

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

*Official Records**



DEC 5 1984

THIRD COMMITTEE
37th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 13 November 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MADAR (Somalia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 85: INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE:
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 89: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH: REPORT OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 90: QUESTION OF AGING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 91: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME OF ACTION CONCERNING DISABLED
PERSONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

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

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/39/SR.37
16 November 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 85: INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/39/L.6, L.12 and L.15 and Add.1)

AGENDA ITEM 89: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/39/L.11)

AGENDA ITEM 90: QUESTION OF AGING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/39/L.13)

AGENDA ITEM 91: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD PROGRAMME OF ACTION CONCERNING DISABLED PERSONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/39/L.14, L.22 and Add.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 and the statement of its programme-budget implications in document A/C.3/39/L.15

1. Mr. VOICU (Romania), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, said that Egypt should be deleted from the list of sponsors. Furthermore, in paragraph 5, the phrase "from 18 to 27 March" should be revised to read "from 25 March to 3 April", because the conference facilities would not be available at Vienna for the fourth session of the Advisory Committee on the dates originally scheduled and, in keeping with the desires of the Advisory Committee, the closest possible dates had been chosen.
2. At the time of the introduction of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, his delegation had hoped that the Committee would adopt it by consensus, in keeping with well-established tradition. However the Secretariat had produced a statement of the related programme-budget implications (A/C.3/39/L.15) whose content could lead to difficulties. That document should have made it clear that the World Conference for the International Youth Year would be organized without additional financial implications, because it would take place during plenary meetings of the fortieth session of the General Assembly. Moreover, although paragraph 5 of the draft resolution had stated that the fourth session of the Advisory Committee would be convened "within existing resources", paragraph 24 of document A/C.3/39/L.15 cited the cost of "additional requirements", including exaggerated expenditures for travel and documentation. He pointed out that representatives from the regional commissions normally covered their own expenses from commission budgets, and that the excess volume of documentation was not justified by any Advisory Committee request. He suggested that document A/C.3/39/L.15 should be revised to indicate that the Secretariat would cover the necessary expenditures within existing resources.
3. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation associated itself with the statement of the representative of Romania. He noted that, at its third session, the Advisory Committee had completely agreed with the substance of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, and he was therefore disturbed that document A/C.3/39/L.15 purported to provide the Committee with a statement of additional

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

programme-budget implications. When a substantive committee inserted the phrase "within existing resources", or when a United Nations conference adopted a report which included the same phrase, it was not a casual attempt to usurp the powers of the Secretariat or the Fifth Committee but was an indication of the intent of the substantive committee with regard to the expenditure needed to implement the draft resolution.

4. He pointed out that paragraph 18 of document A/C.3/39/L.15 referred to consultancy services which the Advisory Committee had never requested; that paragraph 24 contained an excessive estimate for travel expenditures; and that the documents listed in the annex would amount to an estimated total of 250 pages at \$750 per page, an unconscionable expenditure.

5. He stressed that the Secretariat could not ignore the instructions given by the Third Committee, and that the Committee should be provided with an accurate statement of the real financial implications of the draft resolution. His delegation would be delighted to join in the consensus in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 if such a statement were provided to both the Fifth and Third Committees.

6. Ms. COLL (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community, said that all substantive committees should have full, relevant information on the programme-budget implications of draft resolutions so that they could make proper judgements concerning the relative priorities of the programmes in their areas of competence. General Assembly resolution 38/227 should be implemented in the same manner as reviews of financial and administrative implications statements.

7. Mr. van BOLHUIS (Netherlands) said that he was in agreement as to the need for a revision of document A/C.3/39/L.15, because it had added to the confusion about the programme-budget implications of the draft resolution. With regard to Romania's oral revision of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, he said that his delegation, although it was one of the sponsors, did not agree with the new dates proposed for the Advisory Committee's fourth meeting. He pointed out that, in document A/C.3/39/L.15/Add.1, the Committee on Conferences had recommended that the session should be held from 10 to 19 June 1985 to allow sufficient time for the necessary consultations. If the Secretariat had time to prepare the documents requested in draft resolutions A/C.3/39/L.6 and L.11 by the end of March, his delegation would agree to the dates proposed by the representative of Romania. If not, his delegation would propose that the session should be held from 10 to 19 June 1985.

8. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that the representative of the Netherlands had based his objection to holding the session in March on document A/C.3/39/L.15/Add.1, which was not available to all members of the Committee. The other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 had not been in favour of holding the session in June because the impact of the International Youth Year on young people would be reduced if the session were held that late. With regard to the documentation for the

(Mr. Voicu, Romania)

session, he appealed to the Netherlands representative not to create confusion between draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 and draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.11, as the latter would be discussed under another item. He suggested that the Secretariat should inform the Committee whether the documentation for the session of the Advisory Committee could be produced by March 1985.

9. Mr. BRAUN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the proposal by the Netherlands representative raised a valid question with regard to the availability of document A/C.3/39/L.15/Add.1. He asked whether the Secretariat was indeed suggesting that the session should be held in June.

10. Mr. BOUFFANDEAU (France) said that he shared the view that the essential point was to know whether the documents would be available in time. One of the reasons given that the Advisory Committee should meet in March was that its conclusions and guidelines would then be of value throughout the entire year. However, paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 said that guidelines for further planning and suitable follow-up would be transmitted for approval to the General Assembly at its fortieth session. There appeared, therefore, to be a contradiction between the two points of view in respect of the time-frame for the guidelines.

11. Mr. POZHARSKI (Assistant Secretary-General, Department of International Economic and Social Affairs) said that paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 and paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.11 requested the Secretary-General to carry out certain functions, the results of which would be reflected in the report of the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year on the work of its fourth session. At its fortieth session, the General Assembly was expected to take action on the basis of that report.

12. Both requests made of the Secretary-General would require consultations with United Nations agencies and offices, Governments and non-governmental organizations. The Secretariat had strict rules on the preparation, printing and distribution of documentation. If the Advisory Committee's fourth session were held in March 1985, it would be virtually impossible to submit the required documentation in time. If the Third Committee agreed, however, that the only document needed for the fourth session was the report requested in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, then that report could be prepared for distribution at the end of March. However, the documents requested in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.11 and in decision 1 (III) and resolution 1 (III) of the Advisory Committee (A/39/262, paras. 1-2) would have to be submitted directly to the General Assembly at its fortieth session and not through the Advisory Committee at its fourth session.

13. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that the Third Committee was at present discussing only draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6. He interpreted the statement just made by the Assistant Secretary-General to mean that the dates 25 March to 3 April 1985 were available for the fourth session of the Advisory Committee, as confirmed in document A/C.3/39/L.15, paragraph 14. Secondly, the document requested in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 would be ready by the end of March and be available to the Advisory Committee at its fourth session.

(Mr. Voicu, Romania)

14. He therefore appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution, including the representative of the Netherlands and others that had spoken, to maintain their unity. He also appealed to the Third Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus in the firm hope that the Secretariat would submit to the Fifth Committee an explanation of the financial data contained in document A/C.3/39/L.15, as suggested in paragraph 25 of that document.
15. Mr. van BOLHUIS (Netherlands) said he understood that the Third Committee could discuss any of the draft resolutions submitted under the cluster of items under discussion. In any event, he did not agree with the Romanian representative's interpretation of the statement of the Assistant Secretary-General. As a member of the Advisory Committee, his delegation hoped that its work would be of good quality on the basis of well-prepared documentation. The Advisory Committee, at its fourth session, was expected to prepare guidelines for years to come, not just for the International Youth Year.
16. Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had no fixed views regarding the dates of the Advisory Committee's fourth session. He suggested that the Chairman should convoke a meeting of a small group of concerned delegations and members of the Secretariat and/or the Committee on Conferences with a view to setting the dates.
17. Mr. VOICU (Romania) asked the United States representative not to insist on his suggestion. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 should be adopted at the current meeting. His delegation, too, hoped that the Advisory Committee's work would be of good quality and, accordingly, hoped that draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 would be adopted by consensus.
18. Ms. LUND (Norway) said she agreed with the Netherlands representative that it was important that the documents requested in draft resolutions A/C.3/39/L.6 and L.11 should be available to the Advisory Committee at its fourth session. She did not agree that the two draft resolutions could be isolated from each other. In a spirit of compromise, she suggested that, in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, as orally revised by the sponsors, the words "from 25 March to 3 April 1985" should be replaced by "at the most appropriate time".
19. Mr. VOICU (Romania) appealed to the representative of Norway not to complicate matters. The many sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 had agreed to the current wording. He understood the difficulties of some delegations; however, if they had reservations, they were free to express them.
20. Mr. AIDARA (Senegal) proposed a suspension so that consultations could be held on draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6.
21. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 118 of the rules of procedure, he would immediately put the Senegalese proposal to the vote.
22. The proposal was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 12.20 p.m.

23. Mr. van BOLHUIS (Netherlands) said that it was important for United Nations conferences and committees to obtain results based on adequate information and documents prepared well in advance. It had always been possible to adopt decisions in the Third Committee by consensus and his delegation did not wish to depart from that procedure. Accordingly, in a spirit of compromise he would withdraw his proposal in the hope that the fourth session of the Advisory Committee would be concluded successfully.

24. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, as orally revised by the sponsor, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.12

25. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.12, which had no programme-budget implications.

26. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Mozambique and Nigeria had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

27. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.12 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.11

28. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that Belgium, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Indonesia, Rwanda, Senegal and Yemen had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

29. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.11 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.13

30. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.13, which had no programme-budget implications.

31. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Samoa, Senegal, Somalia and the Sudan had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

32. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.13 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.14 and the statement of its programme-budget implications in document A/C.3/39/L.22 and Add.1)

33. Mrs. TIRONA (Philippines) said that her delegation was the principal sponsor of the draft resolution and hoped that it would be viewed in the light of the Third Committee's tradition of adopting draft resolutions on social and humanitarian issues by consensus. The Secretariat must endeavour to implement it in strict accordance with its spirit and letter: after a similar resolution had been adopted

(Mrs. Tirona, Philippines)

at the thirty-eighth session, the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs had been weakened by the abolition of two posts, a step which had been the opposite of that intended. The statement of programme-budget implications was for the Third Committee's information only, since budgetary issues were the province of the Fifth Committee.

34. Mr. HACKETT (Department of International Economic and Social Affairs) said that, under the draft resolution, the Secretary-General was requested to elaborate the guidelines for priority actions during the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons. To comply with that request, the Department would carry out the activities outlined in document A/C.3/39/L.22, paragraph 10 (a) to (d), which would yield three reports to be submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session. The Department considered that, should the draft resolution be adopted, the existing temporary post at the P-3 level would have to be extended until the end of the fortieth session.

35. Mr. TROUVEROY (Belgium) said that the programme-budget implications set forth documents A/C.3/39/L.22 and Add.1, and supplemented orally, left many questions unanswered. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.14, paragraph 6, requested that existing resources should be reallocated to strengthen the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs: he wondered how that could be reconciled with the comments in document A/C.3/39/L.22, paragraphs 15 and 17, that the temporary post at the P-3 level would have to be converted to an established post at a cost of \$48,800. Similarly, the request in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution that the Secretary-General should take steps to publicize the Decade did not imply the allocation of additional resources, yet document A/C.3/39/L.22, paragraph 18, quoted an additional estimate of \$35,000 for the publication of newsletters and pamphlets.

36. His delegation would join in the consensus on the draft resolution, but would reserve its position on the final document to be submitted to the Fifth Committee, which should contain a more detailed explanation of the programme-budget implications.

37. Mr. HAWKES (Canada) said that the statement of programme-budget implications did not explain whether the activities proposed in the draft resolution could be carried out through the redeployment of existing resources. Member States were left to assume that redeployment was possible; if not, the Secretariat should say so unequivocally. The statement also failed to take into account a number of other procedural options suggested in the draft resolution. The Secretariat should give the Committee better guidance regarding programme-budget implications, and should evaluate all possible options for resource conservation.

38. Ms. JONES (United States of America) said that her delegation did not see how the draft resolution could occasion the programme-budget implications outline in document A/C.3/39/L.22 and Add.1 - for example, nowhere did the draft call for the extension of a temporary post beyond the end of the thirty-ninth session. The Secretariat should take full account of the fact that the language of draft

(Ms. Jones, United States)

resolutions was formulated with great care. One example of the Secretariat's misreading of draft resolutions was its response to the request in paragraph 7 that the Decade should be publicized. In drafting that paragraph, the sponsors had expected the Secretariat to devise imaginative ways of making the Decade more meaningful and of furthering its objectives; instead, the Secretariat had simply proposed to publish a few pamphlets. Her delegation attached great importance to the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons, and would accordingly not oppose the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote; it would, however, carefully monitor its passage through the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly, and wished to stress that the draft had no programme-budget implications whatsoever.

39. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not oppose the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, but regretted that it omitted references to the main United Nations organs dealing with social and humanitarian issues, such as the Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council. Nothing could prejudice the important role of such organs in implementing resolutions on social and humanitarian matters, and the General Assembly must be guided by their opinions in implementing paragraphs 5, 7 and 14. The adoption of the draft resolution should not have any programme-budget implications: his delegation therefore objected to document A/C.3/39/L.22 and regretted that the Secretariat had not stressed the full use of existing resources. Under no circumstances should any efforts to implement the resolution inflate the already excessive United Nations budget.

40. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that Austria, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Somalia, Senegal, the United States of America, Uruguay and Zaire had become sponsors of the draft resolution, and that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had withdrawn its sponsorship.

41. Draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.14 was adopted without a vote.

Explanations of vote after the vote

42. Mr. MATHEWSON (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/39/L.6 and L.14, said that the United Kingdom had not opposed their adoption, but felt that the statements of their programme-budget implications had been neither satisfactory nor in conformity with the established guidelines. That unacceptable approach to the adoption of draft resolutions should not be regarded as a precedent, and in future, the Secretariat should furnish precise information on how activities could be carried out within existing resources.

43. Mr. BATH (Brazil) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.3/39/L.6 and L.14 because it considered the proposed activities to be of great social and humanitarian importance. It reserved its position, however, concerning the phrases "within existing resources" in

(Mr. Bath, Brazil)

paragraph 5 of the former draft resolution, and "through a reallocation of existing resources" in paragraph 6 of the latter, because it felt that decisions on programme-budget implications should be taken by the Fifth Committee, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 38/227.

44. Mr. YAKOVLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 because it attached great importance to the International Youth Year and saw the resolution as a means of promoting the contribution of youth to the strengthening of international peace, security and co-operation. The Soviet Union welcomed the emphasis on national measures, but wished to stress that the conferences and festivals mentioned in paragraph 8 must be prepared for and held on a democratic basis and without discrimination. In particular, the reference to the approach to be taken by organizers of conferences and festivals meant that those activities must make the maximum possible contribution to the achievement of the purposes and principles of the Charter. The existing United Nations structure in the social and humanitarian field must be fully preserved, and all relevant recommendations must be submitted through the Economic and Social Council. He agreed with those delegations which had objected to the "programme-budget implications" - which in fact were non-existent - and believed that the Secretariat's mandate was that of implementing the draft resolution without artificially and unjustifiably inflating the United Nations budget.

45. The Soviet Union had not opposed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.11 but wished to stress that, although the wording used in previous years had not been included, that did not imply that the Governments and organizations concerned should not co-operate both with youth organizations which had consultative status with the Economic and Social Council and with those that did not. The preparation of the Secretary-General's report mentioned in paragraph 1 must have no programme-budget implications whatsoever, and the Secretary-General must conform to the relevant principles and guidelines in preparing that report.

46. Ms. LUND (Norway), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Iceland, Finland and Sweden, said that they had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6 but regretted that due consideration had not been given to the fact that the fourth session of the Advisory Committee would be convened before the necessary documentation was available. The programme-budget implications of the draft resolution, as set out in document A/C.3/39/L.15, particularly paragraph 25, did not follow the guidelines for such statements established in General Assembly resolution 38/227.

47. Miss EMARA (Egypt) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.14 even though it had some difficulties with the reference in paragraph 6 to the reallocation of existing resources: such decisions fell to the Fifth Committee. If the phrase in question had been put to the vote, her delegation would have voted against it.

48. Mr. HOFER (Observer for Switzerland), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/39/L.6, paragraph 2, said that his delegation regretted that it would be unable to participate fully in the United Nations World Conference for the International Youth Year, to be held within the framework of plenary meetings at the fortieth session of the General Assembly. It wished, however, to reiterate its support for such United Nations efforts in the social and humanitarian field.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of items 85, 89, 90 and 91.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.