



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 88th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 17: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS (continued)

(j) INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Second reading

Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/34/SR.88
4 January 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

Statute of the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning
(A/C.5/34/L.46)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that at the preceding session the General Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, had requested the Economic and Social Council to transmit the statute of the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning to the Conference of Ministers of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) for consideration and revision in the light of the observations made by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/32/62. The statute had since been amended to take into account all the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee.
2. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee was recommending approval of the statute by the General Assembly, as requested in paragraph 2 of resolution 350 (XIV) adopted by the Conference of Ministers of ECA.
3. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) asked whether approval of the statute by the General Assembly would have any financial implications for the regular budget of the Organization.
4. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that article III of the statute relating to the status of the Institute should be read in conjunction with article IX, which stipulated that the Institute would derive its finances from contributions made by African Governments and UNDP and that it might derive further resources from the United Nations, its specialized agencies, other governmental organizations and institutions, Governments and non-governmental organizations. There was no suggestion that the Institute would be financed from the regular budget; otherwise, the Secretary-General would have had to submit a statement of financial implications.
5. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) observed that article II of the statute stipulated that the Senegalese Government would provide premises, facilities and services for the Institute. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee had confirmed that approval of the statute would not have any direct financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations. Accordingly, he suggested that the Committee, which was the competent body in the matter, should approve the statute.
6. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly approve the statute of the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning as contained in the annex to document A/C.5/34/L.46.
7. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 17. APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS (continued)

(j) INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (A/C.5/34/102)

8. Mr. DEBATTI (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management), introducing the Secretary-General's note in document A/C.5/34/102, said that the resignation of the Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission had raised the question of filling that vacancy for the remainder of the former Chairman's term. In accordance with the provisions of article 4 of the statute of the Commission, the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC), was required to undertake consultations with Member States, with the specialized agencies and with the staff representatives. In addition, he was required to consult with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. The consultation process had begun but the Secretary-General regretted to have to inform the General Assembly that it had not proved possible, despite all efforts, to complete the consultation process in time to permit him to submit recommendations to fill the vacancy for the consideration and decision of the General Assembly at the current session. In order to enable the Commission to function with the full complement of members called for in article 2 of its statute, namely, 15 members of whom two were to serve full-time, the Secretary-General, after having consulted the Advisory Committee, proposed that provisionally, until a Chairman was appointed by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session, Mr. Gastón de Prat Gay of Argentina should be appointed to the Commission to serve, on an exceptional basis, full-time as Acting Vice-Chairman. The present Vice-Chairman would, in accordance with article 8 of the Commission's statute, serve as Acting Chairman in the absence of the Chairman.

9. He stressed that the arrangement was provisional and would cease to apply when the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session decided to appoint a regular Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The proposal in no way affected the position of the present Vice-Chairman, who would continue to be Vice-Chairman even while acting as Chairman.

10. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the proposal was somewhat unusual and it was unfortunate that it had been submitted on the last day of the Committee's work. His delegation was not pleased that the General Assembly was being asked to take a somewhat irregular decision with regard to a body of such importance as the International Civil Service Commission.

11. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) agreed with the representative of Tunisia but felt that the Secretary-General would not have proposed such a solution unless the consultations had indeed been difficult. He was confident that the persons in question were capable and would successfully guide the Commission's work.

12. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would support the Secretary-General's proposal despite its somewhat irregular nature. The difficulties experienced by the Secretary-General derived from the specific structure given to the International Civil Service Commission, which meant that the consultation process would inevitably be slow.

13. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) pointed out that article 2 of the Commission's statute called for a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman and not for two Vice-Chairmen and requested the Under-Secretary-General to explain how the titles and functions of the two officers would be kept separate under the arrangement proposed by the Secretary-General. It was important to remember that arrangements adopted on an exceptional basis must not be allowed to become permanent and every effort must be taken to ensure that the Commission's work was not impeded by the proposed arrangement.

14. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) agreed it was regrettable that the Committee had to deal with such an important matter at the last minute. He was confident that delegations would understand that the Secretary-General was required under article 4 to hold consultations, which had, unfortunately, in the present instance not been sufficiently fruitful to provide the Secretary-General with the necessary basis for proposing a candidate for appointment as Chairman. Rather than allowing the post to go unfilled during an important year in the Commission's work, which would leave the Commission short of one member, and a full-time member at that, the Secretary-General was proposing the interim arrangement in document A/C.5/34/102. In response to the comments made by the representative of Chad, he said that the existing Vice-Chairman would remain Vice-Chairman but would act as Chairman, as called for under article 8, paragraph 2, of the Commission's statute. In order to relieve the burden on the Vice-Chairman acting as Chairman without the support of a Vice-Chairman, the Secretary-General proposed to appoint an Acting Vice-Chairman.

15. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation would have preferred the officials in question to have the full status of Chairman and Vice-Chairman, since the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of ICSC had heavy responsibilities. However, he understood why the Secretary-General had been unable to make such a recommendation and hoped that it would be possible to complete the relevant consultations by the following session. In the meantime, he assumed that the two officials concerned would receive full remuneration, even though serving only as Acting Chairman and Acting Vice-Chairman.

16. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that members who served full-time as Acting Chairman and Acting Vice-Chairman were respectively entitled to the minimum remuneration of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

17. He wished to inform the Committee that Mr. Quijano had resigned at the end of August, and the Secretary-General had raised the question of filling the resulting vacancy during the session of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination at the end of October of the current year.

18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it: (a) defer to its thirty-fifth session the appointment of the Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission;

(b) appoint Mr. Gastón de Prat Gay as a member of the Commission until a Chairman was appointed by the Assembly at its thirty-fifth session; (c) decide that Mr. de Prat Gay should serve, on an exceptional basis, full-time as Acting Vice-Chairman.

19. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

Second reading (A/C.5/34/L.48, part II)

Expenditure sections

20. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve in second reading the recommended appropriations under individual sections of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, as contained in document A/C.5/34/L.48, part II (see pp. 14 to 16). On page 19 of the French version, the total for the income section should be \$221,343,200.

Section 1. Over-all policy-making, direction and co-ordination

21. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

/...

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

Abstaining: Ivory Coast.

22. An appropriation of \$25,113,400 under section 1 was approved in second reading by 86 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

Section 2. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities

23. An appropriation of \$59,258,000 under section 2 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 3. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization

24. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: None.

25. An appropriation of \$13,584,200 under section 3 was approved in second reading by 91 votes to 4.

Section 4. Policy-making organs (economic and social activities)

26. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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: Italy, United States of America.

27. An appropriation of \$7,073,900 under section 4 was approved in second reading by 85 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

Section 5. Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation

28. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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.

29. An appropriation of \$3,850,400 under section 5 was approved in second reading by 88 votes to 9.

Section 6. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs

30. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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: Italy, United States of America.

31. An appropriation of \$40,035,800 under section 6 was approved in second reading by 86 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

Section 7. Department of Technical Co-operation for Development

32. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China,

Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

33. An appropriation of \$13,110,000 under section 7 was approved in second reading by 87 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

Section 8.. Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters

34. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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: United States of America.

35. An appropriation of \$2,500,200 under section 8 was approved in second reading by 87 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

Section 9. Transnational corporations

36. An appropriation of \$7,298,100 under section 9 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 10. Economic Commission for Europe

37. An appropriation of \$24,137,300 under section 10 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 11. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

38. An appropriation of \$23,056,100 under section 11 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 12. Economic Commission for Latin America

39. An appropriation of \$32,455,800 under section 12 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 13. Economic Commission for Africa

40. An appropriation of \$27,120,300 under section 13 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 14. Economic Commission for Western Asia

41. An appropriation of \$14,393,500 under section 14 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

42. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal

Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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: United States of America.

43. An appropriation of \$50,069,600 under section 15 was approved in second reading by 88 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

Section 16. International Trade Centre

44. An appropriation of \$8,370,500 under section 16 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 17. United Nations Industrial Development Organization

45. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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, United States of America.

Abstaining: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan.

46. An appropriation of \$70,117,200 under section 17 was approved in second reading by 83 votes to 10, with 4 abstentions.

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

47. An appropriation of \$10,678,200 under section 18 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

48. An appropriation of \$7,598,400 under section 19 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 20. International drug control

49. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

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

50. An appropriation of \$5,904,200 under section 20 was approved in second reading by 89 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Section 21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

51. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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: None.

52. An appropriation of \$25,740,600 under section 21 was approved in second reading by 88 votes to 9.

Section 22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator

53. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian

Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Belgium.

54. An appropriation of \$4,762,200 under section 22 was approved in second reading by 84 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

Section 23. Human rights

55. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: None.

56. An appropriation of \$9,689,900 under section 23 was approved in second reading by 96 votes to 1.

Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation57. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland.

58. An appropriation of \$27,248,100 under section 24 was approved in second reading by 83 votes to 10, with 5 abstentions.Section 25. International Court of Justice59. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: None.

60. An appropriation of \$7,573,200 under section 25 was approved in second reading by 97 votes to none.

Section 26. Legal activities

61. An appropriation of \$10,049,000 under section 26 was approved in second reading without objection.

Section 27. Department of Public Information

62. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, 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: Israel.

63. An appropriation of \$46,226,300 under section 27 was approved in second reading by 87 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

Section 28. Administration, management and general services

64. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, 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, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

65. An appropriation of \$213,008,400 under section 28 was approved in second reading by 79 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.

Section 29. Conference and library services

66. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan,

Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, 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: Israel, United States of America.

67. An appropriation of \$190,416,800 under section 29 was approved in second reading by 88 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

Section 30. United Nations bond issue

68. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Portugal.

69. An appropriation of \$17,056,000 under section 30 was approved in second reading by 86 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

Section 31. Staff assessment70. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 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: None.

Abstaining: None.

71. An appropriation of \$184,604,300 under section 31 was approved in second reading by 98 votes to none.

Section 32. Construction, alteration, improvement and major maintenance of premises72. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, 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: Afghanistan, Belgium, Brazil, Chad, Cuba, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Panama, Portugal, Romania, United States of America.

73. An appropriation of \$65,693,300 under section 32 was approved in second reading by 71 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

74. Mr. WANG Chengwei (China), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, if section 2 (Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities) had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained.

75. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to explain their vote before the vote on the proposed total budget appropriation in second reading.

76. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that international funds should not be used to finance propaganda and activities of a partisan nature within the Secretariat. Nor should they be used to sustain organs that ignored the sovereign rights of Member States. His delegation could not give its consent to the wasteful use of international resources for such questionable objectives. It would therefore abstain in the vote on the proposed total budget appropriation.

77. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the proposed total budget appropriation for the following reasons. Firstly, the figure for the proposed total budget appropriation was far higher than the original figure that had been proposed. Secondly, the Committee was constantly requested, and in most cases agreed, to approve additional resources without close consideration of possibilities for economy, absorption and redeployment. There was a particular need for active redeployment and other measures of rationalization. Thirdly, his delegation was perturbed at the increasing tendency to override the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for reasons that were not always well-founded. Fourthly, his delegation was concerned at the rather new phenomenon of procedural anomalies, which added a substantial burden to the United Nations budget. Moreover, it regretted the psychological link between consideration of the United Nations budget and the nature of resolutions adopted during the current session of the General Assembly in other areas, including personnel questions.

78. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) said that, although his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed total budget appropriation, it was concerned at the increasingly slow rate of growth of the programme budget. Moreover, his delegation had the impression that the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981 had been presented in a particular manner, in response to concerns

(Mr. Houna Golo, Chad)

or reservations expressed the previous year by a certain number of delegations representing the major contributors. Any change in the way in which the programme budget was presented should be made only in response to instructions from the General Assembly.

79. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that, unfortunately, his delegation could not support the appropriations recommended for the biennium 1980-1981. During the general debate on the budget, his delegation had already expressed concern about the over-all budgetary growth rate of 11.4 per cent compared with the real growth rate of 0.8 per cent. In its opinion, for a country such as Poland, which was a substantial contributor to the budget, it was the over-all growth rate that was important and, thus, the rate of 11.4 per cent was very high. He pointed out that, during the past three months, the level of proposed United Nations expenditure had been adjusted upwards, despite the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee. Moreover, during the current session, some of the Advisory Committee's recommendations had been rejected without thorough consideration. For example, the revised estimates for conference servicing were considerably higher than the original estimates. As a result, the over-all growth of the budget was much higher than had been expected.

80. He asked the Secretariat to comment on the real and over-all budgetary growth rates to which he had referred. It would also be useful to obtain the Secretariat's views on ways in which it could absorb more of the new activities by redeploying resources and eliminating activities that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective.

81. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, although his delegation was opposed to undue increases in the programme budget, which merely added to the burden borne by the Members of the United Nations, it would support the appropriations requested for the biennium 1980-1981 for the reasons which his delegation had stated in the debate on the programme budget earlier in the session. The recommended appropriations were required if the United Nations was to carry out its work properly, and they had in fact been studied thoroughly by the Committee.

82. Mr. BRODININGRAT (Indonesia) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General for his increasingly efficient planning of the use of resources. However, his delegation noted with concern that the policy of budgetary restraint was being implemented without due consideration for the programme aspects of the budget. It also noted that particularly generous appropriations were recommended under certain sections of the budget, for example, sections 27, 28 and 29, and it hoped that during the forthcoming biennium the performance of the departments concerned would justify that generosity; in particular it expected a substantial improvement in the deplorable documentation situation. He drew attention to the fact that almost 2 per cent of the absolute gross budgetary increase of 19 per cent was due to a serious miscalculation in the estimated costs of construction at Headquarters, which the Committee had unanimously deplored.

/...

(Mr. Brotodiningrat, Indonesia)

83. His delegation had explained its position on section 3 when it was considered in first reading, and it maintained that position. However, all things considered, it would vote in favour of the appropriations recommended for the biennium 1980-1981.

84. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the expenditure sections, as a whole.

85. A recorded vote was taken.

- In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, 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: China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

86. A total budget appropriation of \$1,247,793,200 was approved in second reading by 83 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

87. Mr. BRUCE (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, in contrast to the decision it had taken on the programme budget at the previous session, his delegation had been able to vote in favour of the current budget, even though there were several items of expenditure to which it was opposed. The factors responsible for his delegation's support of the budget were the following. First, the Secretary-General had submitted a good budget with a reasonable rate of growth designed to meet the new problems facing the international community. The additions proposed during the session had increased the budget substantially, but the final amount was acceptable. Accordingly, the revised budget reflected a compromise between those who wanted a rapid growth rate, and those who wanted a

/...

(Mr. Bruce, Canada)

slow growth rate, and he praised the work of the Secretary-General and his staff in that respect. Second, the United Nations was, and must be, a dynamic organization and must be ready to respond to serious challenges. Most of the activities for which additional appropriations had been requested were urgent and of high priority. Third, his delegation looked forward to the implementation of the resolution calling for the elimination of activities that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective, and it trusted that Member States would approve whatever reductions the Secretary-General proposed. Fourth, despite the fact that his delegation had been unable to support a number of resolutions and had opposed others, it had tried to work in a spirit of co-operation and compromise with a view to reaching agreement, whenever possible.

88. He expressed the hope that the budget which had been approved would satisfy the interests and concerns of both developed and developing countries and that the spirit of productive compromise shown during the current session would continue during the next session. If such a constructive approach was maintained, it would be possible to make the United Nations more effective and thus better able to respond to the new, serious challenges facing the world community, and particularly the developing countries.

89. Mr. McMAHON (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community, recalled that, during the general debate on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, those States had considered the real growth rate of the budget to be consistent with the Secretary-General's commitment to a policy of financial restraint and had commended him for his efforts. For that reason, none of those States had opposed the adoption of the budget. In their opinion, the policy of budgetary restraint should be continued, and the budget just approved should, in so far as possible, be maintained throughout the biennium. Moreover, the nine States wished to stress the importance they attached to the redeployment of resources within the Secretariat and, in particular, to the identification of activities that were completed, obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective. Accordingly, they had supported the relevant resolution adopted by the Committee during the current session.

/...

(Mr. McMahon, Ireland)

90. However, the nine States had reservations about a number of the appropriations approved, in particular with regard to several individual budget sections. They were also concerned at the inadequate procedures for estimating construction costs and the growth of the bureaucracy of the United Nations Secretariat, often at the expense of operational activities. In that connexion, the nine States were especially concerned at the absence of any significant redeployment of resources within the Organization. In their opinion, through the constant evaluation of the usefulness of programmes, the Secretary-General should be able substantially to redeploy resources and thereby reduce the need for additional appropriations in future.

91. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) reiterated his delegation's appreciation for the laudable efforts of the Secretary-General to present a budget that was honest, rather than padded, and to control the rate of real programme growth in expenditures and to maintain programme levels. He trusted that programme managers would be persuaded that the most effective way to obtain financial resources in the future would be to complete some of the tasks assigned to them. In that endeavour, they would be aided by the programme planning to be undertaken by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its twentieth session.

92. At the beginning of the debate on the 1980-1981 programme budget, his delegation had hoped that the 0.8 per cent average rate of real programme growth would not be exceeded, and its hope had been reinforced by the comments of representatives of both developed and developing countries. For example, one representative, upon learning what his country's contribution to the United Nations budget would be, had noted that contributions from the developed countries were paid out of their marginal resources, whereas those from the developing countries utilized funds that would otherwise be allocated to meet basic domestic needs. That same representative had also asserted that the developed countries were trying to exploit that situation and to maintain the balance of contributions in their favour. Accordingly, one would expect that it would be the developing countries, rather than the developed countries, which steadfastly resisted large increases in their budgetary contributions stemming from additional appropriations. Paradoxically, the voting record of delegations in the Committee showed that the opposite was true. The representative to whom he had alluded had been in the forefront of those supporting increases in programme expenditures in voting on every proposal submitted to the Fifth Committee, regardless of the ultimate financial implications.

93. One way to mitigate the adverse impact of increases in the United Nations budget on individual nations was to encourage the United Nations Administration to produce honest, restrained budgets which satisfied the basic needs of Member States without straining their capacity to meet their contributions. Another way was to encourage United Nations programme managers to make the most efficient and effective use of the resources placed at their disposal, to establish priorities

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

and to complete one task before beginning another. Moreover, the interests of individual Member States could be further protected by exercising the utmost prudence and restraint in voting on budgetary increases and in approving new activities which further complicated and increased the already heavy workload of the United Nations.

94. With regard to the suggestion by some delegations that a ceiling should be placed on increases in contributions, he asked whether those same delegations would support a ceiling on additional appropriations, which would cost Member States more than \$65 million, over and above the \$1,182,000,000 recommended by the Advisory Committee for the coming biennium.

95. His delegation could not but regret the fact that the United Nations budget was much higher than it should be and higher than many Governments were prepared to accept. In his delegation's opinion, a large number of unnecessary activities had been approved. Moreover, negotiated understandings reached in other Committees had been violated when financial action had been taken in the Fifth Committee. His delegation also strongly disagreed with determined efforts made during the session to alter long-standing accommodations concerning the financing of United Nations conferences and the payment of travel for representatives to attend United Nations meetings. A number of the decisions taken by the majority had included the financing, under the United Nations regular budget, of exclusive, segregated meetings and of travel costs for a small number of Member States, in clear violation of the principle of universality, which was essential to the continuation of a viable United Nations. In addition, certain political activities directly violating the Charter had been approved, as had the financing, under the regular budget, of such outside activities as the United Nations International School. Moreover, his delegation deplored the growth of the bureaucracy of the United Nations, which was due to the unwarranted addition of several new posts, especially senior posts, and the unjustifiably high level of United Nations salaries, benefits and allowances. Lastly, the unprecedented display of opposition to the Administration's proposals by individual staff members and units and the open lobbying by the Secretariat had also influenced his Government's position.

96. Under the circumstances, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, as a clear indication of its concern about a number of regrettable budget actions. It had refrained from casting a negative vote in order to give the United Nations a final opportunity to exercise fiscal moderation.

97. Miss GILES (Australia) explained that her delegation had voted in favour of the programme budget, as a whole, in recognition of the efforts made by the Secretary-General to control budgetary expenditures. However, equal restraint was not apparent in the additional appropriations requested and, as a result, the real growth rate of the budget was barely within acceptable political limits for her delegation. There was a continuing need to keep expenditures at a minimum, and the Secretariat must ensure greater efficiency and selectivity in carrying out its activities and must pursue a fiscally responsible budgetary policy. Her delegation

/...

(Miss Giles, Australia)

had noted that the current budget reflected the concerns previously expressed by those countries which provided the bulk of United Nations finances. Those concerns were real, and any attempt to disregard them would be irresponsible in the short term and disastrous in the long term, for the United Nations could not remain untouched by political realities.

98. Her delegation realized that the United Nations must also bear in mind the pressing needs of the developing countries and their desire to obtain United Nations assistance in meeting those needs. It understood that, in response to those needs, United Nations activities were expanding into new areas, and her delegation had supported such activities. However, it felt equally strongly about the pressing need for continued financial restraint. The solution lay in greater efficiency, in closer attention to what needed to be done, and greater emphasis on identifying and eliminating obsolete activities and those of marginal usefulness. The United Nations must consider ways of increasing its output, while reconsidering the manner in which it performed its work. Moreover, ways must be found of building discipline and incentives for efficiency and rational planning into the system.

99. In conclusion, while her delegation supported the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981 for the reasons she had explained, it was concerned about the large sums added to the Secretary-General's original proposals. Unless the effort to exercise budgetary restraint was continued, her delegation could not promise its support in future.

100. Miss GUIMARAES (Brazil) stressed the difficulties involved in drawing up an acceptable proposed programme budget in conditions of widespread and growing international inflation and said that the debates in the Committee had reflected the general concern to find ways of continuing the essential activities of the Organization, in particular those of special interest to the developing countries, without indulging in a policy of budgetary expansion. Accordingly, the main object of the Committee's work must be to provide the Secretary-General with guidance in his effort to encourage the continued rationalization of the administrative system. The Committee should deliberately seek to eliminate non-essential expenditures and to promote a more efficient use of the resources available. Internal resources must be redeployed, whenever possible, in financial terms as well as in terms of staff and equipment. Moreover, the recruitment of temporary and external staff could, in her delegation's opinion, be reduced by improving personnel administration and by making greater use of the vast knowledge and experience of the current staff of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies.

101. However, no effort to improve management would be sufficient without a careful selection of priorities and, in that connexion, each country must consider the financial implications of every proposed activity before approving it. As her delegation had stressed during the debate on agenda item 98, it was particularly

/...

(Miss Guimaraes, Brazil)

concerned at the unabated expansion of the Organization's regular budget in recent years, despite the Secretary-General's efforts towards budgetary restraint. However, in her delegation's opinion, the reduction of expenditures should not interfere with the effort to meet the urgent needs of developing countries, which should be given the highest priority. The solution to that apparent paradox perhaps lay in constantly improving administrative methods and, at the same time, avoiding unjustified increases in requests for additional funds. In that connexion, the United Nations system of medium-term planning was a valuable instrument for determining the direction to be taken. However, Member States must also increase their ability judiciously to control and evaluate the Organization's programmes and, accordingly, her delegation had supported the resolution requesting the Secretary-General to study ways of eliminating activities that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective.

102. Mrs. SANDIFER (Portugal) explained that her delegation had decided to vote in favour of the budget estimates, submitted in document A/C.5/34/L.48, as an expression of appreciation to the Secretary-General for his efforts to control the budget and as an encouragement to him to continue those efforts. However, it wished to stress its view that during the coming biennium stringent efforts must be made, at all levels in the Secretariat, to contain expenditure and to redeploy both financial and human resources, particularly through the identification of activities that were completed, were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective, in order to ensure that the budget approved by the Committee was followed. Her delegation's position was based on two factors, namely, that budgetary restraint must be practised at the United Nations just as it was at the national level, and that United Nations activities must be of full benefit to all the peoples of the world, particularly those in greatest need. Resources must not be wasted in endlessly building up the bureaucratic machine.

103. Her delegation deeply regretted the fact that the Committee had not been able to fulfil its mandate properly and study carefully all the matters submitted to it, because of constant delays in the issuing of documentation and, in many cases, its incompleteness or defectiveness. Those problems had also hampered the extremely important work of the Advisory Committee, especially in connexion with resolutions from the Second Committee. Perhaps there was a lack of co-ordination between the secretariats of the Second and Fifth Committees. In any case, her delegation hoped that similar situations would not recur with such frequency and that the Fifth Committee would not be forced to work under such intense time pressures in future.

104. Mr. VICARIO (Spain) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the appropriations recommended for the biennium 1980-1981, in keeping with its tradition of support and prompt contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations. However, it was important to bear in mind the problems raised by the "full budgeting" procedure currently used by the United Nations and the fact that all the possible cost implications must be known before activities

/...

(Mr. Vicario, Spain)

were approved. Accordingly, special caution must be exercised with regard to the expenditure sections of the budget, and his delegation would examine most carefully any additional appropriations requested in 1980 because of inflation or currency depreciation.

105. Moreover, in his delegation's opinion, the Secretariat must be truly effective in identifying activities which were completed, obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective. By the same token, the recommendations of the Advisory Committee should be considered in accordance with the most stringent administrative and budgetary methodology, and no extraneous factors should be allowed to influence the Fifth Committee's discussions of them.

106. As to the conditions of work under which the Committee had at times been obliged to function, the fact that documentation had not been received on time and that the Committee had been obliged to take decisions on important questions without sufficient reflection had negatively affected the Committee's consideration of the budget. Lastly, his delegation noted with concern the over-all increase in the regular budget for the biennium which, in view of his country's growing contribution to the United Nations regular budget, imposed an especially heavy burden on the Spanish economy.

107. Mr. PAL (India) said that, during the general debate on the programme budget, his delegation had expressed concern at the parameters within which the budget had been elaborated, in particular at the Secretary-General's goal of keeping the budgetary growth rate as close to zero as possible. The Secretary-General had not received any mandate to that effect from the General Assembly but had adopted that goal purely because of the opposition expressed by the major contributors to the continued growth of the budget. His delegation was concerned that, by setting an arbitrary budgetary ceiling, the Secretariat might be obliged to sacrifice programmes that needed a continued high level of resources; moreover, it considered it to be a very unhealthy precedent for the Secretary-General to be guided by the wishes of a minority, however powerful. In his delegation's opinion, such a precedent ran counter to the principles on which the United Nations was based.

108. His delegation's fears had been borne out by the fact that, in several cases, programmes previously approved by intergovernmental bodies or by the General Assembly had not been fully provided for in the budget proposals. It had thus been necessary to adopt unusual procedures, for example, the Second Committee had been obliged to refer to the Fifth Committee resolutions which contained financial implications, not arising from decisions taken during the current session but from work programmes which had already been approved but which had not been reflected in the budget. He expressed the hope that in future no further attempt would be made to include in the budget only part of the resources needed for the satisfactory execution of programmes.

109. With regard to the frequent recommendation that the Secretariat should absorb proposed increases within existing appropriations, he said that the practice of financial osmosis might already have been pushed too far, because a certain amount of real growth was necessary in order to execute programmes properly.

/...

(Mr. Pal, India)

110. The Advisory Committee had performed its functions with its usual efficiency, and the fact that so few of its proposals had been changed reflected the trust Member States placed in that body. However, his delegation wished that there had been a greater spirit of understanding on the part of those delegations that had attacked any request for a revision of the Advisory Committee's recommendations as instances of fiscal irresponsibility. He pointed out that the budgetary effects of the changes the Fifth Committee had made in the Advisory Committee's recommendations had been minimal. In that connexion, even when they had been unhappy with the appropriations recommended, the developing countries had exercised great restraint. Therefore, the budget had in fact grown, but it had grown within very narrow limits, which should be acceptable to all Member States.

111. His delegation continued to believe that the contributions of the developing countries to the United Nations budget represented a sacrifice for them, whereas the contributions of the major contributors had a marginal impact on their economies. That view was borne out by statistics. Such sacrifices were made in the belief that the United Nations was the source of hope for the future, and it was somewhat offensive to cast doubt on them.

112. Mr. J. DROUSHIOTIS (Cyprus) said that, had his delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of the appropriations under sections 1, 2 and 3.

Income sections

113. The total estimate of \$221,343,200 under income sections 1, 2 and 3 was approved in second reading without objection.

Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/34/L.48, parts I-IV)

114. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) observed that, since the figures for actual expenditure during the biennium 1978-1979 and the level of appropriations for 1980-1981 were now known, it should be possible to calculate the approximate percentage of real growth in the budget.

115. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) asked what would be done with the saving of approximately \$1 million from the biennium 1978-1979 which the Secretary-General had reported in the performance report. That amount had apparently not been offset against the appropriations for 1980-1981.

116. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) drew attention to draft resolution VIII C in document A/C.5/34/L.48, part IV, which dealt with the financing of appropriations for the year 1980. It was indicated in paragraph 1 of that draft resolution that the appropriations approved for the biennium 1980-1981 were to be decreased by the amount of saving for the biennium 1978-1979.

/...

(Mr. Ruedas)

117. The Secretariat would calculate the rate of real growth in accordance with the methodology approved by the Fifth Committee.

118. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) observed that the figure given for net expenditure in paragraph 1 of part I of the draft report was \$1,214,478,600, which obviously included staff assessment. That figure might give rise to misunderstanding and, accordingly, he wondered whether it might not be more appropriate to give the figure \$1,026,450,000, which would reflect net expenditure less staff assessment.

119. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that it was the practice of the Committee to indicate in its report to the General Assembly the estimate for income other than that derived from staff assessment. Paragraph 3 of part I of the draft report contained the estimate for staff assessment, which was to be transferred to the Tax Equalization Fund. In order to obtain the net assessment level, it was necessary to deduct staff assessment from the figure for net expenditure in paragraph 1.

120. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that the transfer of staff assessment to the Tax Equalization Fund was only the first step in calculating the assessments of Member States. For those countries which did not tax the salaries of United Nations staff members, an amount was credited against their assessed contribution. Countries which taxed the salaries of staff members, on the other hand, did not receive such a credit.

121. The CHAIRMAN said he wondered whether it might not be useful to indicate the net assessment level somewhere in the Committee's report to the General Assembly so that Member States could have a better idea of what their assessed contribution was likely to be.

122. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that calculating the actual assessment level was even more complicated than simply deducting staff assessment from the figure for net expenditure. A number of other adjustments, which were referred to in draft resolution VIII C in part IV of the draft report, would also have to be made.

123. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) suggested that it should be indicated in a foot-note to either paragraph 1 or paragraph 3 of part I of the draft report that the net appropriation would be adjusted downwards to obtain the assessment level.

124. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, in the light of the discussion, she wondered whether the figure for net expenditure had any meaning at all for practical purposes.

125. Mr. DEBATIN (Under-Secretary-General for Administration, Finance and Management) said that he understood the desire of delegations to have a simplified picture. It was necessary, however, to comply with the Financial Rules of the Organization. It was necessary to know, for example, the net appropriation for the biennium, which was obtained by subtracting income other than staff assessment from the gross appropriation. That figure was the starting point for the financing

/...

(Mr. Debatin)

of the budget. The figure for net expenditure would be subjected to several refinements in order to obtain the amount which Member States would have to pay. He saw no reason, however, why a foot-note could not be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly indicating for information purposes that staff assessment, as well as a number of other amounts, were to be deducted from the figure for net expenditure.

126. The CHAIRMAN suggested that it might be sufficient to include a foot-note drawing attention to the draft resolution on the financing of appropriations for the year 1980 in part IV of the draft report.

127. Mr. BROCHARD (France), referring to the French version of part III of document A/C.5/34/L.48, remarked that in the last paragraph of page 15, the result of the vote was erroneously given as 4 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

128. The CHAIRMAN said that the error pointed out by the French representative would be corrected. The result of the vote had been 83 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

129. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the report on the question of medium-term planning in the United Nations, which appeared at the beginning of part III of document A/C.5/34/L.48, should have been included in the context of the item on the Joint Inspection Unit or of the item on the Economic and Social Council, not in the context of the item on the budget. The draft resolution introduced by his delegation was too broad in scope to be included under item 98.

130. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that at its thirty-third session the General Assembly had decided to consider the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in the context of the proposed programme budget. Thus, at the current session, the Fifth Committee had taken up the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination under item 98. The question of medium-term planning had been considered under item 101, Joint Inspection Unit. The Fifth Committee's report to the plenary Assembly on item 101 referred to the fact that medium-term planning had been considered in the context of item 98. It was not possible, at the present stage, to make any changes. However, draft resolution I (A/C.5/34/L.48, part IV) was entitled "Medium-term planning in the United Nations" and thus the General Assembly would be adopting a separate resolution on that question.

131. Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico) said that his delegation shared the concern of the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. However, he also understood the practical problems involved in changing the report. He suggested that when the Rapporteur introduced the report in the plenary Assembly, he should inform the Assembly that the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on medium-term planning had erroneously been included under agenda item 98 and that the Assembly should take note of the question of medium-term planning in the United Nations in the context of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit. In other words, so as not to delay submission of the report, it would be orally revised by the Rapporteur in the plenary Assembly.

/...

132. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) agreed to the Mexican suggestion.

133. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados) and Mr. RAMOS (Cape Verde) said that the names of their delegations should appear in the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/34/L.26, which was mentioned in part III, section B, of the draft report.

134. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the paragraphs on the United Nations International School (A/C.5/34/L.48, part III, sect. G), contained no reference to the separate recorded vote that had been taken on the sum of \$3,515,000. He insisted that the result of the vote on that appropriation should be reflected in the draft report.

135. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) explained that, pursuant to a decision of the General Assembly, the report of the Committee was not a full summary of the discussion on any particular item. Part III simply listed specific proposals that had been made to the Committee by delegations and the action that had been taken on them. It dealt only with substantive decisions, not with the approval of appropriations. Even part I, which dealt with appropriations did not include a summary of the votes taken, except where proposals had been made during the discussion. In each case, the details could be found in the summary records. On the question of the United Nations International School, the summary record of the 71st meeting of the Fifth Committee showed that neither the vote on the appropriation nor the votes on the draft decisions had been recorded votes.

136. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad), referring to page 15 of the French version of document A/C.5/34/L.48, part III, noted that the Tunisian proposal was reported with the words ... parallèlement à l'octroi As he recalled, when the Tunisian representative had made the proposal, he had used the words ... consécutivement à l'octroi In the English version of the draft report, the word "simultaneously" was used. Neither the French nor the English version correctly reflected the Tunisian proposal.

137. During the discussion of the question, one delegation had stressed that the subsidy should be given to the United Nations International School only after the review of its accounts. Obviously, the situation changed according to whether the word consécutivement was used or whether the word parallèlement was used.

138. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the entire discussion between the delegations of the United States and Tunisia had dealt with the nuances of the words consécutivement and "simultaneously".

139. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that it would be very easy to ascertain which word should be used in the report by replaying the tape of the meeting in question. His understanding of the Tunisian proposal had been the one that was reflected in the English version of the draft report. He would defer to the experts, but hoped that they would not try to alter history.

140. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria), Rapporteur, said that, as he recalled the discussion, the Tunisian representative had held that the study by the Board of Auditors should not be made prior to the subsidy, whereas the United States representative had argued that the subsidy should be provided only if the accounts were reviewed. As representative of Algeria, he had argued that the subsidy should not be tied to the review of the accounts of the School.

141. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the statements made at the meeting had been recorded in the original language. He would therefore ask the Secretariat to verify from the tapes which word had been used by the Tunisian representative and to correct the draft report accordingly.

142. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria), Rapporteur, drew attention to possible translation errors in the English and Spanish versions of paragraph 3 of draft resolution IX (A/C.5/34/L.48, part IV). The French original had une décision, which, he felt, was not accurately reflected in the English and Spanish versions. He suggested a possible English translation might be "a decision".

143. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that draft resolution IX on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1980-1981 contained two departures from previous drafting practice which had been recommended by the Advisory Committee and approved by the General Assembly. Delegations would notice that in paragraph 1 the words "or subsequent to" had been introduced in the fifth line and in paragraph 3 the wording in the third and fourth lines had been made more precise to read "before the thirty-fifth or between the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth session". The new wording would also be used in future resolutions on the subject.

144. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee) said that there was an error in the English version of section XI of draft resolution XI (A/C.5/34/L.48, part IV). Paragraph 2 of that section should be deleted; it was in fact the same wording as section XII.

145. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division), replying to the question raised by the representative of Indonesia (para. 114 above), said that calculating the rate of growth of the budget was very complicated but, since the budget consisted essentially of salaries, it would be possible to work out a rough approximation of budget growth by examining the growth in staff, despite differences in salaries and post adjustments. He noted that of the 142 new established posts proposed by the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee had rejected 33, which meant that there would be 109 new posts; when compared with the total staff of approximately 11,000, that gave an increase of approximately 1 per cent. He noted that the revised estimates for 1978-1979 were below initial expectations, owing to delays in recruitment and a higher-than-expected vacancy rate, which meant that, despite the formal increase of approximately 1 per cent, the total number of staff actually working for the Organization had not changed.

146. Mr. DE FACQ (Belgium) said that he had made the same calculation and arrived at a figure of 1.16 per cent real growth.

147. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve draft resolutions VIII A, VIII B, VIII C, IX and X in document A/C.5/34/L.48, part IV.

Draft resolution VIII A

148. Draft resolution VIII A was adopted by 83 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

Draft resolution VIII B

149. Draft resolution VIII B was adopted without objection.

Draft resolution VIII C

150. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, 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: China, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

151. Draft resolution VIII C was adopted by 80 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.*

Draft resolution IX

152. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde,

* The Brazilian delegation later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution VIII C.

Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: None.

153. Draft resolution IX was adopted by 89 votes to 8.*

Draft resolution X

154. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

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

* The Brazilian delegation later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution IX.

Abstaining: None.

155. Draft resolution X was adopted by 87 votes to 9.*

156. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft report (A/C.5/34/L.48, parts I to IV).

157. It was so decided.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

158. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, for the good conduct of the Committee's work in future, any serious or unwarranted delay in the submission of the proposed programme budget attributable to a particular Secretariat unit should be penalized. As a first step, the Fifth Committee should indicate in its report to the Assembly the names of the department heads concerned, some of whom seemed to prefer that their proposals should not be exposed to the carefully considered judgement of the international community. In his opinion, it was essential that the bodies responsible for the preliminary examination of the programme budget - the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination - should be able to complete their work before the beginning of the General Assembly session. That would greatly facilitate the work of the Fifth Committee and would prevent the Advisory Committee from being overburdened during the Assembly session, as had occurred during the past few months, with questions on which its opinion should have been given earlier. Lastly, that would enable the Chairman of the Fifth Committee to hold meetings at times that were most convenient for all of its members.

159. He also suggested that the Secretary-General should take steps to end the phenomenon commonly known as "lobbying", in which international civil servants sought to persuade delegations to take particular action, by clearly attempting to exert pressure on them. No member of the Secretariat should be allowed in a conference room, unless officially authorized to be there by virtue of his functions. He requested that that matter should be brought to the personal attention of the Secretary-General. It was particularly annoying and unacceptable to see self-styled emissaries of international civil servants preaching what they considered to be right while problems involving the material interests of the staff were being discussed. He appealed to everyone to reflect on the service expected of national and international civil servants and diplomats and to devote every effort to fulfilling those expectations, to be less anxious to derive maximum benefits from the international community and to avoid creating specially privileged groups.

160. As to the programme budget, it was still too much concerned with objects of expenditure and not sufficiently programme-oriented. Efforts should focus on encouraging the execution of practical programmes of benefit to the international

* The Brazilian delegation later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution X.

community, particularly the developing countries, and not on fueling an administrative machine that already showed signs of existing merely for itself.

161. The General Assembly, through CPC, which was now a subsidiary organ of the Assembly as well as of the Economic and Social Council, should ensure that all appropriations approved were strictly and rigorously utilized for the execution of programmes and that no sum, however small, was wasted through negligence or used to promote special interests. Anyone failing to work towards that goal, which was in fact in the common good, should be dismissed, for there was such need in the world today that any laxity in that respect was intolerable.

162. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work for the thirty-fourth session.

The meeting rose at 7.55 p.m.