



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 46th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ARASTOU (Islamic Republic of Iran)

later: Mr. OKEYO (Kenya)

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

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 50: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 116: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 49: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL
FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 119: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued)**
- AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)**

Programme budget implications of draft resolution B contained in document
A/43/32 concerning agenda item 119

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2 750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/43/SR.46
15 December 1988

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 50: CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(A/43/932)

AGENDA ITEM 116: FINANCIAL EMERGENCY OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

(A/C.5/43/29 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. STRÖMHOLM (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, sa'd that the United Nations required strong support if it was to maintain its peace-keeping role and to meet the global challenges of the coming decade. It was unacceptable that a financial crisis should prevent the Organisation from carrying out its mandated activities and jeopardize the orderly reform process initiated as a result of General Assembly resolution 41/213.
2. Although the Secretary-General had noted some positive developments over the past year, it was quite clear from his report on the financial emergency (A/C.5/43/29) that the Organisation remained very vulnerable. Even the cash reserve projection for the end of 1988 appeared to be excessively optimistic. The Nordic delegations agreed with the conclusions that emerged from the Secretary-General's consultations with regional groups and an informal group of permanent representatives to the effect that any solution must address both the short- and long-term aspects of the problem; that full and timely payment of contributions was essential; that the reserves of the Organization must be replenished; and that the most effective means of replenishing the reserves was the payment of arrears. It also noted the Secretary-General's view that, failing the payment of arrears, the United Nations might have to ask Member States and international entities for interest-free loans.
3. The General Assembly must give urgent attention to both the cash and the reserve aspects of the financial crisis, as the Secretary-General could not be expected to achieve substantial further savings. In the interests of coherence, the two agenda items dealing with the current financial crisis and the financial emergency should be merged and addressed at an earlier stage of each General Assembly session. The report of the Secretary-General should also contain clearer indications of when Member States paid their assessments and a concise description of the effects of the financial crisis on the Organization's activities. In that connection, it would be useful if the Secretariat were to clarify how it had adapted to the shortfall of resources during 1988.
4. Member States should continue to hold consultations on the sound financial functioning of the United Nations, including discussions of existing or additional ways and means to encourage the payment of arrears. Such discussions assumed even greater importance in view of the need for expanded peace-keeping operations, which must not be hampered by a lack of resources. Additional efforts were required, especially on the part of certain Member States, to ensure the payment of sums which were far from burdensome. The Nordic countries, for their part, intended to pay their assessed contributions for 1989, as was their custom, at the very beginning of the year.

5. Mr. RALLIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that agenda items 50 and 116, as two aspects of the same problem, should in the future be merged in order to facilitate their consideration.

6. It was impossible not to be seriously concerned by the continuing increase in the Organization's deficit. The United Nations had avoided insolvency in 1988 only as a result of lower than anticipated expenditures due primarily to currency fluctuations and higher vacancy rates. It would not be in a position to meet any additional unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for peace-keeping operations before the end of 1989 because no allowance had been made for such contingencies in the cash flow projection. It was therefore understandable that the Secretary-General might wish to implement certain measures. Borrowing, however, would be only a short-term remedy. Interest-free loans would also fail to address the core of the problem, and the case of UNIDO did not constitute a precedent for that purpose. The only durable solution to the Organization's financial crisis lay in the payment by all Member States of their assessed contributions promptly and in full.

7. Despite some progress towards the payment of outstanding arrears for peace-keeping operations, continued withholding was still causing major difficulties. It was the view of the Twelve that financial responsibility for such operations should, in accordance with Article 17 of the Charter, be shared by all Member States in the proportions established by the General Assembly for that purpose. The withholding of contributions not only caused serious financial problems for the operations themselves but also imposed a disproportionate burden on troop-contributing States, many of which were developing countries. The fact that unpaid reimbursements to such States would amount to \$310.6 million at the end of 1988 was deplorable. The Organization's peace-keeping activities remained in operation only because the troop-contributing States continued to bear an unfairly heavy burden.

8. Those States, including the Twelve, which had always paid their contributions to both the regular budget and peace-keeping operations promptly and in full were carrying a relatively larger share of the actual expenditure of the United Nations than was reflected in their assessed share. The Twelve appealed to all Member States to fulfil their obligations in accordance with the principle of collective financial responsibility and regarded the withholding of assessed contributions to be a breach of Charter obligations.

AGENDA ITEM 49: REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL FUNCTIONING OF THE UNITED NATIONS (*continued*) (A/43/16 and Corr.1 (Part I) and Add.1 and A/43/16 (Part II) and Add.1, A/43/324, 524 and 929)

9. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that paragraphs 2 to 16 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/43/929) explained how the preliminary estimate of the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 1990-1991 had been calculated. The Secretary-General had estimated total programme resources for the biennium 1990-1991 at \$1,763.7 million at 1988 rates, compared with the initial appropriations of \$1,769.6 million for the

(Mr. Mselle)

biennium 1988-1989. After detailed examination of the Secretary-General's proposals, ACABQ had recommended that a 5 per cent vacancy rate rather than the proposed rate of 3 per cent be used to calculate staff costs for the outline, leading to a reduction of \$16,155,000 (at 1988 rates) from the preliminary estimate. On the other hand, it had recommended an addition of \$14,264,800, representing the cost (at 1988 rates) of programme decisions proposed so far for adoption at the forty-third session of the General Assembly and approved by the Advisory Committee, together with an addition of \$5,308,000 (at 1988 rates), being the cost of a net addition of 50 posts over and above the 9,957 posts proposed for the biennium 1990-1991 in document A/C.5/43/1/Rev.1.

10. The total preliminary estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee at 1988 rates was therefore \$1,767,060,000, without taking into account charges for unforeseen and extraordinary expenditures. A problem with regard to the outline submission date was addressed in paragraph 3 of the report of the Advisory Committee, which had recommended that the Secretary-General should exercise the best possible discretion to anticipate changes in programme activities to be introduced during the year in which the outline was considered. Although it would seem to be impossible for the Secretary-General to anticipate all programme changes arising from intergovernmental decisions, the delay experienced in 1988 in estimating requirements within the Secretary-General's jurisdiction, and particularly for such a substantial project as the Integrated Management Information System, should not be repeated. Recosting at 1990-1991 rates would bring the total preliminary estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee for the biennium 1990-1991 to \$1,982,523,700.

11. Paragraphs 17 to 31 of the Advisory Committee's report addressed the difficult problem of how to deal with future changes in currency and inflation rates. The General Assembly, in resolution 41/213, had expressed the desire that additional expenditures to cover such fluctuations should be accommodated within the overall level of the budget. The Advisory Committee had once again held extensive consultations with representatives of the specialized agencies and the United Nations and noted the various new procedures adopted by certain of those agencies. Those included the expression of budgets in the local currency of the host country, the collection of "split assessments" and the forward purchasing of currency. Further details of all those systems could be provided if necessary. The Advisory Committee had, however, concluded that no method so far tried was fully satisfactory. It had therefore proposed two options for consideration by the General Assembly. Either the current system of annual adjustments could continue, or a reserve might be established, as briefly explained in paragraphs 27 to 30 of document A/43/929. Further information on technical aspects of the reserve could be provided if the option attracted detailed comments. In that connection, the Fifth Committee's attention was drawn in particular to paragraph 31 of the Advisory Committee's report.

12. ACABQ had recommended that the contingency fund be set at \$15 million at 1990-1991 rates and had provided, in paragraphs 35 and 36 of its report, technical guidelines with respect to the determination of its size. The amount of the fund

(Mr. Mselle)

was in addition to the preliminary estimate of resources at 1990-1991 rates. As indicated in paragraph 34, no advance appropriation should yet be made in respect of the contingency fund but amounts, within its limit, should be appropriated as needed.

13. Mr. CHABALA (Zambia), Vice-Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), introducing that Committee's report on the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 1990-1991, said that CPC's discussion of the matter was reflected in paragraphs 13 to 35 of document A/43/16 (Part II). The conclusions and recommendations had been adopted by consensus.

14. CPC considered that the report of the Secretary-General (A/43/524) constituted the basis for a decision by the General Assembly. The eight points reflected in paragraph 30 of the CPC report included such important reminders as the need for a strict observance of the financing of the programme budget once it had been approved and appropriated; the need to have a budget outline that would preclude a negative impact on mandated programmes; the need to treat the outline as an evolving exercise to be approached with flexibility, while respecting the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211; and the recognition that the level of the contingency fund, expressed as a percentage of the overall level of resources, was to be in addition to the proposed preliminary estimates of the Secretary-General as adjusted by appropriate estimates of inflation and currency fluctuations.

15. With regard to the level of the contingency fund, the views of CPC were reflected in paragraph 18 and 19 of its report. Some delegations had supported the 0.75 per cent initially recommended by the Secretary-General, others considered the percentage to be too low, while still others felt that it could be subject to review during the biennium.

16. A third issue concerned the treatment of priorities. CPC felt that the paragraphs on priorities in the Secretary-General's report (A/43/524, paras. 8 and 9) did not satisfactorily address the request made in General Assembly resolution 41/213 for the submission of "priorities, reflecting general trends of a broad sectoral nature". In paragraph 31 of its conclusions and recommendations, CPC pointed out that the distribution of staff resources among the various parts of the budget did not represent the establishment of priorities among the various activities of the Organization. CPC emphasized the need for the Secretary-General, in developing his detailed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991, to reflect the priorities deriving from the current medium-term plan as revised. It had further emphasized the need for the implementation by intergovernmental subsidiary bodies of the pertinent regulations and rules governing the setting of priorities. CPC had also requested the Secretary-General to present a report on the treatment of priorities for consideration at its twenty-ninth session.

17. He drew particular attention to paragraphs 23 to 27 of the report (A/43/16 (Part II)). As indicated in paragraph 23, efforts had been made to establish a list of issues which could serve as a framework for determining priorities

(Mr. Chabala, Zambia)

reflecting general trends of a broad sectoral nature. There had been no general agreement on the status of such a list; however, it represented a first step in the right direction.

18. Lastly, in paragraph 35, CPC noted that the proposed programme budget outline was reflected in the revised estimates of the Secretary-General, and reiterated that the level of resources for the biennium 1990-1991, while reflecting the negative real growth of 9.6 per cent proposed by the Secretary-General, should be adequate for the fulfilment of the objectives of the Organisation.

19. He believed that CPC had fulfilled in a positive and constructive manner the expanded mandate given to it by the General Assembly in its resolution 41/213, and he trusted that its recommendations would facilitate an agreement in the Fifth Committee.

20. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) asked why such important questions as the outline of the proposed programme budget and the financial crisis were being discussed at the very end of the session, when there was not enough time to consider them adequately.

21. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that Algeria had raised a point which would need to be taken into account in future demands regarding the timing of the submission of the outline and its consideration by the General Assembly. In view of the need to submit an outline for 1990-1991 using the most reliable estimated requirements, decisions taken by the General Assembly and other legislative organs after the Secretary-General had prepared his outline, but before the outline was approved by the General Assembly, could not be ignored. Secondly, the Secretariat must be allowed to communicate to the General Assembly the most recent rates of inflation and currency rates. To do otherwise would be unrealistic. Therefore it had been necessary for the Secretariat to submit the currency rates applicable for December and the average inflation rates applicable for 1988. Those reasons had led the Advisory Committee to delay submitting its report, which could have been submitted in September; in that case, however, there would have been a need for another addendum to the report at the present time, which would have led to confusion and unnecessary complication. The Fifth Committee would have to decide whether the procedure followed at the current session was right or wrong; if it was not acceptable, the Committee should so indicate. He felt that the current procedure had enabled the Fifth Committee to have an outline which was as realistic as could possibly be proposed.

22. Mr. GOMEZ (Controller) said that the reasons for delaying the discussion of the financial emergency and crisis were similar to those given by Mr. Mselle. Holding the debate as close to 1989 as possible enabled the Secretariat to provide Member States with more up-to-date information.

23. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he took note of the explanations offered. However, he felt that there were several elements on which the debate could have been held, including the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. That exact figures were not available until the end of the session did not mean that some aspects of the calculation of the figures could not have been considered sooner. As for the financial crisis, the real problem was not the amount of revenues but rather the practice of withholding contributions as such.

24. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that he would be grateful for clarification about the additional item included in paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/43/929) concerning an integrated management information system. He wondered whether the item was entirely a non-recurring expenditure or whether some element of it, such as staff costs, might be recurrent. If the latter were the case, he asked whether an estimate of the breakdown between recurrent and non-recurrent expenditures would be made available.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that such a breakdown would be provided the following day.

AGENDA ITEM 119: PATTERN OF CONFERENCES (continued) (A/43/32 and Corr.1 and 2; A/C.5/43/11; A/C.5/43/L.9, L.10)

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on the draft resolutions contained in document A/C.5/43/L.9.

27. Draft resolutions A, C, D and E were adopted without a vote.

28. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution B and suggested that the Committee should take action first on the amendments proposed by Argentina in document A/C.5/43/L.10, and then on the draft resolution as a whole.

29. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) supported by Mr. SANGA (United Republic of Tanzania), proposed that in its report on the item to the plenary Assembly the Committee should specify that nothing in paragraph 4 (c) of draft resolution B should be construed as giving the Committee on Conferences any role in the budgetary process or authority to override decisions on programmes and on meetings and conferences duly decided upon by legislative organs of the United Nations. If such an interpretation were reported to the General Assembly, his delegation would join in the consensus.

30. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that Uganda's point was well taken. However, his delegation would like to see the text of Uganda's proposal before taking a decision on it.

31. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) requested that a vote should be taken on the Argentine proposal contained in document A/C.5/43/L.10. Speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, she noted with regret that a consensus had not been reached on the size and composition of the Committee on Conferences. Her delegation would vote against the Argentine proposal because, although it had been

(Mrs. Shearouse, United States)

willing to support many other proposals made during informal consultations, it believed it inappropriate to reduce any regional group's level of representation on an existing Committee.

32. Mr. BAZAN (Chile) said that, since the equal sovereignty of all Member States had been enshrined in the Charter, they all had the right to equal representation in the various United Nations organs. Convinced that the Committee would be more efficient if it remained small, and that the Argentine proposal represented a readjustment of the membership of the Committee on Conferences to reflect reality, his delegation would vote in favour of that proposal. He called on any undecided delegations to join in supporting it, in that it was the result of long negotiations and had been accepted by the majority of delegations.

33. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that, although his delegation had submitted various proposals which had not been accepted, it would support the Argentine proposal because of its concern for achieving a better geographical distribution and for reasons of efficiency.

34. The draft amendments contained in document A/C.5/43/L.10 were adopted by 89 votes to 13, with 7 abstentions.

35. Mr. UPTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been unable to support the draft amendments proposed by Argentina. The United Kingdom whole-heartedly endorsed the principle of equity with respect to the geographical distribution of seats on the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly, but the Argentine proposal unilaterally reduced by one third the representation of one regional group, which included most of the major contributors. Neither the redistribution adopted in document A/C.5/43/L.10 nor an increase in the size of the Committee on Conferences could be interpreted as strengthening its role, in which connection it should be noted that there had been no significant expansion of the Organization's membership. Further, it was regrettable that some delegations had been unable to accept that the new draft terms of reference should be fully aligned with the relevant recommendations of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations (Group of 18). However, his delegation regarded the Committee's new mandate as being in accordance with resolution 41/213 and expected it to act accordingly. His delegation also regretted that a broader measure of agreement had not been reached on the first item on its agenda relating to the reform process, and hoped that that would prove to be an exception.

36. Mr. Okeyo (Kenya) took the Chair.

37. Mr. VILLADSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that the Nordic delegations had voted in favour of the Argentine proposal because of the importance of limiting the membership of the Committee on Conferences to a size that would enable it to work on the basis of consensus. That position was without prejudice to the views of the Nordic delegations on the composition of other United Nations organs.

38. Mr. GREGG (Australia) said that his delegation had opposed the adoption of the Argentine proposal because of the reduction in the representation of one regional group without that group's consent. It would have been preferable to have negotiated a consensus. Nevertheless, his delegation did agree that a membership of 21 was appropriate and would enable the Committee on Conferences to function more effectively than it would with an enlarged membership.

39. Mr. RUEDAS (Spain) said that his delegation would have been willing to join in any reasonable consensus on the composition of the Committee on Conferences, including a membership of 21 representatives. In the absence of a consensus, his delegation could only conclude that adoption of the Argentine proposal constituted a denial, by the majority, of the acquired rights of the minority, which way contrary to the Organization's practice in such important matters as the composition of its legislative organs. It was to be hoped that that would not establish a precedent. His delegation had voted against the proposed amendments in document A/C.5/43/L.10.

40. Ms. FRIESSNIGG (Austria) said that it was regrettable that it had not proved possible to reach a consensus on an issue of such importance. Her delegation had voted against the amendments proposed by Argentina, not because of its objection to a membership of 21, but because of the unfortunate precedent it might establish.

41. Mr. COTTON (New Zealand) said that the reduction in the size of the Committee on Conferences was fully in accordance with General Assembly resolution 41/213 and would give a sharper focus to its work. His delegation trusted that the Committee's new membership and mandate would provide a basis for its endeavours to achieve efficiency and economy in the scheduling of meetings, and had thus supported the adoption of the Argentine amendments.

42. Mr. SANGA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Committee should have reached a consensus before taking such a decision.

43. Mrs. BERENQUER (Brazil) said that her delegation had supported the adoption of document A/C.5/43/L.10. A membership larger than 21 would tend to hinder the Committee's deliberations, while the Argentine amendment represented a compromise in terms of equitable geographical distribution. The proposal reflected flexibility on the part of the other regional groups, and should have been adopted without a vote.

44. Mr. MAUS (Mexico) said that his delegation had supported the adoption of the Argentine amendments, taking into account the need for the Committee on Conferences to operate more efficiently. The main point of the amendments had been to improve geographical representation on that Committee. Extensive efforts had been made to reach a consensus, in view of which his delegation could not regret that the proposal had ultimately been adopted by a majority vote.

45. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Argentine proposal, since a reduction in the size of the Committee on Conferences was consistent with the reform process. Nevertheless, it was regrettable that no consensus had been reached, and the decision should not set a precedent with respect to the composition or size of other United Nations organs.
46. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that his delegation strongly supported the principle of equitable geographical distribution, in view of which it had not opposed the Argentine proposal. However, it could not support the reduction in the number of seats of one regional group, and had, accordingly, abstained in the voting.
47. Mr. RALLIS (Greece) said that his delegation had been unable to support the Argentine proposal. While the membership of the Committee on Conferences should remain small, it was regrettable that no consensus had been reached. It would have been possible to reach other solutions that would not have reduced the representation of any regional group.
48. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that his delegation had supported the proposal so as to reaffirm the basic principle of equitable geographical distribution. In the informal consultations on the matter it had been clear that one regional group was not willing to make any concessions despite the general desire for a consensus. That group had sought to have geographical distribution reflect the level of each group's contributions, and that would be a dangerous practice.
49. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Argentine amendments as being consistent with the recommendations of the Group of 18. It was unfortunate that no consensus had emerged.
50. Mr. KALBITZER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had voted against the Argentine proposal in document A/C.5/43/L.10 since it ignored the acquired rights of the minority. The precedent was unfortunate, and should not be repeated.
51. Mr. UPTON (United Kingdom), said that the Ugandan proposal relating to paragraph 4 (c) of resolution B went beyond the agreement reached in the informal consultations. Nevertheless, his delegation could go along with it if the Committee also agreed to add, at the end of the sentence proposed by Uganda for inclusion in its report to the plenary Assembly, the phrase "subject always to the provisions of paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 40/243".
52. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he saw no relation between the Ugandan proposal and the addition proposed by the United Kingdom, which he could not support.
53. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) asked if the United Kingdom proposal had been made in earnest.
54. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that the United Kingdom proposal ran counter to the very purpose of the Ugandan proposal. Qualifying the wording proposed by the

(Mr. Fontaine Ortis, Cuba)

Ugandan delegation would be tantamount to limiting the authority of the General Assembly itself. The United Kingdom proposal was therefore unacceptable.

55. Mr. ARIYARATNE (Sri Lanka) agreed with the representatives of Algeria and Cuba. The United Kingdom and Ugandan proposals were unrelated.

56. Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) said that while paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 40/243 was important, the fact that that resolution was mentioned in the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution C (document A/C.5/43/L.9) should satisfy the concerns of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom proposal was therefore unnecessary. His delegation supported the proposal put forward by Uganda.

57. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that her delegation would not be able to support the Ugandan proposal, which went beyond the interpretation of paragraph 4 (c) given earlier. The proposal would prevent the Committee on Conferences from acting on behalf of the General Assembly in considering departures from the calendar of conferences and meetings. Her delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal, which reaffirmed the principle by which the calendar of conferences and meetings was set, and the role of the Committee on Conferences as decided by the General Assembly.

58. The CHAIRMAN asked the representatives of the United Kingdom and Uganda whether they intended to press their respective proposals.

59. Mr. UPTON (United Kingdom) said that the Ugandan proposal was new and went beyond what had been agreed to in the informal consultations. If the representative of Uganda insisted on his proposal, the United Kingdom would insist on its own.

60. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that his delegation wished the Committee to decide on its proposal and that it opposed the United Kingdom proposal.

61. Mr. BARABANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Ugandan proposal, particularly the second part, was unacceptable since it would impair the power of the Committee on Conferences to take decisions on inter-sessional departures from the calendar of conferences. The Ugandan proposal had never been considered in the informal consultations, and delegations should therefore be given an opportunity to consider it more thoroughly.

62. At the request of the United Kingdom, a recorded vote was taken on the United Kingdom proposal.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet

Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Brunei Darussalam, Madagascar, Sierra Leone.

63. The United Kingdom proposal was rejected by 68 votes to 28, with 3 abstentions.

64. A recorded vote was taken on the Ugandan proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden.

65. The Ugandan proposal was adopted by 78 votes to 14, with 15 abstentions.

66. At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution B, as a whole, as amended.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey.

67. Draft resolution B as a whole was adopted, as amended, by 91 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution B contained in document A/43/32 concerning agenda item 119 (A/C.5/43/11).

68. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the Secretary-General's statement of the programme budget implications of draft resolution B in document A/C.5/43/11 and recalled that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had informed the Fifth Committee of the ACABQ recommendation on the matter at the 36th meeting. Accordingly, he proposed that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution B recommended by the Committee on Conferences, as amended, no additional appropriation would be required under section 29 of the budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

69. It was so decided.

70. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) said that draft resolution B, which his delegation had supported, had effectively created a new committee which his delegation hoped would refrain from according privileges to some States over others.

71. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) expressed regret that the compromise in draft resolution B, as amended, had been adopted by a vote rather than by consensus, and, as such, did not accommodate the concerns of all delegations. It was to be hoped that in future, compromise resolutions could be adopted by consensus.

72. Mr. HAMEDA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

73. Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) agreed that it was regrettable that a vote had had to be taken. His delegation had been flexible throughout the negotiations, in which all possible solutions had been explored to no avail. It was to be hoped that the vote taken on the draft resolution would inspire some delegations to be more flexible in future.

74. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation would also have preferred to adopt the draft resolution by consensus. Although his delegation supported the second part of the resolution, in the first part, it had effectively voted for an interpretation of paragraph 4 (c) with which it disagreed. For that reason, his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution B as a whole.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.