



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden)

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

CONTENTS

**AGENDA ITEMS 115 AND 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 AND
PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)**

First reading (continued)

- Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme (continued)
- Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
- Section 17. Centre for Science and Technology for Development
- Section 19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)
- Section 20. International drug control
- Section 21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
- Section 22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator
- Section 23. Human rights
- Section 14. Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (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 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.5/42/SR.41
2 December 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH
/...

14/10

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 115 AND 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/42/3, A/42/6 and Corr.1 and 2; A/42/7 and Add.2; A/42/15 (Part I) and Add.1 and A/42/16 (Part II) and Corr.1; A/42/512, 532, 591 and Add.1 and A/42/640; A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1 and A/C.5/42/5)

First reading

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme (continued)

1. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budgeting Division) said he was unfortunately not yet in a position to reply to the question asked by the representative of France at the 40th meeting. A detailed reply to the question would be given in a few days, when the services in Nairobi had been contacted.
2. Mr. BROCHARD (France) agreed to await the results of those col. acts.
3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Algeria had formally proposed postponing the adoption of a decision on the section. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to defer its decision.
4. It was so decided.

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

5. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that section 15 was not affected by the changes which the Secretary-General envisaged in his progress report (A/42/234) and the related update (A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1). Consequently, the changes indicated in the revised estimates (A/C.5/42/5) were related to actions other than those connected with the reform measures. When it considered section 15, the Advisory Committee had recommended an amount of \$63,215,800, as against the Secretary-General's initial proposal of \$65,805,800. That proposal should be amended as follows.
6. The Advisory Committee had examined the Secretary-General's revised proposals and estimates for UNCTAD for the biennium 1988-1989, as presented in document A/C.5/42/5. The revised proposals appearing in part I had been drawn up in response to the decisions taken at the seventh quadrennial session of UNCTAD, held from 9 July to 13 August 1987. Revised estimates for bringing the Common Fund for Commodities into force were given in part II.
7. The Secretary-General's initial estimates under section 15 had amounted to \$65,805,800 and had been based on existing mandates and orientations of the Conference. In other words, they did not attempt to prejudge the impact of the seventh session on the orientation and implementation of the programme of work. The Advisory Committee noted from paragraphs 2 to 4 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/42/5) that the outcome of the seventh session and the adoption by

(Mr. Mselle)

consensus of its Final Act had necessitated a revision of the initial estimates affecting five programmes, and focusing on programme aspects. The Secretary-General proposed to finance those revisions using resources requested in the initial 1988-1989 estimates.

8. Background information on the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund and the Preparatory Commission was given in paragraphs 8 to 11 of document A/C.5/42/5. The General Assembly had appropriated \$1,750,500 under section 15 of the programme budget for 1980-1981 to finance the preparatory work for bringing the Fund into operation. An estimate of income in the same amount had also been made under income section 2. By resolution 40/253, the General Assembly had appropriated \$942,000 under section 15 for 1986-1987. That amount represented the unspent balance of the \$1,750,500 advance which the Assembly had approved in the context of the programme budget for 1980-1981. The General Assembly had also approved an amount of \$1,750,500 under income section 2, representing reimbursement for expenditures of \$808,500 incurred against the advance in the bienniums 1980-1981 and 1982-1983 and the appropriation of \$942,200 made for the biennium 1986-1987. No expenditure had been incurred in the biennium 1986-1987 from the \$942,000 appropriated. That amount would therefore be surrendered in the context of the second performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987.

9. As the Secretary-General explained in paragraph 12 of document A/C.5/42/5, however, it was confidently expected that the Fund would go into operation by the end of 1987 and that the meetings of the Preparatory Commission originally foreseen for 1986-1987 would be held in 1988. The Secretary-General therefore estimated that the unspent balance of the advance, \$942,000, would be required in the biennium 1988-1989, thereby increasing the estimates under section 15 by \$942,000 and making the Secretary-General's total estimate \$66,747,800.

10. In its first report on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 (A/42/7), the Advisory Committee had recommended an appropriation of \$63,215,800; once again, that amount was unaffected by the proposals in the Secretary-General's progress report and update. In view of the additional appropriation of \$942,000 requested, the Advisory Committee now recommended an appropriation of \$64,157,800 under section 15. To make matters quite clear, the new figure of \$64,157,800 was the sum arrived at by adding the appropriation of \$63,215,800 recommended by the Advisory Committee in document A/42/7/Add.2 and the additional appropriation of \$942,000. An amount of \$49,700 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an equivalent amount of income under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

11. Mr. FIGUERA (Brazil) said that section 15 was one of the most important in the programme budget. He would ask three questions. The first related to paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/42/5, in which it was stated that "the Secretariat is expected to meet these demands in a climate of financial stringency and growing resource constraints". It was not altogether clear what was meant by "is expected to" ("devra" in French). It appeared that there was a relationship between the budget and the crisis situation, and he would welcome explanations in that respect.

(Mr. Figuera, Brazil)

12. The second question related to paragraph 37 of the report of CPC (A/42/16 (Part II)), in which it was recommended that section 15 should be approved as revised by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/42/5 and amended by the Working Party on the Medium-term Plan and the Programme Budget of the Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD. Since the revision by the Secretary-General predated the work of the Working Party, the latter exercise might give rise to new estimates; if that was the case, did the Secretary-General intend to indicate them in the revised estimates he would submit at a later stage?
13. The third question related to the vacancy rate in UNCTAD. It was his understanding that post reductions over and above those recommended by the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts had been carried out or were planned. He would welcome an update on the vacancy situation.
14. Mr. TAKASU (Japan), referring to paragraph 14 of document A/C.5/42/5, said that income section 2 (A/42/5 (Sect.IS2)) made the assumption that the advance to the Common Fund for Commodities would be reimbursed in 1986-1987, whereas in fact that was to be done in 1988-1989. Should it be concluded that the amount shown in income section 2 should also be changed?
15. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation opposed the inclusion of programme element 1.4, the Special Economic Unit dealing with Palestine, in section 15.B, subprogramme 1 (Executive direction and management) (A/42/6 (Sect.15)). It had expressed reservations in that respect during the consideration of the budget by CPC, and they were reflected in paragraph 147 of the report of CPC (A/42/16 (Part I)). The Unit existed only for political purposes, and did not contribute to the economic development of the region. His delegation requested a recorded vote on the appropriation for the Unit.
16. With reference to section 15.1) (Programme support) he noted that under the heading Conference Affairs Service (subprogramme 1), provision was made for 5,000 meeting units during the biennium. Were those really three-hour meetings, and how many meetings had in fact taken place in, for example, 1986? If those estimates were accurate, the calendar of meetings of UNCTAD should be carefully reviewed by the Special Commission of the Economic and Social Council on the In-depth Review of the United Nations Intergovernmental Structure and Functions in the Economic and Social Fields with a view to rationalizing decision-making at the intergovernmental level in that sphere.
17. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), replying to questions raised by the representative of Brazil, said, with reference to paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/42/5, that the secretariat expected to have to meet those demands under the circumstances stated, in other words, it would have to make a big effort to meet them.
18. With reference to the question concerning paragraph 36 of CPC's report, there was no difference between what was stated in document A/C.5/42/5 and the conclusions of the Working Party. The Secretary-General did not expect to have to

(Mr. Baudot)

submit revised estimates only on the basis of the conclusions of the Working Party but he would certainly submit revised estimates for the section, following internal review of the activities of the United Nations in the economic and social sectors requested by the Group of 18. He would not necessarily request additional appropriations but would certainly suggest changes at the programme level.

19. Replying to the third question, he said that the current vacancy rate at UNCTAD (late September-early October 1987) was 8.9 per cent for the Professional and higher categories and 5.1 per cent for the General Service category.

20. With reference to the question from the representative of Japan, he said that document A/C.5/42/5 contained revised estimates also for income section 2.

21. In reply to the representative of the United States, he said that the 5,000 meetings planned for 1988 and 1989 were as exact an estimate as possible of needs during that period. The Committee could be informed of the exact number of meetings held in 1986. The meetings were indeed three-hour meetings.

22. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) said that his delegation was very interested in the work of the UNCTAD secretariat, particularly since the adoption of the Final Act of UNCTAD VII. He urged that the recommendations of the Group of 18 concerning reductions in staff, in the use of consultants and in travel be implemented with the utmost flexibility so that the work of the secretariat would not be hindered.

23. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that, in addition to its executive direction and management function, UNCTAD also executed 10 programmes of activity in such important fields as money, finance and development, transfer of technology and trade among countries having different economic and social systems. He hoped that those activities would not suffer from the ongoing reforms, in particular from the effects of the study referred to in subparagraph 30 (c) of document A/42/234.

24. Mr. HARAN (Israel) objected to the fact that the Special Economic Unit (programme B, subprogramme 1.4) dealt only with the economic situation of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza, since there were more than 100 developing countries and territories which deserved UNCTAD's attention. Such lack of objectivity was unacceptable and his delegation would oppose the appropriation requested for the Special Economic Unit and would reserve its judgement concerning that part of the report of CPC concerning that activity.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning section 15 (A/42/16 (Part I), para. 148-150 and (Part II), para. 37).

26. It was so decided.

27. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation of \$511,700 under section 15 for programme element 1.4 (Special Economic Unit) of programme B "Executive direction and management".

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

28. An appropriation in the amount of \$511,700 under section 15 for programme element 1.4 (Special Economic Unit) of programme B "Executive direction and management" was approved in first reading by 61 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.

29. Mrs. CHOHAN (Pakistan) and Mr. AL-RUMAIHI (Bahrain), Mr. GEORGE (Botswana), Mr. BAZAN (Chile), Mr. MILLS-LUTTERODT (Ghana), Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), Mr. OUSSEINI (Niger), Mr. MANDABA (Central African Republic), Mr. EL-MEKKI (Sudan), Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) and Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that, had they been present during the voting they would have voted in favour of the appropriation requested.

30. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$64,157,800 under section 15 and an amount of \$49,700 under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without a vote.

31. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria), recalling the special importance which his country attached to the activities of UNCTAD, asked the Secretary-General to refrain as far as possible from applying to section 15 the reductions planned for the budget as a whole in respect of staff, consultant services and travel.

32. Ms. SHERWOOD (United States of America) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on section 15, but repeated its opposition to the appropriation for the Special Economic Unit and the appropriation of \$140,600 to cover the travel of representatives of African national liberation movements to attend UNCTAD meetings (A/42/6 (section 15), para. 15.46).

33. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) asked whether the appropriation approved for section 15 took into account the adjustment contained in income section 2 (general income).

34. The CHAIRMAN replied that that adjustment had been included in the total appropriation which had just been approved.

Section 17. Centre for Science and Technology for Development

35. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administration and Budgetary Questions) said that the estimate submitted by the Secretary-General came to \$4,037,700 for section 17 while the estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee came to \$3,887,200. As indicated in paragraph 17.3 of the report of the Advisory Committee, one of the measures taken by the Secretary-General in response to General Assembly resolution 41/213 (see document A/42/234) concerned the Centre.

36. Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil) asked whether the Second Committee had taken a decision on the mandate of the Centre for Science and Technology for Development and the procedure to be followed by the Centre in submitting its reports.

37. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) replied that the Second Committee had taken no formal decision on that point. As indicated in the press release on the subject, the Chairman of the Second Committee had noted the existence of a consensus to the effect that the reform of the Centre should follow upon the restructuring of the intergovernmental machinery, and thus should not take place before the forty-third session of the General Assembly.

38. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said he inferred that the proposed new procedure whereby the Centre would report through the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs had not been approved.

39. He also wished to know whether the recommendation made by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development at its ninth session - according to which priority should be given to the economic situation in Africa - had been adopted and, if so, what its implications would be.

40. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) replied that a recommendation to that effect had indeed been adopted by the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development; he did not know whether it had been approved by the Second Committee. If so, that decision would be taken into account in the revised estimates to be submitted in 1988.

41. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) urged that, in its decision, the Fifth Committee should explicitly state that it would take into account the decision of the Second Committee concerning the recommendation of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning section 17 (A/42/16 (Part I), paras. 157 and 158).

43. It was so decided.

44. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$3,887,200 under section 17 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without a vote, it being understood that the revised estimates to be submitted subsequently would take into account the decision of the Second Committee at the current session concerning the recommendation of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development.

Section 19. United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)

45. Ms. SHERWOOD (United States of America) inquired whether the Advisory Committee's recommendations for the inclusion in the staffing tables of the non-recurrent temporary posts (A/42/7, paras. 62 and 63) would be applied to section 19.

46. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) replied that the Secretary-General intended to apply the Advisory Committee's recommendations to section 19.

47. Ms. SHERWOOD (United States of America) said that her delegation opposed the appropriation requested in paragraph 19.26 of document A/42/6 (Sect. 19) in order to finance various activities concerning the living conditions of the Palestinian people, since the activities were of a political nature. Her delegation requested a recorded vote on that appropriation.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning section 19 (A/42/16 (Part I), paras. 164-166).

49. It was so decided.

50. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation of \$69,100 for the activities mentioned in paragraph 19.26 of the proposed programme budget (programme C).

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya,

Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United States of America.

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

51. An appropriation in the amount of \$69,100 under section 19 for the activities mentioned in paragraph 19.26 (programme C) was approved in first reading by 81 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

52. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico), Mr. HASHI (Somalia), Mr. GOPINATHAN (India), Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) and Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the appropriation.

53. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that, had he been present during the vote, he would have voted against the appropriation, since the conduct of special studies on the living conditions of the Palestinian people was discriminatory and partisan.

54. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$8,100,000 under section 19 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without a vote.

55. Ms. SHERWOOD (United States of America) said that, although it had joined the consensus on section 19, her delegation opposed the appropriation of \$24,100 to defray the travel costs of the representatives of three national liberation movements (A/42/6 (Sect. 19), para. 19.8).

Section 20. International Drug Control

56. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the initial estimates of the Secretary-General (\$6,977,800) and the estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee (\$6,698,600) had not been modified by the considerations set forth by the Secretary-General in his progress report (A/42/234) and the update of that report (A/C.5/42/Rev.1). The estimate submitted by the Secretary-General could be considered fairly moderate in the light of the importance with which Member States and the international community as a whole attached to the campaign against drug abuse. Of course, the bulk of that programme was financed from extrabudgetary resources, which in 1988-1989 were estimated at \$47,377,000 (para. 20.2).

(Mr. Mselle)

57. In the past it had been recommended that measures should be taken to avoid overlapping of activities and efforts in respect of drug control. In paragraph 20.6, the Advisory Committee noted that the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Vienna would in future undertake the co-ordination of all United Nations drug-related programmes. The Advisory Committee trusted that such co-ordination would result in specific measures to avoid duplication of activities, staff, services and facilities.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning international drug control were contained in paragraphs 171 and 172 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

59. Ms. FRIESSNIGG (Austria) pointed out that the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Vienna would not only be responsible for co-ordination of United Nations programmes relating to drug control, but would also be the focal point for follow-up co-ordination for the International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking at Vienna. In paragraph 77 of his report to the Third Committee (A/42/594), the Secretary-General pointed out that that new function would require resources and staff. It should also be noted that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs would take up that question at its 1988 session.

60. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning the section in question, which were contained in paragraphs 171 and 172 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

61. It was so decided.

62. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$6,698,600 under section 20 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without a vote.

63. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position on the decision just taken, said that his delegation attached crucial importance to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee (para. 20.6) and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (para. 168) in their respective reports concerning the need to avoid duplication of activities.

Section 21. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

64. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the estimate submitted by the Secretary-General (\$36,672,600) and the estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee (\$25,339,000) seemed very moderate compared with the total cost of the Programme of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. According to paragraph 21.2 of the report of the Advisory Committee, the cost of the programme, including budgetary and extrabudgetary resources, was estimated at \$865,254,000 which clearly demonstrated the importance of that programme in the United Nations system. The contribution from the regular budget of the United Nations was in line with the statute of UNHCR.

(Mr. Mselle)

65. In the past it had been proposed, in accordance with the agreement between the High Commissioner and the Secretary-General, that certain posts should be transferred to the regular budget. No such transfers were envisaged for the biennium 1988-1989 as was clear from paragraph 21.5 of the report of the Advisory Committee. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee pointed out, in paragraph 98 of the introduction to its report, that the Secretary-General had decided to postpone consideration of the further transfer of posts to the regular budget until after the biennium 1988-1989.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the section under consideration were contained in paragraph 174 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

67. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) expressed his continued concern over the question of languages. Output (ii) of subprogramme 3, programme element 3.2, details of which were contained in paragraph 21.18 of the section under consideration under the title "Dissemination of refugee law", consisted of approximately 20 publications, including reports of seminars and meetings, which were apparently to be issued in one or two languages, with translations "into additional languages" of related documents. His delegation wished to know exactly which those additional languages were. Perhaps the Secretariat did intend to publish all the expected documentation in all the official languages of the United Nations.

68. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that publications policy was based on actual needs, inasmuch as the desired objective was to heighten the awareness of international public opinion. The languages of publication or translation were actually chosen by the governing body, which in that case was the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

69. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) requested an assurance that the documents under consideration would be translated into the six official languages of the United Nations.

70. The CHAIRMAN, in reply to the concerns expressed by the representative of Yemen, proposed that the decision to be taken on the section under consideration should be accompanied by a reservation stating that the Committee would revert to the question when it examined the report of the Advisory Committee on the implications of agenda resolution C (A/C.5/42/L.4), amending the draft resolutions recommended by the Committee on Conferences in paragraph 1 of its report (A/42/32), under agenda item 120 (Pattern of conferences).

71. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that he agreed with that proposal. However, he wished to repeat his question with respect to output (i) of programme element 1.3 (Public information services), as contained in paragraph 21.30 of the section under consideration. That paragraph was concerned with the magazine Refugees, which was produced and published in English and French. Given that quarterly German and Italian editions were also planned, he wished to know if the magazine could be translated into all the official languages of the United Nations.

72. The CHAIRMAN replied that his proposed reservation would also cover the case just mentioned by the representative of Yemen. He invited the Committee to take a decision on the recommendation of CPC with respect to section 21, contained in paragraph 174 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved that recommendation.

73. It was so decided.

74. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$35,339,000 under section 21 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without objection, it being understood that the Fifth Committee would revert to the programme elements set forth in paragraphs 21.18 and 21.30 of section 21 of the proposed programme budget when it considered the report of the Advisory Committee on the statement of financial implications of draft resolution C under agenda item 120.

75. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation had not wished to dissociate itself from the consensus but could not accept the allocation of a sum of \$19,600 under section 21 to finance the participation of representatives of national liberation movements in the sessions of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the High Commissioner.

Section 22. Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator

76. The CHAIRMAN said that, if heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination with respect to section 22, as contained in paragraphs 178 to 181 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

77. It was so decided.

78. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on section 22 as a whole.

79. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$6,082,500 under section 22 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without objection.

Section 23. Human rights

80. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Secretary-General's estimate of \$14,242,800 should be reduced to \$13,798,900. Revaluations of the resource base indicated in table 23.4 for several objects of expenditure were related to exchange rate fluctuations during 1986-1987.

81. In paragraph 23.6 of its report, the Advisory Committee pointed out that the estimates included an amount of \$1.2 million for activities undertaken at the request of the Economic and Social Council. The amount for 1988-1989 was based on actual expenditure in previous bienniums.

(Mr. Maelle)

82. In paragraph 23.8 of its report, the Advisory Committee noted that there was a certain amount of overlapping between the Yearbook on Human Rights and the Yearbook of the Human Rights Committee. It believed that savings could be achieved if the two publications were merged or if steps were taken to ensure that they did not overlap. It would be interesting to know the total cost of those publications. The Economic and Social Council could perhaps consider that issue in the light of the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights.

83. Finally, in paragraph 23.9 of its report, the Advisory Committee referred to measures taken by the Secretary-General in response to General Assembly resolution 41/213.

84. Mr. HARAN (Israel) noted, in table 23.6, that an amount of \$616,100 had been requested to cover the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. Given that no State was entirely blameless, the existence of such a subsidiary organ for Israel alone showed the extent of the biased and discriminatory treatment meted out only to that country. Accordingly, his country reserved its position with respect to the recommendations of CPC and requested that a recorded vote be taken on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

85. Ms. FRIESSNIGG (Austria) noted that activities relating to human rights represented less than per cent of the Organization's budget and that budgetary cutbacks were having a disproportionate effect on that sector. Given that the Charter made explicit provision for such activities, the mechanisms and procedures which had been established in that field should enjoy priority treatment.

86. Mr. BROCHARD (France) wondered whether it would not be better to wait until the Economic and Social Council had decided on the question of merging publications before putting the Advisory Committee's recommendation into effect. He believed that budgetary reductions should be applied with flexibility in the case of the Centre for Human Rights in order to avoid any adverse effect on the implementation of its programmes, of which his country, as a supporter of the recommendations of CPC, had emphasized the priority nature during the meetings of the latter Committee.

87. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) hoped that the Secretariat could provide some justification for the considerable sums allocated in table 23.4 to expenditure on travel, consultants and representation.

88. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) wished to know what percentage of the resources indicated under section 23 would be used to finance activities in connection with apartheid and human rights in South Africa and Namibia.

89. Mr. WANG Jun (China) said he was unsure how to interpret the recommendation of CPC in paragraph 187 of its report and requested that the Secretariat explain how it intended to apply that recommendation.

90. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should take a decision on section 23 at a subsequent meeting, after the Secretariat had replied to the questions raised.

Section 14. Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (continued)

91. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) and Mr. AL-NOEIMY (Qatar) said that, had they been present at the 40th meeting when a vote was taken on section 14, they would have voted in favour of the requested appropriations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.