



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 64th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 115: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 123: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)
- Job classification of the General service and related categories in New York  
(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. GENFRAL  
A/C.5/40/SR.64  
20 December 1985

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 115: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 123: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

Job classification of the General Service and related categories in New York (continued) (A/C.5/40/84 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) recalled that, in his statement to the Committee at its 63rd meeting, the Secretary-General had said that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) had already implemented the results of its job-classification exercise. The Secretary-General's position seemed to be that, unless the Committee took action at the current session, the General Service staff of the United Nations Secretariat would be at a disadvantage vis-à-vis that of UNDP.
2. In paragraph 3 of its decision 85/35, the UNDP Governing Council had authorized the Administrator to implement the results of the job-classification exercise and the new salary scale for General Service staff of UNDP at headquarters when such results were implemented by the Secretary-General for the United Nations General Service and with the same effective date. That decision had been the subject of intense debate in the Governing Council and it had been understood at the time that the results of the classification exercise were not to be implemented until the Secretary-General had been given authority by the General Assembly to implement the results of that exercise in the United Nations.
3. If it was the case that the UNDP Administrator had implemented the results of the exercise in violation of that decision, that problem would most appropriately be addressed by the Governing Council at its next session. If, however, the terms of the decision had been fully respected, that fact should be brought to the attention of the Committee. His delegation requested the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services and, if possible, a representative of UNDP to explain the situation regarding the status of the classification exercise at UNDP.
4. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that the matter under consideration was a delicate one that had immediate consequences for a large number of General Service staff members.
5. It was his understanding that there was a division of functions among the Secretary-General, the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) with regard to the matter. The Secretary-General had the authority to decide on specific reclassifications of General Service staff on the basis of the general norms established by ICSC and approved by the General Assembly. The Advisory Committee had the responsibility of reaching decisions on the administrative and budgetary implications of the Secretary-General's decisions in that regard. His delegation would appreciate clarification as to the precise responsibilities of each of the three.

(Mr. Fontaine Ortiz, Cuba)

6. His delegation also wondered whether the Secretary-General was, in fact, obliged to bring the matter before the General Assembly in such detail. It would appreciate guidance as to what had traditionally been the role and responsibility of the General Assembly on the matter under consideration.
7. The Committee had a number of options before it. There were two extreme positions that, if adopted, would bring the debate to a speedy conclusion; the proposal of the Secretary-General could be approved at once in all its details, or consideration of the matter could be postponed to the forty-first session of the General Assembly.
8. There were also a number of intermediate possibilities. The Committee could decide to approve the uncontroversial aspects of the Secretary-General's proposal for immediate implementation and to leave in abeyance those aspects that had been the target of sustained criticism from Member States and ICSC. If that was done, it would be on the understanding that a decision on outstanding issues would be taken on the basis of retroactivity to 1 January 1985. That option might not be the wisest, but it was practical and fair to the staff, which was not responsible for the delay in the submission of the matter to the General Assembly.
9. Another possibility would be to instruct the Advisory Committee to consider the matter at its spring 1986 session and to report to the Secretary-General so that he could take action without awaiting the forty-first session of the General Assembly. The principle of retroactivity to 1 January 1985 would, again, be applicable to that option. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee might be able to advise the Committee as to the legality of such a procedure.
10. Yet another possibility would be to defer the entire matter until the next session of the General Assembly on the understanding that retroactivity would be granted to 1 January 1985 in respect of all decisions to be taken at that time.
11. Of the options open to the Committee, it should adopt one of those somewhere between the two extremes. His delegation's preference was for that of approving uncontroversial aspects and leaving contentious issues until the forty-first session.
12. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) said that he looked forward to the response of the Secretariat to the points raised by the representative of Cuba. The question of job classification was crucial to the Organization, and his delegation would do its utmost to promote a fair solution.
13. Mr. FALKSTAD (Norway), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that the delegations of those countries had difficulty in forming an opinion on a matter placed before the Committee at such a late date, let alone in taking a decision on it. The Committee was being invited to take a decision on a matter of a scope and magnitude on a par with many of the most time-consuming items on its agenda, and to do so, moreover, without the benefit of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

(Mr. Falkstad, Norway)

14. The only responsible way of dealing with the question would be to defer consideration until such time as the Advisory Committee had made a thorough study and submitted recommendations. If the matter was to be put to a vote, the chances of the delegations of the five Nordic countries casting a positive vote were remote.

15. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), replying to the questions raised by the representative of Cuba, said that, under article 13 of the statute of ICSC, the Commission was required to establish job-classification standards for all categories of staff in fields of work common to several of the organizations, including jobs in the General Service category.

16. The Secretary-General, under Regulation 2.1 of the Staff Regulations, was required, in conformity with principles laid down by the General Assembly, to make appropriate provision for the classification of posts and staff according to the nature of the duties and responsibilities required.

17. It seemed obvious, taking both of those provisions together, that the General Assembly, in approving the statute of ICSC, had delegated to it a large part of the standard-making function which, at least implicitly, had until then been vested in the General Assembly. The responsibility for establishing job-classification standards was therefore that of ICSC and the responsibility for establishing the classification of posts in accordance with those standards was that of the Secretary-General.

18. The role of the Advisory Committee was a broad one and was established both in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and in the Financial Regulations. It was responsible for the expert examination of the United Nations programme budget and submitted reports to the General Assembly whenever proposals made by Member States of the Secretary-General had administrative or budgetary implications. In the case in question, there had been a proposal of the Secretary-General.

19. The question had arisen of why the Secretary-General had submitted such a proposal to the Fifth Committee, since the question of job classification had never before been referred to it and since it was a personnel issue for which the Secretary-General had responsibility. There had been other classifications in the past and they had not been submitted to the General Assembly. In the case under consideration, however, the classification exercise had financial implications, and it was an issue in which the Fifth Committee and ICSC had expressed an interest. The full report was therefore before the Committee in response to specific requests. That did not mean that the Secretary-General or Member States expected the Committee to enter a technical discussion of the actual classification of General Service posts in New York. In accordance with the Staff Regulations, that was obviously a task for the Secretary-General.

20. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that, in the view of his delegation, the Committee must take account both of justice and of respect for procedure. As far as justice was concerned, it was the duty of the Committee to respect the rights of the

(Mr. Sefiani, Morocco)

General Service staff by acceding to the proposal of the Secretary-General. The procedural problem was not one of assigning responsibility but simply of there being sufficient time for the Committee to take up the matter and for the Advisory Committee to discuss it.

21. The best way of deciding the matter while taking account of the need for fairness was to grant the General Service staff the classifications and reclassifications requested as of 1 January 1985, as promised. Having taken that decision, the Committee must also show respect for procedure by allowing itself and the Advisory Committee enough time to discuss the matter.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that it was necessary to begin the process of reaching a decision. Delegations should state their views on the proposals that had been made so that he could then sum up the debate.

23. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that his delegation was willing to respond favourably to the appeal made to the Committee at its 63rd meeting that it should take action on the recommendation before it. No useful purpose would be served by entering into legalistic arguments. His delegation was, however, equally conscious of the need to respect established procedures and would therefore agree that, while the effective date should remain 1 January 1985, an opportunity should be afforded the Advisory Committee to examine the proposals and report back to the Committee at the current session. Technically speaking, the current session would continue until one day before the beginning of the next session.

24. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) said that although a number of delegations had argued that the Committee could not take a decision at the present stage, discussion of the matter could not be deferred. The Secretariat should, before the Committee's 65th meeting, provide a supplement to document A/C.5/40/84 outlining alternatives.

25. Mr. CHUA (Singapore) said that his delegation shared the view of many others that a thorough report of the Advisory Committee was needed. At the same time, it sympathized with the Secretary-General's dilemma. The problem had to be solved. The Committee should perhaps defer the matter until a resumed fortieth session. In the meantime, the Advisory Committee could meet again and make a recommendation for consideration at the resumed session.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that he did not intend to request a resumed session of the Committee.

27. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation favoured the suggestion that the Advisory Committee should be instructed to examine the job classification at its spring session and to report to the Secretary-General accordingly. Implementation should be retroactive to 1 January 1985. An intermediate solution, as proposed by the representative of Cuba, would be appropriate.

28. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that UNDP Governing Council decision 85/35, referred to by the representative of



(Mr. Ruedas)

the United States, had authorized the Administrator to implement the results of the job-classification exercise and the new salary scale for General Service staff of UNDP when such results were implemented by the Secretary-General for United Nations staff and with the same effective date. In October 1985, the Secretary-General had announced, by information circular, his approval of the overall parameters of the classification exercise and his decision to implement it with effect from 1 January 1985.

29. Mr. NEGRE (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) said that the representatives of the United Kingdom and the USSR had expressed surprise that the conclusions of the Classification Review Group differed from the classifications drawn up by the technical services. The Group had been established to examine and interpret the application of the classification standards to each occupational group; to review the preliminary analysis of the post description and tentative classification made by the Classification Section in order to arrive at a final determination of the grade level of each post in the General Service and related categories, and to submit its conclusions to the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services for approval; and to make recommendations regarding criteria for and the level of recruitment of each occupational group. It was because the recommendations of the Classification Section were not definitive in nature that the Classification Review Group had been set up.

30. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to a question from Mr. DITZ (Austria), said that it was for the Fifth Committee to decide whether to approve implementation of the classification exercise and from what date. He understood that the Committee might wish to have the benefit of careful study of the question by ACABQ. Under its mandate, the Advisory Committee could examine the methodology and other aspects of the classification exercise, but would be unable to do so during the current session.

31. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Committee might also benefit from comments by the ICSC on the question of standards and procedures. Those comments could then be viewed in conjunction with the recommendations of ACABQ at the forty-first session.

32. Mr. AKWEI (Chairman of the International Civil Service Commission) said that if the General Assembly so wished, the Commission could include the question of the New York classification exercise in the agenda of its spring 1986 session with a view to reporting to the Assembly at its forty-first session. He pointed out, however, that ICSC had already promulgated classification standards in 1982 and 1983 but had received no detailed information from the United Nations thus far on their implementation. If the Commission were to undertake a study of the General Service classification exercise, it would be essential for it to be supplied with all the facts.

33. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the co-operation of ICSC and the Advisory Committee would be helpful in enabling

(Mr. Khalevinsky, USSR)

delegations to clarify their views, and in particular to resolve the question of retroactivity, which presented some difficulty to his delegation.

34. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) pointed out, with regard to the question of retroactivity, that the Advisory Committee had recommended in paragraph 54 of its report (A/40/7) that, if the results of the classification exercise had not been implemented by the end of the 1984-1985 biennium, funds should only be provided in the 1986-1987 biennium to cover the financial implications of the exercise from 1 January 1986 onwards.

35. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the reference made by the United States representative to the Advisory Committee's report was correct. However, the Secretary-General had announced implementation of the exercise, having set 1 January 1985 as the effective date. If the Fifth Committee postponed consideration of the Secretary-General's report, the Fifth Committee had to decide whether to retain 1 January 1985 as the effective date of implementing the exercise.

36. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) and Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that, in view of the urgency of the matter and the need for fairness towards the staff concerned, it might be preferable for the Fifth Committee to take up the matter again, at a resumed session, once ACABQ had been able to submit its recommendations, so that implementation of the classification exercise could be approved as of 1 January 1985.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that it was for the General Assembly, and not the Fifth Committee, to decide on a resumed session. In any case, as Mr. Mselle had indicated, ACABQ would not be able to give serious consideration to the classification exercise until after the end of the present session. Thus, if the Fifth Committee wished to have the advantage of the Advisory Committee's views, a decision would have to be deferred until the forty-first session. As to the question of justice, the Committee might wish to consider whether its final decision should be retroactive to 1 January 1985, in keeping with the promises which had been made to the staff.

38. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), Mr. SWISI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) and Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said they favoured deferral of the matter until the next session, when the Committee could take a decision on the basis of all the facts. In the interests of justice, that decision should incorporate the idea of retroactivity to 1 January 1985.

39. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) observed that there was a general recognition in the Committee of the need for justice towards the staff concerned, which meant that whatever decision was finally taken should be retroactive to 1 January 1985, and that there was also a general feeling that the Advisory Committee should consider the classification exercise carefully. A decision could, of course, be left until the forty-first session, but there was some merit in endeavouring to reach agreement at a resumed session, particularly in view of the fact that a number of other outstanding issues still remained on which the General Assembly would have to take action.

40. Mr. EDON (Benin), Mr. MOJTAHED (Islamic Republic of Iran), Miss DURRANT (Jamaica) and Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said they favoured any solution that would enable the Fifth Committee to take a fair decision based on the views of the expert body or bodies and with retroactive effect to 1 January 1985.
41. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), replying to questions from Mr. DITZ (Austria) and Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan), said that the General Assembly had to decide on the financial implications for 1986-1987 of the job classification of the General Service and related categories in New York, and specifically the designation of grade G-7 as the highest level of the new Headquarters structure, to be identified separately in the budget as the Principal Level, and the conversion of 11 General Service posts to the Professional category. As to the procedure for addressing those issues, he agreed that the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/40/84 and Corr.1) should normally have been submitted earlier to allow the Advisory Committee time to consider it and offer its recommendations to the Fifth Committee. If, in addition, the Committee wished to have advice from ICSC, the Commission would have to submit comments to the Advisory Committee for its consideration in conjunction with the Secretary-General's report. That would be a complicated and time-consuming process and he hoped that the issues could be clarified and resolved simply without the need for too many formal reports and extended discussions among all the bodies concerned.
42. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the late submission of the Secretary-General's report should not prevent it from being considered in the normal way by ACABQ and the Fifth Committee. Promises had been made to the staff, however, and his delegation therefore supported the view that action on the classification exercise should be deferred on the understanding that a final decision would be retroactive to 1 January 1985.
43. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that no action should be taken until both the Advisory Committee and ICSC had been able to look into all aspects of the exercise, including the effective date of implementation. His delegation could not at the present stage agree to the idea of retroactivity to 1 January 1985.
44. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that he supported the idea of deferring the matter to enable ACABQ to consider it at its spring 1986 session. In the interest of justice, he also agreed that implementation should be retroactive to 1 January 1985.
45. The CHAIRMAN noted that there seemed to be an agreement to postpone a decision so that ACABQ and ICSC could consider the matter and submit their views. There was also a strongly-held view that implementation should be retroactive to 1 January 1985.
46. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would oppose a decision for retroactive implementation. He asked that any such decision at the current meeting should be taken by a recorded vote.
47. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) proposed that the matter should be deferred until the forty-first session.



48. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he would agree to the postponement of a decision on the implementation of the classification exercise so that members could decide with full knowledge of the facts. Furthermore, he could not commit himself to a decision on retroactivity when he did not know the outcome of the decision on the classification exercise.
49. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether there had ever been any precedent for decisions with budgetary and financial implications which had a retroactive effect. His delegation found it difficult to take such a decision.
50. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation also had some reservations on taking a premature decision on retroactivity. He asked whether the Advisory Committee could consider that question at its spring session and report to the Committee at the forty-first session. A considered opinion from the Advisory Committee on the technicalities and financial aspects together with advice on the date of implementation could provide the Committee with the basis for an informed decision. He suggested that the question of the date of implementation should be embodied in a report of the Advisory Committee to be considered at the forty-first session.
51. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, in many cases concerning salaries and allowances of staff in the General Service and related categories, decisions had a retroactive effect. Even the decision to implement the new salary scales for those staff had been taken with retroactive effect.
52. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that the United Kingdom suggestion that the effective date should be left for consideration by ACABQ was a good compromise, which he could support.
53. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that the debates had shown that there was a large majority of delegations that wished the decision to be made effective from 1 January 1985, as the Secretary-General had requested and as justice required.
54. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said he could accept the proposal for postponement of the matter until the forty-first session. Virtually everyone agreed that a decision on retroactivity involved the need for social justice. While any postponement would be harmful to certain members of the General Service staff, that harm would then be offset by retroactivity.
55. Mr. IOZA (Egypt) said that any postponement would be due to the fact that the Committee had not considered the Secretary-General's report. Consequently, it would be a contradiction to approve a recommendation contained in that report. In the interest of social justice, however, postponement should not prejudice retroactivity.
56. Ms. HILLYER (New Zealand) asked the Under-Secretary-General for further clarification of the question of retroactivity. She understood him to say that

(Ms. Hillyer, New Zealand)

decisions had been taken in the past involving retroactive implementation. She therefore wished to know whether there had previously been any cases of taking a decision prior to a substantive decision in order to ensure that that substantive decision would be given retroactive implementation.

57. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) replied that he did not know of an identical case. However, the question at issue was not so much one of substance as the fact that the Committee had not been able to consider the matter and wanted an opportunity to do so.

58. Mr. EDON (Benin) said that he agreed with the representative of Algeria concerning the link between postponement of the matter and the need to secure social justice by ensuring retroactive implementation.

59. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that the first aspect of the problem was procedural, in that the Committee did not have enough information to take a decision on a technical matter and therefore the decision had to be deferred. The second aspect involved social justice, and there appeared to be consensus that the more than 3,000 staff members dependent on the Committee for reclassification of their posts had rights and expectations that should be addressed. He therefore supported retroactivity to 1 January 1985. In any case, the Secretary-General had promised them retroactivity and they had that expectation.

60. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he supported the United Kingdom proposal for consideration of both aspects of the question by ACABQ.

61. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would not object to a consensus decision on the question of retroactivity if based on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

62. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said that he agreed with the representative of Egypt that postponement should not prejudice retroactivity.

63. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that there was the need to strike a balance in order to preserve social justice for the staff, proper procedure and the decision-making authority of the General Assembly.

64. The General Assembly should take note of the Secretary-General's decision to implement the job classification with retroactive effect to 1 January 1985 and should defer a final decision until the forty-first session. In the meantime, ACABQ should be requested to examine that result in consultation with ICSC. The element of retroactivity could be taken into account at that point.

65. Before the Committee took a decision which had financial implications, the principle of retroactivity could be implied without being explicitly stated. The Committee could first take note of the Secretary-General's decision and then add that it had decided to transfer the amount of \$1,391,000 from from the programme

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

budget for the biennium 1984-1985 to the programme budget for 1986-1987. By implication the General Assembly would be keeping the necessary funds needed to implement the job reclassification for 1985, so that when a decision was taken in 1986, the job classification could be applied retroactively.

66. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that, on the question of retroactivity, what was being envisaged was a final decision on the substance roughly two years after the proposed date of effective implementation. Some staff members faced the prospect of the downgrading of their posts, with the possibility of having to repay money, which did not appear to be consistent with the idea of justice.

67. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that appropriate arrangements had been made to ensure that no staff member incurred loss. However, it needed to be made clear whether retroactivity would be effective from 1 January 1985.

68. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) noted that the Secretary-General, as the chief personnel officer, had taken a number of decisions and made certain commitments. With regard to retroactivity, delegations were prepared to honour the Secretary-General's decision in the interest of social justice. The Japanese proposal for the transfer of funds was an attractive one because it made allowance for social justice, covered the Secretary-General's commitments and allowed delegations to meet their responsibilities to their Governments.

69. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) in response to the Chairman's request for clarification, said that there was no need to change the performance report. If the retroactivity requested by the Secretary-General were accepted with effect from 1 January 1985, there was already an amount of \$1,950,700 gross or \$1,314,608 net which represented the amount of the financial implications. Since obligations would arise in the 1984-1985 biennium he saw no reason for deducting money from that biennium and reappropriating it in the 1986-1987 biennium.

70. Mrs. RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) said that the question of retroactivity should be resolved right away so that the Advisory Committee could take a decision on the other matters. Retroactivity should be effective from 1 January 1985 so that the Secretary-General's promise to the staff might be kept.

71. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that, although technically it was not necessary to transfer funds which had already been set aside, such action represented a sort of declaration of intention by Member States to implement the results of the job classification retroactively to 1 January 1985. The most explicit way in which to represent that intention would be for the General Assembly to decide that the effective date of implementation should be 1 January 1985 but that procedurally it would not be implemented before 1986.

72. Technically, the Secretary-General could use funds in the 1986-1987 budget if he were authorized to so. The intention of the General Assembly would be expressed

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

but the implementation date would be left open for a final decision, at which time, given the possible political implications, the whole procedure might be reconsidered.

73. Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that the Committee must act in a manner consistent with its established procedures and refrain from taking a decision until the Advisory Committee had made its recommendations.

74. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) said that, in the light of the answer given by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to the question raised by the representative of Cuba, he did not believe that the Committee would be contradicting itself if it chose to defer a decision on the job-classification question while at the same time taking a decision with regard to retroactivity.

75. Mr. DITZ (Austria) supported the view expressed by the representative of Mexico and urged the Committee to take a decision on the matter before it without further delay.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it the Committee wished to defer a decision on the question of the job classification of the General Service and related categories in New York until the forty-first session.

77. It was so decided.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it the Committee wished to have before it the views of ACABQ and ICSC with regard to the job classification of the General Service and related categories in New York before taking a decision.

79. It was so decided.

80. The CHAIRMAN noted that the issue of social justice had been raised repeatedly in connection with the implementation of the results of the job-classification exercise. Consequently, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee was in agreement that justice should be done to the staff in the General Service and related categories in New York in the implementation of the results of the job-classification exercise.

81. It was so decided.

82. The CHAIRMAN observed that, while a variety of views had been expressed as to how justice might be done, there appeared to be widespread agreement that any decision ought to be made retroactive to 1 January 1985. That being the case, he wished to know whether the representative of the United States would insist on that question being put to a vote.

83. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that, if the Committee insisted on specifying a date for the effective implementation of the results of the job-classification exercise, his delegation would request a recorded vote.

84. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil), supported by Mr. ROY (India), proposed that the debate should be closed and that the Committee should take action on the question of retroactivity.
85. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on the proposal that the implementation of the results of the job classification should be made retroactive to 1 January 1985.
86. Mr. DE CLERCK (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the fact that the Committee did not have all the elements it needed to consider the question adequately would lead his delegation to vote against the proposal.
87. Ms. HILLYER (New Zealand) said that the fact that she would vote against the proposal did not reflect her delegation's attitude towards the job-classification exercise, but was indicative of its unwillingness to take a decision which might prejudice the substantive decision that the Committee would take on the matter at its forty-first session.
88. Miss DURRANT (Jamaica), speaking on a point of order, said it was her delegation's understanding that the Secretary-General had already taken a decision in the matter.
89. The CHAIRMAN said he would interpret the statement just made by the representative of Jamaica as an explanation of vote.
90. Mr. WESTPHAL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation wished to have the benefit of the views of ACABQ and ICSC before deciding whether or not to implement the results of the job-classification exercise retroactively, and would therefore vote against the proposal.
91. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that his delegation would also vote against the proposal, for the reasons just put forward by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. Such a vote did not imply, however, that his delegation was opposed to a retroactive implementation of the results of the job-classification exercise.
92. Mrs. ARCHINI (Italy) said her delegation had always supported the General Service staff. However, she could not take a decision that might set precedents, and she would therefore vote against the proposal.
93. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said it was unfortunate that efforts to avoid a recorded vote on the question had been unsuccessful. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposal, since the parameters within which the decision would be taken were known and because his delegation supported the General Service staff.
94. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) said he had hoped that it might have been possible to reach a decision that conformed with the Committee's established procedures while reflecting the common concern for the interests of the staff. Unfortunately, he could not support a decision which would predetermine some elements of a future substantive decision.



95. Ms. van DRUNEN LITTEL (Netherlands) said that her delegation could not support the proposal until it had heard the recommendations of ACABQ and ICSC.

96. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) said his delegation would abstain in the vote.

97. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that his delegation would vote in favour of implementing the results of the job-classification exercise retroactively to 1 January 1985, because doing so was the only way to compensate for the fact that the General Assembly had been unable to take a decision on that question at its fortieth session.

98. Mr. THORSTEINSSON (Iceland) drew attention to rule 131 of the rules of procedure and pointed out that the representative of Japan had not yet withdrawn his proposal, which had been made before the proposal of the representative of Brazil. It seemed to him that the Committee was obliged to take action on the former proposal first.

99. The CHAIRMAN explained that, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure, once the voting procedure had begun, no one could interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting.

100. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said it was unfortunate that the Secretary-General had not been able to announce his decision in time for the Advisory Committee to make recommendations to the Fifth Committee in the matter. However, while he understood that the report which the Advisory Committee would ultimately submit to the Fifth Committee would have financial implications, he nevertheless intended to vote in favour of the proposal.

101. Ms. BYRNE (Ireland) said she could not support the proposal, although her negative vote would not reflect her delegation's attitude towards the possible retroactive implementation of the job-classification exercise.

102. Mr. OTHMAN (Jordan) said his delegation would support the proposal, for the reasons put forward by the representative of Denmark.

103. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposal, in keeping with its participation in the consensus which the Committee had reached on other aspects of the same question. However, his affirmative vote was not intended to prejudice any decision the Advisory Committee might take.

104. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that the proposals made earlier by the representatives of Egypt and Japan had provided the basis for a consensus within the Committee. Nevertheless, his delegation believed that all procedural considerations had been accommodated in a satisfactory manner in the first three decisions just adopted by the Committee. Therefore, in the interests of social justice, his delegation would support retroactive implementation, although its vote did not imply a prejudgment of the Advisory Committee's eventual decision.

105. Mr. NTSAMA (Cameroon) said his delegation would vote in favour of the proposal because the proposed measures were in the interest of the staff.

106. Mr. MALAGA (Peru) said that, when a question of social justice had to be balanced against procedural considerations, it was preferable to tip the balance in favour of social justice. For that reason, his delegation would support the proposal.

107. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) expressed regret that the Committee had been unable to reach a consensus on such an important question. His delegation did not object to the retroactive implementation of the results of the job-classification exercise; however, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had made it clear that such a decision involved many elements having financial implications, including the creation of G-6 and G-7 levels within the General Service category and the upgrading of certain posts from the General Service to the Professional category, which required Fifth Committee approval. Because his delegation could not accept a decision that would detract from the General Assembly's decision-making capacity, it would vote against the proposal.

108. Mr. BARAC (Romania) said his delegation would vote against the proposal for procedural reasons.

109. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that his delegation would support the proposal in order to ensure that justice was done and to affirm the authority of the Secretary-General as the principal administrative officer of the Secretariat. That vote, however, did not imply a prejudgement of the outcome of the Advisory Committee's consideration of the matter or the final decision to be taken thereon by the General Assembly.

110. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal that the implementation of the results of the job classification exercise should be retroactive to 1 January 1985.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Norway, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

111. The proposal was adopted by 67 votes to 25, with 7 abstentions.

112. Mr. RALLIS (Greece), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation regretted the fact the circumstances had compelled it to cast a negative vote.

113. Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote, believing that the setting of a specific date for retroactivity should have been kept separate from the substantive issue involved. However, her delegation's abstention did not preclude its speaking in favour of retroactive implementation once all the necessary information had been obtained.

114. Mr. ALPER (Turkey) said his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal for procedural reasons.

115. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution for reasons of social justice: the fate of over 3,000 staff members should not depend upon a question of procedure.

116. Mr. RANDRIAMALALA (Madagascar) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal solely in the interest of social justice. However, he did not approve of the procedure which had been followed, and hoped that it would not set a precedent.

117. Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote for the reasons cited by the representative of Argentina.

118. Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal because it believed that doing so constituted the only way to express the consensus that had been reached on the issue of social justice. Furthermore, as bodies of technical experts, ACABQ and ICSC could not be expected to deal with that issue; only the Fifth Committee could do so.

119. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said his delegation had supported the proposal for humanitarian reasons.

120. Mr. SPAIN (Guinea-Bissau) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal for the reasons stated by the representative of Madagascar.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.