



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FONTAINE-ORTIZ (Cuba)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 111: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79 concerning
agenda item 12

Job classification of the General Service and related categories (continued)

First performance report

Consolidated statement of programme budget implications in respect of
conference-servicing costs

Revised estimates: recosting of decisions of the Fifth Committee concerning
statements of programme budget implications and revised estimates

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/41/SR.40
8 December 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 111: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/C.5/41/59; A/C.5/41/L.13/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said he was pleased to inform the Committee that, following informal consultations on the agenda item under consideration, agreement had been reached on the revised draft resolution in document A/C.5/41/L.13/Rev.1. He noted that the adoption of that draft resolution would not prejudice and would therefore be without prejudice to any decision which might be taken by the General Assembly in the light of the recommendations of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts (Group of 18). He also stressed that its adoption would imply full approval of the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), including those relating to programme performance of the United Nations, evaluation and cross-organizational programme analyses.
2. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had approved the text of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/41/L.13 during informal consultations and had therefore been surprised by the submission of the revised draft resolution. Although it had no objection in principle to the revised text, it wished to know why and on whose initiative revisions had been made.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that all interested parties had been asked when the original draft resolution had been submitted to make their views known to the representative of Cameroon. Ample time had been provided for further informal consultations on that subject following objections by some delegations that they had not had an opportunity to express their views.
4. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that no substantive problems had emerged during the informal consultations on the item under consideration. Some delegations, particularly those of Brazil and the United Kingdom, had voiced concerns, which had nevertheless been resolved at a meeting which led to the formulation of the revised draft resolution. He had already had the opportunity to provide some clarification to the representative of the Byelorussian SSR. In reply to those delegations which had asked why a reference to the mandate of CPC had been included, he wished to reaffirm that the subject of the draft resolution still fell within the mandate of that Committee as currently constituted. No prejudice was implied to any decision that might be taken on the recommendations of the Group of 18, and it had been agreed during the informal consultations that mention of the Committee's mandate served to clarify matters. The reference to the mandate of the Board of Auditors had been included because one delegation felt that the Board should not be mandated to audit programmes. The representative of the United Kingdom had stated that correct English would require inclusion of the word "the" before the phrase "other conclusions and recommendations" in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. Given that the draft resolution was to be adopted without any prejudice to a decision by the General Assembly on the recommendations of the Group of 18, he believed that no delegations would have any difficulty in joining in the consensus on the revised text.

5. Mr. TAKASU (Japan), noting that paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution had a direct bearing on discussions of the recommendations of the Group of 18, asked when the General Assembly was likely to address the report of the Fifth Committee on the item under consideration. Confusion might occur unless a decision were to be taken on the report of the Group of 18 at the same time.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that matters relating to the report of the Group of 18, including the timing of plenary meetings on that subject, would be decided by the General Assembly. He re-emphasized that adoption of the revised draft resolution would not prejudice the outcome of discussions on that report.

7. Mr. VAN DEN HOUT (Netherlands) said that, while his delegation could accept the wording of paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution, it would appreciate clarification of the final phrase beginning with the words "in particular". He understood that phrase to reflect the views of the Third Committee as expressed in section D of document A/C.5/41/59. If the views expressed by the Third Committee were in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, contained in paragraph 149 (k) of document A/41/38, his delegation would have no difficulty in joining the consensus on that draft resolution.

8. The CHAIRMAN, explaining the procedure in such cases, said that proposed revisions to the medium-term plan were submitted to the Fifth Committee, which acted on behalf of the General Assembly. The Chairman of the Fifth Committee addressed identical letters to the chairmen of the other Main Committees, which then took up the items within their spheres of competence. All the Main Committees enjoyed the same authority and powers, and the same Member States were represented on all of them. The Fifth Committee was obliged to abide by the decisions taken by the other Main Committees since it had no mandate over those Committees unless their decisions were inconsistent with rules relating to programming and budgeting. In his opinion, the decision taken by the Third Committee was in accordance with those rules and was thus accepted in the context of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution under consideration.

9. Mr. HARAN (Israel) requested that a recorded vote be taken on the draft resolution.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that if, as it appeared, agreement had not been reached on the text of the revised draft resolution, he would have no alternative but to withdraw it.

11. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that certain delegations had always had difficulty in accepting one or another of the activities contained in the medium-term plan. He did not believe that the draft resolution itself was at issue and said that the representative of Israel might have objections to the contents of the medium-term plan rather than to the draft resolution itself. He noted that it had not been necessary in the past to vote on a draft resolution relating to the medium-term plan.

12. The CHAIRMAN, noting that the representative of Israel would be entitled to explain his position following adoption of the draft resolution, said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.13/Rev.1 without a vote.

13. It was so decided.

14. Mr. HARAN (Israel) apologized for any problems that his stand might have caused to the Chairman. Had a vote been taken on draft resolution A/C.5/41/L.13/Rev.1, his delegation would have voted against it. His delegation had already stated its strong objections to certain paragraphs in the CPC report notably paragraphs 119 and 130.

15. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation, in joining the consensus on the draft resolution, wished to express its understanding that the application of the concept of "timeliness" would in no way prevent Member States from examining issues of a controversial or sensitive nature. The United Nations must not adopt a selective approach by according a lower status to activities approved by a vote than to those decided by consensus or without a vote. It was also the understanding of his delegation that the recommendations contained in paragraphs 35 and 66 of the report of CPC would not be construed as authorizing that Committee to infringe upon the mandate of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions or as changing the current terms of reference of the Board of Auditors in such a way as to involve the external auditors in programme auditing. Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/51 had expressly endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the improvement of its work under its mandate, and the Secretary-General's report on the redeployments of posts among departments should therefore be examined by the Advisory Committee rather than by CPC since the subject did not fall within the latter's mandate. The recommendation contained in paragraph 66 of the report should imply no change in the terms of reference of the Board of Auditors, as laid down in regulations 12.4 and 12.5 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations. The Board should therefore strictly limit any reference to output delivery to the context of its examination of the efficiency of the financial procedures, the accounting system, the internal financial controls and the administration and management of the Organization.

16. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that the representatives of Israel and Brazil, among others, should be commended for their understanding in accepting the revised draft resolution. All delegations must try to overcome their differences in order to reach a common middle ground.

17. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the understanding, as indicated by the Chairman, that the decision taken would be entirely without prejudice to the outcome of the ongoing discussion of the report of the Group of 18, which would have a significant bearing on the future functions of CPC. His delegation also had reservations with regard to the decision by the Third Committee, referred to in the first operative paragraph of

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

the draft resolution, which took issue with a recommendation made by CPC after a review of all revisions to the medium-term plan, thus calling into question the review.

18. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus purely because of the difficulty of arranging further meetings of the Fifth Committee at the current stage of the session. He wished it to be clearly understood that adoption of the draft resolution did not prejudice discussions on the future of CPC.

19. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that his delegation, while joining in the consensus without difficulty, supported the statement by the representative of Brazil in connection with paragraph 66 of the CPC report. The draft resolution should not be construed as in any way changing the mandate of the Board of Auditors.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 111.

AGENDA ITEM 110: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/41/57 and Add.1)

21. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79 envisaged 20 meetings of the Working Group on the Drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families, to be held in New York in the two weeks immediately following the Economic and Social Council's first regular session of 1987, and also the holding of an inter-sessional meeting of the Working Group in New York. In document A/C.5/41/57, the Secretary-General estimated that, if all the meetings were held at Geneva, an amount of \$489,900 would be required. However, if an exception was made to General Assembly resolution 40/243 in order to allow the inter-sessional meeting to be held in New York, the amount involved would be \$534,700. In that regard, the Committee on Conferences should submit its views to the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly. The Advisory Committee wished to inform the Fifth Committee that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79 would give rise to conference-servicing costs in an amount not exceeding \$534,700, or \$489,900 if all the meetings were held at Geneva.

22. The CHAIRMAN proposed that on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that should it adopt draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79, no additional appropriations would be necessary under the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 and that conference-servicing requirements, not exceeding \$534,700, would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs to be taken up later in the meeting. Approval of the draft resolution would entail an exception to Assembly resolution 40/243.

23. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

24. The proposal was adopted by 89 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions.

25. Mr. ABOLY (Côte d'Ivoire) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the proposal had not been recorded by the voting machine.

26. Mr. GUERRERO (Ecuador) requested that his delegation should be recorded as voting in favour of the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/41/L.79.

Job classification of the General Service and related categories (continued)
(A/41/7/Add.8; A/C.5/40/30, 34 and 84 and Corr.1)

27. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that the Secretary-General should have considerable flexibility in administering his staff. For that reason, and out of concern for social justice and staff morale, his delegation proposed that the Committee should adopt the Secretary-General's proposals in document A/C.5/41/30 on job classification in New York.

28. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation shared the views contained in the ninth report of the Advisory Committee (A/41/7/Add.8), in particular the opinion expressed in paragraph 14. However, he did not believe that the

(Mr. Figueira, Brazil)

Secretariat would be able by the following session to submit a more satisfactory report rectifying some of the problems which had arisen in the job classification exercise. His delegation therefore supported the adoption of the Secretary-General's proposals.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that, although no additional appropriations would be required if the proposals of the Secretary-General were adopted, the latter would be allowed to charge the additional expenditures against the balance of appropriations under the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985, which would be retained as a result of the suspension of regulations 4.3, 4.4 and 5.2 (d) of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations.

30. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation had been prepared to support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and that, if the Moroccan proposal was put to a vote, his delegation would request a recorded vote.

31. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked how the Moroccan proposal would affect the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 16 of document A/41/7/Add.8. It was not clear whether that recommendation, which the representatives of Morocco and Brazil did not seem to oppose, would be adopted or left without effect. He asked the representative of either Morocco or Brazil to explain what was to be gained by setting aside the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Moroccan proposal was for the Committee to adopt the Secretary-General's original proposals.

33. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) said that the representative of the Soviet Union had asked a question to which her delegation had expected an answer, since it was still unclear whether the Committee was voting to overturn the Advisory Committee's recommendation contained in paragraph 16 of document A/41/7/Add.8.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that Morocco had proposed that the original proposals of the Secretary-General should be adopted to the exclusion of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. He invited the Committee to proceed to a decision on the proposal.

35. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said his delegation regretted the proposal. It had been prepared to accept the recommendations of the Advisory Committee but, if even they were to be turned down, it could not but express its objection and disappointment.

36. Several reasons had been advanced for accepting the Secretary-General's proposals. The first was that the prerogatives of the Secretary-General should not be restricted. The Advisory Committee's report very clearly explained why, despite reservations over the methodology used, ACABQ had decided to go along with most of the Secretary-General's proposals. But the Fifth Committee had not been provided with a breakdown of the posts to be ranked at the G-7 level or converted to Professional positions, nor with any explanation of the upgradings. How could Member States accept such a position?

(Mr. Takasu, Japan)

37. It had been suggested that the Secretary-General would find it difficult to produce a better report by the forty-second session. The Advisory Committee dealt with that point in paragraph 17 of its report. The Advisory Committee's recommendation was reasonable; it preserved the prerogatives of the Secretary-General while upholding the authority of Member States. In short, his delegation was compelled to vote against the Moroccan proposal.

38. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Moroccan proposal raised a number of questions which needed answering before a decision could be taken. He did not, therefore, regard himself as speaking in explanation of vote. The effect of the Secretary-General's recommendations would be to limit significantly the prerogatives of the General Assembly, which in future would have control over a smaller number of posts at the highest level in the General Service category. He did not believe it had been the Moroccan representative's intention to restrict the General Assembly's prerogatives in that manner. He therefore wished to make a formal proposal.

39. Mr. LOZA (Eqvpt), speaking on a point of order, said he had thought that the Soviet representative was explaining his vote.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the voting procedure had begun, and any delegation speaking must be regarded as explaining its vote.

41. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) deferred to the Chairman's ruling. He said his delegation was deeply disappointed that the Fifth Committee was being forced to consider the Secretary-General's recommendations. Such recommendations were hard to accept, given the Organization's present financial crisis; indeed, he believed that similar recommendations which had emanated from the Secretariat before were largely to blame for the financial crisis.

42. In the early days of the reclassification exercise the matter had been entrusted to expert groups - bodies competent to deal with the matter. Those bodies had made specific recommendations which had displeased the staff, and the staff had therefore rejected them. The Administration had given way and a period of anarchy had begun, for the task of classifying posts in the General Service category had been assigned to the staff themselves. Qualified people had been kept out of the exercise, and the Administration had kept itself aside. Such a development was dangerous. It undermined the Secretary-General's Charter prerogatives in personnel matters and amounted to wilful abandonment of responsibility for the staff. His delegation had often expressed doubts about that trend. Similar doubts had been reflected in the report of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts, which had called for an end to the undermining of the Secretary-General's authority by the staff associations.

43. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee's comment that there was justification for the rejection of the whole classification exercise. Unfortunately, the Advisory Committee had been moved by other considerations to take a different decision, a decision unforgivable in view of the Organization's

/...

(Mr. Vislykh, USSR)

present financial straits. His delegation could not support the Advisory Committee's recommendation, still less the Secretary-General's proposal as advocated by the delegations of Morocco and Brazil. It would vote against the motion.

44. If the Moroccan proposal was nevertheless adopted, his delegation would expect the management of the United Nations to comply with the Advisory Committee's recommendation, in paragraph 19 of its report, that posts at the G-6 and G-7 levels should henceforward be indicated separately in budget documents.

45. Mr. LOZA (Egypt) said that during the Committee's discussion of other matters, much had been made of the need to respect the Secretary-General's prerogatives and allow him some flexibility and freedom of action. He did not believe that different criteria should apply in the case of job classification. The Secretary-General had asked for help in fulfilling a commitment to the staff in the General Service and related categories. His delegation supported the Secretary-General and would vote in favour of the proposal.

46. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) said that he sympathized with the sentiments of the Moroccan and Brazilian delegations but believed that they were, in the present case, misplaced. The point at issue was not whether the Fifth Committee should restrict the authority of the Secretary-General, for the Advisory Committee's proposal respected that authority. But at the fortieth session, the Committee had decided to defer a decision on the matter so that it could benefit by the views of the Advisory Committee; now the Advisory Committee's views were being ignored. The Advisory Committee had produced a good and helpful report. Paragraph 13 contained many good things from the staff's point of view: calls for a definition of career paths, the development of a career counselling programme, training programmes and new arrangements for performance evaluation. Paragraph 19 clearly indicated where, in the Advisory Committee's view, the authority of the Secretary-General should end and that of Member States begin. If, therefore, the Advisory Committee's recommendation had been put to the vote, his delegation would have upheld it. While it did not wish its action to be regarded as in any way hostile to the interests of the staff, his delegation was forced to abstain on the proposal currently before the Committee.

47. Mr. ORTEGA-NALDA (Mexico) said that the Moroccan representative had based his proposal on three considerations: a fourth had been added by subsequent speakers, namely the erosion of the prerogatives of Member States. It seemed to him, however, that proposing to set aside the Advisory Committee's recommendations eroded no one's prerogatives but was perfectly normal decision-making procedure in the Fifth Committee.

48. The representative of Morocco had argued that the Secretary-General, as chief administrative officer of the United Nations, should be given a degree of latitude in personnel matters and should be supported in his recommendations. Accordingly, it was only logical to support the Moroccan proposal. The Moroccan representative had spoken of social justice: that was the first point on which the General

(Mr. Ortega-Nalda, Mexico)

Assembly had agreed at its fortieth session, when considering the matter. The point should be borne in mind again now. The Moroccan representative had spoken of staff morale. One delegation had pointed out that the Organization was in financial crisis. Precisely because of that crisis there had been a freeze on recruitment, and even a proposal to cut the staff of the Organization by 15 per cent. Still, it would not be fair to accept the results of the classification exercise for some categories of staff and not for others. Accordingly, his delegation would support the Moroccan proposal.

49. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he shared the Nigerian representative's misgivings. His delegation was concerned for the morale and well-being of staff throughout the United Nations system, and was sorry that on a matter as important as the job classification exercise the Fifth Committee was forced to take a vote.

50. It seemed that the manner in which the job evaluation and classification exercise had been carried out had been unsatisfactory from the outset. Even while the matter was being considered by the General Assembly the results had been implemented by some of the specialized agencies. The Fifth Committee now found itself with its hands tied. It might be a pragmatic decision to endorse the Secretary-General's recommendations, but it would not be a deeply considered one. Those who invoked social justice should recall that the General Assembly, in deciding to defer a decision on the matter at its previous session, had also accepted that the effects of the exercise would be made retroactive to 1 January 1985. Having delayed a decision in order to hear the Advisory Committee's views, delegations were now disregarding the Advisory Committee's recommendations. His delegation would abstain in the vote to register its dissatisfaction with the entire exercise. It hoped that in future the General Assembly would see fit to remedy some of the injustices which its current decision was likely to produce.

51. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the Advisory Committee detailed inconsistencies in the classification exercise in paragraphs 6 to 9 of its report and concluded, in paragraph 10, that the job audit process had been inadequate and that the ultimate classification of a post might well have depended on the skill with which it was described by the staff member and/or supervisor. The Advisory Committee's analysis suggested that many posts were being proposed for unwarranted upgrading, and that the staff members who had tried honestly to describe the content of their jobs would suffer in comparison. His delegation was not opposed in principle to job reclassification and realized that the upshot of such an exercise might be an increase in staff costs for the Organization. It could not, however, accept the Secretary-General's proposals, or believe that under the existing system 51 per cent of jobs were undergraded and only 7 per cent overgraded.

52. The Secretary-General had argued at the fortieth session that delay in introducing the new classifications would have a damaging effect on staff morale. His delegation believed that staff morale would also be affected by the present decision, and that many staff would be left demoralized. Still, the Advisory

(Mr. Michalski, United States)

Committee had concluded that the General Assembly had little choice but to enact at least part of the Secretary-General's proposals.

53. He wished to register strong objections to the failure of the Secretary-General and the staff to carry out the classification task properly. Many of the problems cited by the Advisory Committee could have been avoided. It was not proper to ask Member States to approve an exercise which, in other circumstances, they would have rejected, but, especially after the General Assembly's decision to make the effects of the exercise retroactive - a decision which his delegation had also opposed - the Fifth Committee now had little choice but to come to a decision.

54. Much had been said about social justice. Member States as well as the staff were entitled to social justice. His delegation was sorry that difficulties between labour and management in the Secretariat were once again to be settled at the expense of Member States.

55. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said his delegation fully shared the reservations and dissatisfaction expressed by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. The Advisory Committee itself had said that the job classification exercise gave cause for serious concern, and that there was justification, on some grounds, for the rejection of the whole exercise. The ACABQ's reluctant recommendation for partial implementation had undoubtedly been influenced by the steps already taken by related organizations in New York and by political pressure for speedy action. It would be difficult, however, for the United Kingdom to agree even to the partial implementation recommended by ACABQ, let alone full implementation. It would therefore vote against the Moroccan proposal.

56. Mr. LADJOUI (Algeria) said that he agreed with the representatives of Nigeria, and of Trinidad and Tobago, even though his delegation would vote differently. Indeed it seemed that the Committee's decision might have to be quided more by earlier commitments than by genuine concern for social justice. As the Nigerian delegation had indicated, there was no clear dividing line between the Secretary-General's prerogatives, and those of the General Assembly. Algeria would vote in favour of the Moroccan proposal in the belief that the Secretary-General's prerogatives in the matter should prevail over those of Member States. In implementing the classification exercise, however, flaws should be corrected and the need for equitable geographical distribution should be borne in mind. Finally, the personnel matters under consideration were not responsible for the financial crisis, and they should not be affected by it.

57. Mr. CHUA (Singapore) said his delegation agreed with Nigeria that the vote on the job classification exercise was not a referendum on the Secretary-General's authority. The Advisory Committee's findings were clearly presented (document A/41/7/Add.8, paras. 10 and 11), and its concern, well summarized (para. 14). A decision on job classification had already been deferred, pending the Advisory Committee's recommendations. It would be regrettable if those recommendations were not taken into account. As Singapore could not support all of the Secretary-General's proposals, it would abstain in the vote.

/...

58. Mr. EDON (Benin) said the question of job classification was most delicate, as evidenced by the number of explanations of vote. It seemed the Advisory Committee's opinion had been requested, only to be disregarded. The question, then, was why the Committee had insisted on the ACABQ study, and, for that matter, why it was necessary to have an advisory committee at all. Benin, which would normally abstain on or vote against the Moroccan proposal hoped its vote of support would be seen as the logical consequence of its strong appeal for social justice the year before. However, adoption of the Moroccan proposal should not set a precedent for allowing ACABQ reports to go unheeded in future.

59. Mr. HADWEN (Canada) said his delegation supported the views of Trinidad and Tobago and Singapore and would therefore abstain in the vote.

60. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, said that the Advisory Committee had made several valid points in paragraphs 9 to 14 of its report. The Secretary-General's proposals left a great deal to be desired, and therefore rejection of the whole exercise would have been a perfectly logical conclusion. Nevertheless, the flaws would not disappear by dissecting the proposals and treating each part differently. However, out of a concern for social justice, the Nordic countries would not support the call for partial implementation only.

61. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) said that while his delegation shared the misgivings expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 10 and 16 of its report, it would none the less vote for the Moroccan proposal. It would be unfair to other staff members to defer adoption of the Secretary-General's proposals any longer.

62. Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said his delegation agreed with Nigeria and Trinidad and Tobago that all staff members in the General Service category should be treated fairly. Unfortunately, the issues raised by ACABQ in its report were not addressed in the Secretary-General's report to the Committee. Therefore, his country would abstain in the voting. However, it did support job classification and hoped the Secretary-General would have an opportunity to review his proposals and correct the anomalies in them.

63. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) said that while Tunisia normally agreed with the views of the Advisory Committee, thousands of international civil servants had been waiting for years to benefit from the classification exercise. The Secretary-General would not have asked the Committee to adopt his proposals if he had not been convinced that they were in the interests of the staff. Tunisia would therefore vote in favour of the Moroccan proposal.

64. At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Moroccan proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia,

Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Burma, Canada, China, Ghana, India, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

65. The proposal was adopted by 67 votes to 21, with 23 abstentions.

66. Mr. M'DHO (Kenya), speaking in explanation of vote, said Kenya had supported the Moroccan proposal but had not lost sight of the Advisory Committee's opinion. Indeed, it was Kenya's hope that observations of the ACABQ would be taken into account in implementing the job classification.

67. Miss DURRANT (Jamaica) said re-classification of staff members, in both the General Service and the Professional category, must be included in the programme budget for 1988-1989, and considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on the needs of particular units. Her country had, therefore, reluctantly supported adoption of all the Secretary-General's proposals. It was Jamaica's hope, however, that in future, re-classification exercises would not be unsatisfactory to most of the staff concerned.

68. Mrs. EMERSON (Portugal) said that Portugal had been faced with the dilemma of having to choose between the call for social justice, or the ACABQ recommendations. It had voted against the Moroccan proposal in order to discourage conducting future exercises in a similar manner.

69. Mrs. ARCHINI (Italy) expressed deep disappointment over the circumstances in which the Committee had had to take a decision. In the consideration of a matter as delicate as job classification, there was no place for uncertainty, errors, or a lack of clarity. Italy had been particularly struck by the enormity of the ACABQ's task in reviewing posts. The Italian delegation would have supported the Secretary-General's proposals, had they been applied in accordance with the ACABQ recommendations. It had voted against the Moroccan proposal because it believed that the expert body's findings should not go unheeded. Italy's vote, however, should not be interpreted as a lack of concern over job classification or over personnel questions in general.

70. Ms. BYRNE (Ireland) said her delegation had voted in favour of the proposal, although it was unfortunate that the Committee had had to take its decision on the basis of such an unsatisfactory exercise. Ireland had noted with concern the findings of ACABQ that it would be difficult to reverse what had already happened. Partial implementation, however, would not make matters any better.

71. Mr. BROCHARD (France) said his delegation could not accept the Secretary-General's proposals for the reasons put forward by Portugal and Italy.

72. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) said that while his delegation respected the prerogatives of the Secretary-General, it was not satisfied with the manner in which the classification exercise had been conducted. It also had reservations over the outcome. The General Assembly had deferred its decision to allow time for consideration of the ACABQ report. Uganda had abstained in the voting, because it believed that that report should not be ignored.

73. Mr. JOSHI (Nepal) said that while his delegation had voted in favour of adopting the Secretary-General's proposals, it had not lost sight of the ACABQ opinion.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend that the General Assembly should approve the proposals of the Secretary-General on job classification in Geneva (A/C.5/41/34), bearing in mind the Advisory Committee's recommendations in document A/41/7/Add.8 (paras. 21-24).

75. It was so decided.

First performance report (A/C.5/41/40)

76. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the first performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 (A/C.5/41/40) was a relatively simple document. The largest change in the net requirements resulted from variations in rates of exchange, reflecting the weakening of the United States dollar over the period December 1985-November 1986. As indicated in paragraph 12 and annex IA to the report, the increases amounted to \$83,228,000. Additional requirements arising out of decisions of policy-making organs, as indicated in paragraph 4, amounted to \$432,600. Further additional requirements of \$531,700 were explained in detail in paragraph 5, under the heading "Other changes". They included requirements of the International Court of Justice and requirements resulting from the Secretary-General's exercise of his role under the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (General Assembly resolution 40/254) in the context of questions relating to the maintenance of peace and security.

77. The increases were partially offset by a number of changes described in paragraphs 6-8 of the report. The reductions involved adjustments to standard costs in the amount of \$21,659,600. As indicated in paragraphs 9 to 12 of the report and in schedule 1, further downward adjustments related to inflation.

(Mr. Mselle)

Inflation had moderated almost everywhere, and a reduction of \$26,091,500 was therefore proposed in the provision for inflation. Taken together, the increases and decreases amounted to a net requirement of \$36,441,200.

78. After an exchange of views with the representative of the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee had accepted the revised estimates proposed in the first performance report: on the expenditure side, a gross appropriation of \$1,699,782,700, and on the income side, an amount of \$303,911,000, for a total net requirement of \$1,395,871,700.

79. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Fifth Committee should approve the revised estimates proposed in the first performance report. The representative of the United States of America had requested a recorded vote on the decision.

80. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation believed that, in principle, no additional appropriations should be approved during a budget period. Furthermore, it considered that all additional expenses resulting from inflation and exchange-rate fluctuations should, as far as possible, be absorbed through economy measures, the redeployment of available resources and the elimination of programmes that were marginal or obsolete. In view of that position of principle, his delegation would vote against the revised estimates.

81. A recorded vote was taken on the revised estimates proposed in the first performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Turkey.

82. An additional appropriation of \$36,441,200, to be apportioned as indicated in column (7), annex IA, of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/41/40) and a reduction of \$13,554,600 in the estimates of income for the biennium 1986-1987 were approved by 88 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

83. Ms. COHEN-ORANTES (Guatemala) said that her delegation had been absent during the voting. She requested that the record should reflect that it would have voted in favour of the revised estimate.

Consolidated statement of programme budget implications in respect of conference-servicing costs (A/C.5/41/58)

84. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that when the Advisory Committee had taken up the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/41/58) it was informed that certain errors in the document needed to be corrected. In annex I, part A, the amounts of \$342,600 and \$445,000, shown against documents A/C.5/40/56 and A/C.5/40/57 respectively, should be deleted. Accordingly, in paragraph 3, the total estimate of conference-servicing requirements in 1987 on a full-cost basis should be corrected to \$14,028,200. Of that amount, \$6,502,800 related to Headquarters. The net additional appropriation requested in paragraph 23, however, remained at \$5,775,300. Of that amount, \$4,271,000 was for Headquarters and \$1,504,300 for Vienna. No additional appropriation was requested for Geneva.

85. The Advisory Committee had considered the proposals for additional appropriations and engaged in an exchange of views with the representatives of the Secretary-General. A number of doubts had been expressed as to the justification for the entire amount requested. The Committee had taken into account particularly the levels of full-cost conference-servicing requirements estimated in the past, the net appropriations requested by the Secretary-General and the recommendations previously approved by the Advisory Committee. It had also taken into account its findings on previous occasions that the resources provided for the travel and subsistence costs of conference staff needed to service special meetings had not always been required in the amounts requested by the Secretary-General. In a number of cases, changes in the duration or venue of meetings had led to reductions. In the circumstances, therefore, the Advisory Committee recommended an additional amount of \$2 million for Headquarters and \$800,000 for Vienna. On the basis of that recommendation, the additional appropriation required under section 29B.1 of the programme budget would be \$2 million and under section 29B.5 \$800,000. An additional appropriation of \$597,700 would also be required under section 31, to be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

86. At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Spain.

87. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for additional appropriations of \$2.8 million under section 29 and \$597,700 under section 31, the latter to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1, for the biennium 1986-1987, was approved by 91 votes to 13, with 8 abstentions.

Revised estimates: recosting of decisions of the Fifth Committee concerning statements of programme budget implications and revised estimates (A/C.5/41/60)

88. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had no objection to the recosting indicated in document A/C.5/41/60.

89. A reduction of \$38,800 in the appropriations for the biennium 1986-1987, apportioned as indicated in document A/C.5/41/60, and a reduction of \$28,800 under income section 1 were approved without objection.

90. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.