 42 to 67 without a vote.

94. It was so decided.

Paragraph 68 (A/C.5/42/L.9 (Part IV) and Corr.1)

95. Mr. BARABANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that a new paragraph should be added as follows: "Is guided by the desirability that the overall level of appropriations referred to in paragraph 1 above should not be exceeded, to the extent possible, during the biennium 1988-1989 and requests the intergovernmental bodies and the Secretary-General to make every effort to attain that goal in accordance with the regulations and rules governing programme planning and budgeting in the United Nations." The level of appropriations set forth in paragraph 1 was sufficiently high to enable the Organization to absorb any new activities that might be warranted and the wording of the amendment was sufficiently flexible to give the Secretary-General room to manoeuvre.

96. Mr. RYDZOWSKI (Poland) supported the amendment.
97. Mrs. FANG Ping (China), Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina), Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago), Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), Mr. LOPEZ (Venezuela) and Mr. SINGH (Fiji) requested that the amendment be submitted in writing, since they would need to study it carefully.
98. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) expressed support for the aim of the amendment. It was his understanding that the revised estimates to be submitted the following year would, in fact, be downward revisions.
99. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) pointed out that the Advisory Committee itself had expressed the view that it was not possible to set an overall level for budgetary resources. The proposal just made would be tantamount to setting such a level. Similar proposals had been made and defeated, earlier in the session. He suggested that the Committee should simply take note of the Soviet proposal.
100. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation could not support the proposal. He urged the Committee to take action on draft resolution II A.
101. Mr. BARAVANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), responding to a question from the Chairman, said that he would not press for a vote on his amendment but expressed regret that the Committee would thus be forced to take a vote on the draft resolution. His intention had been to ensure that the draft resolution was acceptable to as many delegations as possible. He was concerned at the levity with which his proposed amendment had been treated. The amendment would not have had a catastrophic impact on draft resolution II A and would merely have reflected the desire, expressed by a number of delegations in both the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly, that the level of budgetary appropriations adopted at the current session should not be exceeded during the biennium. He would withdraw his amendment but pointed out that its withdrawal in no way enhanced draft resolution II A.

Contingency fund

102. The CHAIRMAN said that he had just been informed that agreement had been reached in the consultations on the item concerning the contingency fund for the biennium 1988-1989. Since such agreement might influence the content of draft resolution I, he invited the representative of Zimbabwe to report on the consultations.
103. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe) said that the Group of Non-Aligned Countries had considered the various proposals submitted regarding the contingency fund and had decided that they would prefer a decision along the following lines: "The General Assembly decides to consider at its forty-third session the question relating to the contingency fund in the context of the second year of the biennium 1988-1989."
104. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that two matters needed to be elucidated: who was making the proposal, and in what context the proposal was being presented. The question of the contingency fund had been raised under item 41. He did not

(Mr. Fontaine Ortiz, Cuba)

understand why it was being discussed in the context of the budget. His delegation would prefer the proposal to be made by the Chairman and for it to be a separate decision presented outside the context of the programme budget.

105. Mr. ORTEGA NALDA (Mexico) said that he agreed fully with the representative of Cuba.

106. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 41. Since the contingency fund could be said to fall under both items 41 and 115, it had been his understanding that, if an agreement was reached, it would appear as one of the questions relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989. So far, draft resolution I referred to seven such questions.

107. Mr. BOUR (France) and Mr. KLUFT (Netherlands) requested that the Committee take a decision on the proposal concerning the contingency fund before taking a decision on draft resolution II A.

108. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia), Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), Mr. BOUR (France) and Ms. EMERSON (Portugal) participated, the CHAIRMAN said that since the Committee had begun to take action on draft resolution II A it must pursue such action. He invited delegations to explain their vote on draft resolution II A before the vote.

109. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that while some attempt had been made to implement the reforms outlined in resolution 41/213, much remained to be done to restore confidence in the United Nations by enhancing the effectiveness of its machinery, reducing its complexity and rationalizing its methods of work. The proposed programme budget had been formulated before the adoption of resolution 41/213.

110. Mr. KLUFT (Netherlands), supported by Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon), speaking on a point of order, said that many delegations had been troubled by the procedural discussion which had just taken place. He therefore suggested that the meeting should be suspended to enable the enlarged Bureau to meet briefly. The Committee would then be able to take a firm decision on the issue of the contingency fund and then continue with its decisions on the budget.

The meeting was suspended at 2.45 a.m. and resumed at 3.00 a.m.

111. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it decide to consider at its forty-third session the question relating to the contingency fund in the context of the second year of the biennium 1988-1989.

112. It was so decided.

113. Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said that he hoped that the decision on the contingency fund would not create a precedent.

114. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) agreed that the decision should not create a precedent. He trusted that it would now be possible to reach a full consensus on the proposed programme budget.
115. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) expressed satisfaction that it had been possible, during the suspension, to clarify matters relating to the contingency fund and thus clear the way for adoption of the budget by the broadest possible majority.
116. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that the decision on the contingency fund would assist the Committee in securing the broadest possible agreement on the questions still before it.
117. Mr. LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the contingency fund in order to facilitate the remainder of the Committee's work.
118. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume its consideration of and take a vote on draft resolution II A.
119. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), continuing his explanation of vote, said that his delegation had seen no convincing evidence of reform of the Organization's machinery, as intended by the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations and as called for in General Assembly resolution 41/213.
120. He trusted that it might yet prove possible to adopt the proposed programme budget by consensus. If a vote proved necessary on the budget appropriations for the biennium 1988-1989, however, Italy had reservations concerning the need for further efforts to absorb expenditures and the need for further cost-cutting and rationalization of budgetary procedures in accordance with resolution 41/213. He hoped that the revised budget presented by the Secretary-General in April 1988 would show evidence of progress in those areas. Now that the Committee had taken a decision on the contingency fund, his delegation would be able to vote in favour of the appropriations. In the rationalization of the number of regular budget posts, account should be taken of the fact that Italy was grossly underrepresented in the Secretariat.
121. There was no doubt that the Organization faced a structural crisis which could not be remedied by occasional contributions or changes in the scale of assessments. Delegations must face up to the necessary changes in management and budgetary structures at the United Nations and in the specialized agencies so as to promote the revitalization of the United Nations system.
122. Mr. BOUR (France) said that the Committee was being asked to take a decision on what was a transitional budget, it being the first budget to follow the adoption of resolution 41/213. Since approval of the appropriations would provide impetus to the Organization, his delegation would vote in favour of them.
123. The fact that the proposed programme budget showed a decrease in real terms over the previous biennium was evidence of the efforts to promote rationalization, as was the constructive decision just taken by the Committee on the contingency

(Mr. Bour, France)

fund. It was his hope that, at the forty-third session the Committee would be able to take a decision on the contingency fund that allowed for full implementation of the new budgetary procedures.

124. His delegation had reservations concerning a number of budget sections. France had abstained in the votes on sections 1.A, 3.A, 15.B, 19.C, 23.A and 27.B and also had reservations concerning section 7. He was aware that the appropriations approved were indicative amounts, and looked forward to the revised figures that would be submitted in the spring of 1988. In that connection, he trusted that the Secretariat would take account of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee.

125. With respect to section 29, France had agreed to the Advisory Committee's \$3.1 million reduction in temporary assistance on the understanding that the Secretary-General would have the necessary flexibility to transfer resources within the section. His delegation hoped that the revised appropriations under that section would reflect the provisions of General Assembly resolution 42/207 C and, since the Organization would begin 1988 under the old system, that additional appropriations would, if necessary, be made available under section 29.

126. With regard to section 18, in particular policy-making organs, the revised estimates should take account of the decision to establish the Committee of Permanent Representatives on an official basis.

127. The \$139,491.3 million difference in the estimates attributable to changes in rates of exchange and inflation could not have been foreseen by the Secretariat, but any further cost increases should be absorbed in accordance with resolution 41/213.

128. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation appreciated the effort made by the Secretary-General to establish sound financial management. Nevertheless, he was concerned at the procedures followed by the Fifth Committee at recent meetings. Every effort should be made to keep to established practice.

129. With regard to the proposed programme budget, his delegation was anxious to keep in check the overall level of appropriations for the biennium and to ensure that the budget reflected the aims set forth in resolution 41/213. Regrettably, CPC had failed to establish clear guidelines for the overall level of resources or for the contingency fund. The decision to consider the question of the contingency fund in the context of the second year of the Biennium was unfortunate and agreement on that question must be reached in the early part of the forty-third session. His delegation also regretted the decision to make 15 August of the off-budget year the deadline for submitting the outline of the programme budget. Setting a date so close to the beginning of the session of the General Assembly would not facilitate the attainment of consensus within CPC.

130. His delegation was perturbed at the revised estimates submitted on the basis of changes in rates of exchange and inflation. It was clear from General Assembly resolution 41/213, annex I, paragraph 11, that the Secretary-General should make

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

efforts to absorb the additional costs resulting from currency fluctuations and inflation. Accordingly, his delegation would have to reserve its position on the proposed programme budget until it had had an opportunity to assess the revised estimates to be submitted in 1988.

131. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that Member States should, in the interests of the Organization, support the initiatives taken by the Secretary-General to promote reform. In particular, caution should be exercised in what was a transitional phase in so far as the budget was concerned. His delegation, like those of other third world countries, supported the proposed appropriations.

132. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution II A.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Costr Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Australia, Japan, United States of America.

133. Draft resolution II A was adopted by 80 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

134. Mr. HARAN (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had voted against the appropriations on a number of grounds. Firstly, his Government objected to the appropriation under section 14 for the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia since, although Israel was obviously located in western Asia, it had been excluded from the Commission's activities, in blatant violation of the United Nations principle of universality of membership. Secondly, there were six areas of United Nations activity that were specifically directed against Israel and which did nothing to contribute to peace and security in the region. It was particularly unfortunate that, at a time of cutbacks in many spheres of activity, additional funds had been provided for two such areas: the Division for Palestinian Rights and certain public information activities conducted by DPI. Thirdly, the compromise reflected in paragraphs 7 and 8 of resolution 41/213, annex I, had not been respected: although political activities of a perennial nature had been included in the budget, no provision had

(Mr. Haran, Israel)

been made for a contingency fund. Some members seemed to think that they could support only those expenditures that were to their liking, in which case they should not expect Israel's support. The decision just taken on the contingency fund was not an acceptable substitute for the compromise agreed to earlier.

Draft resolution II B

135. Draft resolution II B was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution II C

136. Draft resolution II C was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution III

137. Draft resolution III was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution IV

138. Draft resolution IV was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution I, part V

139. Draft resolution I, part V was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution I, part VI

140. Draft resolution I, part VI was adopted without a vote.

141. Draft resolution I as a whole was adopted without a vote.

142. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that although a decision had been taken on section 27 in first reading, he could find no record of the decision in the documents before the Committee.

143. The CHAIRMAN said that the decision in question was referred to in paragraph 36 of document A/C.5/42/L.9 (Part I). Paragraph 10 (f) of the draft resolution adopted under agenda item 41 (A/C.5/42/L.23) had settled the issue.

144. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that it had been agreed that the proposed changes in the administrative structure of DPI would be submitted to CPC and ACABQ in 1988 for review. If it was understood that paragraph 10 (f) of document A/C.5/42/L.23 met the requirement that the changes in the administrative structure as well as in the programme structure of DPI would be submitted to ACABQ and CPC for review in 1988, there appeared to be no outstanding problems.

145. The CHAIRMAN said that that was also his understanding.

146. Mr. EHMEDAH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, had he been present, he would have voted in favour of the appropriation under section 14.

AGENDA ITEM 43: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)
(A/C.5/42/L.21)

147. Mr. HAMADZIRIPI (Zimbabwe) said that agreement had been reached in informal consultations on various amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.21. A new paragraph 2 had been drafted which read:

"2. Concurs in the recommendations by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the current financial crisis of the United Nations;"

and original paragraphs 2 and 3 had been renumbered accordingly. In new paragraph 3, the word "consider" had been replaced by the words "keep under consideration", and the words "financial problems and needs" had been replaced by the words "financial situation".

148. New paragraph 4 had been amended to read:

"4. Requests the Secretary-General to communicate to all Member States the latest information on the magnitude of the current financial crisis facing the Organization and, taking into account the views of Member States on the financial situation of the Organization, to prepare a summary of such views together with an updated report on the financial situation of the Organization for the consideration of the General Assembly".

149. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.21 as orally amended.

150. It was so decided.

151. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 43 and he asked the Rapporteur to report it directly to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 3.55 a.m. on Sunday, 20 December.