



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 68th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOBINA SEKYI (Ghana)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/33/L.13, A/33/L.14 and A/33/L.15 concerning agenda item 27

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

Consideration of document A/C.5/33/L.45

* 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.5/33/SR.68
9 January 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 8 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/33/L.13, A/33/L.14 and A/33/L.15 concerning agenda item 27 (A/C.5/33/104)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would, on an exceptional basis, consider the administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/33/104) of draft resolutions A/33/L.13, L.14 and L.15 on the question of Namibia, with a view to enabling the General Assembly to adopt those resolutions at its plenary meeting on 21 December.
2. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had been unable to submit a written report on the Secretary-General's statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/33/104) because that document had been made available to the Committee only a few hours previously. A written report would be submitted to the General Assembly when it resumed in January 1979. The General Committee had recommended that the General Assembly adopt the various draft resolutions on the question of Namibia before it adjourned in December 1978. Because of that decision and in order to enable the Secretary-General to commence some activities early in January 1979, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Secretary-General be given authority to enter into appropriate commitments.
3. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that, if he understood the Chairman of the Advisory Committee correctly, the Secretary-General would be able to start implementing the draft resolutions immediately after their adoption and that the total estimates of the expenditure arising from those resolutions would be considered by the General Assembly in January 1979.
4. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that, the urgency of the situation notwithstanding, he would have wished the recommendations of the Advisory Committee to be submitted in writing, since it was difficult to assess figures on the basis of an oral report. He requested that those recommendations should be read out.
5. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and his own country, said that the aforementioned delegations would abstain on the financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/33/L.15 on budgetary grounds.
6. Paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/33/L.15 contained a proposal to increase the financial provision in the budget of the United Nations Council for Namibia to finance the office of the South West Africa People's Organization in New York. The delegations concerned continued to have grave reservations about financing any

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

external organization through the regular budget of the United Nations, regardless of the merits of the organization thus served. Furthermore, there was a proposal in paragraph 4 (c) to allocate the sum of \$500,000 to the United Nations Fund for Namibia. That was objectionable in principle because an administrative budget should not provide outright grants to a voluntary fund. Finally, paragraph 6 (e) contained a proposal to allocate an additional sum of \$300,000 for the budget of the United Nations Council for Namibia. It appeared evident that the appropriation was being requested in advance of a detailed formulation of a programme of work, which was contrary to the most fundamental principle on which control by Member States of the United Nations regular budget was based. For the above reasons, the five delegations on whose behalf he was speaking would abstain in any vote by the Fifth Committee on the matter.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the action being recommended by the Advisory Committee was an interim measure based on a suggestion made by the General Committee. That suggestion had received broad support, including the endorsement of the delegations on whose behalf the representative of the United States had just spoken. He stressed that the action envisaged was designed purely and simply to enable the Secretary-General to enter into commitments as from 1 January 1979. It did not preclude the Fifth Committee from duly examining the final, written report of the Advisory Committee on the matter at the resumed session.

8. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) supported the request made by the representative of Belgium.

9. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had always defended the rights of the people of Namibia in its struggle for independence, and it supported the draft resolution whose financial implications were now under consideration. However, it could not agree to the practice whereby issues involving several millions of dollars were considered hastily and at the last minute. For that reason his delegation could not support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and would abstain in the vote.

10. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) pointed out that, during the meeting of the General Committee, neither the Secretary-General's statement of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions (A/C.5/33/104) nor the recommendations of the Advisory Committee had been available. Furthermore, his delegation had received no instructions on the matter.

11. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/33/L.15 but wished to examine the financial implications seriously. He repeated his request that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee should read out slowly all of the recommendations, referring, wherever possible, to specific paragraphs of the Secretary-General's statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.5/33/104).

/...

12. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) directed the attention of the Committee to the summary of administrative and financial implications in paragraph 30 of the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/33/104). The Advisory Committee recommended that the Secretary-General be given authority to commit \$250,000, comprising: for the Secretariat of the United Nations Council for Namibia (item (1)), a commitment authority by the Secretary-General of \$50,000; and, for the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia (item (3)), a commitment authority by the Secretary-General of \$200,000. In addition, an amount of \$284,100 for the United Nations Council for Namibia (including SWAPO) (item (2)), had already been appropriated by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

13. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) wondered whether the procedure proposed by the Advisory Committee was proper. Why was the Advisory Committee deferring full study of the matter to the resumed session of the General Assembly? Could the General Assembly adopt the draft resolutions on Thursday, 21 December, if the financial implications had been only provisionally and incompletely studied? At its resumed session the General Assembly would presumably deal not with the contents of the draft resolutions but purely with the political aspects of the question of Namibia and the relevant plan adopted by the Security Council.

14. The CHAIRMAN stated that at the meeting of the General Committee held that morning the possibility of suspending application of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly in connexion with the financial implications contained in document A/C.5/33/104 had been suggested by the representative of the Congo, in his capacity as Chairman of the African Group. That suggestion had, however, subsequently been withdrawn in the light of an alternative course of action which he had proposed in his capacity as Chairman of the Fifth Committee. According to that proposal the General Committee would recommend to the General Assembly: firstly, that document A/C.5/33/104 should be circulated to the Fifth Committee; secondly, that the Fifth Committee should be asked to decide to inform the General Assembly: (a) that the financial implications of the draft resolutions would not exceed the amount indicated by the Secretary-General; (b) that the Fifth Committee would examine the financial statements in January and report separately on them; and (c) that the Fifth Committee would recommend that the General Assembly should appropriate immediately an amount, to be indicated by the Secretary-General, to enable work to begin in January. The proposal also indicated that the Fifth Committee should, at the resumed session in January, consider the recommendations made in A/C.5/33/104, together with the recommendations of ACABQ.

15. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) pointed out that he had merely asked for clarification on the procedure recommended by ACABQ; he had not wished to suggest that the procedure was illegal. His delegation would, however, have preferred to have received information on the matter at the start of the meeting, or at least before the Chairman of ACABQ had presented his recommendations.

16. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) informed the Committee that, in ACABQ's preliminary discussions that afternoon, information had been supplied by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and by the representative of the Secretary-General in the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization. In the light of that information, he thought that it would be reasonable to assume that, if the Fifth Committee approved the recommendations of ACABQ, the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization would face no problem in initiating some activities, pending a detailed examination in January 1979 of the total amount requested by the Secretary-General. There was nothing unusual in the procedure being recommended by ACABQ. In view of the prevailing unusual circumstances, the procedure adopted by ACABQ was, in his opinion, quite proper.
17. Mr. HOUNA GOLO (Chad) suggested that, in view of the lack of time, the Committee should now take a decision. He had been surprised at the statements made by some representatives, since he believed that the Advisory Committee's recommendation, which involved a very modest amount, could be approved by consensus without prejudice to the discussion, in January, of the financial implications of the resolutions in question.
18. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly had frequently been violated for less important matters and that the Advisory Committee's recommendation could be adopted in good faith.
19. Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that the Chairman had not made the substance of the issue clear from the start of the meeting; since he had allowed some delegations to express opinions and reservations, it was normal that other delegations should wish to do likewise.
20. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia) expressed surprise that the Committee was considering the question in haste on the eve of the vote in the General Assembly, although the draft resolutions had been submitted as early as 8 December. He pointed out that there were to be two resumed sessions; one was to be held in January and the other, in the event of the adoption of the relevant resolution by the General Assembly, would be held at a time yet to be decided. He wished to know, if the General Assembly approved draft resolution A/33/L.14, how the decision to consider the financial implications of the over-all programme envisaged for Namibia would fall into place and whether the Committee's decision to approve the allocation of funds on an interim basis and its consideration of the question in January could affect any decision taken by the General Assembly on 21 December.
21. The CHAIRMAN stated that, with regard to appropriations, the Fifth Committee's approval of ACABQ's recommendations would enable the Secretary-General to commit

(The Chairman)

funds from 1 January until such time as the General Assembly was in a position, later that month, to take a comprehensive decision on the resources requested in A/C.5/33/104.

22. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the question asked by the representative of Zambia, said that, in document A/C.5/33/104, the Secretary-General had indicated that it was not possible to quantify the totality of resources that would be required in the event of a resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly on Namibia. The Secretary-General had indicated that the related resources would be dealt with in the context of General Assembly resolution 32/214, on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 1978-1979.

23. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) stated that the General Assembly would, in January, consider only those items remaining on the agenda of the current session. If, on 21 December, the Assembly voted on the resolutions in question, the item concerned might be removed from the agenda. He asked whether the General Assembly would, therefore, suspend consideration of item 27 in order to permit the Fifth Committee to resume its discussion of the financial implications of the resolutions in January.

24. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) said that the arrangement agreed upon that morning had been designed to allow compliance with rule 153 and to permit the adoption of resolutions by the General Assembly. Decisions respecting appropriations were always taken by the Fifth Committee in connexion with the item on the programme budget, whereas the substance of a resolution was the subject of a separate decision by the General Assembly.

25. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) asked the Controller whether, if the draft resolutions in question were voted on at the plenary meeting on the following day, the implication would be that the consideration of item 27 had been concluded. He asked also whether another statement requesting appropriations in respect of Namibia would be submitted by the Secretary-General to the Fifth Committee.

26. Mr. IYER (India) asked whether the interim arrangement proposed would prejudice further consideration of the matter in January.

27. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) said that the General Assembly at its next meeting would decide on the draft resolutions in respect of their substance, under agenda item 27, but would not consider the financial appropriations, which would, as usual, be subject to a separate decision at the end of the session. ACABQ had decided that, although it had not yet fully examined the question, it should recommend adoption of an interim measure so that the Secretary-General could enter into commitments of up to \$250,000 until the financial implications were fully discussed in January. He pointed out that, when the General Assembly approved a resolution in substance, that

/...

decision did not affect any later discussion of the financial implications. In January the General Assembly would decide on the financial appropriations on the basis of document A/C.5/33/104 and of the report of the Fifth Committee. Nothing, therefore, would be lost by the Committee's taking a decision on the interim measure immediately.

28. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation would be willing to take a decision on the basis of the oral presentation made by the Chairman of ACABQ, although it would have preferred to have a written report. He hoped that it was appreciated that the element of scepticism evident in the Committee was genuine. On the understanding that the Committee would be able to discuss document A/C.5/33/104 in January, his delegation would be willing to accept the recommendation made by ACABQ.

29. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) thanked the Controller for his explanation. He suggested that the Chairman might consider the possibility of preparing a draft decision to be submitted to the General Assembly, clearly stating that any decisions taken on 21 December concerned only agenda item 27 and that questions relating to agenda item 100 would be considered at the resumed session.

30. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that, as his delegation understood it, the Committee was being asked to vote in principle on additional expenditure for the United Nations Council for Namibia. In effect, it would be acceding to the request contained in resolution A/33/L.15, even if the details might be altered when the financial implications were studied in depth at the resumed session. In other words, it would appear that the Committee was being asked to vote on a real increase in expenditure by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

31. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) said that, when the General Assembly took substantive decisions on activities or programmes it was, of course, to be assumed that it also took note of the necessity for resources to implement its decisions. It was precisely for that reason that the General Assembly always had before it the respective reports of the Advisory Committee and of the Fifth Committee drawing attention to the financial implications. With regard to Namibia, the General Assembly would decide on the substance of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/33/L.13, L.14 and L.15, but would not decide immediately on the financial implications, except to authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments up to a maximum of \$250,000. The decision on additional appropriations would be taken at the resumed thirty-third session in January, after discussion of document A/C.5/33/104. In the interests of expediency, the normal order of consideration had been reversed.

32. Mr. IYER (India) said that it was clear from the Controller's explanations that any decision on the statement of financial implications (A/C.5/33/104) taken by the Fifth Committee would be the basis for appropriations to be decided by the

(Mr. Iyer, India)

General Assembly at the resumed session. On that understanding, it should be possible to take a decision without delay.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would, of course, be considering document A/C.5/33/104 at the resumed thirty-third session in January; by that time the Advisory Committee would have had time to study it in detail. He said that, in view of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Committee was, in effect, going to take action on an interim basis on document A/C.5/33/104, and would have an opportunity of dealing with it in the usual manner in the context of agenda item 100 during the resumed session, which would begin on 15 January 1979.

34. He suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that: (1) the adoption of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/33/L.13, L.14 and L.15 would involve total expenditures not exceeding \$2,668,900, which would be considered in detail by the Fifth Committee at its resumed session in January 1979; and that, (2) in order to enable the Secretary-General to proceed with the programme of work of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and of the secretariat of the United Nations Council for Namibia, the General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General to commit funds, in addition to the existing appropriations under section 3 of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, not exceeding \$250,000 during the month of January 1979 under the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, pending a final decision on the level of appropriations at the resumed session in January 1979.

35. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, in the light of the discussions, it appeared that the decision would, in effect, authorize an expansion of the programme of activities for Namibia. His delegation, together with those of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom, would have to vote against, rather than abstain, as announced earlier in the meeting.

36. The CHAIRMAN explained that the action recommended by the General Committee had been the result of a consensus; its sole aim was to enable the General Assembly to conclude its work the following day. There would be a full opportunity to discuss the issue in detail at the resumed thirty-third session. If it was possible for the Fifth Committee merely to endorse the decision of the General Committee, that would be most desirable, since otherwise the General Committee would find itself in a very difficult situation.

37. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said he found the procedure very strange and was not altogether convinced by the explanations he had heard. Given the importance of the question of Namibia for the United Nations, the Advisory Committee should have had document A/C.5/33/104 before it in sufficient time to be able to consider it in detail. He did not understand why the document had not reached the Advisory Committee until 20 December.

38. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Algeria that the document had not been available to the Advisory Committee until 1 p.m. He did not believe that the Advisory Committee could possibly have provided its customary report in the short space of an afternoon.

39. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that it was not his intention to doubt the integrity of either the Chairman or the members of the Advisory Committee, but he wondered which language versions had been ready as early as 12 December. Despite the comments he had made, his delegation would nevertheless vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

40. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that his delegation would support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, strictly as an interim measure, on the clear understanding that the Fifth Committee would have the opportunity of considering in January a written report from the Advisory Committee on the statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/33/104. In voting for the recommendations, his delegation was not taking any position on the substance of that document.

41. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation would have to abstain if the two paragraphs were put to the vote together, because it could not support paragraph 1.

42. At the request of the representative of Chad, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

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

43. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee were adopted by 71 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

44. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the recommendations, not because of any objection to the procedure, which it believed to be legal under rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, but because of its objection in principle to certain expenditure proposals contained in resolution A/33/L.15.

45. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the recommendation, but believed that there had been considerable lack of good will on the part of the Secretariat in not providing the statement contained in document A/C.5/33/104 earlier; on the part of the Advisory Committee, which should have made a greater effort to produce a written report; and on the part of some Member States, which had refused to accept the urgency of the situation and vote in favour of the recommendations.

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/33/L.44)

46. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up consideration of the draft report in document A/C.5/33/L.44 on the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979. He said that the report had been prepared to allow interim action on the appropriations already approved in first reading up to the end of the 65th meeting of the Committee. After the second reading of the appropriations, the Committee would be invited to consider the draft resolutions A, B and C contained in paragraph 6.

47. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) said his attention had been drawn to the fact that the numbering of paragraphs in the French version of document A/C.5/33/L.44 was incorrect. The paragraph beginning on page 7 of the French version should have been numbered 3; all subsequent paragraphs should be renumbered accordingly.

48. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the revised estimates of expenditure and income approved in first reading under each section of the programme budget were to be found in paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/33/L.44 and the summaries of the net addition or reduction under each section of the budget, which he would put to the vote, were to be found in paragraph 4. He would take it that, in view of the previous practice established in the Committee, it would not wish to vote on each section separately in second reading.

49. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the view of his delegation that it was totally abnormal and inadmissible that the Fifth Committee should be expected to vote on a document which had been distributed in the course of the meeting and which delegations had had no opportunity even to read, let alone study. The work of the Fifth Committee was becoming farcical and Member States could not but react with deep regret, and even anger, at that situation.

50. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) agreed that the Fifth Committee should not be asked to approve in second reading additional appropriations of some \$10.5 million and revised estimates of some \$3.5 million without even having an opportunity to read the draft report. The Controller had rightly stated that documents such as the draft report were submitted "at the end of the session". The Committee should, therefore, defer any decision on document A/C.5/33/L.44 until the end of the session, which would be in January. He proposed that, in the meantime, it should approve draft resolution C, contained in paragraph 6. Had the Committee received the document 24 hours earlier, the situation would, of course, have been totally different.

51. Mrs. DERRÉ (France) concurred with the views expressed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Belgium and endorsed the proposal that the Committee should vote only on draft resolution C.

52. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller) expressed apologies for the fact that the document had not been available earlier, and explained that that was due to uncertainty as to how the General Assembly would proceed, and whether in fact a resumed session would be held in January. It was unfortunately not possible to defer a decision on the draft report because that would mean that no funds would be available on 1 January 1979 for the substantive activities on which the General Assembly had already adopted decisions.

53. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that, while he sympathized with the concerns of the representatives of Belgium and France, all kinds of legal difficulties might arise if a vote was deferred. He pointed out that the Committee had already voted on the additional appropriations and revised estimates in first reading. The draft report contained in document A/C.5/33/L.44 merely presented those decisions in consolidated form. It was true that there was not time to go through all the figures, but if any error was detected later, which he doubted, it could be corrected. On the grounds of practicality, he proposed that the Committee should proceed to take a decision.

54. The CHAIRMAN said that, if the Committee deferred action, even the appropriations it had approved with regard to the question of Namibia would not be available on 1 January 1979.

55. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that, although he understood the scruples of the representative of Belgium, he was in total agreement with the Controller and the representative of Pakistan that it was imperative for the Committee to take a decision immediately. He therefore appealed to the representative of Belgium to withdraw his proposal.

56. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had not been able to devote the necessary amount of time to studying the additional appropriations and was, like other delegations, a victim of the compression of the schedule and lack of time. It had been acutely aware, however, of the steady

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

accumulation of financial implications, which meant that Member States would be called upon to pay assessments substantially in excess of those contemplated when the budget for the biennium 1978-1979 had been adopted the previous year. That was of great concern to his delegation because, in accordance with its national policy of frugality, the United States Government had had to curtail or delay the growth of many programmes of value and importance to the American people. Priorities had had to be established, and his delegation would have liked to see a similar approach adopted to the budget of the United Nations. It had abstained in the vote on the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979 in the hope that an awareness of the need to economize was beginning to take hold in the Secretariat and among Member States. At that time, the representative of the United States had urged a significant improvement in the fiscal responsibility shown by Member States and had raised the possibility of a negative vote by the United States on the budget in future. He had noted the comments made by the Controller and the Chairman. However, what was before the Committee was only a fraction of the additional appropriations. Requests for an additional \$80 million were still to come. The whole idea of having a biennial budget in the United Nations negated the need for a decision on additional appropriations at the present stage, especially given the fact that the thirty-third session would resume shortly. In any case, most of the programmes contained a lapse factor which would take care of any deficiency in appropriations. The Chairman had contended that the additional appropriations for the Council for Namibia were included in the draft report. He did not believe that that was the case.

57. If the proposal made by the representative of Belgium was not adopted, his delegation would have to vote against the additional appropriations as a protest against a significant programme increase, which it estimated to be close to 4 per cent. It ought to be possible to assume in the second year of the biennial budget that all the necessary programmes had already been included. Moreover, the additional funding included sums for a number of programmes unacceptable to his delegation and destructive of the values of the Organization, such as the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. In voting against, his delegation would also be protesting at the inexplicable failure of the Secretariat, over three full years, to identify programmes that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective.

58. His delegation was well aware that it would be casting its first negative vote on a major United Nations budget request. It would do so more in sorrow than in anger, but also in the hope that it would encourage a greater sense of fiscal responsibility, greater regard for the real work of the Organization, as opposed to empty propaganda, and a greater concern for good management and prudent budgeting in the future.

59. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said it was true that any deferment of a decision until the resumed session would have the effect of delaying new activities, but the

(Mr. Stuart, United Kingdom)

question arose whether it was essential to begin them on 1 January 1979, even if that were possible in practical terms. It had been said that the additional appropriations and revised estimates had already been approved in first reading, implying that the draft report contained in document A/C.5/33/L.44 was not really of particular importance. If that was the case, he wondered why the Committee bothered to consider appropriations in second reading. Delegations required time to read the draft report carefully in order to determine their attitude to the budget as a whole, yet it appeared that the Committee was being asked to vote blindly on it, without even having the chance to read it.

60. Mr. PICO DE COAÑA (Spain) said that, owing to lateness of distribution of document A/C.5/33/L.44, his delegation had been unable to give it the detailed consideration that it required. His delegation therefore fully supported the Belgian proposal that a vote should be taken only on draft resolution C. If the Belgian proposal was not adopted, his delegation would register its protest by not participating in the voting.

61. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services, Controller), in an effort to clarify the situation with regard to document A/C.5/33/L.44, explained that the second reading consisted of a recapitulation of the various decisions taken by the Fifth Committee during the session and took the form of a recommendation to the General Assembly for final appropriations for the biennium.

62. Even if the General Assembly had not decided to hold a resumed session, the Fifth Committee would still have the same document before it, since it would have to make its recommendations to the Assembly following its second reading of the additional appropriations. Since, however, there would be a resumed session in January 1979, the document before the Committee did not contain the total appropriations but only the amounts considered and approved by the Fifth Committee thus far.

63. The reason why it was essential to approve the amounts at the current meeting had already been stated by the representative of Pakistan. He doubted whether it was the Fifth Committee's intention to depart from its original decisions to enable the various programmes to be financed and to commence on 1 January 1979.

64. In conclusion, he pointed out that draft resolution C concerned advance payments towards the expenses of the Organization in 1979, and it would be meaningless to approve that draft resolution without having approved draft resolutions A and B.

65. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that she would have understood better the concerns expressed by the Controller, if the General Assembly had intended to resume the current session two or three months later, rather than a mere three weeks. Her

/...

(Mrs. Derré, France)

delegation found it hard to believe that, if the Committee adopted the draft resolutions in document A/C.5/33/L.44, there would be a rush by the Secretariat to implement them as of 1 January 1979 in respect of such matters as staff recruitment, consultancy services and travel. It was difficult to believe, therefore, that a decision on the revised appropriations could not be postponed for a mere three weeks.

66. Mr. IYER (India) pointed out that document A/C.5/33/L.44 contained a résumé of the various decisions taken by the Committee during the session and that, by adopting the various draft resolutions in the document, the Committee would merely be endorsing its earlier decisions. A decision on draft resolution C depended on decisions to be taken on draft resolutions A and B. While he respected the concerns expressed by certain delegations, he saw no reason for their expressions of dismay.

67. The CHAIRMAN said he hoped that the Secretary-General, in the statement which he would be delivering to the plenary Assembly, would include the question of the Committee's methods of work in his proposals for streamlining the procedures of the General Assembly.

68. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that, when adopting revised estimates in first reading, the Committee was unable to assess the cumulative effects of its decisions. The second reading of the estimates was important because it afforded members an opportunity to consider the over-all growth of programmes and to propose the elimination of marginal, ineffective and obsolete activities. Delegations accordingly required time to study the draft report in document A/C.5/33/L.44, and his delegation therefore supported the Belgian proposal.

69. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) expressed the view that the decisions which the Committee was now called upon to take were not as difficult as some speakers had suggested. The Committee would merely be incorporating into one global figure the various sums which it had approved earlier.

70. He emphasized that continuity in United Nations programmes was much more important for some States than for others, and a failure on the part of the Committee to take the necessary decisions would have serious repercussions. He therefore urged the Committee to take the necessary action on document A/C.5/33/L.44 without further delay.

71. Mr. ARMENTO (Italy) supported the representatives of Belgium and France. As far as he knew, the Financial Regulations provided for a situation where a final decision on the additional appropriations was not taken.

72. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) pointed out that, under draft resolution A in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/33/L.44, the General Assembly would increase the amount of \$985,913,300 that it had already appropriated by an additional sum of about \$10.5 million. It was incorrect to claim that the Committee had to approve draft resolution A in order to request Member States, in draft resolution C,

/...

(Mr. Pirson, Belgium)

to make advance payments for 1979 in the same amount as their assessed contributions for 1978. His delegation considered that the question of the additional appropriation of some \$10.5 million, in order to cover such items as currency fluctuations and inflation, should be examined at the resumed session.

73. The second reading of the revised estimates was intended precisely to enable the Committee to assess the over-all picture with regard to revised appropriations, yet so far only about one eighth of the total requests for additional funds had been received. Moreover, it was hardly a responsible approach to place document A/C.5/33/L.44 before the Committee at very short notice, thereby not giving delegations the opportunity to examine what action had been taken under each section of the budget. If the matter was not deferred, his delegation would cast a negative vote because it wished to have the opportunity to examine both document A/C.5/33/L.44 and the additional requests to be submitted at the resumed session.

74. Mr. OKWARO (Kenya) said he regretted the great divergence of views of different speakers. The procedure whereby the Committee was now called upon to take certain decisions on the additional appropriations was a normal practice, and his delegation would have no difficulty in taking them. As the representative of Pakistan had pointed out, unless the Secretary-General was authorized to incur the necessary expenditure as of 1 January 1979, he would be in a difficult legal situation.

75. He therefore formally moved, in accordance with rule 117 of the rules of procedure, that the Committee should conclude the debate and proceed to the vote on the Belgian proposal.

76. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America), opposing the closure of debate, pointed out that certain matters were still not clear. For example, the Committee had not been informed what the Controller would do if, as from 1 January 1979, he wished to incur obligations in respect of the items enumerated in paragraph 5 of document A/C.5/33/L.44. Furthermore, he understood that proposals for as much as \$15 million in conference servicing costs had still to be submitted to the Committee for its consideration. There were many items of expenditure, including the additional costs arising from inflation, which would not cease on 1 January 1979. Many important issues of that kind had not yet been settled.

77. The motion for closure of debate was adopted by 51 votes to 15, with 13 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations that so wished to explain their votes on the Belgian proposal, to the effect that a vote should be taken only on draft resolution C of document A/C.5/33/L.44 and that decisions on draft resolutions A and B should be deferred until the resumed session.

/...

79. Mr. IYER (India) said that his delegation opposed the proposal of the representative of Belgium. Voting only on draft resolution C would be inconsistent with the practice of the Fifth Committee and would set a dangerous precedent in various ways.

80. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said his delegation would vote against the additional budget appropriations that had been requested because of the utter lack of fiscal responsibility displayed. His delegation protested against wanton spending and urged a policy of frugality. Moreover, it took issue with the procedures used, which did not permit it to ask pertinent questions.

81. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that his delegation opposed the proposal of the representative of Belgium, because it would have the effect of delaying all the activities regarding which decisions on appropriations had been approved in first reading. Although the delay of one month would be slight, it involved an important matter of principle. His delegation felt that those activities should commence on time, especially since they had already been approved. He expressed concern that, unless draft resolutions A and B were also voted upon, action on draft resolution C would be superfluous.

82. Mr. BUJ FLORES (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Belgian proposal.

83. Mr. OKWARO (Kenya) said that his delegation would not be able to support the Belgian proposal for reasons that he had already stated.

84. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that his delegation would vote against the Belgian proposal, as a matter of principle. Since his delegation had already voted for the appropriations in first reading, it saw no reason not to vote for them in second reading.

85. Mr. FALL OULD MALLOUM (Mauritania) said his delegation shared the concerns of the representative of Belgium, but in the light of the explanations given by the Controller, it felt compelled to vote against the proposal.

86. A recorded vote was taken on the Belgian proposal to vote only on draft resolution C in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/33/L.44.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Chad, Ethiopia, Iran, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Singapore, Turkey.

87. The Belgian proposal was rejected by 46 votes to 26, with 9 abstentions.

88. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations that so wished to explain their votes on the total additional appropriations (A/C.5/33/L.44, para. 4).

89. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation would vote against adoption of the revised budget appropriations for the biennium 1978-1979 because they included many unjustified expenditures, in violation of General Assembly directives, and contained amounts designed to finance impermissible activities which were contrary to the United Nations Charter. During the current session the Secretariat had repeatedly failed to implement General Assembly decisions prescribing the avoidance of additional appropriations and the economy of resources. Despite the change-over to a biennial budget, the Secretariat continued the unjustified practice of requesting additional appropriations during the biennium. In his performance report, the Secretary-General requested additional appropriations of about \$62 million, while additional appropriations of \$10.5 million were being requested during the first part of the current session alone.

90. The facts indicated that the Secretariat had not properly carried out the work of designating resources that could be released, so that recommendations could be made for terminating ineffective programmes, eliminating overlapping and improving efficiency. On the contrary, additional appropriations had been requested in order to finance practically all new activities. New posts were established unjustifiably. Increased funds for the use of experts and consultants were proposed in violation of the General Assembly's directives. Additional appropriations had been needlessly requested in order to cover budget expenditures connected with the depreciation of the dollar. The improper practice of transferring posts previously financed by voluntary contributions and extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget was maintained. If the transfer of such posts continued, the Soviet delegation would be forced to withhold payment of that part of its contribution destined to finance those posts. The warning to that effect expressed at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly had not been heeded.

91. In approving the current programme budget, the Soviet delegation had categorically opposed including in the budget unlawful appropriations to finance

(Mr. Palamarchuk, USSR)

such measures as the payment of interest on and the amortization of the United Nations debt, incurred owing to expenditures to finance activities which were in violation of the Charter. In accordance with the Charter, the Soviet Union protested against those measures and refused to assume any responsibility for them.

92. According to Article 17 of the United Nations Charter, the regular budget had an exclusively administrative purpose and could not be used to finance technical assistance. Therefore, technical assistance should be excluded from the regular budget and incorporated into the United Nations Development Programme.

93. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation would abstain from voting. The procedure adopted at the current meeting did not allow sufficient time to consider document A/C.5/33/L.44 and was not conducive to proposals for economies. Member States wished to have time to consider the over-all financial implications of activities to which they would be required to contribute.

94. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation would vote against the total additional appropriations because of the lack of time allowed for considering them and holding consultations. Members of the Fifth Committee should not be forced to vote on a proposal to appropriate \$10 million of additional expenditures on the basis of a document which the majority of delegations had not yet read. The second reading of the revised estimates should enable delegations to gain an appreciation of all the additional expenditures envisaged for the biennium. The Fifth Committee had been apprised of approximately 15 per cent of the additional appropriations which the Administration was proposing to request. It was unfortunate that the Controller could not provide information on the remaining 85 per cent.

95. Mr. CHANG Hsueh-Yao (China) said his delegation would not participate in the vote because the proposed appropriation contained expenditures which it opposed.

96. Mr. ARMENTO (Italy) said that his delegation would vote against the proposed appropriation, as it deemed it necessary to examine each element more carefully within the framework of an over-all request, to be submitted in January 1979.

97. Mr. PICO DE COAÑA (Spain) said that his delegation would not participate in the vote as a sign of protest against the procedure followed. It was known that his delegation always voted in favour of all programmes benefiting developing countries. However, delegations had not had sufficient time to consider document A/C.5/33/L.44 and did not know what the final implications of supporting the total additional appropriation would be. Furthermore, his delegation failed to understand why funds could not be found within the current budget in order to finance activities until 15 January.

98. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that her delegation would vote against the total additional appropriation because it could not accept the procedure imposed on the Fifth Committee at the current meeting and wanted to have a global picture of the funds to be voted upon.

99. A recorded vote was taken on a total additional appropriation of \$10,459,600 for the biennium 1978-1979 (A/C.5/33/L.44, para. 4).

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Cuba, Japan, Singapore, United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire.

100. A total additional appropriation of \$10,459,600 for the biennium 1978-1979 was approved in second reading by 59 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.

101. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to approve without objection a total additional income estimate of \$3,597,400 (A/C.5/33/L.44, para. 4).

102. It was so decided.

103. The CHAIRMAN suggested to the Committee that it should vote separately on draft resolutions A, B and C in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/33/L.44.

104. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Cuba, Japan, Singapore.

105. Draft resolution A was adopted by 61 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.

106. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution B without objection.

107. It was so decided.

108. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution C.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sweden, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Japan.

109. Draft resolution C was adopted by 71 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

110. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolutions A, B and C together.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Somalia, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Cuba, Japan, Singapore.

111. Draft resolutions A, B and C were adopted by 62 votes to 14, with 5 abstentions.

112. Mr. LEMP (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of deferral of action until the resumed session in January as a protest against the procedure used in dealing with such an important question as the additional appropriations. However, since the interim action on the revised appropriations for the biennium 1979-1980 was but a summary of financial implications which his delegation had already accepted, he had voted, albeit reluctantly, in favour of the additional appropriations in the amount of \$10,459,600.

113. Mr. BUJ FLORES (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal of the representative of Belgium and of draft resolutions A, B and C. Its vote in favour of the Belgian proposal was an indication of its displeasure with the irregular procedure whereby the Fifth Committee had been required to consider that document so precipitously.

114. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A because it failed to understand why a decision could not be postponed until the resumed session in the light of the serious concerns expressed by a number of delegations.

Consideration of document A/C.5/33/L.45

115. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Fifth Committee to document A/C.5/33/L.45, which proposed an interim measure in order to allow continuation of the integrated programme for commodities of UNCTAD during January 1979. He took it that the Committee wished to request the General Assembly to authorize the Secretary-General to continue to incur the related expenditure during January 1979 for the programme of commodities pending consideration of document A/C.5/33/52 at the resumed session.

116. The proposal was adopted by 64 votes to 9, with no abstentions.

117. Mrs. DERRÉ (France) said that her delegation had not taken part in the vote because it had not had time to study the document and the proposal properly. Her delegation considered the UNCTAD integrated programme for commodities to be very important and had always supported it, since it was in favour of agreements on commodities.

/...

118. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation was not satisfied with the work of the Fifth Committee at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. He regretted to note that the Committee had not completed its work, and was therefore compelled to have a resumed session requiring enormous expenditure on human and material resources, because of delays in the preparation and submission of essential documents, organizational short-comings and poor work on the part of the Secretariat. The inadmissible attacks by certain Secretariat officials of the Fifth Committee against other Secretariat officials who, in order to avoid additional expenditure on conference services, had tried to ensure that the work of the Committee proceeded in a rational and economical manner were regrettable and had hindered the work of the Committee.

The meeting rose at midnight