

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records*

UN LIBRARY

JAN 11 1982



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L.201 (WWBR)

FIFTH COMMITTEE

74th meeting

held on

Monday, 14 December 1981

at 7.30 p.m.

New York

UN/SA COLLECTION

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 74th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 110: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.144 concerning agenda item 69 (e)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.142 concerning agenda item 69

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.139 concerning agenda item 69 (p) (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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.5/36/SR.74
24 December 1981

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 110: FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS INTERIM FORCE IN LEBANON: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/601 and Corr.1 and 2, A/36/797; A/C.5/36/L.39)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in paragraphs 8 to 10 of its report (A/36/797) the Advisory Committee provided information on commitments for UNIFIL entered into by the Secretary-General for the periods 19 December 1980 to 18 June 1981 and 19 June to 18 December 1981 in accordance with the authority granted to the Secretary-General under resolution 35/115 A. The total sum committed - \$146,166,000 gross - would have to be appropriated by the General Assembly at the present session. Depending on the Security Council's decision on the future of UNIFIL, the Secretary-General indicated that he might require commitment authority of up to \$83,491,000 gross for the first six months of the new mandate, from 19 December 1981 to 18 June 1982 and a similar sum for the period 19 June 1982 to 18 December 1982. In paragraphs 13 to 16 of its report (A/36/797) the Advisory Committee maintained that estimates for UNIFIL should be submitted and justified on the basis of requirements for 12 months, not six. That procedure would, the Advisory Committee believed, make for a clearer picture of the total requirements of the Force within the commitment period authorized by the General Assembly. Representatives of the Secretary-General had confirmed that it would be possible to present the estimates on a 12-month basis without changing the financial reporting procedure for UNIFIL by mandate periods.

2. In paragraphs 3 to 28 of its report, the Advisory Committee recommended reductions totalling \$3,591,000 in the Secretary-General's estimates for the forthcoming six months. Subject to the renewal of UNIFIL's mandate, therefore, the total commitments which the Secretary-General would enter into would be \$159.8 million gross, or \$13,316,666 gross per month.

3. He noted that the draft resolution on the subject (A/C.5/36/L.39) would authorize the Secretary-General to enter into commitments for UNIFIL until 18 December 1982, which seemed to support the Advisory Committee's recommendations as to the period to be covered by the Secretary-General's estimates.

4. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.39, said that without the United Nations efforts to control the conflict in the Middle East, the situation there would be infinitely more dangerous and destructive than it

/...

(Mr. Amneus, Sweden)

actually was. Peace-keeping operations had become fundamental to the preservation of peace and security, which was the primary purpose of the Charter. All Member States had a collective responsibility under the Charter to share the financial burden of such operations equitably. Growing deficits in the budgets of peace-keeping operations undermined efficiency and made it increasingly difficult to find additional Member States to take part in the operations, given the disproportionate financial burden borne by troop contributors. The practice of withholding assessed contributions for peace-keeping operations could thus undermine the principle of wide geographical distribution in the composition of peace-keeping forces.

5. He then reviewed the contents of the draft resolution, and announced that France had become a sponsor. In connexion with section A IV, he pointed out that the shortfall in the UNIFIL Special Account owing to the non-payment of contributions by certain Member States represented over 23 per cent of the total amount apportioned among Member States since the inception of UNIFIL in 1978; the Governments of troop-contributing States were receiving less than half of their entitlement under the standard rates and practices approved by the General Assembly.

6. Part B of the draft resolution should be viewed in the light of paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/36/797). The "surplus" in the UNIFIL Special Account as at 31 December 1980 had already been used, because certain States were withholding their contributions, to meet the expenses of UNIFIL. The purpose of suspending financial regulations 5.2 (b), 5.2 (d), 4.3 and 4.4 was to prevent that "surplus" from being used as a credit to reduce the assessments of Member States - including those Members which were withholding their assessed contributions.

7. Ms. CONWAY (Ireland) said that the peace-keeping responsibilities of the United Nations were fundamental to the effective implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. Her country had always valued the peace-keeping role of the Organization, and had participated in most peace-keeping and observation missions since 1958.

8. UNIFIL played a vital role in southern Lebanon in exceptionally difficult circumstances. Adequate financial provision must be made to enable the Force to fulfil that role. The Secretary-General's report (A/36/601) demonstrated the financial difficulties, caused by the withholding of assessed contributions, which continued to confront UNIFIL. She did not intend to repeat her delegation's views as to the universal obligation of Member States to contribute to peace-keeping operations, but hoped that a satisfactory solution would be found to the problem of withholding, in order to safeguard the present and future peace-keeping role of the United Nations.

9. Mr. PAPENDORP (United States of America) said that his delegation firmly supported the draft resolution. United Nations peace-keeping operations,

/...

(Mr. Papendorp, United States)

which went to the heart and purpose of the United Nations and provided the means for maintaining peace while long-term solutions were negotiated, were facing a financial emergency. The non-payment of assessed contributions was of immediate concern, because it threatened the participation of some troop-contributing countries, and the United Nations owed it to the memory of the men who had died to support peace-keeping operations. His delegation therefore strongly appealed to Member States which were withholding their contributions to reconsider their position. In that connexion, it welcomed the intention of the Chinese Government to contribute.

10. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation believed that all expenditures for the elimination of the vestiges of colonial aggression against Lebanon should be borne by the aggressor itself. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution and would not contribute to the financing of UNIFIL.

11. Mr. ARAPI (Albania) said that his delegation would not participate in the financing of UNIFIL and would vote against the draft resolution.

12. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation appreciated UNIFIL's role and its efforts to counteract the effects of Israeli aggression against Lebanon. The main reason for UNIFIL's existence was the aggressive, expansionist policy of the Zionist entity. His delegation believed that the aggressor should assume the material consequences of its aggression. Since the draft resolution placed obligations on all Member States, not only on the aggressor, his delegation would vote against it.

13. Mr. TOUGOU (Mongolia) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and would not participate in the financing of UNIFIL, because it believed that those who were guilty of aggression must bear the responsibility for its material cost.

14. Mr. GUBSCI (Hungary) said that his delegation's position on the financing of UNIFIL was unchanged; Hungary would not participate in the financing of that operation.

15. Mr. YOUNIS (Iraq) said his delegation believed that the aggressor alone must bear the consequences of its aggression. Since the draft resolution did not distinguish between aggressors and innocent parties, his delegation would vote against it and his Government would not contribute to its implementation.

16. Draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.39 was adopted by 73 votes to 13, with 2 abstentions.

17. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation's position of principle on the financing of UNIFIL was unchanged. Consequently, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution and would not contribute towards UNIFIL's

/...

(Mr. Abraszewski, Poland)

financing. Articles 17 and 19 of the Charter did not apply to expenditures connected with peace-keeping operations.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued) (A/36/6, A/36/7, A/36/38 (chaps. V and VII D))

Section 21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
(continued) (A/C.5/36/L.35)

18. Mr. KHARMA (Lebanon), introducing the draft decision in document A/C.5/36/L.35, said that the growing number, dimensions and complexity of refugee situations had grown considerably in recent years, making it necessary to expand the activities of UNHCR at every level, while the General Assembly had progressively assigned new tasks to the Office of the High Commissioner. The total expenditure of UNHCR had increased geometrically to over \$500 million in 1980, but the level of resources provided to the Office from the regular budget had not grown at the same rate. The High Commissioner had had to strengthen the management structure of his Office while trying to reconcile article 20 of the statute of UNHCR with the current United Nations policy of fiscal restraint.

19. The Board of Auditors had recommended in paragraph 6 of document A/36/5/Add.5 "appropriate steps ... to ensure compliance with article 20 of the statute". Acting on a decision by the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme, UNHCR and the Office of Financial Services had initiated a joint review of the additional costs of the Office to determine to what extent they were administrative in nature. Some progress had been made, but the joint review had not been completed by the time-limit set by the Executive Committee in its decision. The Executive Committee had urged the Secretary-General and the High Commissioner to continue their efforts and report to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. Even that, however, had not proved possible, which was why he was submitting draft decision A/C.5/36/L.35, which requested the Secretary-General, in co-operation with UNHCR, to complete the joint review. The resulting report should permit the Fifth Committee to agree on the appropriate basis for funding the additional administrative costs of UNHCR, bearing in mind the universal responsibility of the international community and the essentially non-political, humanitarian vocation of the Office of the High Commissioner.

20. In response to a query from the Soviet delegation, he explained that under article 20 of the statute of UNHCR, the administrative costs of the Office were to be borne by the regular budget. The Board of Auditors had correctly pointed out that the administrative outlays of the Office were increasingly being borne by voluntary contributors. The purpose of the review was to establish a sound basis for apportioning such administrative outlays between voluntary funds and the regular budget. Work had therefore begun, with the Office of Financial Services, on a post-by-post analysis of the expenditure involved, but it was a time-consuming business and had taken longer than expected. His intention in submitting the draft decision was therefore to make sure the review was completed so that the Fifth Committee could determine the basis on which each post should be funded.

/...

21. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that his delegation and those of Denmark, Finland and Norway supported the Lebanese proposal.

22. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that in view of the increasing burden on UNHCR there was every reason to undertake the review referred to in the draft decision and complete it as soon as possible.

23. Mr. DITZ (Austria) reminded the Committee that his delegation had called for the results of the joint review to be made available to the Fifth Committee during the current session, in view of its interest in solving the long-standing problem of the administrative costs of UNHCR. Behind the unemotional language of the draft decision lay the key issue of universal responsibility for dealing with the refugee problem. It could do no good for the reputation of any international humanitarian organization to know that a small part of its membership was having to bear a burden assumed on behalf of the entire body. His delegation would support the draft decision.

24. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee had too little time left to give so serious a topic the careful consideration that it warranted. As he saw it, moreover, the question of how to fund the administrative costs of UNHCR should have been taken up during the discussion of the substance of the item in the Special Political Committee, and he was nonplussed by its sudden appearance in the Fifth Committee. In view of that and the lack of time, he suggested deferring consideration of the matter until the thirty-seventh session.

25. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said it was clear to him that the expanded administrative structure resulting from UNHCR's growing activities required more funding from the regular budget. The review must be carried out so as to decide what costs should be borne by the regular budget and what by voluntary contributions. Without prejudging the outcome of the review, he supported the draft decision and observed that the Committee would have ample time at the thirty-seventh session to go into the substance of funding for UNHCR.

26. Mr. PAL (India) said that he would have no difficulty in endorsing the draft decision, which simply requested the Secretary-General to meet a deadline. There was no need either to go into the substance of the matter or to postpone a decision.

27. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) also called for the survey to be completed.

28. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) asked why the Committee had not been provided with a statement of financial implications in conjunction with the draft decision.

29. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that the draft called for the continuation of a survey which was already under way, as described in paragraph 21.6 of the proposed programme budget. He had already

(Mr. Ruedas)

explained why the survey had not yet been completed; some progress had been made during November but more remained to be done.

30. The consultations between UNHCR and the Office of Financial Services could be scheduled when the persons concerned were required to travel for other purposes. Thus the review would not, in itself, have any financial implications. The General Assembly would of course have to take a decision on the implications of the findings.

31. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the Lebanese proposal in document A/C.5/36/L.35.

32. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that that proposal had been introduced only at the current meeting and therefore needed more study. The question of financial implications had been raised. The Committee required more detail in that regard, and should not hurry to a decision. The Assistant Secretary-General had, he believed, referred to correspondence; that correspondence should be placed before the Committee. In the circumstances, it would be more appropriate to defer any decision on the draft for 24 hours.

33. Mr. KHARMA (Lebanon) said that the Soviet representative was avoiding the essential point, namely, that the draft merely called for a review to be completed so that the results could be referred back to the General Assembly through the Fifth Committee. There would be ample time at the thirty-seventh session to go into the details of the larger question. The current debate was not concerned with the causes of the refugee problem, and did not belong in the Special Political Committee. He appealed to the Soviet representative to be co-operative.

34. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) proposed an immediate adjournment of the debate on the matter, under rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

35. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adjourn its discussion of the matter until the following day, on the understanding that it would then reach a decision on the draft decision.

36. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.144 concerning agenda item 69 (e) (A/C.5/36/99 and Add.1 and 2)

37. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution under consideration established the long-term arrangements for the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and requested the Secretary-General to convene a Pledging Conference in the first quarter of 1982. In paragraph 9, it

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

provided that an Ad hoc Intergovernmental Group of the Whole on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development should hold two sessions in 1982. In documents A/C.5/36/99 and Add.2, the Secretary-General indicated that the convening of the Pledging Conference and the holding of two sessions of the Ad hoc Intergovernmental Group of the Whole would entail conference servicing requirements not exceeding \$346,700 on a full-cost basis. Those requirements would be reviewed in the context of a consolidated statement of conference-servicing requirements to be submitted to the General Assembly at its current session.

38. In document A/C.5/36/99, paragraph 3, the Secretary-General indicated his intention to submit the proposals of the Administrator of UNDP for the 1982 administrative budgetary requirements of the Financing System's secretariat to the Fifth Committee for approval. Those proposals were contained in the annex to document A/C.5/36/99/Add.2. Tables I and II of the annex provided information on the proposed staffing structure for 1982 and the related administrative and support cost estimates. A total of 12 Professional and above and 11 General Service posts were proposed for the Financing System starting 1 January 1982, an increase of 1 P-3 and 1 G-4/3 over the 1980-1981 level approved by the General Assembly for the Interim Fund. The related administrative support costs were estimated at \$1,892,115 for 1982, as compared with \$1,145,140 authorized for the Interim Fund for 1981.

39. The Advisory Committee had noted that the staff level and amounts indicated as having been authorized were consistent with what it had recommended for approval. The number of staff indicated in table I for 1980-1981 was also consistent with what had been outlined in the report of the Secretary-General (A/34/587/Add.2, annexes I and II). The Advisory Committee had no objection to the requested posts and recommended that the estimate of \$1,892,115 for the Financing System for 1982 be approved.

40. The Administrator had indicated that additional staff and resources might be necessary during the course of 1982, however. The related administrative and support cost estimates in 1982 would amount to \$2.7 million instead of the \$1,892,115 just recommended for approval. The Advisory Committee had noted that paragraph 7 of the draft resolution under consideration requested the Secretary-General to convene a Pledging Conference to receive pledges for 1982. Decisions related to the level of operations in 1982 should be taken after the results of the Pledging Conference and any subsequent fund-raising efforts were known. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that the General Assembly authorize it to approve further increases in the staff and other resources of the Financing System up to the levels indicated in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Administrator's proposals. Such approval would be granted by the Advisory Committee after the Pledging Conference in the light of requests made by the Administrator and of information on the expected level of operations at the time or times the requests were made.

/...

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, based on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, no additional appropriations would be required under the programme budget for 1982-1983. The draft resolution would entail additional conference-servicing costs of \$346,700, and they would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement. He therefore recommended that the Fifth Committee submit the following draft decision to the General Assembly for its approval:

"The General Assembly, having noted the proposal of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme for the 1982 administrative budget of the secretariat of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development (A/C.5/36/99/Add.2) and the related oral report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/C.5/36/SR.74) authorizes the Advisory Committee to approve further increases in the staff and other resources of the Financing System up to the levels indicated in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Administrator's proposals, after the Pledging Conference, in the light of requests made by the Administrator and of information on the expected level of operations at the time or times the requests are made".

42. It was so decided.

43. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as the socialist countries had indicated in their joint statement before the Second Committee, they had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.144 on the understanding that it would not lead to major expenditures from the regular United Nations budget and would not have any additional financial implications.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.142 concerning agenda item 69 (A/C.5/36/100)

44. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, under the terms of paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would request the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa to organize in 1982 the three consultative technical meetings which the Second Committee had recommended be organized. At the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, an additional appropriation of \$250,600 had been made under section 13 for the purpose of holding in 1981 four consultative technical meetings based on African subregions. Only one of those meetings had been held in 1981: for the countries of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), at Lomé, Togo.

45. The unexpended balance of \$48,300 against the 1981 appropriation would be surrendered at the end of the year. Additional funds amounting to \$136,100 would be required in 1982, however, to cover the cost of completing preparations for and holding the remaining three technical consultative meetings, which had been rescheduled for 1982. A breakdown of that requirements could be found in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/36/100. Furthermore, \$8,900 would be needed

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

for the cost of travel of one ECA staff member to the three capitals in which the meetings would be held. Accordingly, the total requirement for holding the three technical consultative meetings was \$145,000. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's request.

46. In paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/36/100, attention was drawn to a project consisting of the identification and formulation of national and multinational projects, which had been referred to the United Nations Development Programme for financing. UNDP had earmarked \$500,000 for that project; however, in paragraph 10 it was noted that the substantive backstopping of that project would require an additional P-4 post in the ECA Transport, Communications and Tourism Division. For the reasons detailed in paragraph 11, the Secretary-General was not requesting an additional P-4 post, but rather was proposing to redeploy to the transport programme a vacant P-4 post from another programme that had less priority. The Advisory Committee noted that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.142 would give rise to an additional appropriation of \$145,000 under section 13 and that \$7,200 would also need to be appropriated under section 31, to be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

47. Mr. FALL OULD MAALOU (Mauritania) requested information from the Director of the Budget Division as to whether the Executive Secretary of ECA was aware of the recommendation contained in paragraph 11 of document A/C.5/36/100 regarding the redeployment of a vacant P-4 post, especially in the light of the fact that the Executive Secretary had stated before the Fifth Committee that vacant posts in the Commission would soon be filled.

48. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that not using monies which had been allocated for specific purposes was faulty management on the part of the Secretary-General. The sums which had been earmarked for the technical consultative meetings should have been spent and the meetings held; Member States should not have been requested to make additional appropriations for that activity. Paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/36/100 indicated that a project consisting of the identification and formulation of projects for inclusion in the programme of action for the second phase of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa had been referred to UNDP for financing and that additional funds might be required for its implementation. There was no doubt that additional funds would be required; paragraph 8 of the same document described many measures which had still to be carried out in connexion with the Decade. Those measures did not have a direct relationship to technical co-operation activities, as the Secretary-General contended (A/C.5/36/100, para. 9), but were part of the support activities for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa, which the Secretary-General was charged with carrying out under the terms of General Assembly resolution 32/197, annex, section 8. The Secretary-General should be more forthcoming in his performance of the responsibilities placed upon him by that resolution.

/...

(Mr. Tommo Monthe, United Republic
of Cameroon)

49. He requested information on whether it was still true that, as indicated in document A/C.5/36/100, paragraph 11, 12 P-4 posts were vacant at ECA. As to the redeployment of posts from one programme within ECA to another, he did not believe that that was a very efficient method of dealing with the problem.

50. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that he whole-heartedly supported the statement by the Cameroonian delegation. He regretted the attempts to ignore and even sabotage the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) and the General Assembly concerning the Decade. The Secretary-General had assured CPC that he would make the necessary changes in the programme budget but instead had produced something which had already been rejected, and he felt bound to deplore the Secretary-General's irresponsible behaviour in that regard. He also deplored the confusion which had arisen regarding the vacant ECA posts, which it was the responsibility of ECA and the Secretary-General to fill in accordance with their original job descriptions. New posts must have their own job descriptions, in the interest of good management and of the programmes themselves.

51. The Decade included important projects, such as the one aimed at improving transport between Africa and Europe, and if it were sabotaged and the projects imperilled because of the poor allocation of resources, the Secretariat would have to bear the responsibility.

52. He requested further information on the consultative technical meeting scheduled to be held in Rabat.

53. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division), in reply to the representative of Morocco, said that the Secretariat had given its full attention to the holding of the Rabat meeting, for which it had originally requested an amount of \$57,200, as indicated in paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/36/100. However, it was now clear that the cost of the meeting would be much higher than had been estimated in 1980.

54. Replying to the representative of Mauritania, he said that ECA, as part of the Secretariat, had naturally been consulted on the financial implications and had fully supported them. He recalled too that the Executive Secretary of ECA had said that, while progress was being made in filling the ECA vacancies, it could not be done overnight, and therefore a number of administrative posts still remained vacant. He was confident that the redeployment solution suggested in paragraph 11 of document A/C.5/36/100 would prove to be effective.

55. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan), referring to paragraphs 10 and 11 of document A/C.5/36/100, said that he wondered whether the redeployment solution was not tantamount to a delayed appropriation.

/...

56. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) drew attention to the statement in paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/36/100 that the Secretary-General understood that additional funds might be required to implement the project referred to in that paragraph. He therefore proposed that, should additional resources be required in connexion with the preparation of the programme for the second phase of the Decade and the reinforcement of the Transport Division of the Economic Commission for Africa, the Secretary-General should be authorized to incur the necessary expenditures and should report thereon in the context of the performance report on the programme budget.

57. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he fully supported the proposal of the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. He also recalled that the Committee, when it had taken up consideration of the financing of the four consultative technical meetings of experts, had been informed that since those meetings dealt with the Decade, they would be held in Freetown, Salisbury, Yaoundé and Rabat. So far only one had been held, but the three remaining ones, according to paragraph 5 of document A/C.5/36/100, were to be held in Yaoundé, Abidjan and Ouagadougou. The intended geographical distribution therefore no longer prevailed and his delegation was deeply concerned.

58. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that he supported the proposal of the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon. He also wanted some explanation from the Secretariat regarding paragraphs 4 and 5 of document A/C.5/36/100. As indicated in paragraph 4, the capital of his country had originally been selected as the venue for one of the four consultative technical meetings, but, according to paragraph 5, it was not among the venues for the three meetings which had been deferred to 1982.

59. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Division of the Budget), replying to the questions raised by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania and the representative of Sierra Leone, drew attention to the relevant comments made by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa at the 24th meeting of the Second Committee (A/C.2/36/SR.24, paras. 21 and 22) and noted that the States members of ECA had decided on the organization of sectoral meetings, each dealing with a particular type of transport. The sectoral meetings had to be distinguished from the regional meetings.

60. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the light of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the proposal of the Cameroonian delegation, the Committee should decide to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.142, an additional appropriation of \$145,000 would be required under section 13 of the programme budget for 1982-1983. An additional appropriation of \$7,200 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment). Furthermore, should additional resources be required in connexion with the preparation of the programme for the second phase of the Decade and the reinforcement of the Transport Division

/...

of the Economic Commission for Africa, the Secretary-General should be authorized to incur the necessary expenditures, and should report thereon in the context of the performance report on the programme budget. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that suggestion.

61. It was so decided.

62. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of position, said that while his delegation had not opposed the Chairman's suggestion regarding document A/C.5/36/100, his delegation would not have supported the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.142 had the matter been put to the vote. His delegation regretted that there had not been time for a full discussion, as it felt that the Committee should not adopt proposals without carefully considering them first.

63. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, while his delegation had fully supported the proposal of the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon, it wished most emphatically to stress that the decision to hold the three consultative technical meetings referred to in paragraph 5 of document A/C.5/36/100 was not a new one. What was new was the request for additional appropriations. His delegation deeply regretted the change in venue of those meetings and their present concentration in one geographical area.

64. Mr. SAULS (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had already expressed reservations on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.142 in the Second Committee and noted that paragraph 9 of document A/C.5/36/100 made it clear that the Secretary-General was clearly thinking about funding from extrabudgetary resources. The implication that funding from the regular budget would have been sufficient was misleading and his delegation would have cast a negative vote had the proposal been put to the vote.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.139 concerning agenda item 69 (p)
(continued)

65. Mr. GOH (Singapore) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the proposal concerning the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.139 had it been present during the vote at the 73rd meeting.

The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.