



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados)

later: Mr. BUSHEV (Bulgaria)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 116: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/39/SR.55
26 December 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/39/4 and Corr.1 and Add.1; A/C.5/39/L.32 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. AGAIANTS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.32, which had been adopted at the Committee's previous meeting, said that the Soviet Union's negative stand on General Assembly resolution 38/232 with respect to the education grant had not changed. However, his delegation had not raised any objection to section II of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.32 in order to maintain consensus on such an important matter as personnel questions.
2. Mr. KUTTNER (United States of America) said that, although his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it was concerned about the Committee's preoccupation with geographical distribution, at the expense of efficiency and competence. In that connection, his delegation supported the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the Committee's previous meeting.
3. With regard to section I of the draft resolution, his delegation regretted the deletion from paragraph 6 (e) of the words "including the conciliation and mediation functions", because those functions were of vital importance in settling cases before they went to the Joint Appeals Board or the Administrative Tribunal. Moreover, the study of ways and means of applying the population factor, requested in paragraph 6 (h), should not be given high priority, since that factor was built into the mathematical processes used by the Secretariat and since the Secretariat was to report to the General Assembly on that matter at its forty first session. Referring to paragraph 8, he stressed that the specialized agencies were autonomous bodies which should not be subjected to interference by the Assembly. Interested countries could pursue such matters directly in the legislative bodies of those agencies. In general, he expressed the hope that the plethora of requests to the Secretary-General concerning geographical distribution would end with the current session so that the Secretary-General could fulfil his tasks in accordance with the Charter and with the principles of good management.
4. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that serious attention would be devoted to section I, paragraph 2.
5. Mr. MA Longde (China) and Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that their delegations had joined the consensus on the understanding that paragraph 6 (h) would be implemented in the context of section II of General Assembly resolution 35/210.
6. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) and Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria), welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.6/39/L.32 and stressed the importance of applying Article 101, paragraph 3 of the Charter in letter and in spirit through a balanced recruitment of staff.

7. Mr. ROY (India) supported the views expressed by the representatives of China and Pakistan.
8. Mr. CASTROVIEJO (Spain) said that equitable geographical distribution was one of the goals of recruitment policy but it should not be the foremost or only consideration and it should be seen in the context of Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter, which referred also to the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. Accordingly, the word "equitable" in section I, paragraph 2, of the draft resolution was understood by his delegation to mean that a balance should be struck between competence and efficiency, on the one hand, and the necessary geographical distribution, on the other. Regarding the Secretary-General's decision to appoint a Co-ordinator to improve the situation of women in the Secretariat, he said that his delegation preferred the original text on that subject, to the wording in the draft resolution. While supporting the need to strengthen the role of the Office of Personnel Services, his delegation believed that the subject should have been dealt with separately, as in the original draft, instead of being combined with other issues. Lastly, his delegation regretted the deletion of the words "including the conciliation and mediation functions" from section I, paragraph 6 (e), because those functions were an important aid in the recourse procedure.
9. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt) said that his delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter would be strictly implemented, due account being taken of the delicate balance established in that provision. Although Egypt supported the improvement of the status of women, his delegation felt that paragraph 5 of section I was unnecessary. The Office of Personnel Services, which was responsible for all personnel questions, should be strengthened wherever possible, and its authority should be maintained.
10. Mr. WEDICK (Canada) supported the comments made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the Committee's 54th meeting. Geographical distribution should not be promoted at the expense of efficiency, competence and integrity, and Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter must be upheld.
11. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), after pointing out that, draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.32 requested the Secretary-General to prepare six reports for submission at the fortieth session, said that the Office of Personnel Services might have difficulty in producing them in the necessary detail.
12. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the reports of the Secretary-General contained in documents A/C.5/39/4 and Corr.1 and Add.1, which had been discussed at the Committee's previous meeting, said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to take note of those reports.
13. It was so decided.
14. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 116.

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)
(A/C.5/39/L.33)

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider its draft report on agenda item 109, which had been circulated in document A/C.5/39/L.33.

16. Mr. DUQUE (Secretary of the Committee), referring to paragraph 9 of the draft report, said that under section 28 the decrease shown against item (a) should read (50,000), instead of (150,000), although the totals for that section were correct. On page 26 of the English version, opposite "Total, expenditure sections", the figure 24,391,400 should be inserted in the column entitled "Increase or (decrease) approved at the current session" and the figure 1,611,551,200 should be inserted in the "total" column. All the blanks in paragraph 10 would be filled in after the current meeting, before the draft report was submitted to the plenary Assembly. In the second sentence of paragraph 61, "of \$37,100" should be inserted after the words "A consequent decrease".

17. Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report, briefly outlined its four sections and drew attention to the draft resolutions at the end of the report.

18. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) drew attention to an error in paragraph 7, where "20 December 1984" should read "20 December 1983".

19. Mr. YACOUBOU ABOU (Togo) pointed out that in the French version of section I of draft resolution II A (para. 67), the amount appropriated by resolution 38/236 A had erroneously been listed as 33,960,500, instead of 39,960,500.

20. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt the draft report.

Section I

21. Section I was adopted.

Section II

22. Section II was adopted.

Section III

23. Section III was adopted.

Section IV

Draft resolution I

24. The CHAIRMAN said that he would not submit draft resolution I to the vote, since it incorporated various decisions which the Committee had already taken, in some cases by a vote and in others without a vote. The manner in which the Committee had reached a decision on each specific section of the draft resolution was reflected in section III of the draft report.

Draft resolution II A

25. The CHAIRMAN said that he intended to submit draft resolution II A, containing revised budget appropriations for the biennium 1984-1985, to the vote.

26. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America), explaining his vote before the vote, said that throughout the current session his delegation had adopted a critical approach to additions to the budget and had voted against proposals it found unjustified. Under the current financing system, there was little incentive to limit budget growth. Although the Secretariat had an interest in keeping budget requests to a minimum because all such requests were scrutinized by the major contributors, the voting majority of the Fifth Committee did not seem concerned about maintaining the budget within established levels. The \$48.3 million in savings attributable to favourable currency and inflation trends had been virtually eliminated as a result of various decisions made prior to the current session. The decisions taken in the course of the session had raised the biennial expenditure budget by \$33 million to over \$1.6 billion. The one positive step taken by the Committee in the direction of fiscal responsibility had not actually reduced Member States' assessments; however, it was significant because it constituted a clear statement of principle on the adequacy of staff salaries. Otherwise, neither the Member States nor the Secretariat had shown much responsibility. The construction projects in Addis Ababa and Bangkok were costly status symbols that would provide no added benefit to the Organization or the peoples of the world it purported to represent. The General Assembly had unwisely decided to provide regular budget subsidies to two voluntary programmes: UNITAR and United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research. Should that trend continue, the United Nations regular budget would contain more unproductive programmes than Member States would be willing to finance. The introduction of the statement of programme budget implications was promising, but the Secretary-General had yet to include among his funding options the curtailment of low-priority activities. For the reasons he had outlined, the United States delegation would vote against draft resolution II A.

27. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said the fact that the revised estimates represented only a moderate increase over the initial estimates was due solely to fortuitous factors, namely, currency gains and a lower than expected rate of inflation. The savings achieved had already been reduced to \$25.6 million by increased staff costs and other items, and could well be further reduced by currency fluctuations before the end of the biennium. Moreover, with the additional amount of roughly \$32 million approved by the Committee during the current session, the revised budget proposals represented a 9.7 per cent increase over the final 1982-1983 appropriations. Under current circumstances, that rate of growth was too high. The statements of programme budget implications had failed to reveal signs of determined efforts to absorb costs through savings or redeployment, any such efforts being the exception rather than the norm. Some of those statements simply inflated cost estimates or blurred the established distinction between voluntary contributions and regular budget. Japan would therefore vote against draft resolution II A at the present stage. Depending on the outcome of three statements of financial implications, including that of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, it might re-examine its position prior to the vote in the plenary Assembly.

28. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that, despite the growing acceptance of the importance of absorption and redeployment, substantial additional appropriations had been approved, bringing the real growth of the 1984-1985 budget still further from the zero growth advocated by the United Kingdom. There were those who would dwell on the savings of a \$6.8 million that had been achieved. But the exchange-rate relationships which had produced the savings were not an unmixed blessing; they made the burden of dollar-denominated United Nations contributions notably heavier for countries with non-dollar currencies. The United Kingdom would in any event be concerned at the level of the budget, since its objective was to maximize United Nations cost efficiency. Given the budget ceilings, it was essential for the United Nations managers to set priorities to ensure that full value for money was obtained. His delegation therefore welcomed the Secretary-General's management improvement programme and the introduction of statements of programme budget implications which, if properly applied, would promote efficiency. New or expanded programmes should be financed by redeploying resources already provided in the biennial budget, and the redeployment should be made possible by improved efficiency and the curtailment of obsolete, marginally useful or ineffective programmes. Unfortunately, the revised budget proposals called instead for significant additional appropriations, and his delegation would therefore vote against them.

29. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that in one sense the net additional appropriation of \$6.8 million being requested was not a great deal of money to keep the Organization functioning through 1985. The Nordic countries continued to believe that Member States were, on the whole, getting reasonably good value for the money they invested, and that there were many worthwhile programmes in the programme budget. Even those of primarily symbolic value were justified as a reflection of the inability of the international community to solve certain conflicts and problems which were its responsibility. At the same time, the Nordic countries continued to believe in the need for greater efforts towards a more coherent, unified and efficient management of the Secretariat. Seen from another perspective - that of the unemployed worker, the citizen whose standard of living was declining or the hungry child - the sum of \$6.8 million was, indeed, a great deal of money. One means of striking the right balance within the United Nations was through a rational redeployment of resources, to make room for new and urgent programmes and activities. Redeployment was official budget policy in the Nordic countries. The United Nations programme budget was a policy instrument as well as a management tool and a budget of its size and complexity could not be implemented exactly in the way it was programmed.

30. Three items on the Committee's agenda - the programme budget, the scale of assessments and the activities dealing with the financial emergency - touched the financial core of the Organization, and were bound by a logic of interdependence that demanded that each should be promoted in conjunction with the others. There was also a basic logic to the distinction between the regular budget and voluntary funds, and care should be taken not to blur that distinction.

31. The Nordic countries would vote in favour of the revised budget estimates.

32. Mr. JANNUZZI (Italy) said that by utilizing the available funds more efficiently and monitoring distribution of tasks within the various departments and offices, and above all, by eliminating low-priority initiatives, the role of the United Nations could be strengthened, to the benefit of everyone, especially the developing countries. Member States were concerned about the scale of priorities because they had to contain their national budgets in view of persistent economic difficulties and the need to control inflation. Thus it was imperative for the United Nations to maintain rigid financial discipline and to refrain from enlarging the budget to meet rising costs, especially administrative ones. Since contributions from Member States remained the primary source of financing, increases in contributions to the regular budget would ultimately only limit voluntary ones. Of particular concern to his delegation were the continuous requests, halfway through the biennium, for additional funds to finance administrative costs which should have been programmed at the beginning of the biennium. Equally disturbing was the limited consideration given to the recommendations of ACABQ, particularly to the distinction between expenditures to be financed from the regular budget and those which should come from voluntary contributions. Another source of concern was the continuing underrepresentation of States, including his own, in the Secretariat. The financial cost of various programmes should remain within the limits set, and maximum efforts should be made to finance additional requests from available resources. For those reasons, and in the light of the reservations it had already expressed, his delegation could not support the revised budget estimates and would therefore abstain in the vote.

33. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that the General Assembly was being accused of a lack of fiscal responsibility because of an increase in the agreed budget of \$6.8 million, or 0.43 per cent. Was there any national budget, he wondered, which had undergone such a modest annual increase? For the past three bienniums, the United Nations had kept to zero budget growth and had exercised maximum restraint: coming at the end of such a period, a small increase was not a serious crime. In his view, States had shown responsibility: many programmes had been curtailed and many requests for valid activities had not been made, in recognition of the financial constraints. Egypt would vote in favour of draft resolution II A.

34. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland) said that Ireland would vote in favour of the draft resolution, in line with its general policy that the United Nations should have sufficient funds to perform its functions. It was pleased that the revised estimates represented an increase of only \$6.8 million and it welcomed the efforts to redeploy funds and set priorities, including the Secretary-General's management improvement programme and the introduction of statements of programme budget implications. Ireland believed, however, that the United Nations must further improve its management efficiency, priority-setting and rational redeployment of funds.

35. Mr. van den HOUT (Netherlands) asked the Secretariat, in relation to the remarks by the representative of Egypt, to inform the Committee of the net real growth of the 1984-1985 programme budget, on the basis of the figures given in document A/C.5/39/L.33.

36. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said that the 1984-1985 programme budget, as adopted at the thirty-eighth session, had registered 0.9 per cent real growth over the 1982-1983 programme budget. The revised 1984-1985 programme budget would represent a further increase of 0.55 per cent, making a total rate of real growth of 1.5 per cent.

37. Mr. van den HOUT (Netherlands) said that the increasingly strong position on budgetary restraint taken by his Government in its votes in the Committee stemmed from its sincere concern to ensure sound and prudent management. Through priority-setting, the United Nations could avoid growth in real terms. The Netherlands would therefore vote against the revised budget estimates in draft resolution II A.

38. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that the Committee was being asked to approve an additional amount of \$6.8 million for an Organization dedicated to the maintenance of peace and social and economic progress. At the current time, far more was being spent for far less noble causes. Austria agreed with Sweden that that amount was very modest and would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution II A. There was, however, another issue: whether the money was being spent to further the goals of the Organization and to obtain the best value from it. One lesson to be drawn from the debates was that the activities funded should be considered important and worth while by all States - or at least by a broadly-based majority including both developed and developing countries. It was also clear that every effort must be made to get the best value for taxpayers' money and that the Organization should not shrink from redeploying its resources whenever necessary.

39. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that his delegation was pleased that the representative of Sweden had placed the revised estimates in the proper perspective. The budget was indeed interrelated with the negotiations being carried out in the United Nations: the more difficult those negotiations, the larger the number of meetings and studies required, and therefore the more funds must be appropriated. He did not see how a modest increase in funds could be avoided. As to the use of those funds, many resolutions designed to rationalize programme planning had received his delegation's support. It was more than ever necessary to scrutinize the way in which funds were used, with a view to achieving progress in that area before the next programme performance report was submitted. In view of the aforementioned, his delegation was prepared to support draft resolution II A.

40. Mr. KHALEVINSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in order to make the most rational and economic use of the financial resources of Member States, additional budgetary appropriations should be made only when required in order to implement the most essential tasks, namely, to maintain international peace and security, promote disarmament and avert the threat of another world war. Unfortunately, a number of decisions had been taken at the current session to launch new activities without due effort to redeploy available resources. Having included in the 1984-1985 budget deliberately overstated rates of inflation, the Secretariat currently had millions of dollars at its disposal, which unnecessarily increased the contributions of Member States for the current budget period. Despite General Assembly resolutions calling for greater efficiency and economy, a

(Mr. Khalevinski, USSR)

trend persisted of unjustifiably high rates of growth expenditures in real terms, and too little was being done to stabilize budgetary expenditures. Specifically, the Secretariat was doing little to implement a resolution calling for information on resources released as a result of the completion or curtailment of programmes and for observations on obsolete and ineffective programmes. The Fifth Committee's efforts to effect greater economies was hampered by a lack of opportunity to evaluate the type and the scope of activities which could be implemented with released resources. The Soviet position regarding the increase in the remuneration of staff had not changed.

41. The Fifth Committee had approved additional appropriations of \$24.4 million for the 1984-1985 budget. His delegation had strongly objected to the inclusion in that budget of appropriations for unlawful and anti-Charter activities, to which his country had no intention of contributing. His delegation also wished to reaffirm its position of principle regarding the financing of technical assistance. Article 17 of the United Nations Charter made it perfectly clear that the regular budget had an exclusively administrative function and could not be used to finance technical assistance, which must be financed on a voluntary basis and consolidated with the United Nations Development Programme. In the light of the above, and also because the estimates under consideration included additional expenditures for particular budget items, his delegation would vote against draft resolution II A.

42. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained the previous year in the voting on the 1984-1985 budget proposals, which it had welcomed as a first step in the right direction. The Committee was currently faced, however, with revised estimates representing a 1.5 per cent growth in real terms. His delegation felt that the budget as a whole was no longer reasonable, particularly in view of the current world-wide financial situation and the concept of zero real growth which, in his delegation's view, was the right approach to that situation. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against draft resolution II A.

43. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed revisions to the programme budget because it felt that the Secretary-General had shown maximum restraint in requesting additional appropriations. The increase of only \$6.8 million appeared modest in view of the increasing demands being placed on the Organization for ensuring international peace and security and promoting international economic and social development. The preoccupation with budgetary restraint should not reduce the capacity of the Organization to promote and implement various action programmes effectively, especially those of prime importance to developing countries. His delegation believed that the insistence of Member States on the necessity of financing programmes or new activities from within existing budgetary resources and their reluctance to provide sufficient financial resources for programmes approved by the General Assembly would undermine the credibility of the Organization.

44. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that it was still possible to improve the budget performance of the United Nations, provided that Member States, both large and

(Mr. Oduyemi, Nigeria)

small, showed more flexibility and a willingness to understand each other's views. The amount of increase in the proposed budget was only \$6.8 million and would hardly lead to a budgetary crisis in the United Nations. His delegation was in favour of financial restraint, efficiency and fiscal responsibility, which could all be improved if Member States were prepared to demonstrate the political will necessary for a more successful multilateral co-operation. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the revised programme budget.

45. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that the overall amount being requested was modest and that, fortunately, it was gradually being accepted that additional costs for new programmes should be absorbed and resources redeployed. What disturbed him, however, was the increasing unwillingness of States to share the financing of the budget, together with an unrestrained enthusiasm for new and expanded activities. His delegation was anxious to see what could be done over the coming year and at the fortieth session to bring about programme and resources rationalization and co-operation in connection with the new scale of assessments. At the current stage, therefore, his delegation would abstain in the voting.

46. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that his delegation would abstain in the voting. It believed that the Secretariat should exercise better control over the growth of expenditures of the Organization, particularly in the area of operational costs. His delegation also felt that further efforts should be made with regard to salary policies and the regular-budget financing of activities which should be funded by voluntary contributions. It hoped that the control of expenditures would be improved in the coming year, by means, inter alia, of substantive discussions of the programmes submitted so as to enhance their effectiveness.

47. Mr. de CLERCK (Belgium) said that his delegation appreciated the efforts made by Member States and the Secretariat to restrict expenditures. He noted, however, that since his Government was in favour of zero budgetary growth, any increase in the regular budget would unfortunately mean a reduction in Belgium's voluntary contributions. For that reason, his delegation would vote against the revised estimates.

48. Mr. SOUDANI (Tunisia) said that for several years his delegation had advocated the elimination of all waste in the budget, and it was happy to see that commendable efforts had been made to that end by the Secretariat. Tunisia would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution II A.

49. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution II A.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland,

Ghana, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, Romania, Spain.

50. Draft resolution II A was adopted by 87 votes to 16, with 7 abstentions.

51. Mr. FERNANDEZ MAROTO (Spain) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution II A because, although it acknowledged the efforts which had clearly been made to limit expenditures, it was somewhat discouraged by the fact that, before the end of the first year of the 1984-1985 biennium, the appropriations had proved inadequate.

52. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, although the Organization should continue to strive to achieve the maximum possible savings in the budget, the very modest increment in real growth should not be cause for alarm. An increased expenditure of \$6.8 million was not out of line with the growing need for resources to promote development and peace. Some Governments were against budgetary growth on grounds of financial soundness; others wanted to cut the budget in order to limit the role of the Organization. His delegation supported the concerns of the former but firmly opposed the intentions of the latter. It had therefore voted in favour of draft resolution II A, although it had opposed certain items which it felt to be unlawful.

Draft resolution II B

53. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote against draft resolution II B because of the additional posts for security guards in connection with the United Nations Headquarters garage, which would result in increased expenditures but which were only reflected in the budget as reduced income under income section 3.

54. A recorded vote was taken on resolution II B.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

55. Draft resolution II B was adopted by 85 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

Draft resolution II C

56. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution II C.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel*, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden,

* See para. 58 below.

Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, New Zealand, Romania, Spain.

57. Draft resolution II C was adopted by 86 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions.

58. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that his delegation had intended to vote against draft resolution II C.

59. Miss MORALES (Philippines), Mr. MA Longde (China), Mr. MALAGA (Peru) and Mr. OKEYO (Kenya), referring to section III, paragraphs 39 and 40, of the draft report, said it was their understanding that the project to expand the conference facilities of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific would be implemented as scheduled. They looked forward to a progress report by the Secretariat on the matter at the next session of the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 115: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued)
(A/C.5/39/L.18 and L.26)

60. Mr. BARRETT (New Zealand) announced that his delegation had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26.

61. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation was deeply concerned about the situation which had arisen in the Committee with respect to agenda item 115. The scale of assessments was an important index of the commitment of Member States to the Organization and any draft resolution on it must reflect the positions of all States so as to produce a consensus. Unfortunately, one group of States had put forward an unbalanced and unsound text. It had responded with inflexibility, to the readiness of others to compromise, thereby creating an unprecedented situation which could have a divisive effect, undermine trust in the United Nations, and eventually reduce the financial commitment of Member States.

62. His delegation had difficulties with a number of paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18, especially paragraph 2 (b), which involved questions of principle, and paragraph 3, which wrongly created two categories of countries on the basis of economic criteria.

63. He proposed the addition of two new subparagraphs to paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26, the first to read: "The inclusion of an additional

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

relief factor reflecting the severe economic and financial situation in developing countries, in particular the problems relating to the ratio of export earnings to debt servicing"; and the second to read: "Relief consideration to developing countries where national revenues are primarily generated by the export of one or a few products or where per capita income overtakes the low per capita limit for the first time."

The meeting was suspended at 5.40 p.m. and resumed at 7.15 p.m.

64. The CHAIRMAN announced that extensive consultations had been held on draft resolutions A/C.5/39/L.18 and A/C.5/39/L.26.

65. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said that the Group of 77 had discussed the amendments which the representative of Japan had proposed to draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26 and had then made a counter-proposal to the sponsors of that draft resolution, which had not, however, been accepted.

66. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that, since the Group of 77 had not accepted his delegation's amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26, Japan would withdraw those amendments and become a sponsor of that draft resolution.

67. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said that several delegations had urged the Group of 77 to amend the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18 by replacing the word "correctly" with the word "adequately". Furthermore, the representative of Poland, supported by the representative of Hungary, had proposed an amendment to paragraph 2 (d) of the draft resolution at the Committee's 51st meeting. The Group of 77 was prepared to accept both amendments in the hope that the draft resolution would meet with broader approval.

68. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Community, recalled a number of the principles underlying the Community's approach to the question of contributions and scales of assessment which she had enumerated at the 11th meeting. In the view of the Ten, those principles were not reflected in draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18; instead, the draft resolution would further diminish the objectivity of the measurement of capacity to pay and would add to the excessive burden of detailed instructions already borne by the Committee on Contributions.

69. During the long and difficult informal consultations on the agenda item under consideration, the Ten had emphasized the importance which they attached to the attainment of a broad measure of agreement among Member States on questions relating to the scale of assessments. However, efforts on the part of the Ten to achieve that goal had not been well received by other groups, and the draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77 had been modified only superficially. Such inflexibility had led some members of EEC to join with a number of other countries in submitting draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26, which reflected the principal recommendations of the Committee on Contributions. Since draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18 failed to reflect those recommendations and thus did not offer a

(Ms. Conway, Ireland)

basis for consensus, the States members of the European Community would vote against it.

70. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that, if a consensus was to be reached, delegations must do more than repeat their positions. It was true that principles were involved in the vote on the draft resolutions currently before the Committee, but the most important principle at stake was the Committee's unity. Consequently, to avoid any confrontation, which would jeopardize much that the Committee had worked for, and since the Committee was unlikely to reach agreement on that issue before it during the current session, he proposed that the Fifth Committee should simply take note of the report of the Committee on Contributions and resume its consideration of that issue at the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

71. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) supported the proposal of the representative of Canada.

72. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) maintained that the Committee had already considered all possibilities for revising the scale of assessments during the current session. The solution proposed in draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18 represented a step in the right direction, and could be improved upon in the future. He therefore urged all delegations to support the draft resolution.

73. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) offered to modify his proposal to render it acceptable to a larger number of delegations. Thus, in addition to taking note of the report of the Committee on Contributions, the Fifth Committee might also request the Committee on Contributions to take into consideration the views expressed by delegations on draft resolutions A/C.5/39/L.18 and A/C.5/39/L.26.

74. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his delegation could not muster great enthusiasm for the Canadian proposal, since it effectively failed to give any instructions to the Committee on Contributions. He would nevertheless support the proposal, and urged others to join him in doing so, because it would prevent a split in the Committee along North-South lines.

75. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) asked whether, in view of the procedural difficulties which might arise if the draft resolutions were put to a vote, a decision might first be taken on his proposal.

76. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said it was too late for the proposal of the representative of Canada to be of any practical use. Moreover, any procedural debate at present would only widen the gap between the sponsors of the two draft resolutions. He therefore hoped that the Committee would proceed to take the necessary action and vote on the draft resolutions before it.

77. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon), Mr. ROY (India), Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) and Mr. MILLS-LUTTERODT (Ghana), said that, as the representatives of States belonging to the Group of 77, they believed that action should be taken on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18. If the representative of Canada insisted on his proposal, they would have to consult their Governments before taking a decision on it.

/...

78. Mr. JAGUARIBE (Brazil) said that there was no reason to delay action on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18.

79. Mr. SHIHABI (Saudi Arabia) appealed to the delegations that had expressed a wish to consult their Governments to abide by the consensus which had been reached within the Group of 77 and agree to take action on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18.

80. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that his delegation would heed the appeal of the representative of Saudi Arabia for a consensus on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18; however, his wish to consult his Government related to the Canadian proposal, and not the draft resolution.

81. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that the Committee was faced with a purportedly procedural question. In his view, the Canadian proposal was neither an amendment nor a motion, but simply a new proposal, and must therefore be voted on once decisions had been taken on the two previously submitted draft resolutions.

82. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) agreed with the representative of Cuba that the issue before the Committee was in fact political and not procedural. He appreciated the wishes of those delegations that wished to consult with their Governments; he also wanted the Group of 77 to have an opportunity to discuss his proposal, since it offered an alternative to confrontation. He therefore invoked the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and proposed that the Chairman should adjourn the meeting.

83. In accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, a vote was taken on the Canadian proposal to adjourn the meeting.

84. The Canadian proposal was adopted by 56 votes to 50.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.