



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (WWRB)

FIFTH COMMITTEE
68th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 9 December 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 68th MEETING

UN LIBRARY

Chairman: Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan)

FEB 2 1982

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

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/36/L.54 concerning agenda item 42

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 55

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions in documents A/36/L.23/Rev.1, A/36/L.24, A/36/L.25, A/36/L.26, A/36/L.27 and A/36/L.28 concerning agenda item 36

Implementation of revised General Service salary scales in Geneva (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 107: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

- (a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

* 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 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.5/36/SR.68
16 December 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)
(A/36/6, A/36/38 (chaps. V and VII D))

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/36/L.54 concerning agenda item 42 (A/C.5/36/92)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Group of Experts to Investigate Reports on the Alleged Use of Chemical Weapons, to continue his investigations pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/144 C. The travel and subsistence expenses to bring the four experts comprising the Group to New York would amount to \$49,000, while the cost of their mission to the field, including supporting staff, would be \$92,000. Consultancy services amounting to \$34,000 would also be required. In addition, the travel and subsistence expenses of the Chairman and Secretary of the Group would amount to \$15,000. Accordingly, the Secretary-General estimated that additional appropriations totalling \$195,000, including \$5,000 for miscellaneous costs, would be required if the draft resolution were to be adopted.

2. He pointed out that, with respect to the study authorized at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the Advisory Committee had recommended an amount of \$42,400. The representative of the Secretary-General had informed ACABQ that that study had required a redeployment of funds within section 2 of the budget. Total expenditure of \$73,000 had been incurred, including a mission to Thailand. The amount of \$195,000 requested by the Secretary-General in his statement would cover additional missions in 1982. Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee felt that additional funds could be redeployed within section 2, as had been done in 1981, and had therefore recommended an additional appropriation of only \$125,000 under that section.

3. The CHAIRMAN suggested, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.54, an additional appropriation of \$125,000 would be required under section 2 of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. Furthermore, conference-servicing costs estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$125,800 would arise. The actual additional appropriations that might be required, however, would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of such costs.

4. Mr. HOANG HAI (Viet Nam) requested a vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendations concerning financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.54 and thus on the action suggested by the Chairman.

5. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution in the First Committee. The costs involved if the resolution were adopted would be unjustified, and his delegation would vote against that expenditure.

/...

6. Mrs. LOPEZ ORTEGA (Mexico) said that her delegation would abstain, since it was not convinced of the need to continue the existence of the Group of Experts.
7. Mr. HOANG HAI (Viet Nam) said that in the First Committee his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, which sought to use the name of the United Nations in a slanderous campaign and to conceal the crimes committed against the peoples of Indo-China, who had been victims of chemical weapons. His delegation would vote against the financial implications of the draft resolution.
8. Mr. KITTIKHOUN (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that there was no point in extending the mandate of the Group of Experts. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution in the First Committee and would vote against its financial implications.
9. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation would abstain, as it had done in the First Committee.
10. The Advisory Committee's recommendations were adopted by 40 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions.
11. Mr. VASSILEV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation would have voted against the Advisory Committee's recommendations if it had been present during the voting.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 55

(A/C.5/36/93)

12. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of other Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the total cost of implementing the draft resolution would be \$1,364,400, including \$222,500 for non-conference-servicing costs. An amount of \$167,500 had been included in section 2B of the programme budget and had been approved in first reading by the Fifth Committee, so that the additional requirement was for \$55,000.
13. In paragraph 2.13 of its first report (A/36/7), the Advisory Committee had recommended the deletion of \$68,200, since it felt that certain aspects of the study needed clarification before the Secretary-General determined the amount required to carry it out. In addition, CPC had recommended that the study on conventional disarmament should be deleted from the programme budget because of the lack of legislative authority. The General Assembly, by its resolution 35/156 A of 12 December 1980, had requested the Disarmament Commission to work out the general approach to the study, its structure and scope. At its 54th meeting on 5 June 1981, the Disarmament Commission, because of a divergence of views had "decided to recommend Member States to give the matter further consideration in the light of all the papers presented to the Working Group, with the aim of reconciling the differences of views" (A/36/42, p. 14). In the special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations (A/36/658) it had been placed among those which should be deleted from the programme budget as being of low priority.
14. It appeared that the First Committee had adopted draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1 before the special review of the ongoing work programme of the United Nations had been issued, in which case the General Assembly should be

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

informed of the situation to avoid the possibility of a conflict if the Assembly adopted the resolution and the Fifth Committee subsequently recommended the adoption of the proposals contained in the special review. However, if the Assembly decided that the study should continue as recommended by the First Committee, the Advisory Committee proposed an additional appropriation of \$55,000 under section 2, in addition to which there would be conference-servicing requirements, which would not exceed \$1,141,900.

15. Mr. BETTINI (Italy) said that his Government was extremely interested in the study on conventional disarmament requested in the draft resolution.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.3/Rev.1, an additional appropriation of \$55,000 would be required under section 2 of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. In addition, conference-servicing costs estimated, on a full-cost basis, at \$1,141,900 would arise. The additional appropriations that might be required in that respect would, however, be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements.

17. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions in documents A/36/L.23/Rev.1, A/36/L.24, A/36/L.25, A/36/L.26, A/36/L.27 and A/36/L.28 concerning agenda item 36 (A/36/7/Add.16; A/C.5/36/59)

18. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had accepted virtually all the Secretary-General's requests. Its recommendations were contained in paragraphs 29 and 30 of its report (A/36/7/Add.16).

19. Mr. BROCHARD (France), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, said that the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia entailed expenditure to which the five delegations were opposed for reasons of political and budgetary principle.

20. The five delegations opposed the allocation of \$1 million under the regular budget to the United Nations Fund for Namibia for two reasons. First, proposed expenditure under the regular budget should be justified in every detail; the lump-sum allocation to the Fund had not been broken down and the Committee was therefore unable to take an informed decision on whether it was justified. Second, the allocation to the Fund would be used for operational activities, which should as a matter of principle be financed from voluntary contributions.

21. The five delegations were also opposed to the proposed allocation of \$200,000 for the Council for Namibia to finance a programme of co-operation with non-governmental organizations, in the absence of any details concerning the objectives of the programme or the manner in which the funds would be used. They objected to the financing under the regular budget of information activities which were, in reality, nothing more than partisan propaganda against certain Member States.

/...

(Mr. Brochard, France)

22. The expenditure proposed to implement the draft resolutions ignored the urgent need for greater budgetary discipline in the United Nations generally. Accordingly, the five delegations would vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendations and requested separate votes on the amounts recommended in paragraphs 20, 21, 23 and 24 of the ACABQ report (A/36/7/Add.16).
23. Mr. HICKEY (Australia) said that his delegation had serious reservations with regard to the financial implications of the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia as outlined in the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/36/59). While his delegation regarded the question of Namibia as one of the most urgent issues before the United Nations, it was concerned over the excessive and extravagant nature of some of the appropriations requested. It did not as a general rule favour the holding of meetings away from established United Nations conference centres. It was clear from the statement of financial implications that the normal United Nations guidelines requiring that all costs above and beyond those which would have arisen if a meeting had been held at Headquarters should be borne by the host country would not be applied to the proposed meetings of the Council for Namibia. He appreciated that the additional costs might represent a considerable burden for a host country, but the solution was not to transfer the costs to the regular budget. His delegation had been embarrassed by the presence of a large contingent of Secretariat staff at the extraordinary meetings of the Council held in Panama in 1981 and hoped that that situation would not recur in 1982.
24. While recognizing the importance of information activities, his delegation considered the provisions of the draft resolutions relating to information to be tendentiously worded and would not blame the largest contributor to the Organization if it took strong exception to them.
25. Lastly, he wondered whether the proposed staffing level of the Luanda office of the Commissioner for Namibia was not too generous and hoped that savings might be made in respect of other offices of the Commissioner established in the region.
26. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) observed that the expenditure requested to implement the draft resolutions would be unnecessary if the problem to which the draft resolutions were a response did not exist. That was why so many third world countries, especially in Africa, had consistently advocated a speedy solution to the question of Namibia. His delegation was surprised that some delegations seemed unwilling to support the cause of decolonization; for its part, it would willingly support the very reasonable recommendations of the Advisory Committee.
27. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) emphasized the responsibility of the United Nations for the Territory of Namibia. The statement that the General Assembly should not, for reasons of principle, appropriate funds to bring about a solution of the question defied all logic and understanding. All the voluntary contributions made so far had not solved the problem, and there was nothing wrong or extravagant in asking Member States to appropriate funds from the regular budget for activities in behalf of a Territory that was under United Nations jurisdiction.

/...

(Mr. Suedi, United Republic of
Tanzania)

28. While he understood the concern to limit the number of Secretariat staff who would be assigned to the proposed extraordinary meetings of the Council for Namibia, he did not see how anyone could argue against holding meetings away from Headquarters. His delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and would vote accordingly.

29. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria), Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt), Mrs. LOPEZ ORTEGA (Mexico), Miss VILLEGAS (Venezuela), Mr. PADUA (Philippines), Mr. JOHNSON (Benin), Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia), Mr. FRASER (Guyana), Mr. ALPER (Turkey), Mr. MEMMI (Tunisia), Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) and Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that they would vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

30. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the funds needed to implement the draft resolutions could have been saved if all Member States had shown the political will to bring about an effective solution to the problem of Namibia. However, the problem subsisted and his delegation would support whatever appropriations were needed to achieve the independence of the Namibian people. He requested that the votes asked for by the representative of France should be recorded. His delegation would support all the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

31. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) said that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa was a cause of great concern to all peace-loving third world countries. His delegation fully supported the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia and the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding their financial implications.

32. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations and hoped that the circumstances which necessitated the appropriations requested would be eliminated during the coming year.

33. Mr. KABA (Guinea) said the fact that the draft resolutions were sponsored by more than 100 delegations was a measure of the international community's broad support for the just cause of the Namibian people. The number of sponsors alone would seem to argue in favour of adopting the Advisory Committee's recommendations by consensus; yet a request had been made to vote separately on several of those recommendations. His delegation would vote in favour of all the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

34. Mr. FALL OULD MAALOUM (Mauritania) supported the views expressed by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon.

35. Mr. RUGWIZANGOGA (Rwanda) said that his delegation would support all the appropriations requested, which it did not consider extravagant, as some speakers had suggested.

36. Mr. OKWARO (Kenya) said that, in view of the continued sufferings of the Namibian people, financial considerations should not be allowed to hamper the ability of the United Nations to promote a solution to the problem. Responsibility for Namibia rested squarely with the United Nations, and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

37. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that the question of Namibia had been on the agenda of the General Assembly for too long. The expenditure recommended by the Advisory Committee for the implementation of the draft resolutions was infinitesimal compared to the amount already spent on publications concerning the Namibian problem. Budgetary considerations should not stand in the way of a political and moral commitment. He therefore appealed to all members to support the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

38. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/36/L.26, an additional appropriation of \$200,000 would be required under section 3C.1 (see A/36/7/Add.16, para. 20).

39. A recorded vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden.

40. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$200,000 under section 3C.1 was approved by 85 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

41. Mrs. de HEDERVARY (Belgium) said that she had inadvertently pressed the wrong button in voting. Her delegation had intended to abstain.

42. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/36/L.27, an additional appropriation of \$381,100 would be required under section 27 (see A/36/7/Add.16, para. 21).

43. A recorded vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Sweden.

44. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$381,100 under section 27 was approved by 83 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

45. Mr. GEBRE-MEDHIN (Ethiopia) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the recommendation.

46. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/36/L.28, an additional appropriation of \$1,000,000 would be required under section 3C.1 (see A/36/7/Add.16, para. 23).

47. A recorded vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal.

48. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$1,000,000 under section 3C.1 was approved by 92 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

49. Mr. de SILVA said that, although he had pressed the button to vote in favour of the recommendation, his delegation's vote had not been recorded by the electronic voting machine.

50. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/36/L.28, an additional appropriation of \$19,400 would be required under section 3C.1 (see A/36/7/Add.16, para. 24).

51. A recorded vote was taken on the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

• Against: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Italy, Japan, Portugal.

52. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for additional appropriation of \$19,400 under section 3C.1 was approved by 94 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in the light of the decisions just taken on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/36/L.23/Rev.1, A/36/L.24, A/36/L.25, A/36/L.26, A/36/L.27 and A/36/L.28, an additional

(The Chairman)

appropriation of \$2,681,100 would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983, to be distributed as follows: \$109,600 under section 3B.2, \$1,686,000 under section 3C.1, \$454,500 under section 3C.2, \$396,900 under section 27, \$25,100 under section 28D and \$9,000 under section 29. An additional appropriation of \$66,000 would be required under section 31, to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1.

54. Mr. PEDERSEN requested a vote on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal.

56. The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

57. Mr. BETTINI (Italy) said that, if separate votes had been taken on all the Advisory Committee's recommendations, his delegation would have voted in favour of the recommendations concerning draft resolutions A/36/L.25, A/36/L.26 and A/36/L.28 and would have abstained on the others.

58. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that, if he had been present during the voting, he would have voted in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

59. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) said that the taking of separate recorded votes on paragraphs 20, 21, 23 and 24 of the ACABQ report had made it possible for the Committee to demonstrate the overwhelming support of Member States for the cause for which the additional appropriations had been requested.

/...

Implementation of revised General Service salary scales in Geneva (continued)
(A/36/7/Add.8; A/C.5/36/29; A/C.5/36/L.27)

60. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that the draft decision (A/C.5/36/L.27) proposed by his delegation under items 99, 100 and 108 was designed to meet the considerations raised at a previous meeting by the representative of New Zealand. In paragraph 1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to reconsider his intention to grant a 3 per cent increase in salaries with effect from 1 March 1981 to those General Service staff in Geneva to whom the pre-1978 scale had once applied, taking into account the views expressed in the Fifth Committee. Paragraph 2 proposed that the Assembly should decide not to approve the related expenditures for 1981, 1982 and 1983, thus making the attitude of the Assembly on the issue quite clear. Care had been taken in drafting paragraph 1 not to derogate from the authority of the Secretary-General to fix General Service salaries.

61. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that, in the light of paragraph 1 of the draft decision proposed by the United States, he considered it his duty to remind the Committee that, under the Staff Regulations, the Secretary-General was authorized to fix the salaries of General Service staff; there might therefore be some doubt as to the consistency of the request contained in paragraph 1 that he should reconsider his intention with the terms of paragraph 2, which in effect asked him to change his intention. A further point in connexion with paragraph 2, was that it would seem to constitute a decision on an issue which had not even been submitted to the Fifth Committee. The question therefore arose as to the procedures which should be followed. There had been no request by the Secretary-General for funds.

62. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said it was most regrettable that ILO had broken ranks and given its General Service staff members a 3 per cent salary increase. The Governing Body of ILO should clearly not have permitted such a situation to arise. While it might seem unfair that comparable treatment should not be given to the General Service staff of other agencies in the common system, the phenomenon was of a temporary nature, as it was expected that the "new" Geneva General Service salary scale would catch up with the pre-1978 scale by the end of 1982. The question was whether a decision not to grant United Nations General Service staff in Geneva a comparable increase might be more harmful to the common system than the implementation of the United States proposal. It might be worth while to consider suggesting a compromise solution under which, for example, an increase would be given from a later date. If the United States draft decision was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

63. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) supported the representative of New Zealand, since there seemed to be a contradiction between paragraphs 1 and 2 of the United States proposal. The Secretary-General might be requested to report on the whole issue to the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

64. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) pointed out that, according to paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/36/29), the financial implications of the increased allowances were estimated at \$903,400 for the year 1981 and \$1,084,000 for the biennium 1982-1983. It was suggested in paragraph 16

(Mr. Papendorp, United States)

of the Advisory Committee's report (A/36/7/Add.8) that the increased allowances for 1981 could be financed by means of savings attributable to the strength of the United States dollar in relation to the Swiss franc during most of 1981. If in fact such savings had accrued, they should not be disposed of by the Secretary-General without regard to his responsibility to return the results of economies to the Member States.

65. He did not consider that paragraph 1 of the draft decision encroached on the Secretary-General's authority. Paragraph 2, on the other hand, made the attitude of the General Assembly clear to the Secretary-General. It was important that the Secretary-General should be aware that the Fifth Committee knew that General Service staff in Geneva were overpaid by local standards. The intent of the salary scales was to enable the Organization to recruit and retain the best-qualified General Service staff at any United Nations duty station. It must therefore be in a position to compete with the local market. The whole idea of the common system was that the different agencies should not compete among themselves. The unfairness to which the representative of New Zealand had alluded had been created as a result of action taken by an agency which had unilaterally decided to deviate from the accepted norms. The United Nations could not be held hostage to such action.

66. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that the Secretary-General's note had not shown the financial implications in a technical sense but had indicated the magnitude of the funds at stake. If the Committee adopted the draft decision proposed by the United States, it would derogate from the Secretary-General's authority to fix General Service salaries, inasmuch as it would be tantamount to saying that he could not exercise his judgement because the necessary funds would be denied him.

67. With regard to the suggestion made by the representative of New Zealand, the Secretariat had not contemplated any other solution to the problem such as, for example, the elimination of retroactive payments.

68. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the powers of the Secretary-General in regard to General Service salaries had been delegated by the General Assembly, which could also take away such powers. Moreover, if the Secretary-General considered that he had the authority to grant such increases, the question arose as to why it had been necessary for him to mention in paragraph 10 of his note that he and his colleagues would bring the matter before their respective legislative bodies. The fact that no payment had been made as of March 1981 showed that the Secretary-General wanted to ascertain the views of the General Assembly on his intention to grant a 3 per cent salary increase to the General Service staff in Geneva.

69. If the increase was implemented, the corresponding expenditure, for the regular budget and extrabudgetary resources, would be \$903,400 and \$1,084,000 in 1981 and for the biennium 1982-1983 respectively. The authority to authorize such expenditure lay with the General Assembly and not with the Secretary-General. If the Fifth Committee took strong exception to the way in which the Secretary-General

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

proposed to use the powers delegated to him, it would be quite in order for the Committee to advise the General Assembly regarding the position it should take on the expenditure anticipated under the item in 1981 and 1982-1983.

70. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said it was not clear to him whether there was any legal distinction between a decision not to approve the related expenditures for 1981, 1982 and 1983 and a decision not to appropriate funds for those years.

71. Mr. PAL (India) agreed with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. Paragraph 1 of the draft decision left the Secretary-General the option to exercise his discretion, but that did not mean that the Fifth Committee could not itself exercise discretion.

72. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) moved the closure of the debate on the question.

73. The motion was adopted.

74. The draft decision (A/C.5/36/L.27) was adopted without a vote.

75. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft decision because it was not happy with the prospect of granting a salary increase under a zero-growth budget. However, in view of the points raised by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the Under-Secretary-General, it would have abstained if the draft decision had been put to the vote.

76. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would also have abstained if a vote had been taken on the draft decision.

77. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, said that those delegations had joined the consensus on the draft decision but recognized the validity of some of the arguments put forward by the Secretary-General. Member States bore some responsibility for the situation in Geneva, in view of the fact that there had been no significant opposition in the ILO Governing Body to the original proposal for a General Service salary increase. It would have been inadvisable to condone an error made by one member of the common system by allowing others to repeat the error. The overriding concern of the Nordic delegations was the welfare of the common system, and they believed that that had been best served by the adoption of the draft decision.

78. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that he could see merit in the arguments put forward by the New Zealand delegation and the representatives of the Secretary-General. If the draft had been put to the vote, he would have abstained.

79. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) observed that the "common system" generally seemed to be taken to mean Geneva and New York; however, the United Nations had other duty stations. He wondered how the Fifth Committee would have reacted if the decision to raise General Service salaries had been taken by an

/...

(Mr. Suedi, Tanzania)

organization based in Rome, Paris or Nairobi. Had a vote been necessary, his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft decision.

80. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that the decision taken by the Committee was entirely within its competence. The General Assembly must strengthen the hand of ICSC in enforcing the provisions of the common system. If one organization deviated from the common system, there was no reason for the others to follow slavishly. The Committee had taken an excellent step, whatever the immediate consequences to the Organization.

81. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that he had not opposed the consensus, but would have abstained if a vote had been taken.

82. Mr. HAND (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said the 10 were aware of the difficulties which ILO had caused for General Service staff in Geneva, who were now to be paid different rates for the same work at the same duty station. However, they believed that it was the study of the Fifth Committee to uphold ICSC as the chosen instrument of Member States for implementing a single system for all United Nations organizations, which included the setting of General Service salary levels. If a vote had been taken, they would have voted in favour of the draft decision.

83. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) said he felt strongly that the common system should be preserved and that all staff in the system should be treated equitably. Regulating and co-ordinating conditions under the common system was the responsibility of ICSC. Any member organization which deviated from the common arrangements for its own convenience should be urged to return to the fold. If other agencies were to adopt the same tactics as ILO when they sought a pay increase, neither the Secretary-General nor the Fifth Committee, having acquiesced once, would have the moral authority to oppose such initiatives. His delegation would therefore have voted in favour of the draft decision if a vote had been taken.

84. In proposing a zero-growth budget, the Secretary-General had acknowledged that the United Nations had limited resources with which to meet its requirements. It would be absurd to cut assistance programmes for countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa and then grant a salary increase to Secretariat staff. He would therefore have voted in favour of the draft decision on moral grounds also.

85. His delegation's devotion to the welfare of the staff was not, however, in doubt; it had been happy to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.16/Rev.1 and would continue to support measures which would enhance the prestige of the staff.

86. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) recalled that his delegation had already said it would find it difficult to support the ILO decision to increase General Service salaries and had suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend against approval of the Secretary-General's resulting proposal. That was why it had joined the consensus on the draft decision.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 107: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

- (a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/495)
- (b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

87. Mr. JONAH (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) noted that, while 1981 was not a personnel year, some 45 delegations had participated in the debate. Useful suggestions had been made which should help the Office of Personnel Services to carry out its task. He also said that in view of time constraints many of the questions raised by delegations during the debate on the personnel item had been answered privately. A question raised by the representative of Spain, however, was of interest to staff members as well as delegations; he had asked for clarification on the procedures employed in the competitive examinations for promotions from the General Service category to the Professional category.

88. The utmost care was taken to guarantee the impartiality and confidentiality of the examinations in accordance with General Assembly resolution 33/143, section I, paragraph 1 (i). Anonymous examination papers written by the candidates were marked by boards comprising members designated by both the administration and the staff, and the marking and decoding procedures were carefully supervised by the Central Examination Board, to which any staff member with a complaint was entitled to apply. As a result of the first round of examinations 48 staff members had been promoted, 26 of them being women, from a total of 17 countries.

89. The delicate nature of personnel questions could be seen in the variety of views expressed by States, which suggested the difficulties faced by OPS in trying to reach the recruitment targets set by the General Assembly and evaluating candidates from many different countries with different backgrounds and educational systems. He was pleased that representatives of Member States had noted the progress made in the implementation of resolution 35/210. The system of earmarking posts which OPS had introduced to meet those targets was only a temporary device. Once the targets had been attained, the system would be dispensed with. The procedure had been explained to the staff representatives in view of their concern about its compatibility with staff regulation 4.4. He hoped that Member States would show their understanding of the procedure in relation to the JIU report on equitable geographical distribution within the Secretariat, which recognized some of the difficulties faced by the Secretariat but recommended solutions which might have serious implications in terms of staff regulation 4.4. There was greater co-operation on the part of departments and offices, which was essential in attaining the objectives set by Member States. That was made possible by the interim measures instituted by the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 35/211. Those measures had made it easier for his Office to carry out its task, and he hoped to be able to show more progress in the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session. He interpreted the remarks made during the general debate to mean that the Fifth Committee was prepared to wait and see what progress could be made under the present arrangements before making further substantive recommendations.

90. He had taken note of the comments by members regarding the JIU report on personnel policy options. Career development was an issue of crucial importance:

(Mr. Jonah, OPS)

staff joining the Secretariat were entitled to expect a sound career policy. The studies to be prepared by ICSC and JIU for the thirty-seventh session should be useful in that respect.

91. The question of the privileges and immunities of United Nations staff had been discussed. But another cause for concern was the increasing tendency of Governments to intervene on behalf of individual staff members. Of course Governments were entitled to make representations to the Secretary-General, but the task of the Secretariat was made that much harder when such representations concerned the promotion of, or disciplinary measures against, a staff member. He trusted that the matter could be discussed in greater detail at the following session.

92. The staff representatives of FICSA and of the United Nations Secretariat had presented their views in a cogent and calm manner. He therefore believed that most members had recognized, having heard staff representatives address the Fifth Committee for the first time, that the arrangement was a good one. He hoped that similar arrangements could be adopted in the future.

93. He expressed his gratitude for members' support of the Secretary-General's position on the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and specialized agencies. In conclusion he stressed the importance of the debates on personnel questions, which could help to build an impartial, independent international civil service without which the United Nations and the Secretariat in particular could not long survive.

94. Mr. FUJIWARA (Japan) said that his delegation had been staggered by the data provided to it by OPS on appointments to the Secretariat from unrepresented and under-represented Member States. Of the 112 posts subject to geographical distribution filled between 30 June and 31 December 1980, only 17 per cent had gone to nationals of unrepresented or under-represented countries; over the following six months, only 17.6 per cent of the 182 appointments had gone to such candidates. The General Assembly, in its resolution 33/143, had set a target of 40 per cent of vacant posts subject to geographical distribution to be filled by candidates from unrepresented and under-represented Member States, and it had reaffirmed that target in resolution 35/210. The figures showed that appointments of such candidates had accounted for 21.4 per cent of the total in 1979, 20.8 per cent in 1980 and 17.4 per cent in 1981. In other words, the situation was deteriorating year by year. He would not dwell further on the matter, but he hoped that the recruitment target set by the General Assembly would finally be met by the following year.

95. Mr. SAGRERA (Spain) asked how many of the 48 successful candidates in the first competitive examinations referred to by the Assistant Secretary-General had been Spanish-speaking, and how many of that number had been women. He also wished to know what percentage of all appointments and promotions to the P-1 and P-2 levels for the year in question had been promotions.

96. Mr. JONAH (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) confirmed that the analysis given by the representative of Japan was correct. He pointed out that a new recruitment programme had been initiated in January 1981 on account of the slow progress made previously, and that progress had been made since then.

(Mr. Jonah, OPS)

97. The 48 successful candidates in the first competitive examinations had included one male Spanish-speaking staff member. OPS was considering how to deal with Spanish-speakers taking the competitive examinations in future.

98. Promotions to the P-1 and P-2 levels had accounted for 50 per cent of all appointments and promotions to those levels in 1980.

99. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation had already called for the same criteria to apply to all candidates for posts at the P-1 and P-2 levels, whether they came from within the Secretariat or outside. In particular, his delegation had stressed that all candidates should have a university education. However, figures supplied by OPS showed that only about half the 48 successful candidates in the first competitive examinations had received a full university education, while 14 had presented high school diplomas and seven more had furnished proof that they had attended university courses. He insisted that all candidates for Professional posts in the United Nations must have a university degree.

100. Despite explanations by OPS, he believed that the new body established to deal with staff management relations (SMCC) had been set up in contravention of the General Assembly's instructions. He wished to know what the financial implications of creating that body had been.

101. Mr. JONAH (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) pointed out that, after an extensive debate during the thirty-third session on whether a university degree should be required for staff members seeking to take the competitive examinations for promotion from the General Service category to the Professional category, the Fifth Committee had finally decided that candidates should present evidence of "post-secondary educational qualifications": that was the criterion which his Office had followed ever since. Failing instructions to the contrary from the General Assembly, however, OPS would continue to require a degree in the case of external candidates for P-1 and P-2 posts.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.