



FIFTH COMMITTEE  
26th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 5 November 1985  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. Tommo MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 117: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 1. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination

\*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 IX.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.5/40/SR.26  
08 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 117: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued) (A/40/3, A/40/6, A/40/7, A/40/38 and Add.1 and A/40/262)

Section 1. Overall policy-making, direction and co-ordination.

A. Policy-making organs

1. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said, (with reference to the costs of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (A/40/6, sect. 1.8) that his delegation strongly opposed continued implementation of paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 31/93 authorizing payment of travel and subsistence expenses to members of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (para. 1.50). The time had come to end the experiment and to require governments to pay for their representatives.
2. Mr. TAKASU (Japan), while acknowledging the need for representatives of the regional commissions and of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs to participate in meetings of CPC, said that he had problems with the budgetary presentation. Although the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had said that it was not easy to identify cases of duplication the provisions for staff travel in paragraphs 4.8 and 11.13 of the proposed programme budget clearly duplicated those in paragraph 1.51. Accordingly, he proposed that the estimated requirement of \$68,900 be reduced by a reasonable amount, possibly by \$30,000 at 1985 prices.
3. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the practice of paying the travel and subsistence expenses of members of the CPC - which had been introduced on an experimental basis by resolution 31/93 - must be reviewed and a final decision taken to determine whether it should become a permanent practice.
4. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that he would have difficulty in encouraging the type of cut proposed by the representative of Japan, particularly since the Committee had not gone through the proposed programme budget. At the same time, the Secretariat realized that there was a need to economize on travel costs; the Advisory Committee had suggested how that could be done. In the meantime he suggested that note should be taken of Member States' concern and that the Secretariat should review the travel needs and ensure that strict economy measures were instituted and inform Member States of such measures.
5. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that attendance by representatives of the regional commissions at CPC meetings was extremely important and his delegation would find it very difficult to support any cut in the appropriations for such travel. At the same time, he supported the recommendation by the Advisory Committee that, in future, resources for staff to attend meetings of CPC should be reflected in the budget submissions of each individual regional commission rather than appearing under section 1.

(Mr. Oduyemi, Nigeria)

6. He did not agree with the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union that the practice of having the travel and subsistence expenses of members of CPC paid for by the United Nations should be reviewed. The practice was now an established one; moreover, it was important for Member States to be able to participate in the work of CPC.

7. Mr. ROY (India) said that the participation of the regional commissions in meetings of CPC was extremely useful and must continue. At the same time, travel by staff of the regional commissions to New York to attend CPC meetings must as far as possible be combined with travel to attend other meetings. He noted that resolution 31/93 had made it possible for developing countries to be represented on CPC. Certainly, participation in CPC had improved since the adoption of that resolution.

8. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that, although it was generally agreed that the provisions outlined in paragraph 1.51 of the proposed programme budget duplicated the resources provided for in other sections, the Director of the Budget Division seemed to be suggesting that the reduction recommended by CPC did not have to be acted upon until the next proposed programme budget was submitted. Unless existing procedures were revised radically, much of the work done by CPC on the programme budget would be pointless.

9. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation continued to have reservations concerning the payment of the subsistence expenses of members of CPC and it would like to know whether the discussions which had taken place in CPC and elsewhere constituted the review mentioned in resolution 31/93. While it was true that the procedure to be followed, starting with the next biennium, would ensure that all travel of staff from regional commissions was reflected in a limited number of sections, that did not resolve the current problem. The Committee was still faced with a request for a certain appropriation even though, as stated in paragraph 42 of the CPC report (A/40/38), the representative of the Secretary-General was doubtful about the need for the attendance of the representative of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs (CSDHA). His delegation had reservations on the subject and would support the cut proposed by the representative of Japan.

10. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) replying to the representative of Belgium, said that he had certainly not meant to imply that no reduction would be effected until the next proposed programme budget was prepared.

11. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that six months had elapsed since CPC had made its recommendations. The Committee could either approve the amounts requested in the budget knowing them to be too high and leave it to the the Secretariat to make the necessary reductions or it could make arbitrary cuts in order to take account of the recommendation of CPC. Both alternatives were unsatisfactory. The Committee should have been informed about the financial implications of the recommendation of CPC. Accordingly, he supported the proposal made by the representative of Japan.

12. Mr. GOMEZ (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination) said that participation of representatives from the regional commissions and CSDHA had been discussed thoroughly in CPC and the Secretariat had been able to provide programmatic justification for the inclusion of travel of the regional commission representatives under section 1. At the same time it had stated that to include a provision for the participation of a representative of CSDHA would be a clear case of overlapping with the provision in section 4. The fact that the CPC report made no reference to the regional commissions seemed to indicate that CPC had taken the Secretariat's advice on that issue. However, with regard to the representation of CSDHA, CPC had decided to bring the matter to the General Assembly; hence the current discussion.
13. The feeling in the Fifth Committee seemed to be that the provision under section 1 overlapped with that under section 4. If that was indeed the case, there would be a reduction in the budget, which would be reflected in the financial implication statement. The Advisory Committee itself appeared to feel that it could not detect any clear cases of duplication, although it had recommended that in future programme budgets all travel requests for the regional commissions should be consolidated under the sections for the respective commissions.
14. In answer to the question from the representative of the United Kingdom, he did not think that the discussions in CPC regarding the payment of travel and subsistence expenses constituted the review called for in General Assembly resolution 31/93. Moreover, that also seemed to have been the feeling of members of the Economic and Social Council.
15. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that he could not go along with the Japanese proposal. At the same time he endorsed the suggestion by the Advisory Committee that resources for staff from the regional commissions to attend meetings of CPC should be combined with provisions for staff travel under the sections for each commission.
16. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) pointed out that it might be advisable to consider a closer linkage between CPC and the Advisory Committee. Had such a linkage already existed, it might have been possible for the Advisory Committee to estimate the reduction in the estimates which acceptance of the recommendation of CPC would entail and the Fifth Committee could then have taken a decision. Finally, while his delegation considered it was important for staff from the regional commissions to be present at meetings of the CPC when the work of the regional commissions was discussed, it was not necessary for them to be present throughout the session.
17. The CHAIRMAN responding to the questions which had been raised as to why the Advisory Committee had not considered the recommendations of CPC and determined what impact they would have on the budget, said that CPC was a subsidiary organ of the Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council. It was therefore not clear whether the Advisory Committee should consider its reports before those other bodies had done so. Secondly, difficulties arose because of the way the sessions of CPC and the Advisory Committee were scheduled. Before the end of the Assembly, the Fifth Committee would have revised estimates and the financial implications of all the decisions taken by other Main Committees and those of the recommendations of CPC. Only then would it determine the final amount to be voted for each section of the budget.

Executive direction and management

18. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil), speaking in connection with subsection 2, the Executive Office of the Secretary-General, said that his delegation warmly supported the Secretary-General's request for the reclassification of the post of Chief of Protocol from the D-2 to the Assistant Secretary-General level (para. 1.60). The special nature of the responsibilities of the Chief of Protocol required special status. The growing number of high-level meetings held at the United Nations made the position increasingly important and demanding. His delegation hoped, therefore, that the Secretary-General's proposal would be accepted.
19. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) supported the Secretary-General's proposal to reclassify the post of the Chief of Protocol, and recalled the excellent work done by the Protocol and Liaison Service during the Organization's fortieth anniversary celebrations.
20. Mr. OULD MALLOUM (Mauritania) said that the Secretary-General's proposal for reclassification was fully justified by the importance of the post. The increase in the number of Member States and in the complexity of the Organization had greatly increased the Chief of Protocol's responsibilities. He noted, furthermore, that in national administrations the post of Head of Protocol in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was one of considerable seniority and status. His support for the Secretary-General's proposal, however, should not be interpreted as questioning the decision of the Advisory Committee. In general, he would continue to support its recommendations.
21. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question of reclassifying the post was not a simple one. The arguments put forward in support of the Secretary-General's proposal had stressed the increase in the volume of work and in responsibilities. His delegation conceded that the volume had increased but felt that the character of the work had not changed. The increased volume would argue more in favour of enlarging the staff assisting the Chief of Protocol. While it was true that Chief of Protocol was an important office in national Ministries of Foreign Affairs, the United Nations Chief of Protocol was not asked to deal with political matters and his functions had a narrower scope. In view of the importance of reducing and limiting expenditures, and the fact that a D-2 level already implied considerable status and responsibility, his delegation would support the Advisory Committee's recommendation.
22. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), Mrs. KNEZEVIC (Yugoslavia), Mr. RAHMA (Oman), Mr. ROY (India), Mr. MALAGA (Peru), Mr. MOHI EL DIN (Sudan), Mr. DANUS (Chile), Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan), Mr. PANESSO (Colombia), Mr. KOCATURK (Turkey), Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh), Mr. SWEISI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. FALL (Senegal), Mr. RANDRIAMALALA (Madagascar), Mr. RUSTICO (Benin), Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) and Mr. MASSOUD (United Arab Emirates) warmly endorsed the Brazilian proposal to approve the reclassification requested by the Secretary-General.
23. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) asked what level the post had been when it was originally created and when and how many times it had been reclassified. He also asked how large the Service was and how many professionals and general service staff worked in it.



24. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Division of the Budget Division) replied that in 1968 the post of Chief of Protocol had been at the P-5 level. In 1969, the incumbent had been promoted to D-1, and on 1 February 1973, the post had been upgraded to the D-2 level. It had remained at that level since 1973. Regarding the number of posts in the Protocol and Liaison Service, he said that there were seven professional posts, one D-2, one P-5, one P-4, one P-3 and three P-2s, and six General Service Staff. Posts at the Under-Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General level were not normally classified according to number of subordinates but in the light of the complexity and politically sensitive nature of their functions. The Secretary-General considered that the nature of the duties entrusted to the Chief of Protocol fully warranted the upgrading of his post to the level of Assistant Secretary-General.

25. Mr. SHAKER (Egypt) urged the members of the Committee, in view of the general support for the Secretary-General's proposal, to approve the reclassification without a vote. All delegations had witnessed the excellent work of the Protocol and Liaison Service during the fortieth anniversary celebrations, and the Chief of Protocol deserved a mark of appreciation in the form of an upgrading of his post to the Assistant Secretary-General level.

26. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium), speaking on subsection (3), the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, including the Division of General Assembly Affairs and the Division for Palestinian Rights, said that despite the great importance that Belgium attached to the drug problem his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation not to accede to the request for a new P-4 post in connection with international drug control. There were already three United Nations bodies dealing with drugs and efforts should be directed towards co-ordination rather than to the creation of new posts and new units.

27. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in regard to subsection 6, the Office for Field Operational and External Support Activities, understood that the Administrative Management Service had conducted a study of the Office's workings. He wondered whether its findings had been considered and any changes introduced as a result.

28. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Division of the Budget) said that the Administrative Management Service had undertaken such a study but it was not yet completed when the budget document was prepared and the findings had not therefore been factored into it. The political implications of the report in respect to peace-keeping operations in the Middle East had been the subject of discussion among senior officials but it had not been made available to the Budget Division in time for the purposes of the General Assembly.

29. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in connection with subsection 8, the Office of the Director-General, United Nations Office at Vienna, said that the text had been prepared in advance of the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency. He understood that the UNIDO budget for the biennium 1986-1987 had now taken shape and had been considered by the Programme and

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

Budget Committee of UNIDO. Delegates were aware of the costs of the new UNIDO, but not of the significant changes that would presumably take place in the operations of the Vienna Office. His delegation would like to know the net effect of the conversion. He did not think that the Fifth Committee should decide on the requests under that subsection until it had the full picture before it.

30. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) fully supported the representative of the United Kingdom. The Committee was always called upon to consider additions to the budget, but was never asked to consider reduction in appropriations once activities had been terminated. All delegations agreed that administrative costs should be reduced so as to increase the amounts available for programme activities. The Committee needed a detailed report indicating the possibility of reductions in view of the conversion of UNIDO.

31. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said he was surprised by the remarks made by the representative of Belgium. Austria understood the view of the United Kingdom and the fact that the conversion of UNIDO would result in changes at the United Nations Office at Vienna. It should be noted, however, that many of the administrative functions of the Office had been performed by UNIDO, and that the Office would now have additional responsibilities. Accordingly, Austria did not agree that the conversion of UNIDO meant that the staff of the United Nations Office at Vienna could be reduced.

32. Mr. VAN DEN HOUT (Netherlands) said that his delegation supported the position of the United Kingdom. The Committee needed additional information before taking a decision. Perhaps the Committee could be given a consolidated budget statement to clarify the situation.

33. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that his delegation also supported the United Kingdom position. Consideration of the matter should be deferred until additional information was available.

34. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Secretariat shared the concern of the United Kingdom, and was preparing a consolidated paper along the lines suggested.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that a recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 593 of the report of CPC (A/40/38).

36. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 593 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji,

Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

37. Paragraph 593 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination was adopted by 110 votes to 2.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraphs 587 to 593, relating to section 1 of the programme budget, of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination as a whole.

39. It was so decided.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that a recorded vote had been requested on the estimates, in section 1, of \$86,500 for the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and of \$2,762,800 for the Division for Palestinian Rights.

41. Mr. HERIJANTO (Indonesia) said that his delegation would support the estimates for the Committee to ensure it had the resources to discharge its mandate.

42. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People had been responsible for activities which had been intended solely to vilify Israel. The aim of the Division for Palestinian Rights was to channel United Nations funds into a campaign against Israel. Accordingly, his delegation was opposed to the appropriations requested.

43. Mrs. KNEZEVIC (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation supported the appropriations for the Committee, since the solution to the Palestinian question was of critical importance to a settlement in the Middle East.

44. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation also supported the appropriations for the Committee, given United Nations responsibility for the Palestinian people.



45. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that his delegation supported the provision of funds to the Committee.

46. A recorded vote was taken on the estimates for the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and for the Division for Palestinian Rights.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

47. Appropriations in the amounts of \$86,500 under section 1.A.7 and \$2,762,800 under section 1.B.3 (b) for the biennium 1986-1987 were approved in first reading by 95 votes to 2, with 13 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Japanese proposal to reduce the requirements referred to in section 1, paragraph 1.51, to \$30,000 at 1985 prices.

49. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said he understood that the Committee had already taken such a step by adopting the CPC recommendations.

50. Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina) said that it seemed to her delegation that the proposal made by Japan was duplicating the CPC proposal.

51. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that it was not clear whether the Japanese proposal related only to the Centre.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the CPC recommendations related to one staff member only.

53. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that travel in respect of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs referred to in paragraph 592 of the report of CPC, amounted to approximately \$6,000.

54. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that it was important for officials of the regional economic commissions to be present at CPC meetings. Although France would support efforts to rationalize the work of CPC, the proposal made by the representative of Japan seemed arbitrary and should be amended.

55. Mr. YONIS (Iraq) said that his delegation wondered whether the Japanese proposal would leave enough to meet the travel expenses of the staff of the regional commissions.

56. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that negative growth of \$4,800 was already reflected in the estimates for staff travel under section 1.A.8. Cuba agreed with the Secretary-General's estimates and with the Advisory Committee that it should be possible to combine resources for staff attending sessions of CPC with provisions for staff travel under the sections governing requirements for the regional commissions and CSDHA. Japan should reconsider its proposal.

57. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that the budgets of the regional commissions contained specific provisions for the travel of staff, so that it seemed that there might have been double counting. The reduction proposed by his delegation would not prevent regional commission representatives from attending CPC meetings, since even with the reduction for staff travel some \$40,000 would remain under section 1.A.8. With respect to the CPC report, when the Fifth Committee had endorsed paragraph 592, the effect had simply been to take note of its provisions, and not to decide on a reduction of \$6,000.

58. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that given the importance of attendance by regional commission staff members his delegation would view any reduction as arbitrary and would vote against the Japanese proposal.

59. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that his delegation supported budgetary restraint and sympathized with the Japanese concern over double counting. It was not, however, clear what amount had been included in the budgets of the regional commissions. It was his understanding that not all commissions had such a provision. An arbitrary cut might mean that some commissions could not send representatives. More information was decided before a decision could be taken.

60. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had raised the question of the financial implications of paragraph 592 of the CPC report. The representatives of the Secretary-General had stated that, in view of the Advisory Committee's recommendations in paragraph 1.25 of its report, it would not be necessary to recommend a specific deduction from the estimate for travel appropriation since the

(Mr. Mselle)

concerns expressed by CPC and the Advisory Committee would be taken into account. In administering the budget appropriations on the item the figure of \$68,900 was based on 1985 prices, and the Japanese proposal would result in a reduction of almost 50 per cent. Given the statement that the adoption of paragraph 592 of the CPC report would result in a reduction of \$6,000 and since paragraph 1.51 of the proposed programme budget referred to travel by a staff member from CSDHA, it would seem that acceptance of the Japanese proposal would result in a double deduction. In view of the uncertainty, it would be preferable for the Fifth Committee to defer consideration of the matter to its next meeting.

61. It was so decided.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Committee wished to agree to the reclassification of the post of Chief of Protocol without a vote.

63. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.