

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-NINTH SESSION

*Official Records**



COPY
FOR REFERENCE
ONLY - DO NOT
CIRCULATE

FIFTH COMMITTEE
53rd meeting
held on
Saturday, 15 December 1984
at 3.00 p.m.
New York

DEC 27 1984

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 53rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados)

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)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34 concerning
agenda item 80 (d) (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.33 concerning
agenda item 12

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.35 concerning
agenda item 80 (d)

Use of consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups in the United
Nations in 1982-1983 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 113: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 112: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE
UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (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.5/39/SR.53
20 December 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/39/L.17 and L.24)

Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.24

1. Ms. van DRUNEN LITTEL (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.24, said that the last line of paragraph 6 should be amended to read as follows: "regulations of the United Nations, in particular regulation 1.8, and from the equivalent provisions governing the staff of the other agencies,". She drew particular attention to paragraphs 4, 6 and 7 and expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

2. Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.24, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.17

3. Mr. SOEPRAPTO (Indonesia) suggested that, in view of the concern expressed by a number of delegations at the recruitment difficulties of the regional commissions, the second preambular paragraph should be amended to read as follows: "Deeply concerned about the high vacancy rate and difficulties in recruitment which have prevailed in the regional commissions, in particular in the Economic Commission for Western Asia for a number of years,".

4. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) expressed the hope that Member States would support the draft resolution.

5. Mr. NUGALI (Saudi Arabia) said that the sponsors accepted the amendment proposed by the representative of Indonesia.

6. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that the failure to include Israel in the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) constituted a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and that the inclusion of the so-called PLO, which was not even a State, as a full member of the Commission was a further such violation.

7. He protested most strongly at the outrageous draft resolution which would have Member States agree to the recruitment of members of the so-called PLO for service in the ECWA secretariat, and called on Members to reject it.

8. Mr. NUGALI (Saudi Arabia) pointed out that the Fifth Committee was not the appropriate forum to discuss membership in regional or international organizations.

9. Mr. NEGRE (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) said that according to a recent cable from ECWA personnel services the number of vacant posts currently stood at 10. The second preambular paragraph would therefore seem not to reflect the reality with respect to ECWA. The situation in the other regional commissions likewise did not seem to be a matter of concern to their respective executive heads. It might be wise to correct the second preambular paragraph and to insert in paragraph 2 the words "in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Assembly" between the words "staff" and "from".

10. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that a high vacancy rate had long been a problem in ECWA. The sponsors would, of course, hold consultations regarding the Assistant Secretary-General's suggestion.

11. Mr. NUGALI (Saudi Arabia) proposed that the draft resolution should be put to the vote forthwith.

12. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the expedient proposed in the draft resolution would create a bad precedent as it would allow ECWA to violate the principle of equal employment opportunities for nationals of all Member States and even to offer employment to members which were neither Governments nor States nor Members of the United Nations but organizations which paid no assessment and therefore had no claim to be represented in the ECWA secretariat. Moreover, the statistics cited by the Assistant Secretary-General seemed to indicate that the critical situation might no longer exist. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

13. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.17, as orally amended by Indonesia.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

14. Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.17, as orally amended by Indonesia, was adopted by 72 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions.

15. Mr. FORBES (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community said that it was their understanding that the draft resolution was intended to resolve problems in ECWA, that its provisions were of a temporary nature and that nothing in the draft resolution should constitute a precedent for any other regional commission or United Nations body, particularly in respect of States which were already overrepresented. The policy of the Community

(Mr. Forbes, Ireland)

on matters affecting the region in question was well known and their stand on the draft resolution should not be taken as implying any change.

16. Mr. GUERRERO (Ecuador) said that his delegation had been unable to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.17 for lack of instructions from its Government.

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

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34 concerning agenda item 80 (d) (continued) (A/C.5/39/91)

17. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that he would accept the recommendation made in the Fifth Committee without prejudging what might happen in the plenary Assembly.

18. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34, an additional appropriation of \$1,135,000 would be required under section 17 of the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985, and that an additional appropriation of \$238,500 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), which would be offset by an increase of the same amount in the estimates of income under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

19. A recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, 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, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

20. The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 71 votes to 17, with 11 abstentions.

21. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that his delegation had been obliged to vote against the proposal because of the financial implications of paragraph 3 or section I of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34.

22. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt) said that members of the Committee could draw their own conclusions regarding who were the real friends of Africa.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.33 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/39/93)

23. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in his statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.33 (A/C.3/39/93), the Secretary-General was proposing that financial resources should be provided from the regular budget to enable the Economic Commission for Africa to implement fully activities mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 38/150 concerning the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa. The resources requested would also finance additional activities called for in the draft resolution. A detailed account of the programme of work for the implementation of resolution 38/150 had been submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/39/223. The status of implementation as at 1 November 1984 was described in annexes 1 and 2 to document A/C.5/39/93. For the reasons given in paragraphs 9 to 14 of the Secretary-General's statement, an additional appropriation of \$1,439,600 was being requested for 1985.

24. Paragraph 15 of document A/39/271, dealing with the implementation of the programme of work for the Decade, informed the General Assembly that for the second-phase programme 1,053 projects were involved, costing \$18,360,000,000. In paragraph 19 of that document the Secretary-General indicated that the African countries had already secured or were about to secure approximately \$4.3 billion of that total. Some countries were financing most or all of the projects themselves. He quoted those figures to put into perspective the amount being requested by the Secretary-General, which represented the kind of programme support which would enable ECA to convene consultative meetings and organize studies on how projects should be formulated and implemented. In that light the Advisory Committee had no hesitation in recommending acceptance of the Secretary-General's request for \$1,439,600 under section 13 of the programme budget.

25. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.33, an additional appropriation of \$1,439,600 would be required under section 13 of the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985.

26. A recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, 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: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

27. The proposal was adopted by 73 votes to 17, with 9 abstentions.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.35 concerning agenda item 80 (d) (A/C.5/39/94)

28. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), orally presenting the report of the Advisory Committee, said that the Secretary-General's statement in document A/C.5/39/94 concerned the implementation of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.35 on the Industrial Development Decade for Africa. The Second Committee was recommending that an allocation of at least \$5 million be made from the regular budget in order to enable UNIDO to assist African countries in implementing the programme for the Decade. The activities to be undertaken in pursuance of the draft resolution were described in paragraph 7 of the statement. In paragraph 18 of that document the Secretary-General proposed that the UNIDO Co-ordination Unit for the Decade be strengthened through the addition of one P-4 and two General Service posts at a cost of \$135,300. The Advisory Committee had been informed orally by representatives of the Executive Director of UNIDO that that Unit currently had one P-5, one P-3 and one General Service post. Substantive responsibility for activities in connection with the Decade, however, rested with the Industrial Operations Division. The Committee had sought additional information regarding the level of resources being disbursed by UNIDO in relation to the Decade and had been informed that they amounted to approximately \$36 million, from both the regular budget (sections 17 and 24) and from extrabudgetary sources. The Committee considered that if the Unit was currently able to co-ordinate programmes costing approximately \$36 million, an additional \$5 million did not warrant the creation of three additional posts at UNIDO headquarters at Vienna, while most of the programme of work was being carried out in Africa. Therefore, the Committee did not recommend acceptance of the additional posts requested by the Secretary-General. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that if draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.35 was adopted, the amount to be appropriated would be the \$5 million referred to in that draft resolution.

29. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that his delegation shared the Advisory Committee's view that any additional appropriations should go towards programmes rather than administration, and it supported the Committee's recommendation.

30. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.35, an additional appropriation of \$5 million would be required under section 17 of the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985.

31. A recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain.

32. The proposal was adopted by 71 votes to 18, with 10 abstentions.

33. Mr. KHALEVINSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union's support of development activities was well known. It had extensive trade, technical and other co-operation with developing countries, including with the African countries. The Soviet Union supported United Nations activities in the sphere of industrial development co-operation and the goals of the two Decades in question, but it considered that unjustified growth in the United Nations budget should be held down. Draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.33, L.34 and L.35 should not entail any additional appropriations. For that reason his delegation had voted against the Chairman's proposals on the programme budget implications of those three draft resolutions.

34. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said that his delegation had abstained in the voting on the programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.33, L.34 and L.35, because it was concerned at the significant financial implications of the

(Mr. Kastoft, Denmark)

draft resolutions and at the fact that their adoption by a vote was a departure from the traditional practice of adopting resolutions with major financial implications by consensus. He feared that in the long run such actions could have detrimental effects on the financing system of the United Nations. He had been saddened by the remark made by the representative of Egypt concerning Africa's friends, which seemed to ignore that Denmark and other countries very closely co-operated with many African countries, Egypt included, in a variety of fields.

35. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that Sweden remained a friend of Africa, as evidenced by the level of bilateral and multilateral development assistance it provided to countries in that continent.

36. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the proposals concerning draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.33, L.34 and L.35. It supported the substance of those draft resolutions and had voted in favour of them in the Second Committee, in the hope that a consensus could be reached on financing. Her delegation deeply regretted the action just taken by the Fifth Committee and hoped that even at the current late stage consultations could continue with the aim of reaching a solution to which all Member States could subscribe.

37. Mr. FERNANDEZ MAROTO (Spain) said that his delegation regretted the lack of consensus on the proposals just adopted concerning the three draft resolutions of the Second Committee.

38. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, noted that the representative of Denmark had taken offence at his earlier statement after the decision on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34. He (Mr. El-Safaty) had not, however, mentioned any country by name in his statement. The representative of Denmark, on the other hand, had referred to Egypt by name in explaining his delegation's vote. The Egyptian delegation regretted very much that the representative of Denmark had done so.

Use of consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups in the United Nations in 1982-1983 (continued) (A/C.5/39/L.29)

39. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he had already expressed doubts about a number of points with respect to which draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.29 differed from the resolution adopted on the same subject at the thirty-seventh session. The title of the draft resolution should be brought into line with that of General Assembly resolution 37/237, and, accordingly, the word "experts" should be inserted between the words "of" and "consultants". He also proposed that paragraph 2 should be replaced by the following paragraph:

"2. Confirms its interim measure instituted by section VIII, paragraph 3, of its resolution 37/237 of 21 December 1982 and decides to review the situation at its fortieth session in the light of additional information to be provided by the Secretary-General on former staff members of any organ, body or institution of the United Nations system in receipt of a pension benefit from the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund who are engaged by the Secretary-General in any capacity."

/...

40. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) observed that the Belgian proposal with regard to paragraph 2 would seem to require a further amendment of the title, the reference to "ad hoc expert groups" being replaced by one to "any organ, body or institution".

41. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that the new paragraph 2 would request a study by the Secretary-General and did not involve a decision on the recruitment of experts and consultants. The title, with the insertion of the word "experts", sufficiently reflected the substantive content of the draft resolution as amended.

42. Mr. PIÑEIRO ARMABURU (Argentina), supported by Mr. PANESSO SERNA (Colombia), said that the proposed review should cover only the United Nations and not the entire system. He therefore proposed that the words "of any organ, body or institution of the United Nations system" in the Belgian amendment should be replaced by the words "of the United Nations" and that the words "engaged by the Secretary-General in any capacity" should be replaced by the words "engaged as experts and consultants by the Secretary-General".

43. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he could not accept the amendments proposed by Argentina. It would be neither logical nor fair if the Secretary-General could engage former staff members of various United Nations agencies but not former staff members of the United Nations itself. Furthermore, experts and consultants were covered by paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, while the purpose of paragraph 2 was to deal with the case of all those engaged by the Secretary-General, for any kind of work and in any capacity.

44. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, before taking a final position on the matter, he would appreciate some clarification as to the implications of requesting the Secretary-General to take action affecting the entire United Nations system.

45. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), replying to a question asked by the representative of Argentina, said that the Secretariat could indeed provide the information called for in the amendment proposed by Belgium. It was his understanding that it should cover only former staff members in receipt of a pension and not those re-employed within their normal working life.

46. Mr. PIÑEIRO ARMABURU (Argentina) said that, although he still had serious doubts about the Belgian amendment, he would withdraw his sub-amendment in the light of the assurance given by the Under-Secretary-General.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.29, as orally amended by the representative of Belgium.

48. It was so decided.

49. Mr. ABRAS ZEWSKI (Poland) said that it was important to stress that in reporting on the application of the guidelines laid down by the General Assembly on the use of consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups the Secretary-General should, in the future, provide more precise information on how those guidelines were observed.

AGENDA ITEM 113: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT
(A/C.5/39/L.25)

AGENDA ITEM 112: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY
(continued) (A/C.5/39/L.25)

50. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.25 under agenda items 112 and 113, said that it had been drawn up after consultations with interested delegations. She apologized to any delegation which it had not been possible to consult owing to time constraints and the pressure of simultaneous consultations on other issues.

51. The draft resolution had three main points of emphasis. Firstly, it contained a reaffirmation of the important investigative, co-ordinating and advisory role of the Joint Inspection Unit vis-à-vis the United Nations and other organizations of the system. Secondly, given the recognition of the fundamental role of the Joint Inspection Unit, the draft resolution called, in parts B, C and D, for a response to the Unit's request for clear and specific decisions by the organizations on its recommendations. Thirdly, the draft resolution would request the Unit to ensure that its programme of work responded to the priorities set by intergovernmental bodies in the United Nations system by giving Member States an opportunity to look more closely at studies undertaken by JIU and by ensuring the regular transmission of its reports, together with the comments of the Secretary-General, to all subsidiary organs directly concerned with the issues dealt with in its reports.

52. Mr. PEDEKSON (Canada), referring to part D of the draft resolution relating to conference services of United Nations organizations at the Vienna International Centre, said that according to the Advisory Committee's report, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee had all favoured unified conference services at the Vienna International Centre. His delegation was in full agreement with that position, based on considerations of recruitment, efficiency, economy and the provision of a full range of services to all organizations concerned. He looked forward to receiving proposals of the Secretary-General on that subject at the fortieth session.

53. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Canada.

54. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that there was a strong argument in favour of pooling conference services under the management of the United Nations, but, in his delegation's view, an equally strong argument existed for structuring such a single conference-servicing operation to take into account the interests and requirements of all organizations with headquarters at the Vienna International Centre. He hoped that the Secretary-General, in preparing the report mentioned in paragraph 2 of part D of the draft resolution, would take into account the detailed views expressed by the delegation of Austria in the debate on agenda item 112. Subject to that reservation, the draft resolution was acceptable to his delegation.

55. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) wished to propose the addition of a new preambular paragraph in part C of the draft resolution, to read: "Taking into account the

(Mr. Maktari, Yemen)

views expressed by the delegations of Member States in the Fifth Committee during the current session,".

56. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that the formulation in the sole preambular paragraph had been used because delegations' comments had not differed in substance from the comments of the Advisory Committee. She hoped that the representative of Yemen could accept the draft resolution as it stood.

57. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) pressed his delegation's proposal for a new preambular paragraph.

58. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that, reluctantly, she would accept the proposal. She could not, however, speak for the others which had been involved in the preparation of the draft resolution.

59. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) inquired which delegations had been involved in the consultations on the draft resolution.

60. Miss ZONICLE (Bahamas) said that the delegations of Austria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, Nigeria, the Ukrainian SSR, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States and Yugoslavia had participated in the consultations, adding that she hoped she had not omitted any delegation. She had encouraged the participation of representatives from each regional group and all delegations that had taken part in the debate on the item.

61. The CHAIRMAN trusted that the representative of Algeria would recall that when he had announced that the representative of the Bahamas had agreed to act as co-ordinator of the consultations on the item, he had invited all delegations to contact her.

62. Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.25, as orally amended, was adopted.

63. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in explaining its vote on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.22 on agenda item 112 (b) at the preceding meeting, one delegation had used offensive language, describing that draft resolution as a cheap propaganda exercise. If that kind of language was used in future discussions of the item, his delegation would no longer confine itself to the technical aspects of the question and would have to go into the substantive and political aspects as well.

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)

64. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26 on behalf of its 24 sponsors, said that, at its 51st meeting, the representative of Bulgaria, in his capacity as Vice-Chairman, had reported to the Committee on informal consultations regarding the report of the Committee on Contributions. Two days previously, a draft resolution (A/C.5/39/L.18) had been formally introduced in the Fifth Committee by Egypt on behalf of the members of the Group of 77 despite the

/...

(Mr. Kastoft, Denmark)

fact that informal consultations had been scheduled to continue on the afternoon of the same day. At the outset of those resumed consultations, the representative of the Soviet Union had stated, very pertinently, that a draft resolution formally introduced in the Committee could no longer be the subject of informal consultations. Towards the end of that last meeting in the series of informal consultations, the Vice-Chairman had circulated the text of a draft resolution which had never been discussed.

65. A number of delegations had found the Vice-Chairman's text to be a good and balanced one which, at the least, deserved consideration. For that reason, they had decided to submit the text, in a very slightly modified form, as a formal proposal. A decision on a new scale of assessments would have to be taken at the fortieth session of the General Assembly and the Committee on Contributions would be fully occupied in the coming months. The draft resolution therefore dealt only with the points on which the Committee on Contributions had asked for guidance.

66. Paragraphs 1 (a) and 1 (b) of the draft resolution reflected provisions contained in the draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77, except that the relief gradient would remain at 85 per cent. Paragraph 1 (c) would freeze the rates of assessment of the least developed countries, a slight difference from the draft resolution of the Group of 77. Paragraph 1 (d) would accept scheme III, as defined in paragraph 49 of document A/39/11, to be used to limit the variations of individual rates of assessment between successive scales, differing somewhat from the proposal of the Group of 77. In paragraph 2, note was taken of the studies of the Committee on Contributions without spelling out the nature of those studies. Paragraphs 3 and 4 did not differ from the draft resolution of the Group of 77.

67. The draft resolution proposed by the Group of 77 (A/C.5/39/L.18) sought to accommodate the views of various delegations. Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26 had the same intention and met some of the major concerns of the members of the Group of 77.

68. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) and Mr. WITHEFORD (Australia) announced that their delegations had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26.

69. Mr. BARRETT (New Zealand) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.26 and was considering the possibility of becoming a sponsor.

70. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said he disagreed with the representative of Denmark on the proper forum for the discussion of draft resolutions that had been formally introduced. Texts that had been formally introduced had been discussed informally in the past; thus there had been no departure from established practice. The gap between the two draft resolutions was not unbridgeable.

71. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said it was encouraging to hear that it might yet be possible to reach agreement on a text which, while not enjoying consensus support, would at least avoid a vote pitting the Group of 77 against an East-West alliance. His delegation would be grateful if the Chairman would use his good offices to help the Committee find a solution acceptable to a broad majority of both developed and developing countries.

/...

72. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that, at the Committee's 51st meeting, he had suggested the addition of the words "and other countries facing high levels of external indebtedness" to paragraph 2 (d) of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.18. The representative of Egypt, speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, had said that that suggestion would be given appropriate consideration. Coincidentally, an article had since appeared in The New York Times of 15 December 1984 substantiating the point he had been making at that meeting. According to the article, Poland was one of the world's most heavily indebted nations and its external debt was almost equivalent to that of Argentina.

73. The CHAIRMAN suggested that action on draft resolutions A/C.5/39/L.18 and L.26 should be deferred pending further consultations.

74. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/C.5/39/L.28)

75. The CHAIRMAN recalled that a vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.28 and that the representative of Egypt had stated that, if there was a vote, his amendment, by which the words "decides that" would be replaced by the words "decides to correct" and the words "should read" would be replaced by the words "to read", should be considered. He understood that the request for a vote still stood.

76. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said that resolution 38/227 had been adopted by consensus, and assured the Committee that the text on which agreement had been reached had contained the word "section" in paragraph 7 (c) (iii). The Committee had been assured by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management that the word "sections" in the current text was the result of a typographical error. He therefore appealed to the representative of the United States not to press his request for a vote, as such a vote would have serious implications.

77. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that his delegation failed to see the need for the adoption of a decision on the matter, given the assurances provided by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management. It was clear that, in interpreting and applying resolution 38/227, the Secretariat would follow the wording of the agreed text.

78. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said that a decision was necessary so that the terms of the agreed text would be absolutely clear to those who, at some point in the future, might be responsible for implementing the resolution.

79. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) asked whether the draft decision would mean that when a resolution requested the Secretary-General to undertake specific activities within existing resources, he was limited to the resources of the relevant section of the budget and was prevented from using the resources of other sections. If that was the case, his delegation would be even more strongly in favour of the draft decision.

80. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, said that the real issue was that if a

(Mr. Tommo Monthe, Cameroon)

resolution contained an error, it should be corrected. The substantive issues arising from resolution 38/227 could be discussed by the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

81. After a discussion in which Mr. Al-ASFOOR (Bahrain), Mr. YONIS (Iraq) and Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) took part, Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) proposed that, in order to avoid the impression that the General Assembly was changing its original decision, the draft decision should be worded as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Noting that the official records of the General Assembly contain a typographical error in the text of resolution 38/227 A,

"Decides accordingly to correct the word 'sections' in paragraph 7 (c) (iii) of the said resolution to read 'section'."

82. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the procedure just suggested was even more suspect than what had originally been proposed. The proposal of Bangladesh stated that the official records of the General Assembly contained a typographical error, which implied that the official records contained something different from what the Assembly had adopted. That was factually incorrect. He suggested that the Committee should seek the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs on the matter.

83. Mr. ROY (India) recalled that the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had indicated to the Committee at an earlier stage his intention of discussing the matter within the Secretariat in order to see how the error in the text of resolution 38/227 could be corrected. The Under-Secretary-General had subsequently informed the Committee that the only possible course was for the General Assembly to adopt a formal decision on the matter. He was confident that, in his consultations, the Under-Secretary-General had sought the views of the Office of Legal Affairs.

84. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) suggested that the problem raised by the representative of the United States might be obviated by adopting a decision which contained no reference to the official records and stated simply that the General Assembly decided to correct the typographical error in the relevant paragraph of the resolution to read "section".

85. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, following his earlier statement to the Committee, he had inquired into the possibility of correcting the record with respect to resolution 38/227. It was clear that the typographical error had originated in the Secretariat. It was also clear that the draft resolution which had been put to the vote in the Fifth Committee at the preceding session contained the word "sections", as had the text adopted in plenary. If that had not been the case, it would have simply been a matter of issuing a corrigendum. However, since the plural had been used in the text decided upon, the Legal Counsel had advised the adoption of an interpretative statement either in the report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly or a

(Mr. Ruedas)

separate decision to be submitted to General Assembly for adoption. The Legal Counsel had not, however, given his opinion on the draft decision before the Committee at its current meeting. Such an opinion could be obtained if the Committee so desired.

86. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the draft decision proposed would actually change the wording of a previous resolution. It was not, therefore, of an interpretative character, and a legal opinion on it should be sought.

87. Mr. EL-SAFETY (Egypt) said that the matter had been under discussion in various forums since July. He therefore moved the closure of the debate under rule 117 of the rules of procedure.

88. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 117 of the rules of procedure and inquired whether any delegation wished to speak against the motion.

89. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the request made by the Egyptian delegation to close the debate before the Committee had an opportunity to hear the opinion of the Legal Counsel only confirmed his delegation's suspicions that what was being sought was probably not in accordance with the legal rules of the General Assembly.

90. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the motion to close the debate.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Ecuador, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal.

91. The motion was adopted by 63 votes to 22, with 7 abstentions.

/...

92. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft decision A/C.5/39/L.28, as orally amended. He informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested.

93. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft decision would alter the wording of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session. It was claimed that that wording had been a mistake. Whether or not that was true, the wording should remain. The final version submitted to delegations at that session had contained the word "sections", as had the version adopted by the General Assembly. If some delegations were unhappy with the wording of resolution 38/227, they should make new proposals on the subject for the consideration of the Assembly. His delegation, for his part, considered the rewriting of history to be an abhorrent practice.

94. The delegations which supported the change contended that the use of the singular "section" implied a vital substantive difference. His delegation considered that that point was somewhat overdrawn in the light of the wording of the resolution as a whole, where common sense alone would require the plural. The statement of programme budget implications of the draft resolutions on the question of Namibia, for example, referred to six different sections of the budget. If the resolution were to refer to "section" in the singular, he wondered which section the Secretariat would have discussed. Other delegations had chosen to read a deeper substantive meaning into a wording which, in the view of his delegation, had never been at issue. They had done so, moreover, in the guise of an editorial change, and that was entirely unacceptable.

95. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft decision A/C.5/39/L.28, as orally amended. Everyone recognized that resolution 38/227 contained a typographical error and that the General Assembly must take action to correct it. To do so was not to rewrite history. It was within the power of the General Assembly to correct a mistake. Only one delegation was contesting that fact.

96. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.5/39/L.28, as orally amended.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

/...

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

97. Draft decision A/C.5/39/L.28, as orally amended, was adopted by 64 votes to 9, with 20 abstentions.

98. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that, in the light of the vote just taken, resolution 38/227 could no longer be considered to have been adopted by consensus.

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

99. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in accordance with the usual practice, the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of those chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council which had been allocated to the Fifth Committee.

100. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.