



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 49th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 115 AND 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.8 concerning agenda item 134

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/42/L.38 and L.39 concerning agenda item 18

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.10 concerning agenda item 137

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.5 concerning agenda item 125 (a) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 121: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (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 Record Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

AGENDA ITEMS 115 and 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/42/3, A/42/6 and Corr.1, A/42/7 and Add.2, A/42/16 (Part I) and Add.1 and (Part II), A/42/512, 532 and 640; A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1)

First reading (continued)

Section 32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises (A/42/7/Add.3; A/C.5/42/4)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the total estimates proposed by the Secretary-General under section 32 amounted to \$18,041,800. Revised estimates had been submitted in document A/C.5/42/4 but did not involve any request for additional appropriations. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) recommended an appropriation of \$17,874,800.
2. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the recommendations of the Advisory Committee under section 32 would reduce the Secretary-General's estimate of \$18,041,800 by \$167,000. The reasons for the reduction were explained in paragraph 32.7 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/42/7). The Advisory Committee had not endorsed the Secretary-General's proposal to install 20 closed-circuit surveillance cameras in the General Assembly Hall, the Security Council Chamber and their immediate surroundings because it felt that the presence of such equipment was not appropriate inside those meeting places; it had accordingly deleted the amount for the acquisition of the cameras.
3. The revised estimates contained in document A/C.5/42/4 were more in the nature of revisions to projects rather than revised estimates proper. As indicated in that document, no additional funds were requested for the biennium 1988-1989. The Secretary-General proposed that construction projects at Addis Ababa and Bangkok be revised in the manner indicated in paragraph 4 of document A/42/7/Add.3. The Advisory Committee's views were summarized in paragraphs 5 to 8 of the same document. In that connection it might be appropriate to point out that the new cost estimates were very tentative and the precise amounts could be determined only after a detailed examination of all the other elements relating to the revised proposals.
4. As indicated in paragraph 8 of document A/42/7/Add.3, the Advisory Committee considered that the figures given by the Secretary-General would have to change and it was not therefore possible for the Advisory Committee to give an opinion on the issue at the present time.
5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee wished to take note of the decision by the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination as reflected in paragraph 56 of its report (A/42/16 (Part II)), and was to the effect that the Committee had decided to refer to the General

(The Chairman)

Assembly for its consideration the report of the Secretary-General on revised estimates under section 32 (A/C.5/42/4) together with a summary of the views expressed in CPC.

6. It was so decided.

7. Mr. SORNVAI (Thailand) said the expansion of conference facilities at Bangkok was an issue of great importance to his delegation. The existing facilities left a great deal to be desired and had been used to their full capacity since 1980. The Secretary-General had proposed a construction project, approved by the General Assembly in 1984, which would have provided for ESCAP's requirements for the next 20 years. However, the Secretary-General was now proposing to scale down estimated expenses by 40 per cent. While appreciating the gravity of the financial crisis, his delegation maintained that a project, once approved by the General Assembly, should be implemented in full. ESCAP was the only regional commission which had several categories of membership and some of the States which participated in its work were not members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. It was, therefore, a unique forum for enhancing co-operation among countries having different economic and social systems.

8. Mr. GABRIEL (Philippines) shared the concern of the representative of Thailand regarding the proposed drastic scaling down of the construction project in Bangkok and expressed the strong support of his delegation for the implementation of projects which had been approved by the General Assembly. He expressed the hope that, when reviewing the estimates for Bangkok, the Secretary-General would bear in mind the concerns of delegations on the issue.

9. Mr. DAMIT (Brunei Darussalam) reaffirmed his delegation's support for the efforts of the Secretary-General to solve the financial crisis. In considering the Bangkok construction project, the evolving financial situation of the Organization must be taken into account and in present circumstances delays seemed unavoidable. There was however a need for the project as existing conference facilities were inadequate. The Secretary-General should proceed with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 39/236.

10. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) expressed the concern of his delegation that two construction projects, for ESCAP and ECA respectively, were not being implemented notwithstanding their approval by the General Assembly. Moreover, the General Assembly had endorsed the principle embodied in recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations that programmes, once approved by the General Assembly, should be implemented. He therefore sought formal clarification from the Secretariat as to how the decision to scale down the ECA project had been taken. It was his understanding that a decision of the General Assembly could only be countermanded by a further decision of the same body.

11. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the revised estimates might look extremely attractive at a time of financial crisis. He wondered, however, whether consideration of the provisional figures mentioned really addressed the issue. He agreed with the Chairman of ACABQ that what had been submitted to the Fifth Committee was not revised estimates but rather revised projects. Was the Fifth Committee being asked to approve revised projects which, even before their completion, might be white elephants?
12. Mr. NGAIZA (United Republic of Tanzania) asked on what legislative authority the Secretary-General had recommended the scaling down of projects already approved by the General Assembly. The understanding on which General Assembly resolution 41/213 had been based was that, in accordance with recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts, the implementation of projects already approved by the General Assembly should proceed. In the view of his delegation, the original project should be adhered to. He would also like to know the estimated cost of the scaled-down project in real terms. Because of inflation the figure adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session should be increased, not reduced.
13. Ms. FANG Ping (China) said that the two construction projects were matters of concern to many delegations, including her own. At the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had confirmed that there was a need for additional conference facilities in Addis Ababa. In 1984 he had found that the existing conference facilities in Bangkok were not adequate and had put forward proposals for their improvement. Her delegation therefore fully supported the view that the two construction projects should be implemented. Work should commence immediately in order to avoid higher construction costs at a later date as a result of inflation.
14. Mr. PRODJAVARSIT (Indonesia) shared the view that the conference facilities in Bangkok should be expanded in order to meet the requirements of ESCAP. Once a project had been approved by the General Assembly it should be implemented. He hoped that the Secretary-General would bear in mind the concerns of the countries of the region in reconsidering his revised estimates.
15. Mr. GUPTA (India) supported the views expressed by other African and Asian delegations. The two projects were very important and their early completion would greatly assist the work of the regional economic commissions concerned. The expenditure proposed would be spread over a period of time and not incurred all at once. The projects should be implemented in accordance with resolution 39/236.
16. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that in view of the sensitivity of the two projects, it was indefensible for the Secretary-General to submit proposals aimed at scaling them down. The General Assembly had agreed at its preceding two sessions that, while it might be necessary not to proceed with construction while funds were unavailable, the projects should not be adversely affected by the financial emergency. Even at the height of the crisis, the General Assembly had decided that work on important projects should proceed as soon as possible to avoid higher costs being incurred later.

(Mr. Monthe, Cameroon)

17. Since the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/42/4) did not call for new expenditures, he should be asked to lift the freeze on the projects and to implement them in accordance with General Assembly resolution 39/236. The contention that they could be scaled down and still meet current needs was untenable because requirements were no static. Section 32 provided for other expenditure, notably in Vienna, which deserved lower priority than the projects under discussion. His delegation therefore insisted that there was no case for revising them. The consensus reached on General Assembly resolution 41/213 had been based, inter alia, on its decision that the implementation of recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts should not prejudice projects and programme already approved by the General Assembly. If that decision were questioned, delegations would be entitled to question other aspects of the consensus. He therefore appealed to the Committee not to reopen that issue.

18. Mr. TEH (Malaysia) said that the economic and social development which ESCAP promoted was the key to peace and stability in his region. The Asia and the Pacific region had a crucial role to play in the twenty-first century and, consequently, the development of the ESCAP regional facilities in Bangkok must not be prejudiced.

19. Mr. MILLS-LUTTERODT (Ghana) said that General Assembly resolution 41/213 had been adopted by consensus on the understanding that the implementation of recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts should not prejudice projects such as those under consideration. The projects had been critically evaluated before being approved by the General Assembly and completion of the Addis Ababa development, in particular, was important for the area. Since all the technical questions had been investigated and construction appeared to be possible, he urged the Committee to lift the freeze on the project and enable it to proceed because further delay would lead to higher costs in the end.

20. Mr. ZONGWE (Zaire) said that his delegation shared previous speakers' concern at the revised estimates presented by the Secretary-General. Such a reduction of resources was not in keeping with the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 39/236 and 41/213. In view of the observation in the last sentence of the Advisory Committee's fourth report (A/42/7/Add.3) that further delay, either in deciding the scope of the projects or in undertaking the actual work, could very well lead to higher costs in the future, he proposed that work on the two projects should proceed without delay.

21. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that, since the Secretary-General's proposals to scale down the two projects approved at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly were obviously unacceptable to the African delegations, the Committee should not waste time in seeking a compromise. However, the timetables for completion of the projects proposed by the Secretary-General should be accepted. If the unexpended balance of \$2.6 million remaining from the amount appropriated for 1984-1985 was sufficient to proceed with the projects in 1988-1989, that should certainly be done. But he doubted whether the amount was in fact adequate and would like to have the Secretariat's views on the subject. The rest of the Secretary-General's proposals should be rejected.

22. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia) said that the Secretary-General's revised estimates for the project in Addis Ababa were unjustified and difficult to accept. However, by submitting them, the Secretary-General had implicitly lifted the freeze on the project, and his delegation therefore expected it to proceed as envisaged in General Assembly resolution 39/236. He agreed with the representative of Algeria that the Committee should accept the Secretary-General's summary timetable for completion of the project, with any necessary modifications. He also agreed that the sum already available should be examined to see whether it was sufficient to enable work to proceed during the biennium 1988-1989.

23. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) said that his delegation, which had supported General Assembly resolution 39/236, was in favour of any steps that would enable work to proceed on the projects under consideration without further delay.

24. Mr. NASSER (Egypt) said that his delegation shared the concerns voiced by previous speakers about the Secretary-General's revised estimates for the two projects and supported the proposals made by the representative of Algeria.

25. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted for the original appropriation of over \$73 million for the Addis Ababa project in recognition of its importance. However, it also understood why the Secretary-General had found it necessary to present revised estimates that were more realistic in current circumstances. Since the Secretary-General's proposals required no additional appropriations, his delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that any further delay in deciding the scope of the projects or undertaking the actual work could well lead to higher future costs.

26. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that the projects were both familiar and politically sensitive. In 1984, his delegation had opposed expenditure on them because it took the view that others should enjoy higher priority. It still held that view and circumstances remained similar to those of 1984. Because General Assembly resolution 41/213 related in part to the implementation of approved projects, his delegation agreed that a decision on the proposals in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/42/4) should be taken after the consultations to be held on the implementation of that resolution and its impact on the programme budget proposals for the 1988-1989 biennium. He hoped that the proposals made by the representative of Algeria could be considered in that context.

27. Mr. GOMEZ (Controller), responding to the observations made, said that the report of the Secretary-General was not intended to revise the estimates for the projects but to put forward proposals which, if accepted, would establish timetables for them. The report certainly revised the two projects, but since they had been approved by the General Assembly, they were exempt from recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts.

28. The Secretary-General had attempted to assess the impact of resolution 41/213 on his commitment to continue work on the projects as mandated by resolution 39/236. His report indicated that the latter should be implemented and that the freeze imposed on the projects in 1986-1987 would no longer be applicable.

(Mr. Gomez)

However, the Secretary-General had been obliged to scale down the work to accord with what was reasonable in the circumstances, while leaving room for expansion later.

29. With regard to the questions raised by the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania and Algeria about the financing of the projects, he was sure that if the Secretary-General's proposals were adopted, work could start on both projects in 1988 within the available resources. In particular, the sum of \$2.6 million mentioned in paragraph 20 of the report of the Secretary-General would suffice to finance his proposals for the project in Addis Ababa, whereas attempting to implement the original scheme would probably leave a shortfall of uncertain dimensions.

30. The Secretary-General had a clear commitment to implement the projects and it was that commitment, not financial considerations, that had inspired his proposals to scale down the plans so as to enable work to resume in 1988-1989. By accepting them, the Committee could ensure that there was no overexpenditure on the projects in the next biennium. However, if it rejected the proposals, it might be necessary to submit revised estimates by the end of 1988 to enable work to continue in 1989.

31. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he would welcome a more detailed response to his question concerning the financing of the project, in the course of the informal consultations.

32. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) pointed out that according to paragraph 1 (a) of section I of General Assembly resolution 41/213, the implementation of recommendation 5 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts should not prejudice the implementation of projects and programmes already approved by the General Assembly. The two projects had been exempted from only one angle whereas in fact they should have been exempted from every angle.

33. Mr. NGAIZA (United Republic of Tanzania) asked what had prompted the Secretary-General to scale down the Addis Ababa project and whether the figures relating to the projects were expressed in real or nominal terms.

34. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) asked at what exact moment the Secretary-General had decided to scale down the projects.

35. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that he fully endorsed the view that the projects should not be linked with either the financial crisis or the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213. Any attempt to implement the recommendations of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts in a selective and partial manner was unacceptable in principle. However, if the Secretary-General could demonstrate that his proposal was technically justified and that he could carry out the projects using fewer resources without impairing the original concept, his proposal would certainly be acceptable.

(Mr. Fontaine-Ortiz, Cuba)

36. He would like confirmation that the financial resources necessary to repair damages to ECLAC headquarters caused by the earthquake in Chile would be dealt with at some point in the session, although not necessarily under the current item.

37. Mr. GOMEZ (Controller), replying to a question as to whether the regional commissions had been given an opportunity to review and approve the revised projects, said that no formal presentation had been made to those commissions. The commissions would be consulted in considering the possibility of future expansion. The Secretary-General had been prompted to make the proposals not by financial constraints as such but by a desire to be seen clearly as implementing as many recommendations of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts as possible.

38. The new figures represented an order of magnitude rather than precise estimates. Not enough of the architectural and engineering data needed to prepare a full presentation for the Advisory Committee was available yet. That was why the Secretary-General described his submission as a proposal to revise the two construction projects rather than revised estimates. More precise details would be provided to the Advisory Committee before the next session of the General Assembly.

39. He understood that the representative of Cuba was ready to have one of his questions answered during the informal discussions. With respect to his second question, recent developments on the construction for ECLAC following the earthquake would be dealt with in the context of the programme budget performance report.

40. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should take action under section 32 on the understanding that the question of the construction projects at Bangkok and Addis Ababa would be dealt with before the second reading of the programme budget in the context of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213.

41. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) asked why it was necessary to link the discussion of the construction projects with the implementation of resolution 41/213.

42. Mr. EL-MEKKI (Sudan) said that the two matters should not be linked. Work on the two projects should proceed within the existing appropriations on the understanding that it might be necessary to request additional appropriations at a later stage.

43. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve an appropriation under section 32 in first reading on the understanding that it would revert to the question of the construction projects at Bangkok and Addis Ababa before proceeding to the second reading.

44. It was so decided.

45. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$17,874,800 under section 32 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without objection.

46. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that while some delegations objected to the linkage of the construction projects with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213 others, including his own, considered it appropriate to do so. However, as it had been decided to revert to the projects before the second reading of the programme budget, he hoped that delegations would reflect on the matter and reconsider a possible linkage.

47. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) endorsed the views just expressed by the representative of Cuba.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.8 concerning agenda item 134 (A/C.5/42/47)

48. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the requests contained in draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.8 were set forth in paragraph 2 of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/42/47. As could be seen from paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's statement, the related conference-servicing requirements were estimated on a full-cost basis at \$307,300. The Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that no additional cost would be incurred under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 as a result of the adoption of draft resolution A recommended by the Committee on Conferences.

49. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.8, no additional cost would be incurred over and above the costs under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 as a result of the adoption of draft resolution A recommended by the Committee on Conferences in document A/42/32.

50. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/42/L.38 and L.39 concerning agenda item 18 (A/C.5/42/48)

51. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/42/L.38 were set forth in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the statement submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/42/48. As shown in annexes I and II to the statement, the Secretary-General estimated resource requirements for implementing the activities in question in 1988 at \$230,700, after taking account of the economies that should be possible in the light of the actual pattern of expenditure over the past three bienniums. In that connection, the Advisory Committee noted that, for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 3, 4 and 8 of his statement, the

(Mr. Maelle)

Secretary-General planned to meet the requirements in question from the appropriations to be approved by the General Assembly at its current session under section 3 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989. With regard to the possibility that, in accordance with the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 1654 (XVI) and 2621 (XXV), the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples would hold a series of meetings away from Headquarters in 1988, the Advisory Committee noted that the Secretary-General indicated in paragraph 9 of his statement that in such an eventuality he would seek the necessary budgetary provision in accordance with established procedures.

52. The activities envisaged in draft resolution A/42/L.39 were set forth in paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's statement of programme budget implications in document A/C.5/42/48. The related resource requirements for the proposed activities had not been identified and costed for inclusion in the statement. In that connection, the Advisory Committee noted that, for the reasons stated in paragraphs 3, 4 and 11 of the statement, the Secretary-General intended to meet the requirements in question from the appropriations to be approved by the General Assembly under sections 3 and 27 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

53. The Advisory Committee had no objection to the estimates, as set forth in the Secretary-General's statement, and accordingly recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/42/L.38 and L.39, no additional appropriations over and above those already requested under sections 3 and 27 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 would be required.

54. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/42/L.38 and L.39, no modification in the programme of work for 1988-1989, as proposed in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989, would be required and that no additional appropriations over and above those already requested under sections 3 and 27 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 would be required to accommodate the 1988 programme of activities of the Special Committee.

55. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.10 concerning agenda item 137 (A/C.5/42/46)

56. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the requests set forth in draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.10 were discussed in paragraph 2 of the Secretary-General's statement of programme budget implications in document A/C.5/42/46. Paragraph 4 of the statement showed that the related conference-servicing requirements were estimated on a full-cost basis at

(Mr. Mselle)

\$314,200. The Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that no additional cost would be incurred under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 as a result of the adoption of draft resolution A recommended by the Committee on Conferences.

57. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division), responding to a point raised by the United Kingdom, said that the discrepancy between the requirements of the Office of General Services indicated in document A/C.5/42/46 and the Office's requirements indicated in document A/C.5/42/47 was attributable to the different number of participants at the sessions in question. Although the sessions would be of equal length, in the case of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization there would be 47 participants, whereas in the case of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries there would be only 31 participants.

58. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/42/L.10, no additional cost would be incurred over and above the costs under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 as a result of the adoption of draft resolution A recommended by the Committee on Conferences in document A/42/32.

59. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.5 concerning agenda item 125 (a) (continued)

60. Mr. ORTEGA-NALDA (Mexico), Mr. GUPTA (India) and Mrs. CUCALON (Colombia) said that, had they been present at the preceding meeting, they would have voted in favour of recommending to the General Assembly the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.5.

61. Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, if he had been present at the 48th meeting, he would have abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.5.

AGENDA ITEM 121: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/42/L.8)

62. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.8*, said that the issue of the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations was one of the more contentious questions before the Committee and views on it were consistently polarized. The draft under consideration represented many weeks of intensive consultations and compromises. Before drafting the text, delegations had agreed that it should respect the mandate, competence and integrity of the Committee on Contributions and that it should not attempt to address non-technical or political problems relating to the

(Mr. Murray, Trinidad and Tobago)

scale of assessments. Delegations had thus focused on providing the Committee on Contributions both with broad guidelines for the preparation of the following scale of assessments and with encouragement to review and refine its own technical work on a continuing basis. Draft resolution A/C.5/42/L.8* reflected the views and principles in question.

63. Although it would be a gross exaggeration to claim that the draft enjoyed the full support of each and every delegation, he trusted that it could be adopted without a vote.

64. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. EL-MEKKI (Sudan), Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba), Mr. SINGH (Fiji) and Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should revert to the matter at a subsequent meeting in order to take action on the draft resolution just introduced by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.