

UNITED NATIONS  
**General Assembly**

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

*Official Records*

FIFTH COMMITTEE  
20th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 1 November 1991  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 20th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SPAANS (Netherlands)

later: Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 107: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993  
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 108: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 7. Elimination of apartheid

Section 8. International Court of Justice

Section 9. Legal activities

Section 10. Law of the Sea and Ocean Affairs

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned  
with the text of the draft of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2.250,  
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 volume, and may vary from the original text.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/46/SR.20  
8 November 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Spaans (Netherlands),  
Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 107: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993  
(continued) (A/46/6/Rev.1 and A/46/7)

AGENDA ITEM 108: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/46/16 and Add.1)

First reading (continued)

Section 7. Elimination of apartheid

1. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Secretary-General's total estimates of \$8,184,800 for section 7 were very modest in relation to the budget as a whole. The 1.2 per cent rate of real growth was slightly below average; no new posts were to be created and only two reclassifications of posts were proposed, one from P-4 to P-5 and the other from P-3 to P-4. Also, there were no non-recurrent expenditures and neither the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) nor the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) had requested additional reports. Both of those Committees had, however, discussed to what extent proposed activities might have been overtaken by events, a question that reflected the difficulties of programming political sections of the budget relating to areas where fundamental changes were under way. If the pace of change accelerated in the region concerned, the Secretary-General would obviously make new proposals and, as the Advisory Committee had indicated in its report (A/46/7, para. 7.3), once the Special Committee against Apartheid had approved its programme of work for 1992, the work outlined in the submission would very probably be reoriented. The Fifth Committee would be able to review the programmatic and financial aspects of any further proposals in 1992.
2. The CHAIRMAN, speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Coordination, drew attention to the conclusions and recommendations of CPC concerning section 7, as contained in paragraph 123 of its report (A/46/16).
3. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), referring to subprogramme 2 (Publicity against apartheid), observed that there was an inconsistency in the programme narrative concerning special events between the dates for certain promotional activities and the biennium covered by the proposed programme budget. Also, as the changes taking place in the region concerned were difficult to foresee and to budget for, his delegation would welcome clarification regarding the proposed timetable for the review of the programme of activity under section 7.

4. Mr. WORONIECKI (Poland) said that his delegation wondered whether the changing world was reflected at all in the proposed programme budget. In particular, despite the welcome positive trend towards the elimination of apartheid, resources under section 7 showed moderate growth, the number of posts remained unchanged and the requirements for the acquisition and replacement of office automation equipment seemed to indicate that there was an expectation that apartheid would continue to exist indefinitely. The estimates for section 7 represented two thirds of the stated requirement for section 5, concerning disarmament; moreover, the part of section 11 covering one of the five priority areas, namely the critical economic situation, recovery and development of Africa, would receive roughly five times less in terms of money and three times less in terms of posts.
5. In his delegation's view, the Committee should not limit itself to the examination of individual budget sections one after another but should also, and perhaps more importantly, compare the level of expenditures among various areas, where such comparisons made sense, in the light of recognized priorities and changing situations. The "business as usual" attitude to budgeting could only undermine the Organization's prestige at a time when so much hope was vested in it by the international community.
6. In addition to disarmament and the critical situation in Africa, another key area was East-West economic relations, since more and more of the centrally planned economies were becoming countries in transition and badly needed the assistance and advice of the United Nations system. Their relations with the developing countries and inherent problems and opportunities called for objective examination and constructive recommendations, without attempts to prejudge the matter in a one-sided manner, as was being done in another committee during the current session.
7. The idea of releasing staff and resources as a result of the completion, reduction, reorganization, merging, elimination, or otherwise of United Nations programmes, projects or activities, and providing Member States with the relevant information thereon, had been outlined in General Assembly resolution 3534 (XXX), which had been sponsored by his country. It was surely time to think of redeploying resources to areas where they were needed more, and to do so not in general terms but taking account of specific possibilities, for the benefit of all Member States and, in particular, the developing countries. As the resources to be allocated originated from State budgets, the Organization could not ignore public opinion and had a responsibility to try to catch up with the rapid changes taking place in the world in the last decade of the twentieth century.
8. Mr. ONWUALIA (Nigeria) said that any reductions in the appropriations under section 7, including those recommended by the Advisory Committee, could be detrimental to the activities of the Special Committee against Apartheid. The pace of change in South Africa was slow and the Fifth Committee should base its decisions not on anticipated developments but on the actual situation in that country.

9. Mr. ELDEEB (Egypt) said that his delegation wished to emphasize the importance of the role of the Special Committee against Apartheid and the need to abide by decisions already adopted by the General Assembly in connection with its activities. The Fifth Committee certainly could not base its decisions on changes that had not yet occurred, nor should it reduce appropriations when there was no information to suggest that alternative funding for programmes could be found. On the contrary, the Organization had to maintain its level of funding until the objective of the elimination of apartheid had been achieved. His delegation could not, therefore, agree to the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee.

10. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the process of change in South Africa should not lead the United Nations to weaken its efforts to ensure the complete elimination of the infamous system of apartheid. He was surprised by the suggestion that other issues, such as the critical economic situation in Africa, could be compared with the dehumanization resulting from apartheid and that resources should be redeployed away from the task of restoring dignity to its victims.

11. With regard to funding for section 7, his delegation was concerned, in particular, that extrabudgetary resources were expected to remain unchanged from the 1990-1991 biennium. The Advisory Committee's recommended reduction mainly affected travel, which was essential for publicity against apartheid, that being a crucial activity in sensitizing people to the issues involved. The Secretariat had to be more imaginative and the resources requested were, if anything, too modest in view of the challenges still ahead.

12. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) questioned the view that the activities outlined in section 7 could in any way be regarded as obsolete within the strict context of the regulations and rules applicable to the proposed programme budget. Publicity and promotional activities against apartheid were being programmed at a critical time in South Africa when there was a greater need than ever for the Special Committee to intensify its efforts to ensure an irreversible transition to a democratic, non-racial society in that country. His delegation doubted the appropriateness of the Advisory Committee's recommended reductions and felt that whatever changes might be required in programmes could be discussed in the framework of the revisions to the medium-term plan. For the time being, the Committee should base its decisions on approved and mandated activities and not try to anticipate future developments.

13. Mr. COHEN (United States of America), referring to paragraph 7.4 of the proposed programme budget, which mentioned the possibility of a re-evaluation of existing policies and programmes of action under section 7, asked what contingency plans the Secretariat was making for the eventuality of a breakthrough with regard to South Africa.

14. Mr. ZARI-ZARRE (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he wished to underline the importance of the contribution being made by the Special Committee to the elimination of apartheid. That was one of the fundamental objectives of the United Nations and his delegation therefore supported the Secretary-General's total estimates for section 7.
15. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), replying to questions raised during the discussion, first of all thanked the United Kingdom representative for pointing out the mistake in the programme narrative for subprogramme 2, where the dates should be amended to reflect events that would be held during the 1992-1993 biennium. On general questions of procedure, the Special Committee against Apartheid would be meeting shortly to discuss its programme of work for 1992 and once a decision had been adopted in that regard by the General Assembly, the Fifth Committee would be able to consider it in the light of the Secretary-General's statement of programme budget implications. It should be recalled that the proposed programme budget had been drawn up in the spring for submission to CPC and that a number of changes had meanwhile been taking place in the context of the 1990-1991 programme budget. Programmatic changes would accelerate as warranted by developments in South Africa. There had, for example, already been a shift in the Committee's programme of work towards assistance to victims of apartheid and to disadvantaged sectors of society. Should apartheid come to an end, the Centre against Apartheid would disappear ipso facto and the Secretary-General would be pleased to submit revised estimates to the General Assembly suggesting different uses for the resources allocated.
16. Ms. BERENGUER (Chairman of the Committee for Programme Coordination) said that the comments of the representative of Poland about the failure of the programme to reflect the positive developments in South Africa were quite appropriate and had been widely debated in CPC. Nevertheless, CPC recommended approval by the General Assembly of the programme narrative of section 7.
17. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the recommendation of CPC regarding section 7 contained in paragraph 123 of its report (A/46/16).
18. It was so decided.
19. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$8,156,800 under section 7 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 was approved in first reading, on the understanding that the issues raised in connection with section 7 would be considered in informal consultations and any necessary adjustments made.
20. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of his position after the decision, said that his country shared the deep concern about the abhorrent system of apartheid. However, its long-standing position that the programme of action might be more productively oriented was reinforced by the ongoing changes in South Africa. Thus, he attached great importance to the statement by the Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division that

(Mr. Kinchen, United Kingdom)

the work of the Special Committee against Apartheid would very probably be reoriented and was happy to proceed on a provisional basis under the current assumption that appropriations for the biennium 1992-1993 would be based on actual expenditures for the previous biennium.

Section 8. International Court of Justice

21. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, as indicated in paragraph 8.6 of the proposed programme budget, programme budget proposals for the International Court of Justice were prepared by the Court in consultation with the Secretary-General and the Secretary-General traditionally submitted those proposals for approval by the General Assembly basically unaltered.

22. The Court and the Secretariat attached great importance to the funding of the Registry's request for \$1,270,300 for temporary assistance for meetings. The 3.9 per cent growth rate was linked to the unprecedented case-load of the Court and to welcome developments in international relations. The request for \$461,200 for external printing and binding was well justified. While the Chairman of CPC had stressed the desirability in general of implementing technical innovations and doing more work in-house, that option did not apply to the Court. Finally, the increase requested for travel expenses was negligible.

23. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to the proposal for the establishment of a new post at the P-3 level for a systems coordinator for the Electronic Services Division of the Secretariat, said that it had not been possible to determine whether the functions would be of a permanent nature. Accordingly, ACABQ recommended instead the provision of a 12-month consultancy at the P-3 level. On the basis of the general recommendations made in chapter I of its report, ACABQ recommended reductions totalling \$314,700. He wished to state clearly that those reductions should in no way adversely affect the emoluments and other conditions of service of the members of the Court.

24. Ms. BERENQUER (Chairman of the Committee for Programme Coordination) drew attention to the conclusions and recommendations of CPC concerning section 8, as contained in paragraphs 127 and 128 of its report (A/46/16).

25. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the conclusions and recommendations of CPC regarding section 8 contained in paragraphs 127 and 128 of its report (A/46/16).

26. It was so decided.

27. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$16,510,900 under section 8 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 was approved in first reading.

Section 9. Legal activities

28. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the rate of real growth for section 9 of the proposed programme budget had been calculated at minus 0.7 per cent after deletion of \$1,965,000 for non-recurrent items. Although the details of its discussions were not reflected in its report, ACABQ had concluded that the real growth rate was considerably understated because the current methodology had not been followed. The total estimated requirement at 1991 prices was \$21,291,200, including \$19,326,200 for recurrent activities. ACABQ had been informed that the increase in recurrent expenditures was \$332,800. He believed that the real growth rate would range between 1 per cent and 2 per cent. That discrepancy illustrated the problem of the current budget methodology and the urgent need to proceed with the discussion of budget methodology proposed for early 1992.

29. The Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of all the proposals under section 9 except for the reclassification from P-4 to P-5 of one post of Legal Officer in the Codification Division. In that connection, he noted that the Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of all but 11 of the proposed reclassifications for 1992-1993 (A/46/7, para. 47). In deciding whether to accept its recommendations in that regard, it was important for the Fifth Committee to keep the issue of fairness uppermost in mind and not to let an energetic Secretariat campaign sway it to accept some reclassifications while rejecting others simply because there had been no campaign for them.

30. In accordance with the general proposals in chapter I of its report, ACABQ recommended an additional reduction of \$614,700, including \$548,500 for printing. As the printing account was centrally managed, he saw no reason why such a reduction could not be accommodated.

31. Mr. BERENQUER (Chairman of the Committee for Programme Coordination) said that section 9 had been widely discussed in CPC, as indicated in paragraphs 130 to 135 of its report, with respect to the reclassification, CPC shared the opinion of ACABQ that further details were needed to determine whether the workload justified the change. In paragraph 136 of its report, CPC recommended approval by the General Assembly of the programme narrative of section 9.

32. Mr. SENA CARDOSA (Brazil) said that his country would support any cost-saving measures compatible with the implementation of mandated programmes. However, in a number of resolutions, including resolutions 42/156, 43/169 and 45/41, the General Assembly had pointed to the increased importance of the role of the Codification Division, and had also stressed the importance of the work of the Division in preparing summaries, updating the survey of international law and servicing the International Law Commission. Its workload had increased as a result of both the declaration of the United Nations Decade of International Law and requests accepted by the International Law Commission. Brazil therefore believed that the proposal to reclassify the post of Legal Officer in the Codification Division was fully justified.

33. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that, in reading the report of ACABQ, he had been concerned to note repeated instances in which the Secretariat had classified ongoing activities as non-recurrent. That practice distorted the measure of real growth. The volume of such so-called "non-recurrent" expenditures noted by ACABQ in section 9 was small. He would, however, like to know whether the Advisory Committee had found other examples of similar improper classifications of expenditure that were not mentioned in its report.

34. His delegation had been particularly troubled by the Secretary-General's proposal that the period for the elimination of the backlog in the Treaty Series should be extended by another five years. It believed that economies could be achieved by contracting with outside specialists, as had been done in the case of the United Nations Yearbook, and it proposed that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to explore a similar arrangement for bringing the Treaty Series up to date.

35. His delegation supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that the United Nations should seek the financial support of end-users of the Yearbook of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL) and urged the Assembly to endorse that recommendation and to request the Secretary-General to provide the Fifth Committee with a plan for its implementation at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly. With respect to the programme for the computerization of the General Legal Division, he noted the view expressed by ACABQ that the number of personal computers proposed was excessive in comparison with the staffing level. His delegation would appreciate an explanation from the Secretariat regarding the general policies and guidelines applied in determining the number of work stations allocated. His delegation was not confident that the computerization programme as currently envisaged would result in either savings or greater efficiency and believed that an in-depth review should be undertaken.

36. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) said that, despite the increased workload under legal activities, the budget estimates for the section appeared to result in a negative growth rate of 0.7 per cent. Her delegation therefore opposed any cut in the proposed appropriations under section 9.

37. Referring to the estimated percentage distribution of resources among subprogrammes, she noted that the priority designations were not reflected in the resource allocations. With respect to the redeployments proposed in paragraph 9.20 of the proposed programme budget, her delegation regretted that such redeployments had been achieved only within the same expenditure section and not on an intersectoral level. As for the proposal to redeploy resources for long-distance telephone calls and facsimile transmission from the Office of the Legal Counsel to the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, her delegation found it rather coincidental that the exact amount required by the Tribunal happened not to be needed by the Office of the Legal Counsel.



(Ms. Rotheiser, Austria)

38. The Secretary-General was to be commended for the downward reclassification proposed in the Codification Division - the only downward reclassification in the entire proposed programme budget. However, her delegation did not understand by ACABQ had accepted the argument of a redistribution of responsibilities in the case of the downward reclassification and rejected it in the case of the upward reclassification requested for the same Division. It strongly supported the Secretary-General's proposal that the post in question should be upgraded from the P-4 to the P-5 level.

39. As it had stated before, her delegation opposed the Organization's increased reliance on extrabudgetary resources, which hindered its ability to control resource flows, implement its mandates and maintain the order of priorities established by the General Assembly. It therefore could not support the ACABQ recommendation that relevant non-governmental subscribers should be asked to support the work of UNCITRAL (A/46/7, para. 9.6). It also could not support the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the travel budget of UNCITRAL should be cut simply because requested appropriations for travel costs had decreased under other expenditure sections. Given past experience, it could see no reason for reducing that estimate, which, when adjusted for inflation, reflected a zero rate of real growth.

40. Mr. CONMY (Ireland) said that his delegation attached importance to the international legal activities of the Organization. It also appreciated the frank views of the Chairmen of ACABQ and CPC and the Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division on the problem of reclassification. However, with regard to the proposed reclassifications in the Codification Division (A/46/6/Rev.1, para. 9.54), which his delegation found admirable and supported, he regretted that ACABQ had not appreciated the Secretary-General's proposal for the reclassification of one post of Legal Officer from P-4 to P-5.

41. Mr. DROUSHIOTIS (Cyprus) said that his country also attached importance to the work of the International Law Commission and to the United Nations Decade of International Law, which had been proposed by a meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of non-aligned countries in Cyprus in 1988. His delegation therefore supported the Secretariat's efforts to enhance the importance of the International Law Commission and supported its proposals for the reclassifications in the Codification Division.

42. Mr. MOSCHOPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation rarely disagreed with ACABQ, which gave the Committee invaluable service, but thought that both the proposed reclassifications in the Codification Division were justified, in particular the reclassification from P-4 to P-5.

43. Mr. BELHAJ (Tunisia) said that his delegation, too, supported the work of the Office of Legal Affairs and was satisfied with the work of the Codification Division. Although it did not see the proposed reclassifications in that Division as raising a matter of principle, it would appreciate more

(Mr. Belhaj, Tunisia)

information about the additional work and responsibilities that were deemed to justify the upgrading from P-4 to P-5, to ensure that the proposal was not just a matter of career development.

44. Mr. OSELLA (Argentina) said that his delegation supported the upgrades proposed in the Codification Division, which were justified by the greater responsibility involved in performing more work with less supervision.

45. Mr. KARBU CZKY (Hungary) said that his delegation also supported the proposed reclassifications and looked forward to the results of the ad hoc seminar on career development in 1992.

46. Mr. BARIMANI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation agreed with those who supported the proposed reclassification of a post in the Codification Division from the P-4 to the P-5 level, in the absence of any justification for the recommendation by ACABQ against it.

47. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that he wished to record his delegation's support for the recommendation of ACABQ against the upgrading from P-4 to P-5 in the Codification Division.

48. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that he could not understand the apparent competition that was developing between delegations to voice support either for the Secretariat or for ACABQ over the proposed reclassifications in the Codification Division and expressed concern at the way in which the discussion was being conducted.

49. Mr. BELHAJ (Tunisia) said that it was not possible to discuss the change in workload that was said to justify the proposed upgrading without the presence of representatives from the Secretariat department concerned. His delegation had asked for the whole problem of reclassification to be examined in informal discussions where representatives of departments could be present.

50. Mr. BIDNY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of Japan that the discussion had taken an unusual turn. As a member of ACABQ, like Japan, his delegation also had views on the arguments in favour of the recommendation in the Advisory Committee's report (A/46/7, para. 9.10). The current discussion was, however, not about substance and, if it was to continue, it would be necessary to resort to the unusual procedure of asking a representative of the Secretariat to explain the arguments in favour of the upgrading so as to give a clear idea of the issues involved.

51. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that the Secretariat had always spoken with one voice and had been represented by the Programme Planning and Budget Division in the Fifth Committee. His delegation considered it important to maintain that practice.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the course of the discussion was not a matter for concern because all those involved had kept to relevant issues. The Committee's needs would be served if the Chairman of ACABQ and the Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division responded to the discussion in the usual way.

53. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he had not found the debate on the proposed reclassifications in the Codification Division surprising, because the Committee sometimes did reject proposals that had been made by ACABQ on purely technical grounds. However, the Committee was not yet taking a decision on the recommendations which would be the subject of further consideration at informal discussions, together with other proposals for reclassifications on which delegations had commented.

54. In reply to the comments by the representative of Austria, he said that, as he had mentioned in his introductory statement, the bulk of the general reduction recommended by ACABQ related to printing. The Advisory Committee's investigation had revealed that the printing account had realized large balances over the years, as a result of the introduction of new technology and the enhancement of the Organization's internal printing capacity. However, as the Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division had indicated, because there was one single printing account which was managed centrally, the reductions attributed to printing under individual budget sections, such as those shown under section 9, could be transferred to those sections with larger savings.

55. Ms. BERENGUER (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Coordination) said that CPC hoped to be able to work on the new procedures for evaluating workloads when they were presented by the Secretary-General. It therefore hoped that at its current session, the General Assembly would designate competent bodies to look into the matter in time to avoid a similar sort of debate at the forty-seventh session. For the time being, the Committee's recommendations on the matter were as set forth in paragraph 44 of its report (A/46/16).

56. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that information had been available on the backlog in the printing of the United Nations Treaty Series, a question which had been raised by the representative of the United States of America, but he would try to provide more information during informal discussions. Considerable progress had been made and the development of a more serious backlog was not due to lack of efficiency but to the difficulty of finding enough competent personnel. It was generally agreed that publication of the Treaty Series should have priority and more money would be made available for that purpose if it was necessary. Much had been said about the large reduction proposed in printing costs, but that was due to the volume of resources allocated to printing. The matter could be clarified in informal discussions.

(Mr. Baudot)

57. With regard to the comment made by the representative of Austria about the apparent redeployment of resources from subprogramme 1 to subprogramme 3, he said that it was simply a matter of presentation. On the question of the proposed reclassifications in the Codification Division, he, too, considered the discussion quite normal. There would doubtless be an opportunity to discuss the proposals formally or informally, but the ad hoc seminar proposed by CPC and referred to by the representative of Hungary was not, so far as he knew, to be concerned with the very important question of reclassification.

58. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America) said that, as the backlog in the publication of the United Nations Treaty Series had been 260 volumes in 1980 and was currently 305 volumes, there had evidently been some slippage. He therefore asked the Secretariat to confirm that it would provide a detailed picture of developments over the past decade.

59. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Secretariat would do its best to provide the information requested.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the recommendation of CPC regarding section 9 contained in paragraph 136 of its report (A/46/16).

61. It was so decided.

62. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$22,058,600 under section 9 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 was approved in first reading.

63. Mr. Muntasser (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) took the Chair.

#### Section 10. Law of the Sea and Ocean Affairs

64. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation would welcome clarification of the budgetary provisions for the servicing of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The Advisory Committee had noted that some elements of the budget estimates reflected certain assumptions regarding the status of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, and he asked what specific changes had been included in the proposed programme budget with respect to such developments. He would also welcome an indication that all regular budget funding of activities would be terminated once the Convention entered into force. Lastly, he noted his Government's reservation regarding funding for the Preparatory Commission under the regular budget.

65. Mr. KOÇATURK (Turkey) said that expenditures arising under the Convention on the Law of the Sea should not be met from the regular budget, but by the signatories to the Convention. On the understanding that his Government reserved the right not to contribute to such expenditures, his delegation would join the consensus and not request a vote on section 10.

66. Mr. BELHAJ (Tunisia) said that the Secretary-General was being somewhat optimistic concerning the possible date of entry into force of the Convention and the establishment of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf. He would welcome additional information. He noted the comment by CPC (A/46/16, para. 140) that consultants for specialized studies should be selected on a wide geographical basis. The question of the proposed reclassification of one P-4 post to the P-5 level (A/46/6/Rev.1, para 10.22) could be dealt with in the informal consultations to be held on reclassification.

67. Mr. RAE (India) said that his delegation supported the proposed reclassification of the P-4 post and the use of consultants under section 10.

68. Mr. SIKKANDER (Sri Lanka) said that the Secretary-General should be provided with the necessary resources to implement activities falling under section 10, such activities being designed essentially to help developing countries.

69. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada) agreed that the activities proposed under section 10 were important and that the estimates were reasonable. The Committee should exercise prudence in considering any cuts.

70. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had noted the Secretary-General's comment that the servicing of the Preparatory Commission was expected to be completed within the biennium or shortly thereafter (A/46/6/Rev.1, para. 10.5). Given the uncertainty regarding the exact date of entry into force of the Convention, it had been assumed that servicing would continue throughout the biennium. Should that not be necessary, the Advisory Committee would review the matter, as noted in paragraph 10.3 of its report (A/46/7).

71. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) endorsed the comments of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee concerning the servicing of the Preparatory Commission.

72. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) asked whether the proposed estimates reflected the decision of the Preparatory Commission to shorten its 1992 session by one week. He also asked whether all regular budget funding for the Preparatory Commission would end once the Convention entered into force.

73. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the budget estimates had been prepared before the Preparatory Commission had taken the decision to shorten its session. Should that decision be maintained there would be an element of over-budgeting.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the recommendation of CPC regarding section 10 contained in paragraph 145 of its report (A/46/16).

75. It was so decided.

76. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$9,351,900 under section 10 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 was approved in first reading, on the understanding that the issues raised in connection with section 10 would be considered in informal consultations and any necessary adjustments made.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.