

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION
Official Records*



FIFTH COMMITTEE
69th meeting
held on
Monday, 19 December 1977
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 69th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TALIEH (Iran)

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

CONTENTS

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

Status of classification projects

Revised estimates under section 22B, 1, Office of Financial Services

Consolidated statement of administrative and financial implications in respect of
conference servicing costs

First reading (continued)

Section 25, Staff assessment, and income section 1, Income from staff assessment

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

AGENDA ITEM 104: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

(a) REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

Report on first-class travel in the United Nations organizations (continued)

UN LIBRARY

DEC 30 1977

UN/SA COLLECTION

* 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.5/32/SR.69
23 December 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)
(A/32/6, A/32/8, A/32/38; A/C.5/32/12 and 13)

1. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation would welcome an exact indication of the amount, in dollars, by which the proposed programme budget to be adopted in second reading exceeded the budget proposals made by the Secretary-General at the beginning of the session. According to his own calculations, the original proposals had been for a total of approximately \$942 million, while the revised estimates involved an amount in the region of \$980 million.

2. He would be grateful if the Controller would therefore draft a brief document indicating: (a) the approximate over-all amount of the budget proposals on which the General Assembly would have to vote in second reading; (b) whether the 2.2 per cent increase in real growth suggested by the Secretary-General at the beginning of the session had changed as a result of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly at the current session, in particular with regard to new programmes; and (c) by how many dollars and by what percentage the budget for the biennium 1978-1979 would have increased in relation both to the budget adopted in 1975 for the biennium 1976-1977 and to the revised budget for the biennium 1976-1977. Such a document would be invaluable to delegations in preparing for the vote on the budget as a whole in second reading.

3. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller) said that he would provide such a document as soon as possible. He also recalled that, although the budget was to be voted on as a single, over-all appropriation, for the purposes of evaluation in the Fifth Committee budget increases had been classified under three basic headings: (a) increases required in order to continue existing programmes; (b) the impact of inflation; (c) the actual growth in real terms of United Nations activities and programme delivery. As the representative of Belgium had rightly recalled, the Secretary-General had predicted that the real growth rate for the biennium would be approximately 2 per cent, and that figure was now confirmed by the latest statistics. It should be noted that that growth had been achieved in spite of inflation and changes in exchange rates which had increased requirements in dollar terms.

Status of classification projects (A/C.5/32/57)

4. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.5/32/57.

5. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said he hoped that the classification of posts at the General Service level at Geneva would be completed by the end of 1978.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that, as document A/C.5/32/57 was for the information of the Committee only, if he heard no objections, he would assume that the Committee wished to take note of it.

7. It was so decided.

/...

Revised estimates under section 22B, 1, Office of Financial Services (A/C.5/32/66)

8. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, suggested that, as the question of revised estimates for the Office of Financial Services was not urgent, consideration of that item should be deferred to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

9. Mr. HAHN (Canada) urged that, as the item was very important and, moreover, the report concerning it was short and straightforward, the Committee should deal with it immediately.

10. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had in fact decided to recommend the same action as that just proposed by the Soviet Union. Document A/C.5/32/66 had been submitted late and the Committee had been unable to consider its contents in detail. Postponement of that item would not prevent the Secretary-General from using available resources to implement recommendations which came within his mandate. The item was important, but it was also complex and the Advisory Committee believed that its consideration should be postponed until the Advisory Committee had had time to consult the Board of Auditors and to determine how many posts would be required to implement the Board's recommendations.

11. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller) said that he wished to place on record that the Office of Financial Services could act only on the basis of resources available to it. At the current session, there had been numerous complaints about the Office's poor performance, yet it was impossible to improve that performance with the manpower currently available. It was those considerations which had prompted the Secretary-General to submit document A/C.5/32/66, paragraphs 4, 6 and 7 of which clearly indicated why additional resources were required.

12. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if the Advisory Committee had not discussed the implications of the proposals in document A/C.5/32/66, the Fifth Committee could not take a decision on the item at the current session.

13. Mr. HAHN (Canada) said that, while he acknowledged that in the circumstances it was difficult for the Fifth Committee to act on the proposals in document A/C.5/32/66, he felt that the Controller had made a valid point; his delegation would support the Controller in any attempt to improve the situation in the Office of Financial Services. If consideration of the item were postponed to the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, he hoped it would be on the understanding that the Advisory Committee would consult the Board of Auditors in the interim and submit the item for thorough consideration early in the thirty-third session.

14. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be highly regrettable if the Fifth Committee took a decision on an item concerning which the Advisory Committee had made no recommendations. It would indeed be ill-advised to take a decision on the basis of comments made by the Controller or the Secretary-General, especially in view of the United Nations critical financial position.

/...

15. Mr. HART (Australia) acknowledged that the Advisory Committee had had to deal with a tremendous workload. However, it had been able to consider proposals concerning far larger sums of money which had been submitted later than document A/C.5/32/66. He wondered whether the Advisory Committee could clarify that situation.

16. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that there were some proposals on which the Advisory Committee could not defer action without preventing the Secretary-General from implementing urgent activities. In view of its tremendous workload, the Advisory Committee had therefore been obliged to postpone consideration of a number of less urgent items, of which the current item was just one.

17. Mr. HANNAH (New Zealand) endorsed the suggestion by the representative of Canada that consideration of the proposals in document A/C.5/32/66 should be deferred only on the understanding that the item would be given priority at the thirty-third session.

18. Mr. IYER (India) agreed with the representative of the Soviet Union that the Fifth Committee could not take a decision on the item until the Advisory Committee had made a recommendation. However, the explanation given by the Advisory Committee for its failure to recommend action in the present case was inadequate and left some members of the Fifth Committee feeling rather helpless.

19. Mr. ANDERSSON (Sweden) said that, if the proposals in document A/C.5/32/66 had been voted on at the current session, his delegation would have supported them.

20. Mr. SEKYEI (Ghana) endorsed the comments made by the representative of India.

21. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that that was not the first time the Advisory Committee had recommended postponement of an item, nor indeed the last. The Advisory Committee firmly believed that it was preferable to postpone its consideration of important items until such time as it was able to make meaningful recommendations, rather than to make hasty, perfunctory recommendations.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to postpone consideration of the proposals contained in document A/C.5/32/66 on the understanding that the item would be given priority at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

23. It was so decided.

Consolidated statement of administrative and financial implications in respect of conference servicing costs (A/32/8/Add.29; A/C.5/32/110)

24. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that, in his statement in document A/C.5/32/110, the Secretary-General had indicated that statements of financial implications in respect of conference servicing had been provided to the Fifth Committee on the basis of

/...

full costing (para. 1) and that a consolidated statement of financial implications would be issued towards the end of the session which would show what costs could be met from within existing resources (para. 2). According to the Secretary-General's statement, conference-servicing requirements for 1978 would total \$16,331,950, of which \$12,804,050 (\$7,133,650 at Headquarters and \$5,670,400 at Geneva) could be absorbed. That left an additional appropriation for 1978 of \$3,087,100 (\$2,887,100 at Headquarters and \$200,000 at Geneva).

25. Paragraph 4 of document A/32/8/Add.29 gave a breakdown of the additional \$2,887,100 required for Headquarters and paragraphs 5 to 7 detailed the Advisory Committee's views on that appropriation. On the basis of those views, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Secretary-General absorb an additional \$747,500 at Headquarters, thereby reducing the total additional appropriation under section 23A to \$2 million (para. 6), and that the amounts under sections 21 and 22 be absorbed completely (para. 7). With regard to Geneva, the \$200,000 requested by the Secretary-General related to conference-servicing requirements for the Conference on the Law of the Sea which were already indicated in document A/C.5/32/109. The Secretary-General's representative had informed the Advisory Committee that the Conference on the Law of the Sea was scheduled for March to May 1978 at Geneva. However, he had also indicated that the Secretary-General intended to send one team of interpreters to Geneva for the first four months of 1978 (para. 8). When the Advisory Committee had asked whether the \$200,000 appropriation took that fact into consideration, it had not received a satisfactory answer. Accordingly, it was recommending that the \$200,000 should be met from existing resources. The Advisory Committee was thus recommending that an additional appropriation of \$2 million under section 23A alone should be allocated for conference-servicing requirements for 1978.

26. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the additional appropriations requested by the Secretary-General for conference servicing costs were unjustified, and his delegation supported the reductions recommended by ACABQ (A/32/8/Add.29). The Secretary-General's statement of administrative and financial implications in respect of conference servicing costs (A/C.5/32/110) gave no indication as to whether existing resources for conference servicing would be fully utilized throughout the entire biennium or whether they were inadequate. Many scheduled meetings were cancelled, and in considering the report of the Committee on Conferences, the Fifth Committee had taken a decision concerning the more efficient planning of meetings. That decision had not been taken into account by the Secretary-General, and the absence of information in that respect made it impossible to decide whether existing resources for conference servicing were being used in a satisfactory manner.

27. Finally, the Secretary-General's statement gave no indication of the steps being taken by the Secretariat to correct the existing situation where very busy periods, when additional staff had to be hired, alternated with very slack periods,

/...

(Mr. Safronchuk, USSR)

when regular staff were under-utilized. The existing shortcomings in that respect should be eliminated immediately, or at least in stages. His delegation would vote against the additional appropriations requested in respect of conference servicing costs.

28. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) asked the Secretariat for additional information on the conference servicing costs for UNCTAD V.

29. Mr. IYER (India) said that the cancellation of scheduled meetings resulted in the waste of resources, and in that connexion the Fifth Committee had endorsed the proposal of the Committee on Conferences to over-programme in the context of the calendar of conferences. However, the Secretary-General's statement concerning conference servicing costs (A/C.5/32/110) made no reference to over-programming, and he therefore wondered whether the Secretary-General had decided not to over-programme, or had decided to over-programme but had simply not mentioned the fact in his statement.

30. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an additional appropriation of \$2 million under section 23A for the biennium 1978-1979 was approved by 76 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

First reading (continued)

Section 25, Staff assessment, and income section 1, Income from staff assessment (A/C.5/32/CRP.13)

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the amounts indicated in document A/C.5/32/CRP.13 for section 25 and income section 1 on the understanding that any additional appropriations required in connexion with document A/C.5/32/86, which affected section 25 and income section 1, would be considered in second reading.

32. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/32/3 (chap. III, sects. C and G to K; chap. IV, sects. A to D, G, I and J; chap. V; chap. VI, sects. A to D; chap. VII, sects. A to C, H and I; and chap. VIII, sects. E and G))

33. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of those chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council allocated to the Fifth Committee.

34. It was so decided.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 104: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

(a) REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

Report on first-class travel in the United Nations organizations (continued)
(A/32/272 and Add.1, A/32/384; A/C.5/32/L.41, L.43/Rev.1 and L.44)

35. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Syrian Arab Republic had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44.

36. Mr. OUSSEINI (Niger) said that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 would mean overturning a previous decision of the General Assembly. He therefore proposed that the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44 should be taken before that on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1.

37. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 were aware that restricting the use of first-class travel would not lead to major savings for the United Nations, but some travel between New York and Geneva was clearly unnecessary and some savings could be effected. There had been a certain amount of lobbying by the Secretariat in connexion with the issue under discussion, and his delegation considered that such lobbying was improper. Draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 represented a compromise, since the goal of the original sponsors had been more or less to eliminate the use of first-class travel. The draft resolution was the result of long consultations, and the sponsors would be unwilling to accept any last-minute amendments.

38. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, which represented a satisfactory compromise. With respect to economy-class travel, he wished to know whether the United Nations paid for excess baggage equal to the difference between the economy-class baggage allowance and the first-class baggage allowance. In some cases, experts were required to spend long periods on mission and needed more luggage.

39. Mr. BOMELE (Zaire) said he had hoped that the question of first-class travel would be discussed in an objective manner. His delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 3198 (XXVIII) as a means of ensuring the more rational use of travel funds. However, the current financial situation of the United Nations made it necessary to seek further economies. In that connexion, the recommendations of JIU (A/32/272) deserved support, not only because they would result in savings but because they provided for uniform criteria limiting the use of first-class travel. His delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44, since its adoption would result in the postponement of any decision on first-class travel until the thirty-third session and would rule out the possibility of effecting savings in 1978. His delegation also had some difficulties with respect to draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, paragraph 2 B of which would mean that persons currently entitled to first-class travel would continue to enjoy the same privileges. Mr. Bertrand had already explained why JIU had decided against the introduction of a time-limit. However, his delegation was prepared to support that draft resolution.

/...

40. Mr. FREYRE (Argentina) said that his delegation supported proposals designed to reduce expenditure or to increase efficiency. However, the current system with respect to first-class travel was quite reasonable, and was similar to that used by many Member States. Under-Secretaries-General and Assistant Secretaries-General should travel first class for reasons of protocol and because they represented the Secretary-General. His delegation could not support draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1.

41. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that the existing system whereby some officials travelled first class and some travelled economy class was unjust, and the recommendations of JIU were designed to introduce a measure of equity. Under the existing system, staff members undertaking flights of 8 to 16 hours in economy class were entitled to certain additional allowances. He therefore wished to know whether, under the new system envisaged in draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, persons who were entitled to first-class travel but had to travel economy class for flights of less than nine hours would also be entitled to such allowances, and if so, what the cost to the Organization would be. He also wished to know how many people would be affected by the proposed new system.

42. Mr. MOHMOUD (Nigeria) said that his delegation attached great importance to the question of first-class travel, since the dignity of Member States was involved. His delegation had some difficulties with draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, and in particular with the establishment of a nine-hour limit. A seven-hour limit would have been preferable. With respect to paragraph 2 B of the draft resolution, it was not clear what would happen if a flight originally scheduled to last less than nine hours was delayed and took more than nine hours. If the staff member concerned was entitled to first-class travel for flights lasting more than nine hours, would he be able to change his ticket? His delegation did not wish to squander the resources of the United Nations, but there were certain types of expenditure that should not be cut. Furthermore, paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 appeared to give the Secretary-General much broader powers of discretion than he had enjoyed under General Assembly resolution 3198 (XXVIII).

43. Draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 was clearly designed to effect savings, but it did not deal with existing anomalies. Under the current system, the presiding officers of General Assembly and Security Council committees, who were generally at the permanent representative level, were not entitled to first-class travel, with the result that Governments had to pay the difference between economy-class and first-class travel. However, members of expert committees, though usually of a lower rank than the presiding officers referred to, were entitled to first-class travel. The President of the United Nations Council for Namibia was expected to travel economy class, while members of the Secretariat who dealt with Namibian affairs travelled first class. The General Assembly should specify which presiding officers should be entitled to first-class travel, and members of expert committees should travel first class only if the General Assembly had

(Mr. Mohmoud, Nigeria)

specifically taken a decision to that effect. Such a system would reduce costs and eliminate the existing anomalies. With respect to draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44, his delegation thought that it would be unwise for the Fifth Committee to postpone its decision on the question of first-class travel.

44. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said that careful consideration of the question was needed, in view of its controversial nature in the past. The existing situation should not be changed without convincing reasons. As the practice of Governments and international organizations varied widely, his delegation would like more information before deciding on any change of the existing practice. The United Nations should not depart too far from the practice of Governments, or even that of the private sector. If the Committee decided on drastic measures, Member States might be forced to subsidize those representatives who were considered to deserve first-class travel; that might represent a heavy financial burden for developing countries.

45. Another factor was that experts on United Nations service, including persons of considerable prestige, normally received only a per diem allowance and travel expenses. If draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 was implemented, they would be required to travel economy class for journeys of less than nine hours, with the result that some experts might become unavailable. A minimum of courtesy was required towards those who volunteered to serve the United Nations.

46. Senior officers of the United Nations, such as Under-Secretaries-General and Assistant Secretaries-General, deserved respect and should be treated at least on a level with their counterparts in national Governments. Although the nine-hour rule in draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 would alleviate hardship, it did not go far enough.

47. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44, but would abstain on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, being of the view that the authority given to the Secretary-General in paragraph 3 of the latter resolution to exercise discretion in making exceptions was too vague and contradicted the rule laid down in paragraph 2 B.

48. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he favoured implementing the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit. Its report showed a tendency to favour economy-class travel. The increasing comfort of modern airlines made second-class travel almost equivalent to first-class travel 15 years previously. He disagreed with the argument that economy-class travel detracted from the prestige of senior officials; first-class passengers were a minute fraction of the total number of airline passengers carried each year. An individual's prestige derived from his character and dedication to the common good, and not from the class of travel he used. Several institutions, such as the World Health Organization, required their representatives to travel economy class and there was no loss of prestige; indeed, they thereby demonstrated their concern for economy. It seemed that the Committee did not wholly favour the proposals of the Joint Inspection Unit, but it should

/...

(Mr. Pirson, Belgium)

proceed to a vote without delay on the well-balanced proposals in draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1.

49. Mr. SEKYEI (Ghana) said that he fully agreed with the representative of Japan. The subject of travel was controversial and should be approached with greater care and with much more information. He also agreed that United Nations practice should not diverge too far from that of national Governments. Another factor was that experts normally received from the United Nations only travel and per diem allowances. If those allowances were stringently controlled, the United Nations might lose its experts. Furthermore, under existing regulations, when experts travelled beyond a certain distance and broke their journey en route, they were entitled to a per diem allowance. More information was therefore required before a decision was taken. His delegation favoured draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44, which called for a study to provide more tangible information as the basis of future discussion. He would be unable to support draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1.

50. Mr. IYER (India) said that it was difficult to accept the extensive use of first-class travel by a mere handful of people as being of value to most Member States or peoples of the world. Member States should show their sincerity by discouraging such expenditure, so that the sum saved could be devoted to substantive programmes. The dignity of the individual derived from his service to the United Nations, and not from the privilege of first-class travel.

51. Mr. OUATTARA (Ivory Coast) said that the implementation of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 would not effect much saving. Most Member States would be obliged to subsidize the United Nations by paying the cost of first-class travel for their experts, who were often eminent individuals in their own countries accustomed to travelling first class. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44, which had the advantage of allowing further reflection on the matter.

52. Mr. ABDEL FATTAH (Egypt) suggested that, as there were so many differences of view on the question, the Controller should perhaps be asked for a clarification as to which resolution would achieve the greater savings.

53. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. GAMBOA (Venezuela), proposed that, in view of the limited time remaining, the Committee should proceed to a vote on the draft resolutions.

54. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain), supported by Mr. SEKYEI (Ghana), proposed that a decision should be postponed to the thirty-third session because some aspects of the question had not been thoroughly debated.

/...

55. After a procedural discussion, the CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal made by the Spanish delegation.

56. Mr. de PINIÉS (Spain) withdrew his proposal.

57. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) observed that it was not in order for a delegation to withdraw its proposal when the Committee was in the process of voting.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to proceed to a vote on the draft resolutions, as had been proposed by the Soviet delegation.

59. It was so decided.

60. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that the Committee had before it a proposal by the Niger delegation that the Committee should vote first on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44.

61. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados), said that the draft resolutions should be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted, and he accordingly proposed that the Committee should vote first on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1.

62. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Niger proposal.

63. The Niger proposal was rejected by 47 votes to 36, with 18 abstentions.

64. Mr. HOUNA (Chad), explaining his vote before the vote, said that his delegation was unable to endorse whole-heartedly either of the two draft resolutions. Nevertheless, it was prepared to vote for draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, even though some of the savings proposed were unreasonable. If draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44 was put to the vote, it would abstain.

65. Miss L. UK (Austria) said that her delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, which represented a compromise in that it maintained first-class travel for flights exceeding nine hours and authorized the Secretary-General to make exceptions if the circumstances so warranted. The new measures contemplated would achieve savings, which could be used to strengthen programme activities.

66. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation would be unable to support draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, because it would be undignified for the representatives of Member States, particularly officials in the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, to travel by economy class.

67. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, because it represented an excellent compromise between the status quo and the recommendations made by JIU. Draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.44, on the other hand, seemed somewhat pointless; it was difficult to see what was to be gained by entrusting to the Secretary-General a study which had already been carried out by JIU.

/...

68. Mr. GEORGESCU (Romania) moved that the Committee should proceed immediately to a vote in view of the late hour.

69. The Romanian motion was adopted.

70. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Empire, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Iran, Ivory Coast, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahrain, Congo, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Uganda.

71. Draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1 was adopted by 64 votes to 12, with 26 abstentions.

72. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it represented a well-balanced compromise.

73. Mr. NDOM (United Republic of Cameroon) said that, despite certain reservations, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it considered that sacrifices were necessary at a time of financial crisis.

74. Mr. APALDO (Togo) said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/32/L.43/Rev.1, the alternative proposal in document A/C.5/32/L.44, which his delegation was co-sponsoring, would be withdrawn.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.