

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 101: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE
MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-
GENERAL (continued)

(c) REVIEW OF THE RATES OF REIMBURSEMENT TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF TROOP-
CONTRIBUTING STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by
the Second Committee in document A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 concerning agenda
item 63 (a)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the
signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date
of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550,
866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.5/35/SR.39
8 December 1980
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 99: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)
(A/35/30 and Corr.1, A/35/7/Add.15; A/C.5/35/37, 39 and 61)

1. Mr. PAL (India) said that the Noblemaire principle had been evolved at a time when the concept of the international civil service had been very different: it had been thought at that time that the service could be formed of career civil servants of the highest quality and integrity who would serve the United Nations throughout their professional career. In order to attract such persons, it had been thought necessary to pay them higher remuneration than that of the best-paid national civil service.
2. Conditions were currently very different. However much the fact might be deplored, the concept of a career international civil service no longer held good. A large percentage of the Organization's staff members currently held fixed-term contracts. Many of them were seconded from their Governments and retained links with their national civil service.
3. The concept of an autonomous international civil service had been endangered from the start by the idea of desirable ranges of posts for Member States, based largely on the amounts paid to the United Nations budget. Member States with the largest entitlements naturally considered that they had, as it were, bought their quota of posts and that those privileges were to be protected and used to further national policy.
4. That had taken the international civil service so far from the initial concepts that it was surprising to see that the Noblemaire principle remained as the only unchallenged concept. While it was necessary to pay adequate salaries to United Nations Professional staff members, his delegation believed that it was no longer necessary to apply the Noblemaire principle when the reasons for such application were no longer valid. The argument that the result of ceasing to apply that principle would be to deprive the United Nations of the services of men and women from certain countries or of persons of the highest competence was unconvincing. The United Nations Secretariat had become so highly politicized that the abandonment of the Noblemaire principle could make little difference to the situation. For some officials, employment in the Secretariat would simply form part of their tour of duty in their national civil service; others would join, as all of them should, out of a sense of idealism. His delegation was convinced that, despite all the Commission's recommendations and all the General Assembly resolutions on the subject, certain countries would continue to subsidize their nationals in the Secretariat, not because those staff members were poorly paid, but in order to retain control over them. That practice was a serious threat to the integrity and independence of the international civil service. As long as it continued, other Member States would continue to regard with suspicion staff members from countries making such payments.
5. In those circumstances, intellectual honesty compelled recognition of the fact that the concept of an international civil service of which the Noblemaire

/...

(Mr. Pal, India)

principle had been an essential part had long ago disintegrated, and that it would make sense to discard that principle. It would, of course, be necessary to proceed carefully in order to avoid hardship. His delegation, which hoped that steps would be taken in that direction in the next few years, would refrain from commenting on the Commission's views based on the maintenance of the Noblemaire principle.

6. Mr. AKWEI (Acting Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission), replying to questions raised about the report of the International Civil Service Commission, said that many delegations had expressed concern at the present operation of the post adjustment system, which seemed to them to encourage certain distortions and inequalities. It should be pointed out that, in resolution 34/165, the General Assembly had requested the Commission to undertake a comprehensive review of the purposes and operation of the post adjustment system with a view to proposing possible reforms.

7. With regard to the inter-city and chronological comparisons made by the Commission, it had been suggested that the Commission's Advisory Committee on Post Adjustment Questions should deal with such matters as the relevance of the questionnaires established for certain duty stations or the assumption that all staff members, whatever their duty station, had the same patterns of consumption. On the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Commission had decided to establish a special working group to consider methods of measuring the cost of living. The Working Group, presided over by Mr. de Souza, a statistician member of the Advisory Committee, was composed of highly competent experts. The Working Group had held an initial session and drawn up a list of problems for study: distortions in areas with a high cost of living and in those with a low cost of living, inclusion of contributions to the Pension Fund in post adjustment calculations, exclusion of housing costs from those calculations, distinction between the "inflation" and "currency fluctuation" elements in post adjustment indices, the problem of staff members' out-of-area commitments, questionnaires to be used in evaluating expenses of staff members and, lastly, formulae for making objective and equitable price evaluations for various goods used by staff members. The Working Group should be able to formulate recommendations for study by the Advisory Committee at its session in May 1981. Those recommendations would then be transmitted by the Advisory Committee to the Commission for its session in the summer of 1981. The Commission thus hoped to have available by the end of the summer of 1981 a scientific, objective and strict method for cost-of-living measurement, so as to eliminate the problems to which the operation of the post adjustment system had previously given rise.

8. The post adjustment system concerned only staff members in the Professional category and above, the remuneration of General Service staff being established on the basis of the most favourable conditions of employment prevailing at their duty station. The post adjustment system was designed to respect the principle of equal remuneration for all staff members in the Professional category and above, and therefore assumed a knowledge of cost-of-living developments at the various duty stations. The adjustments were directly related to movements in cost-of-living indices and local exchange rates against the dollar. When

/...

(Mr. Akwei, ICSC)

inflation at the duty station was accompanied by a rise in the local currency against the dollar, there would be an inevitable increase in the post adjustment. On the other hand, a low rate of inflation, accompanied by a relatively stable exchange rate, would produce a much less rapid increase in the post adjustment. However, no reduction in the amount of post adjustment ever took place since, even in a period of relatively low inflation, prices continued to rise.

9. In calculating the post adjustment indices, no account was taken of contributions to the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund. Those contributions, which represented 7 per cent of gross salary, were equivalent on average to 10 per cent of net salary. Since they were not taken into account in calculating post adjustments, an increase of 1 per cent in the post adjustment index corresponded to an actual increase of 0.9 per cent in post adjustment.

10. The representative of Pakistan had asked a question regarding the recommendation that the resources of the Cost-of-Living Section of the ICSC secretariat should be strengthened. The number of duty stations to which international staff were assigned was currently about 175, distributed over approximately 165 countries. The workload of the Cost-of-Living Section had therefore increased. For example, in 1980 it would have been necessary to conduct over 150 surveys in order to keep up to date the classification of duty stations for the purpose of applying post adjustments. The Section had only 9 Professional and 13 General Service staff to carry out all the tasks entrusted to it. The ICSC Advisory Committee had therefore recommended that at least one additional Professional post and two General Service posts should be established. While recommending that the General Assembly should grant the request for more resources, ICSC had decided to conduct a study on the long-term needs of the Cost-of-Living Section; its findings would subsequently be submitted to the General Assembly.

11. The representative of Pakistan had also wondered whether most of the problems to which the post adjustment system gave rise were not attributable to selection of a base date corresponding to a point in time when the dollar had been over-valued. As members of the Committee knew, the base date was currently November 1973 - in other words, before rampant inflation and currency instability had appeared on the scene. The question that arose in that connexion was whether it was possible to take a different base date. It was true that prior to 1973 exchange rates had been relatively stable, because the value of the dollar in relation to various other currencies had been set by the International Monetary Fund. However, it was impossible to say whether the dollar exchange rates prior to 1973 reflected the true value of that currency more accurately. In fact, that was a matter of opinion. After consideration of the question, ICSC had decided to retain as the base date November 1973, which immediately preceded the period during which the world economy had been shaken by inflation and currency upheavals.

12. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had asked what had been the reaction of ICSC to criticism of the post adjustment system on the ground that distortions and inequalities resulted from its implementation. The Commission, which was the body responsible for administering the post adjustment system, was naturally concerned when it heard repeated assertions that the

/...

classification of a given duty station was incorrect and did not correspond to reality. In fact, it regularly received appeals concerning classification decisions regarding a given duty station. Such complaints, which were always the subject of a thorough inquiry, were usually settled to the satisfaction of the staff assigned to the duty station in question. The great majority of classifications were not challenged at all. ICSC actually believed that on the whole the post adjustment system had functioned well, in view of the constraints inherent in the common system.

13. With regard to the question of the classification of Geneva as compared with New York, raised by the representative of the United Kingdom, he said that, following detailed surveys and after having considered the matter at length, ICSC had decided to reduce the post adjustment index for Geneva by 5 per cent, or one class. That decision had given rise to protests from several staff representatives, and one executive head in Geneva had requested, in accordance with the statute of ICSC that that question should be included in the agenda of the following session of ICSC. It was precisely because it was aware of the extremely sensitive nature of everything relating to the post adjustment system that ICSC attached great importance to the special working group to review the methodology for cost-of-living measurement, whose work should make it possible to establish once and for all an equitable, objective and universally acceptable basis for the post adjustment system.

14. Responding to a suggestion by the representative of Pakistan, he said that ICSC was ready to assist any Member State that wished to adapt the post adjustment system of the common system at the national level. The table comparing the cost-of-living indices in Member States' capitals, which had been requested by the representative of Pakistan, already existed and would be transmitted to delegations.

15. Although many remarks had been made about the Noblemaire principle, it had been unanimously supported by speakers, because it was that principle which made it possible for the Organization to retain the highest quality staff where work and integrity were concerned. With regard to the more specific question of the margin between the remuneration of the United States Civil Service and that of the United Nations common system, there had been a wider range of views: some delegations had considered the margin too wide, while others had considered it acceptable and still others considered that it could be even wider. The proposal by FICSA that the whole salary scale should be raised had been rejected by a number of delegations. With regard to remuneration, he welcomed the favourable remarks made in connexion with the work carried out by ICSC, namely, the study of methodology for comparison of total compensation and the study of methodology for identifying the highest paid civil service. As ICSC indicated in its report, that work was not very far advanced, since the General Assembly, at its thirty-fourth session, had set the Commission other priorities.

16. With regard to the application of the Noblemaire principle, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had suggested that the expatriation factor and the practice of granting rental subsidies should be taken into account. His remarks would be brought to the attention of ICSC.

/...

(Mr. Akwei, ICSC)

17. The representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union had pointed out what seemed to them to be an anomaly in remuneration: they felt that ICSC had not carried out those of its functions that concerned Professional grading equivalencies between the international civil service and the civil service used as the comparator. ICSC believed that that question had been resolved at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, when that body had in resolution 34/165 approved the grading equivalency recommended for the D-2 grade. The matching grades system, which was based on analysis of job content, was impossible to implement in respect of the other grades.

18. In conclusion, he stressed that the recommendations of ICSC must be implemented gradually, in order to safeguard the effectiveness of the international civil service. With regard to ongoing work, ICSC hoped to receive the Committee's support once it had completed the studies it had undertaken.

AGENDA ITEM 101: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

- (a) UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/35/585 and Corr.1, 2 and 3, A/35/653; A/C.5/35/L.23, A/C.5/35/CRP.1)
- (c) REVIEW OF THE RATES OF REIMBURSEMENT TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF TROOP-CONTRIBUTING STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/35/653; A/C.5/35/38, A/C.5/35/L.22)

19. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services), in reply to a question from the representative of the Philippines, explained that although the Board of Auditors had in fact made detailed comments on the United Nations Emergency Force and on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force in its report (A/35/5, paras. 29 to 34), it had not raised the question of the sale of the equipment or vehicles of the military contingents.

20. Mr. KELLEHER (Ireland) announced that Austria and Egypt had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.22.

21. Mr. FAUTEUX (Canada) announced that Australia and Austria had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23, bringing the total number of co-sponsors to 12.

22. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Office of Financial Services for the information, provided at the request of his delegation, on the liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Force (A/C.5/35/CRP.1). It was evident from that document that the initial allocations had been exceeded by \$711,000 in respect of aircraft rental alone. The figures were a matter for concern, for if the Secretariat had taken more energetic measures it could certainly have avoided exceeding the allocations and could even have made some savings. Thus, the expenditure item "Freight, cartage and express" would have been less if the liquidation of the Force had been organized along more efficient lines.

/...

23. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.22 and L.23.

24. Mr. WANG CHENGWEI (China) announced that, in accordance with its position, the Chinese Government would not take part in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23 and would not accept any consequential financial obligation.

25. Mr. MAKOSSO (Congo) said that the economic crisis which had been afflicting his country for several years prevented his Government from responding favourably to the call of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.22 and L.23.

26. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that he would like to reaffirm briefly the position of his Government, which was already well known: the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East were a direct consequence of Israel's occupation of Arab territories and of its refusal to recognize the rights of the Palestinian people. The draft resolutions under consideration made no distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression, which was a way of sanctioning aggression. By opposing the financing of those forces, the Syrian Government sought to reaffirm the principle that any expenses incurred by the United Nations should be borne by the aggressor. International law and practice confirmed that it was the victim of aggression who ought to be indemnified for the consequences of aggression. The Charter of the United Nations forbade the occupation of a territory by force. It was therefore unacceptable and illogical for a Member State like Syria to contribute to defraying the costs of an aggression of which it was itself the victim. For all those reasons, his delegation would vote against the two draft resolutions and would not accept any consequential financial obligation.

27. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that in accordance with the position of principle which it had often had occasion to invoke in the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Libyan delegation would not take part in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.22 and L.23.

28. Mr. ALTAHS (Democratic Yemen) recalled that his delegation had already expressed its views on the presence of international troops in the territories occupied by the Zionist entity. Their presence seemed to be self-perpetuating because of the intransigence of Israel and its continuing violation of the aims of the Charter and of the resolutions of the General Assembly. Democratic Yemen categorically rejected the policy of aggression and annexation practised by the Zionist entity. It would abstain from voting on the draft resolutions under consideration and would accept no consequential financial obligation, for it considered that it was incumbent upon the aggressor to finance operations necessitated by its actions.

29. Mr. HOANG HAI (Viet Nam) reaffirmed that the financing of the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East should be assumed by the aggressor and not charged to all Member States. His delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolutions under consideration and would accept no consequential financial obligation.

30. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) paid a tribute to the soldiers and officers of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force established by the Security Council which had just extended its mandate. He also thanked the Member States which

(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

provided troops for the Force. As for the draft resolutions under discussion, he hoped that the debate would remain confined to the budgetary question and that the Committee would resist the attempts of certain delegations which sought to manipulate it, and would not allow itself to be lured into the political arena. His delegation regretted the statements made regarding Israel by certain delegations whose allegations it totally rejected.

31. Mr. WILSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had not changed its position on the United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. Its decision with regard to draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.22 should in no way be regarded as changing that position.

32. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) recalled that, although his Government had always supported the actions of the United Nations in the world, it was unable to endorse the existence of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force since the aggressor alone should bear the responsibility for his aggression: financing UNDOF was tantamount to offering comfort to the aggressor. The Iraqi delegation would therefore vote against draft resolutions A/C.5/35/L.22 and L.23.

33. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.22.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen.

Abstaining: Algeria, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Guinea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Suriname, Tunisia.

34. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.22 was adopted by 79 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.

/...

35. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said in explanation of his vote that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it considered peace-keeping to be one of the principal functions of the United Nations. However, the operative part was not sufficiently clear as to the extent and duration of applicability of the new reimbursement rates. The Panamanian delegation considered that the new rates should apply for all United Nations peace-keeping forces both present and future.

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23.

37. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on parts A and B.

38. Mr. RIZO (Albania), speaking in explanation of his vote, reaffirmed his country's position of principle; Albania would not participate in the financing of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force and would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23.

39. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on part A of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Albania, Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

40. Part A of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23 was adopted by 85 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.

41. A recorded vote was taken on part B of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen.

Abstaining: Algeria, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Guinea, Romania.

42. Part B of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23 was adopted by 82 votes to 13, with 5 abstentions.

43. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23 as a whole was adopted.

44. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.22 and parts A and B of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23. It would explain its position on the two draft resolutions at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

45. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.22 and parts A and B of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.23.

46. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's report (A/35/585) in which the Secretary-General indicated that he had proposed in his report to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly that, since the United Nations Emergency Force had terminated its operations, the special financial period of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force should run from 25 October 1979 to 30 November 1980, provided that the Security Council extended its mandate, and that thereafter it should cover 12-month periods running from 1 December of a given year to 30 December of the following year, in line with UNDOF's mandate periods thus far. In its report on the subject (A/35/688, para. 18), the Advisory Committee had recommended approval of the Secretary-General's proposal. The General Assembly must therefore take a decision on the matter at the current session. On the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Chairman suggested that the Committee, in the absence of any objections, should recommend to the General Assembly that it approve the Secretary-General's proposal.

47. It was so decided.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 63 (a) (A/35/7/Add.13; A/C.5/35/43)

48. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report (A/35/7/Add.13), said that, under the terms of operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution B in document A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1, the General Assembly would decide that a grant-in-aid should be provided from the budget of the United Nations to meet the current deficits as reflected in the budget estimates approved by the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research. He pointed out, however, that the draft resolution did not indicate the precise amount of those deficits. In paragraphs 3 to 5 of the statement of administrative and financial implications, the Secretary-General indicated that UNITAR envisaged for 1980 expenditures of \$2,627,510, against an income of \$2,321,810. The deficit for 1980 was therefore \$305,700. For 1981, UNITAR envisaged expenditures of \$2,757,960, as against an income of \$2,111,900; the deficit for 1981 was estimated at \$646,060. On that basis, the total estimated deficit for the two years was \$951,760.

49. The Advisory Committee had discussed the question of a grant-in-aid with the Executive Director of UNITAR. ACABQ had had before it the Institute's budget estimates for 1981, the revised budget estimates for 1980 and the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on UNITAR and the related comments by the Secretary-General.

50. The Advisory Committee had considered that it should study the budgets of UNITAR in order to be able to inform the General Assembly about the nature of the deficits for 1980 and 1981 and to recommend to the Assembly the amounts of the deficits which a grant-in-aid would cover. To the extent that such a grant would be made from the regular budget of the United Nations, the Advisory Committee should also indicate to the General Assembly whether the deficits could not have been reduced by the adoption of suitable measures. It was for those reasons that the Advisory Committee had tried to analyse the causes of the deficits for 1980 and for 1981.

51. The Advisory Committee believed that the 1980 deficit could have been lower. It recognized, however, that the deficit was a real one and recommended an appropriation of \$305,700 as a grant-in-aid to meet that deficit.

52. With regard to the 1981 budget, he believed that it was not yet appropriate to speak of a deficit, since the Institute had only estimates of income and expenditure. Moreover, the Advisory Committee considered that the opportunity still existed to eliminate or at least substantially reduce the deficit for 1981. In those circumstances, the Advisory Committee felt that it would be premature to authorize an appropriation of \$646,060 to cover the 1981 deficit. It recommended that the question of a grant-in-aid for 1981 should be considered by the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session.

53. Mr. CROM (Netherlands) said that draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 provided only a short-term solution to the problem of financing UNITAR. He drew attention to the reservations of principle which his delegation maintained on the subject: the services provided by UNITAR were universal in scope and it would be natural for their costs to be borne by the entire membership of the United Nations. For that reason his delegation believed that the UNITAR budget should be included in the regular budget of the United Nations. He supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and hoped that a more satisfactory and lasting solution could be found at the next session.

54. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that for two reasons his delegation was opposed to the granting of a subsidy from the regular budget of the United Nations, whether in 1980 or in 1981. Firstly, his delegation did not believe that the nature of UNITAR's work justified its financing from the regular budget and for the same reason it had traditionally voted against appropriations requested under chapter 24. Secondly, the proposed measure came at a bad time, given the present need for budgetary austerity.

55. If the General Assembly decided to grant a subsidy to the Institute, it was pointless to think that the granting of an additional appropriation could be avoided. Furthermore, if the Committee favoured subsidizing the Institute, that would have a serious impact on his country's attitude vis-à-vis requests for additional appropriations as a whole. He asked that the matter be put to the vote.

56. Mr. MONTAGNA (Italy) supported the comments made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 19 of its report (A/35/7/Add.13), in which it said that the 1980 deficit could have been smaller. His delegation therefore did not consider the time appropriate for granting an additional appropriation to absorb the 1980 deficit. Furthermore, it supported the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 20 of its report.

57. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 in the Second Committee and would also vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendation on the draft resolution. Furthermore, his delegation associated itself with the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom with regard to the financing of UNITAR.

58. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said he had hoped that the Advisory Committee's recommendation would be adopted by consensus. His delegation, which was a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 submitted to the Second Committee, had full confidence in the decisions of the Board of Trustees of UNITAR and considered that the Second Committee had taken the right decision on the substance of the matter.

59. From the purely financial point of view, his delegation approved the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning the deficit for 1980, but had reservations about the recommendation on the estimated deficit for 1981. In accordance with paragraph 1 in part B of the draft resolution (A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1) adopted by the Second Committee, the General Assembly decided that a grant-in-aid should be provided, on an exceptional basis, from the budget of the United Nations to meet

/...

(Mr. Kemal, Pakistan)

the current deficits as reflected in the budget estimates approved by the Board of Trustees of the Institute. Those budget estimates covered both 1980 and 1981. Everything indicated that those estimates had been correctly prepared and that UNITAR would be faced with the deficit referred to, unless of course it reduced its programme of activities. He expressed the hope that that problem could be satisfactorily settled at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

60. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt) said that he would have liked the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee to be approved by consensus in the Fifth Committee. It would have been preferable for the General Assembly to decide on UNITAR's financial situation for 1980 and 1981, which would have given the Institute more leeway when establishing its programme of work. However, the Advisory Committee preferred to study the financial situation of UNITAR for each of the two years separately, and his delegation accepted its recommendation.

61. At its thirty-fifth session, the General Assembly would have to try and find a global, lasting solution to that problem. His delegation supported the comments made on that subject by the representative of the Netherlands. For its part, Egypt, which was a sponsor of the draft resolution submitted to the Second Committee, had no objection to UNITAR's budget being incorporated in that of the United Nations.

62. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) reminded the Committee that his delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 and that, like those of the other developing countries, it attached great importance to UNITAR's activities. It recognized that the resolutions establishing the Institute provided for voluntary financing but, after all, it would not be the first time that the Committee decided to make appropriations from the Organization's regular budget for activities for which voluntary contributions were lacking.

63. His delegation was surprised to note that the Advisory Committee had not recommended any decision concerning the estimated deficit for 1981. It would have been desirable for the Committee to concern itself with the evaluations made in that respect and give an opinion on ways of reducing the Institute's expenditure. However, the Sierra Leonean delegation accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning UNITAR's financial situation in 1981.

64. Mr. LÖSCHNER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the deficit for 1980 and the estimated deficit for 1981 should be treated separately, as recommended by the Advisory Committee. From the point of view of principles, a grant-in-aid to UNITAR would contravene the budgetary regulations of the United Nations. However, since the aim of that grant was to cover a deficit which had already been incurred, his delegation would abstain rather than vote against the grant-in-aid. On the other hand, the Federal Republic of Germany was categorically opposed to the estimated deficit for 1981 being financed out of the regular budget, especially since it was still possible to eliminate that deficit, as the Advisory Committee had pointed out.

/...

65. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) expressed unqualified support for the proposal before the Committee. His delegation had abstained on part B of the draft resolution in the Second Committee merely because it considered that because of its financial nature, that part of the draft resolution was the exclusive concern of the Fifth Committee. However, when all was said and done, having created a body, it was the General Assembly's duty to help it if it was in financial difficulties.

66. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation would vote against a supplementary appropriation to cover UNITAR's deficit. As it had stated in the Second Committee, it was categorically opposed to taking funds from the regular budget to finance activities which, as stated in the resolution establishing UNITAR, should be financed from voluntary contributions. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that UNITAR should ensure that its expenditure did not exceed its income.

67. It was surprising to note that the statement on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 made no mention of the reasons for requesting such a large appropriation from the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. The fourteenth report of the Advisory Committee showed that the financial management of UNITAR left much to be desired, hence that considerable deficit.

68. Mr. NDOM (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the least the Committee could do was to help UNITAR to cover the deficit it had already incurred; his delegation would therefore support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

69. Mr. MUGARA (Uganda) said that UNITAR's current deficit should be covered out of the regular budget of the United Nations; his delegation would therefore vote for the Advisory Committee's recommendation because the Institute's projects were of great importance to the developing countries, and to Uganda in particular.

70. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that the General Assembly should be informed that should it adopt the draft resolution (A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1) recommended by the Second Committee, there would be need for an appropriation of \$305,700 under a new section (sect. 33) of the programme budget for 1980-1981, as a grant-in-aid to UNITAR.

71. In the absence of any objection, the General Assembly would also be informed that it should consider the question of a grant-in-aid for 1981 at its thirty-sixth session, in the light of the report to be submitted by the Executive Director of UNITAR pursuant to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution B (A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1).

72. Mr. DEUTSCHER (German Democratic Republic), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had already stated in the Second Committee that it was opposed to part B of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1, which provided for UNITAR's deficit to be covered out of the regular budget of the Organization. It would vote against the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

73. At the request of one delegation, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee contained in document A/35/7/Add.13, paragraph 19.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain.

74. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$305,700 under a new section (sect. 33) of the budget for the biennium 1980-1981 was adopted by 85 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

75. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait), explaining his vote after the vote, said that he had voted for the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning UNITAR. With particular reference to the estimated deficit for 1981, the Advisory Committee's recommendation was compatible with the provisions of draft resolution A/C.2/35/L.6/Rev.1 adopted by the Second Committee. At its next session, the General Assembly would not consider the principle of covering the deficit, which was already agreed, but the size of that deficit. The criticisms of UNITAR had been made in a constructive spirit and should enable it to become more efficient.

76. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked if the rule that the Secretariat should not submit to the Committee new documents on matters which had administrative and financial implications after 1 December would be complied with.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that two documents had not yet been submitted to the Committee for various reasons, some of which were beyond the Secretariat's control: the first concerned the Centre on Science and Technology for Development and the

/...

(The Chairman)

second concerned common services in Vienna. As those two documents, which were at present being translated, had first to be considered by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, they would be submitted to the Committee a few days after 1 December.

78. In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to consider those two documents.

79. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.