

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

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

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
 (continued)

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

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

First-class travel in the United Nations organizations (continued)

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat
 officials serving the General Assembly (continued)

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by
 the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.46/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by
 the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.54/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by
 the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.73/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 82 (d)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by
 the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.86 concerning agenda item 12

Establishment of the Information Systems Unit in the Department of International
 Economic and Social Affairs (continued)

*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.48
 15 December 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

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

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/35/613, 668; A/C.5/35/L.29)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited those representatives who so wished to explain their votes on the draft resolution on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) (A/C.5/35/L.29) before a vote was taken.
2. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a recorded vote on the draft resolution. His delegation wished to reaffirm its position of principle that all expenses connected with the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor. In accordance with that position of principle, it would vote against the draft resolution. Also in accordance with that position, the Soviet Union had not participated and would not participate in future in the financing of UNIFIL.
3. Mr. GUBCSI (Hungary) reiterated his delegation's objection to both parts of the draft resolution and said that it would vote against it. On the instructions of the Hungarian Government, it also wished to place on record that it would not participate in the financing of any future activity of UNIFIL.
4. Mr. WANG Chengwei (China) said that, in accordance with the Chinese Government's well known and consistent position, his delegation would not participate in the vote or assume any responsibility for the financing of UNIFIL.
5. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had already made known its position of principle in regard to the financing of UNIFIL and of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East in general. The Syrian Arab Republic had no objection to the temporary presence of United Nations troops in Lebanon. Their mission, designed to permit sincere efforts to establish a just and lasting peace, was a noble one. The cost of financing such operations, however, should be borne by the aggressor alone. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution and would not contribute to the financing of UNIFIL operations.
6. Mr. BAHAR (Afghanistan) said that it was his Government's position of principle that all expenditures arising out of efforts to eliminate the consequences of Israel's armed aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution and would not participate in the financing of UNIFIL.
7. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that, in accordance with its traditional and consistent position on the financing of United Nations peace-keeping forces, his delegation would not participate in the vote on the draft resolution.

/...

8. Mr. DEUTSCHER (German Democratic Republic) said that his country's view that the costs of UNIFIL should be borne by the aggressor State alone had been expressed on many previous occasions. That position was unchanged and he would vote against the draft resolution.

9. Mr. SPAHO (Albania) said that his delegation had opposed the establishment of UNIFIL, in accordance with its well-known position regarding all United Nations forces in the Middle East. It did not consider that they served the cause of peace and it had not participated in their financing. It would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

10. Mr. AWOKOYA (Nigeria) said that, in the light of the Nigerian Government's contribution to the maintenance of peace and security, his delegation would not only vote in favour of the draft resolution but wished to become one of its sponsors.

11. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that, since the problem of Lebanon had first arisen, his delegation had not participated in the voting on UNIFIL. Its constant position on the Middle East problem, both in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, had been that the question of Palestine was at the heart of the matter. A permanent solution must continue to be sought, with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the people of Palestine.

12. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) said that his delegation had already made known its position of principle on the financing of United Nations peace-keeping forces in the Middle East. In its view, the aggressor alone should bear the consequences and not the States Members of the United Nations. That aggressor was the Zionist entity which had been occupying the Arab territories of Palestine since 1948. Since the draft resolution made no distinction between the aggressor and the victim, there was no justification for its adoption. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution as a whole and would accept no financial commitment arising from it.

13. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution. There was a difference between condemning aggression and condemning the troops sent to the area to make peace. Clearly, the United Nations should assist the States in the region to repel aggression and to recover their territories. Those States which wished to assist the countries of the region should take a positive attitude, as Morocco had done in sending troops to the Golan Heights and the Sinai, when Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic had been the victims of aggression. The international community should give the States of the Middle East all possible help.

14. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that peace-keeping operations, though directly in line with the Charter, could not be a substitute for the peaceful settlement of disputes. In principle they were only temporary, and it was regrettable that, owing to circumstances, they should have acquired a seemingly permanent form. He noted that the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon had been established by the Security Council. As long as the Secretary-General and the Security Council

/...

(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

regarded peace-keeping operations in general and the function of UNIFIL in particular as vital, all Member States were duty bound to pay their assessed share of the costs of those operations, whether or not they agreed with them.

15. During the debate on agenda item 93 (Financial emergency of the United Nations), many representatives had referred to the need to accept collective responsibility for financing operations that fulfilled the aims of the Charter. The withholding of contributions by certain Member States had caused a tremendous increase in the over-all deficit, about two thirds of which was due to the refusal of certain States to fulfil their obligations. Those States which rejected their obligations in that regard were impeding one of the more positive tasks undertaken by the United Nations.

16. Israel supported the continued operation of UNIFIL and hoped that the Committee would approve the requisite allocation, in accordance with the report of the Secretary-General and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. It would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.29.

17. It was unfortunate that some delegations continued to use the Fifth Committee, which was concerned with budgetary matters relating to the implementation of Security Council resolutions agreed on by all the parties concerned, as a forum for unwarranted political attacks on Israel. The statements of some representatives at the current meeting were completely extraneous to the issue before the Committee, and his delegation once again rejected the allegations made against Israel and objected to the attempt to manipulate the Committee for political purposes.

18. Mr. BOUSHEV (Bulgaria) said that, on the instructions of its Government, the Bulgarian delegation would not support the activities of UNIFIL, either morally or financially. It would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

19. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) reiterated his delegation's position of principle that the presence of United Nations troops in the Middle East did not represent any solution to the problems of the area. It would therefore not participate in the vote on the draft resolution.

20. Mr. TOUGOU (Mongolia) said that his delegation's position on aggression was very clear. On that basis it would vote against the draft resolution and would take no share in the financing of UNIFIL. It believed that the aggressor State alone should bear the expense of financing its operations.

21. Mr. KOZUBIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and would not participate in the financing of UNIFIL.

22. Mr. WILSKI (Poland) said that his delegation's position on the financing of UNIFIL, made known on many occasions in the past, remained unchanged.

23. Mr. MAKOSSO (Congo) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution and would not participate in the costs that its adoption would entail.

/...

24. 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.29.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, 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 Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Congo, Guinea, Yemen.

25. The draft resolution was adopted by 80 votes to 13, with 3 abstentions.

26. Mr. DRAMOU (Guinea), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. Although it believed in the importance of peace-keeping forces established in accordance with the mandate of the Organization, it felt that it was still more important to eradicate the causes that made the forces necessary.

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; A/C.5/35/L.31)

27. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.31, and announced that Panama and the Philippines had become sponsors.

28. The draft was not designed to advance the specific interests of the sponsors so much as to provide a balanced reflexion of the mainstream of opinion in the Committee. The different degrees of emphasis attached to different parts of the draft resulted from the sponsors' efforts to produce a generally acceptable resolution that gave recognition to the importance of the Commission's work and afforded the Commission the encouragement it merited. Since the issue of staff assessment for the General Service category was to be dealt with in connexion with the pensions question, the draft made no mention of it; the sponsors felt, however, that it ought to have been covered in the same resolution as the other recommendations of the Commission.

/...

(Mr. Schmidt, Federal Republic of Germany)

29. The draft was broadly similar to the resolution adopted the previous year, dealing in separate sections with issues affecting the entire United Nations system and their specific application to the United Nations itself. Paragraph 6 sounded a note of caution, on the applicability of the common standards of post classification throughout the system. Additionally, paragraph 18 would establish three temporary posts where the Commission had requested permanent posts: the sponsors felt it was preferable to provide temporary posts only, for the remainder of the current biennium, since the Commission was due to conduct a general review of its staffing levels.

30. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the draft resolution in document A/C.5/35/L.31 had some minor financial implications; it would not therefore be possible to take a decision until the Secretary-General had prepared the relevant statement.

31. Mr. AKWEI (Acting Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission) welcomed the draft resolution, which was the outcome of a fruitful discussion on the report of the Commission (A/35/30). He said that he did, however, have a few suggestions and comments to offer for the consideration of the sponsors.

32. In paragraph 2, the use of the adjective "present" to describe "anomalies" might be a rather strong assessment of the situation, which the Commission would find difficult to accept. Although views had been expressed indicating that the post-adjustment system was somewhat defective, in that some duty stations were over-compensated, while others were under-compensated, the Commission was convinced that the system had worked well, since there was no real proof of any defects. He therefore suggested that the word "possible" might be more appropriate. Indeed, the expression "possible anomalies" had been used in paragraph 2 of section II of General Assembly resolution 33/119. The use of the words "their own system" in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution might give the false impression that ICSC would be expected to develop systems for every Member State. He therefore suggested that the words "their own" might be replaced by the word "a". Because of its connotations, he would also prefer the word "overseas" in the same paragraph to be replaced by "expatriate". In paragraphs 5 and 6, the term "post classification" should read "job classification". In introducing the draft resolution, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had stressed the need for balance. It was recognized that there was some uneasiness about the concept of common standards of job classification, but ICSC believed that there was already a sufficient safeguard in paragraph 6 in terms of the intention to ensure appropriate consideration of the individual situation and requirements of each organization. Precisely for reasons of balance, it should be clear that the reference was to the Master Standard; he therefore hoped that the sponsors would be able to agree to replacing the words "common standards of job classification" by the words "the common standards of job classification promulgated by the Commission".

33. With respect to that section of the draft resolution dealing with General Service salary surveys, he believed that the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services might wish to comment on paragraph 9, in the light of the statement contained in paragraph 203 of the ICSC report (A/35/30). The wording of

/...

(Mr. Akwei, ICSC)

paragraph 16 was also somewhat inaccurate. What the Commission had undertaken to study was the relationship of the staff assessment system to the Tax Equalization Fund, not the staff assessment system per se. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had already mentioned the slightly misleading wording in paragraph 18. The Commission had indeed requested permanent, not temporary, posts, but it understood that because of budgetary procedures it would be difficult to use the term "permanent". However, as long as it was understood that the temporary staff would be made available on a permanent basis, the wording was acceptable. Paragraph 19 gave the impression that ICSC had not previously provided information on the financial implications of its recommendations. There were certainly problems in providing that information for the whole United Nations system because, in the case of organizations other than the United Nations itself, the recommendations were submitted directly to the executive heads. However, all the financial implications of those recommendations which were subject to a decision of the General Assembly were submitted on a regular basis, and he suggested that the words "in future" might be replaced by the words "to continue".

34. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that she was somewhat puzzled at the curious interpretation put on the word "temporary" by the Acting Chairman of ICSC. She wondered whether he was putting the Committee on notice that any temporary posts it might authorize would turn out to be permanent. As far as her delegation was concerned, in terms of language and intent, the word "temporary" was not to be interpreted as "permanent".

35. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the sponsors would be happy to take into account the suggestions made by the Acting Chairman of ICSC, as well as those which might be made by delegations. He clarified, however, that the wording of the draft resolution had been a matter of close consultation with the ICSC Secretariat.

36. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services), referring to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, confirmed that the Secretary-General had already informed the Commission (A/35/30, para. 203) of his decision to implement its conclusions and recommendations with respect to the New York General Service salary survey with retroactive effect to 1 August 1979. He would be in a position to report to the Commission with respect to the Geneva salary survey in a week's time.

37. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that the draft resolution successfully and comprehensively addressed the broad range of issues before the Commission, and made positive proposals to improve conditions in the international civil service. It therefore merited the Committee's approval. However, he was anxious to ensure that any measure taken should benefit all the staff. He therefore believed that in paragraph 11 ICSC should be requested to consider the possibility of extending the education grant to all staff, irrespective of duty station.

38. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representative of Panama should put his suggestion in writing and consult the sponsors of the draft resolution to see whether it could be incorporated in a revised version.

/...

39. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) said that the situation with respect to the application of the Noblemaire principle was far from satisfactory, and his delegation could not therefore agree that the Committee should note with appreciation the continuing efforts of the Commission in that regard (para. 1). He believed that that paragraph should invite the Commission to continue its study on a review of the application of the Noblemaire principle. He would be happy to work with the sponsors on suitable wording to that effect.

40. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) requested confirmation that the Commission's study pursuant to paragraph 8 would encompass the General Service of the whole United Nations system. As long as that was the intention, his delegation had no problem with the wording of that paragraph. As it stood, paragraph 12 seemed to be making a value judgement. To avoid that, it might be preferable to reverse the order of the two clauses so that the Commission would have the necessary latitude objectively to determine the eligibility of duty stations before implementing its recommendations with respect to home leave and travel entitlements.

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

First-class travel in the United Nations organizations (continued)
(A/35/7/Add.17; A/C.5/35/62)

41. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services), responding to an inquiry by the Indian representative at the previous meeting, said that most of the travel undertaken by the representatives of Member States on the Organization's behalf was associated with the work of five bodies: the Special Committee of 24, the Special Committee against Apartheid, the Trusteeship Council, the Council for Namibia and the Security Council. The travel entitlements of the chairmen of the two special committees and the President of the Council for Namibia were established in resolution 32/198, paragraph 2 (b): first-class travel at United Nations expense was authorized for journeys of more than nine hours' duration. The same applied to all members of visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council.

42. Although it had not been possible to obtain exhaustive information in the time available, he had ascertained that in 66 instances during 1979 and 1980 permanent representatives to the United Nations had travelled on Organization business; in 17 of those cases first-class travel had been authorized, 14 in accordance with paragraph 2 (b) of resolution 32/198, exceptions being made in the remaining three as permitted under paragraph 3 of the resolution. At a very rough estimate, the extra cost of first-class travel for the other 49 journeys would have been between \$25,000 and \$40,000. If the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) rather than 2 (b) had applied to travel by permanent representatives, 19 additional first-class passages would have had to be authorized at an approximate additional cost of between \$10,000 and \$20,000.

43. Mr. PAL (India) commented that, of the five bodies mentioned by the Assistant Secretary-General, two or even three might reasonably be expected to approach the end of their work in coming years, with a corresponding decrease in the travel

/...

(Mr. Pal, India)

occasioned. It was evident that the question of travel by permanent representatives had not been given special consideration during the drafting of resolution 32/198; the costs involved being small, he therefore proposed that permanent representatives to the United Nations should be entitled to first-class travel when on United Nations business, and that the amendment suggested by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 9 of its report should be modified accordingly.

44. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that the principal intention of resolution 32/198 had been to show that the United Nations could display a sense of economy at a time when it was in extreme financial difficulties and the world was facing an oil crisis. Admittedly, the apparent costs of the Indian proposal would not be great, but the effect of the proposal would be to create a distinction between permanent representatives and others of ambassadorial rank, which he found hard to accept. In any case, he did not think that the Committee could reach a decision on the matter without a much fuller report on the financial implications than the Assistant Secretary-General had just provided; for example, travel by permanent representatives to the Organization stationed in Geneva and Vienna would also have to be considered. He felt that the Secretary-General should be asked to submit a study on the whole question to the Assembly at the following session.

45. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt) said that his delegation had been concerned from the outset with the cost of official United Nations travel, and had been closely associated with resolution 32/198. Nevertheless, the costs of the Indian proposal were very small and likely to diminish; his delegation would support the call for permanent representatives to be entitled to first-class travel.

46. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that he was opposed to any change in the provisions of resolution 32/198. Given the hardships which the world was facing and the scarcity of resources, anyone who was interested only in the class of his travel accommodation must have the wrong priorities.

47. Mr. BROCHARD (France) endorsed the Senegalese request for a study of the problem to be submitted at the thirty-sixth session.

48. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) asked whether the representative of India would be prepared to accept the Senegalese suggestion.

49. Mr. PAL (India) said that he would, in view of the short time at the Committee's disposal and the need for more detailed information on the implications of his proposal.

50. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it: (a) Take note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/35/62 and the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/35/7/Add.17) and that it decide to amend the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) of resolution 32/198 as follows:

/...

(The Chairman)

"(a) The Secretary General, the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and one representative of each Member State attending regular, special or emergency special sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to first-class travel;"

(b) Request that the report submitted by the Secretary-General on that subject to the thirty-sixth session should cover the period from 1 October 1980 to 30 June 1981 so as to enable the Fifth Committee to consider it at the beginning of the session, and that thereafter, reports be submitted annually to cover the period from 1 July to 30 June of the following year; (c) Request the Secretary-General to prepare a study on the conditions for travel of permanent representatives accredited to the United Nations when travelling on official mission on behalf of the Organization.

51. It was so decided.

52. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation would have preferred to see the issue put to a vote, and would then have voted against the Chairman's suggestions.

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials serving the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.5/35/53; A/C.5/35/L.32)

53. The CHAIRMAN announced that Panama had withdrawn draft decision A/C.5/35/L.33.

54. He said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.32.

55. It was so decided.

56. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, had the draft resolution been put to the vote, his delegation would have voted against it.

57. Mr. URQUIDI (Bolivia) announced that his delegation would also have voted against the draft resolution had it been put to the vote. It was very perplexed at a situation where, on the one hand, ways were being sought to solve the financial emergency of the Organization and, on the other, salary increases were being approved which the Organization could ill afford. Although his Government contributed only a small percentage to the budget, he believed that it was advisable to heed public opinion, particularly in those countries which were sizable contributors. In an era of inflation, unemployment, hunger and depletion of resources, no nation would look favourably on an international organization which voted itself magnificent salary increases. While conditions had to be such as to attract the best qualified people to the Organization, that objective would not be met merely by increasing the monetary rewards. If that trend continued unabated, the Organization was likely to attract not the most dedicated international civil servants, but those with the most keenly developed mercenary instincts.

/...

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi (continued) (A/35/7/Add.11; A/C.5/35/35 and Add.1; A.C.5/35/L.27/Rev.1)

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution on United Nations accommodation at Nairobi originally proposed by Kenya (A/C.5/35/L.27) had been revised after consultations and reintroduced at the 45th meeting as draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.27/Rev.1, sponsored by Kenya, Panama, Senegal and the Sudan.

59. Mr. MAHMOOD (Bahrain) said that his delegation would support the revised draft resolution on United Nations accommodation at Nairobi (A/C.5/35/L.27/Rev.1), since it was anxious to see such a major United Nations endeavour implemented in a developing country. It expressed its appreciation to the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme for the report before the Committee, which was the result of genuine efforts to achieve savings for the United Nations. It also thanked the Advisory Committee for endorsing the report by the Executive Director.

60. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that his delegation attached great importance to the strict application of the resolutions adopted by the Organization and would not support any action intended to frustrate the common will. It had regretted the manoeuvring that had prevented the implementation of the General Assembly's previous decisions on United Nations accommodation at Nairobi. The revised draft resolution offered a well-balanced solution, and his delegation would vote in favour of it.

61. Mr. ABDEL RAHMAN (Sudan) said that his delegation was generally in agreement with the recommendations of ACABQ, which had a long experience in financial and administrative matters, although it was also always ready to study proposals from elsewhere. The decision to restore the two conference rooms envisaged in the original project added a new dimension, and his delegation had therefore joined in co-sponsoring the revised draft resolution.

62. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation was anxious to promote as far as possible the construction of United Nations facilities in developing countries and to encourage the process whereby major meetings could be held in those countries. With that in mind, it was in favour of the speedy completion of the project in Nairobi and grateful to the Government of Kenya for its co-operation with the United Nations in that regard. His delegation would whole-heartedly support the revised draft resolution.

63. He noted that paragraph 1 of the revised draft expressed appreciation to the Secretary-General and to the Executive Director of UNEP for their efforts to provide a more economical alternative for the accommodation of the United Nations at Nairobi, efforts that had been supported by ACABQ. He also noted the decision in paragraph 2 to restore the two major conference rooms envisaged in the original project and said that his delegation was greatly in favour of that restoration. The addition of the two conference rooms would encourage Member States to consider holding more meetings in Kenya. He expressed the hope that, once the draft resolution was adopted, the project would be implemented without delay and the General Assembly kept informed of progress.

/...

64. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) asked whether the figure given for the total appropriation in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was correct.

65. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that there were two typographical errors in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. The word "also" should be inserted in the second line before the word "decides" and the figure for the total appropriation should be 254,944,000 Kenyan shillings.

66. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation had supported the resolutions on accommodation at Nairobi adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-second and thirty-fourth sessions and noted that, if those resolutions had been implemented, the Assembly would have been considering a progress report on the construction project authorized. However, the General Assembly had unfortunately been asked to review the situation. His delegation was pleased to support draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.27/Rev.1 and attached special importance to the implementation of the project without delay, as requested in paragraph 3.

67. Mr. CULLEN (Argentina) said that the Fifth Committee should as a general rule give due weight to the Advisory Committee's recommendations. In the case before the Committee, his delegation was satisfied that the draft resolution represented a fair compromise in that it would restore only two conference rooms to the construction project at Nairobi. In view of the importance to the developing countries of constructing United Nations facilities in such countries and bearing in mind the provisions of resolution 32/203, his delegation considered that there were grounds for setting aside the Advisory Committee's recommendations and would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.27/Rev.1.

68. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that his country took a keen interest in the question of United Nations accommodation in Nairobi, since the project there represented the first United Nations facilities ever to be constructed in a developing country. It was to be hoped that the United Nations would locate other units in Latin America and Asia in the future. His delegation supported the draft resolution, since it was balanced, and called on all Members to take into account the views expressed during the debate.

69. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) said that the draft resolution was sufficiently balanced and reflected the efforts which had been made to reconcile opposing views. His delegation was prepared to support it since the construction of United Nations facilities throughout the world was a means of strengthening the universality of the Organization.

70. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) said that his delegation would gladly support the draft resolution, because its intent was basically the same as that of resolutions 34/228 and 34/233 and because it was consistent with the general desire for prudent management of the scarce resources of the Organization. It was generally recognized that the more economical alternative proposed by the Executive Director might pose an obstacle to the growth of UNEP's establishment, particularly from 1985 onwards. His delegation could not therefore support the Advisory Committee's recommendations; to do so would be to invite the heads of the United Nations programmes and organizations to reverse decisions taken by the General Assembly. His delegation had misgivings that such a concern was not reflected in the draft resolution.

71. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the considerations put forward by the representative of Kenya at the preceding meeting were just and valid. The draft resolution represented the best compromise in the circumstances and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of it.

72. Mr. AMOKOYA (Nigeria) said that the draft resolution would ensure that the first United Nations headquarters facilities ever to be constructed in a developing country would measure up to the standards of existing facilities elsewhere. He commended the co-operation of the Kenyan Government and whole-heartedly endorsed the draft resolution. It was to be hoped that the Committee would adopt it without a vote.

73. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that the delegations of Burundi, Malawi and Mauritania had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

74. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee was being asked to take a decision on a serious matter and therefore requested that a recorded vote should be taken on the draft resolution. His delegation had made known its position of principle with regard to United Nations accommodation at Nairobi when the Assembly had adopted resolutions 32/208 and 34/233. It regretted that the report of the Executive Director of UNEP and the Advisory Committee's recommendations, which were intended to bring about savings, had been rejected by the Fifth Committee. His delegation, therefore, would not be able to vote in favour of the revised draft resolution.

75. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution for the reasons it had already stated. It understood that the Secretariat would make every effort to ensure the most economical implementation of the resolution within the total appropriation approved by the General Assembly at the thirty-fourth session.

76. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and that it regretted the delays which had occurred in the project and was concerned over the unorthodox practices which had been followed. Officials of the Secretariat should refrain from actions which were inconsistent with established United Nations rules and regulations and he urged caution on all those who thought that they could play games in important United Nations financial matters. His delegation understood that all contracts under the draft resolution would be awarded by competitive bidding open to all in accordance with financial regulation 10.5 and rule 110.18 and that the total cost of the construction project would not exceed the total appropriation referred to in paragraph 2. The Secretariat should not report to the General Assembly at the next session that it had made a mathematical or other error and that the cost of the project would be greatly in excess of that amount. It was unfortunate that ineptitude or other short-comings had caused delays in the project and a decrease in the facilities which could be constructed for the amount approved. He urged the Executive Director of UNEP to heed the views put forward by members in the discussion and proceed with the project without delay. It was to be hoped that political considerations would never become a feature of United Nations contracting procedures.

77. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) endorsed the draft resolution. The Executive Director and

(Mr. Lahlou, Morocco)

the Advisory Committee had been motivated purely by a desire to achieve savings for the Organization and there was nothing suspicious about their recommendations. His delegation rejected the innuendo which had characterized some statements. Political considerations were entirely out of place in the Fifth Committee.

78. Mr. RUGWIZANGOGA (Rwanda) said that his delegation was satisfied with the draft resolution, which was the result of extensive consultations and reflected an accommodation of the various positions. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution, not only because it related to the headquarters of a programme to which his country attached great importance but also because it concerned the first United Nations headquarters facilities to be constructed in an African developing country. He was concerned over the delays which had occurred despite the adoption of General Assembly resolutions 32/208 and 34/233, and he therefore attached great importance to paragraph 3.

79. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, since the accommodation envisaged was appropriate to the requirements of UNEP and the United Nations system as a whole. He regretted that it had not been possible to identify earlier the precise requirements so that planning could have proceeded in a more orderly fashion and that the normal procedures had not been followed in dealing with the bids received. His delegation understood that proper tendering procedures would be followed in implementing the draft resolution.

80. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) commended the Executive Director and the Advisory Committee for their efforts to achieve savings in the construction project and said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

81. 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.27/Rev.1.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

/...

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

82. Draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted by 83 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

83. Mr. JODAHL (Sweden), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland and Norway, said that, in the light of the Committee's lengthy discussion of the matter and the Executive Director's assurances that the financial regulations had been fully complied with, those delegations had found it possible to vote in favour of the draft resolution. It was their sincere hope that the stipulation in paragraph 2 that the construction should be carried out within the total appropriation approved in 1979 would be taken seriously and that the net result would be a saving in comparison with the original calculations for the project.

84. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation was concerned that the accommodation to be constructed at Nairobi should meet the needs of the Organization and that in so doing optimum use should be made of the resources of the Organization. It expected that in awarding contracts the financial rules and regulations would be observed and that the construction would be carried out within the appropriation already approved.

85. Mr. CROM (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, since it believed that the United Nations facilities in Nairobi should be equal in quality to facilities elsewhere in the world. He was concerned over the bidding procedures which had been followed and the delays which had occurred, and understood that all relevant financial rules and regulations, especially regulation 110.21, would be observed in implementing the project.

86. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote. It attached great importance to the adequacy of United Nations accommodation at Nairobi and believed that the revised project proposed by the Executive Director was adequate to meet the Organization's requirements and that a valid case had been made for substantially reducing the original project. It seemed that the financial rules and regulations had not been fully complied with in the past and his delegation trusted that they would be strictly observed in awarding the contracts for the work authorized under the draft resolution. No extraneous considerations should be allowed to influence the award of contracts. Those views must be taken into account by the Executive Director.

87. Mrs. SANDIFER (Portugal) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that the relevant financial regulations governing competitive bidding would be strictly complied with and that the cost of the project would not exceed the approved appropriation.

/...

88. Mr. KELLEHER (Ireland) said that, in voting in favour of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to demonstrate its commitment to UNEP and its determination that the facilities at Nairobi should be on a par with United Nations facilities elsewhere. His delegation was concerned over the contracting procedures followed and hoped that future work on the project would be carried out rapidly and smoothly and in full compliance with the financial rules and regulations.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.46/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.3/35/84)

89. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that under draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.46/Rev.1 the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General in co-operation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to send follow-up missions to carry out feasibility studies with a view to strengthening the Sudanese Government's capacity to pursue cost-effective strategies and to plan and locate new settlements for refugees. The Secretary-General indicated in document A/C.3/35/84 that an amount of \$41,700 would be required in the form of consultants' fees, travel and subsistence for three follow-up missions. The Advisory Committee recommended that an amount of \$41,700 should be appropriated if the General Assembly adopted draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.46/Rev.1.

90. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.46/Rev.1, an additional appropriation of \$41,700 would be required under section 1 of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.

91. It was so decided.

92. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, on the basis of his delegation's position that no additional appropriations should be made during the budgetary period and that all new measures implemented during that time should be financed from existing resources, if the proposal in document A/C.3/35/84 had been put to a vote, his delegation would have been unable to support it.

93. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the sending of follow-up missions as called for in draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.46/Rev.1. If the proposal had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained because it believed that the funds already available to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees were adequate to cover the cost of the follow-up missions.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.54/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.3/35/85)

94. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that under draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.54/Rev.1 the General Assembly would request the Commission on Transnational Corporations to study, during its

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

seventh session, the ways and means within the information system on transnational corporations to improve the exchange of information on banned, hazardous chemicals and unsafe pharmaceutical products, with a view to formulating appropriate recommendations. The Secretary-General had indicated in document A/C.5/35/85 that additional appropriations not exceeding \$19,300 would be required under section 9 of the programme budget for 1980-81 to finance the travel and fees of a consultant for three work-months and for the services of a research assistant recruited on a temporary assistance basis. The Advisory Committee recalled that section 9 included a sizable appropriation for consultants for the Commission on Transnational Corporations and noted that the amount of \$19,300 was also below the figure proposed by the General Committee as the minimum amount which did not require consideration by the Fifth Committee. The Advisory Committee believed that the amount should be absorbed within the resources already appropriated under section 9 of the programme budget for 1980-81. Thus the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.54/Rev.1 would not entail additional appropriations from the regular budget for 1980-1981.

95. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.54/Rev.1, no additional appropriations would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981.

96. It was so decided.

97. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, if the proposal had been put to the vote, his delegation would have been unable to support it. It did not believe that the Commission on Transnational Corporations was the appropriate forum for the study proposed and thought that it should be possible to absorb the costs within the existing appropriations.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.73/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 82 (d) (A/C.5/35/87)

98. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.73/Rev.1 envisaged an amount of \$179,600 for the conference servicing requirements which would arise from the establishment of the open-ended working group to conclude consideration of the draft body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment. The amount of conference servicing should be considered in the context of the consolidated statement.

99. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.73/Rev.1, the expenditure for conference services, which would not exceed an amount of \$179,600 would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference servicing costs which would be submitted at the end of the current session.

100. It was so decided.

/...

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/35/L.86 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/35/88)

101. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that under draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.86 the General Assembly would decide, at its thirty-sixth session to establish an open-ended working group for the purpose of concluding the elaboration of the draft declaration on the human rights of individuals who were not citizens of the country in which they lived. The Secretary-General indicated in document A/C.5/35/88 that the conference servicing requirements would not exceed \$179,600. Those requirements would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement.

102. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.3/35/L.86, the expenditure for conference services, which would not exceed an amount of \$179,600, would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference servicing costs which would be submitted at the end of the current session.

103. It was so decided.

Establishment of the Information Systems Unit in the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (continued) (A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 and L.28)

104. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1, said that paragraph 2 had been revised to suggest that the Information Systems Unit should be maintained and would be reimbursed for the services it provided to users through voluntary contributions. It was therefore essentially left to the Secretary-General to maintain the Unit and Governments using the services of the Unit would not be required to pay for those services as they would have been under the original text (A/C.5/35/L.26). Paragraph 3 recommended that future users within the United Nations system should reimburse the Unit for the costs of services. Paragraph 4 had been revised to note that, since the report of the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems had not been received, the financing of the Unit from the regular budget would be deferred. Under the new paragraph 5, the Unit would be continued and its costs absorbed within funds already allocated; that represented a compromise on the part of his delegation. Paragraph 6 suggested that the work of the United Nations Bibliographic Information System and the work of the Unit might overlap and provided a way of avoiding such duplication.

105. Mr. FAUTEUX (Canada), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28, said that they wished to delete the phrase "revenues generated by the services rendered to its users" in the sixth line. That change was essentially aimed at ensuring that developing countries would in no way be obliged to pay in order to have access to or use of the services of the Information Systems Unit. It did not exclude the possibility of the Unit obtaining user fees from bilateral donor programmes and non-governmental development research institutions in developed countries and therefore left a certain measure of flexibility with regard to financing.

/...

106. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that he had been asked at a previous meeting about the possibility of absorbing the remuneration of the staff of the Information Systems Unit within the funds already allocated from the regular budget for 1981. From the budgetary point of view, it would be possible to allocate funds to other activities if savings occurred in the implementation of the budget for the 1980-1981 biennium. No savings were expected during the current biennium, however, and indeed as a result of inflation some additional funds would be required. From the point of view of programmes, the recent review carried out by the Secretary-General on the identification of activities that had been completed or were obsolete, or marginal usefulness or ineffective revealed that the Secretary-General did not envisage any possibilities for programme redeployment. The answer to the question raised was therefore negative on both counts.

107. Mr. FAUTEUX (Canada) noted that the basic thrust and underlying intent of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 remained unchanged. Under the new paragraph 2, a measure of discretion initially granted to the Secretary-General by the use in the original text of the words "should he wish" and "may explore" had been removed. The paragraph had thus been somewhat strengthened to the extent that the General Assembly would suggest the continuation of the Information Systems Unit and request the Secretary-General to carry out studies concerning arrangements whereby the Unit would be reimbursed for the services it provided to users through voluntary contributions. It should be stressed the last part of the original formulation had confused two completely different sources of extrabudgetary financing - user fees and voluntary contributions; user fees had been totally eliminated in the revised text. The first word of paragraph 2 - "Suggests" - was non-imperative and indicated an absence of commitment which was very different from the use of the word "Decides" in draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28, as orally revised. That in itself reflected the positions of the different sponsors. In introducing draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26, the United States delegation had put forward reasons why the Unit was unworthy of support from the General Assembly; yet the representatives of Sweden and Canada, in agreement with the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination, had expressed wholehearted support for the work accomplished by the Unit and confidence in its promise for the future. It was therefore not surprising that draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 referred to studies to be undertaken, whereas draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28 contained specific, realistic and concrete proposals for financing the work of the Unit in 1981.

108. In the revised text of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1, the reference to users outside the United Nations system had been deleted. It had never been the intention of the sponsors of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28 that developing countries should be charged a fee for availing themselves of the services of the Unit's Development Information Service and that fact was made amply clear in the revision of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28.

109. Despite minor changes, the effect of paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1, which was the most crucial and the most irreconcilably opposed to draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28, was exactly the same as before, since it denied to the Unit the minimum amount of regular budget funds

/...

(Mr. Fauteux, Canada)

essential to provide for its survival for the next year. In practice, as the Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination had informed the Committee, that would mean the end of the Unit and the services it provided to Member States. The ultimate effect was further illustrated by the fact that, as the Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services had just pointed out, paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 was impossible to implement in its existing form. For a variety of financial, programme and time-constraint reasons, that paragraph offered no hope of funding the Unit's activities for a further year and was in no way an alternative to the method of financing proposed in draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28.

110. Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 was concerned with the possible overlap between the work of the Unit's Development Information Service, and the United Nations Bibliographic Information System. It had been indicated in an evaluation report prepared for UNESCO by Professor Lancaster that the Development Information Service was a specialized information system working with a specialized data base, which provided information for a specialized group of users; on the other hand, the United Nations Bibliographic Information System was concerned exclusively with documents published by the United Nations and other items received by the Dag Hammarskjöld Library. The two systems were thus completely different and, if the work of the Development Information Service was transferred to the United Nations Bibliographic Information System, it was difficult to imagine that it would give high priority to the special services provided by the Development Information System. That comment by an independent expert made it clear that the issue raised in paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 had been thoroughly investigated and that no problem existed. The Development Information Service operated by the Information Systems Unit was a very useful tool at present and would prove even more useful in future in assisting developing countries in bettering their economic and social conditions. He therefore urged all delegations to vote against draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 and in favour of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.28.

111. Mr. BRODOWING (Indonesia) requested clarification of paragraphs 4 and 5 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1. Paragraph 4 indicated that the financing of the Unit from the regular budget would be deferred pending the submission of the report by the Inter-Organization Board for Information Systems, yet under paragraph 5 the remuneration of staff of the Information Systems Unit would be financed from the regular budget for 1981.

112. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, if the Secretary-General was unable to find the required funds to provide for the remuneration of staff of the Unit, that indicated the type of priority he attached to the Unit; it was difficult to see how he could be unable to find \$120,000 from a total budget of \$1.2 billion. There had so far been no offers of voluntary contributions and those countries which had given so freely to start the Unit hoped that other Members of the United Nations would pay for the Unit even though the Advisory Committee, in paragraph 12 of its report (A/35/7/Add.9), had expressed the view that the need for the Information Systems Unit and the Development Information Service had not been

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

demonstrated. If the Secretary-General could not find \$120,000, he could perhaps reprogramme the whole project by having the United Nations Bibliographic Information System carry out the work within its existing resources.

113. With regard to the question raised by the representative of Indonesia, paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/35/L.26/Rev.1 decided to defer financing from the regular budget until the General Assembly received the report it had requested; paragraph 5 decided that, if the Secretary-General assigned priority to the Unit, the financing should be absorbed within the very generous funds already appropriated by Member States.

114. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, proposed that the meeting should be adjourned under rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

115. Mr. ALLAFI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) proposed that the debate on the proposals under discussion should be closed under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

The meeting rose at 2.30 p.m.