



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd 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 23. Human rights activities (continued)

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

Section 15. United Conference on Trade and Development (continued)

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

Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

Section 25. International Court of Justice

Section 26. Legal activities

Section 27. Public information

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/42/L.33, A/42/L.34 and
A/42/L.35 concerning agenda item 38 (Question of Palestine)

*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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 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, A/42/7 and Add.2, A/42/16 (Part I) and Add.1 and A/42/16 (Part II), A/42/512, A/42/532 and A/42/640; A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1; A/41/591 and Add.1; A/41/806 and Corr.1, A/42/295, A/42/673 and A/42/724 and Corr.1)

First reading:

Section 23. Human rights activities (continued)

1. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), replying to questions raised by delegations during the previous meetings, confirmed to the representative of France that the Secretariat did not intend to reduce the number of publications under section 23 before the Economic and Social Council had taken a decision on that question. The delegation of China had inquired about the meaning which the Secretariat gave to the word "priority" used by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in the recommendation appearing in paragraph 187 of its report. In reply, he explained that for the Secretariat, it was not the same type of priority as the one which the Secretariat gave to the Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development and to the question of the advancement of women. It had a more general meaning, namely, the priority which Member States attached to the question of human rights in all the concerns of the international community. The recommendation of CPC implied that, as for certain other sections of the budget, the Secretary-General would ensure, especially with regard to recommendation 15 of the Group of 18 concerning reductions in staff, that the reductions planned would not interfere with the smooth working of that programme.

2. The delegation of Yemen had requested a breakdown of the appropriations requested under section 23 concerning consultants, and travel and representation. In reply, he pointed out that he had drawn up a table which the delegation in question could consult. It was clear from the table that \$87,000 were allocated for consultants and for Economic and Social Council mandates and other activities relating to human rights; \$6,000 represented the standard amount of representation expenditures of the Centre for Human Rights; \$1.7 million represented the travel expenditures of representatives within the framework of the Commission on Human Rights, the Sub-Committee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and other organs, and Economic and Social Council mandates; finally, travel costs of staff were broken down in the following manner: \$74,000 for policy-making organs, \$44,000 for the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, \$118,000 for Economic and Social Council mandates and a total sum of \$120,000 for the travel costs of staff to service meetings.

3. In reply to the question raised by the delegation of Kenya concerning the appropriations requested under section 23 for activities against apartheid, he pointed out that one of the subsidiary organs of that programme listed under

(Mr. Baudot)

paragraph 23.5 of Section 23 was the Group of Three established in pursuance of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid. In paragraph 23.47 of the same section three outputs concerned that Group. In addition to those activities which were directly linked to action against apartheid, other outputs concerned South Africa and southern Africa. Finally, a number of activities against apartheid were scheduled in other sections of the budget and in particular under the Centre against Apartheid, the Centre on Transnational Corporations and the Department of Information.

4. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a separate vote had been requested on the estimate of \$612,800 for the activities of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.

5. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

6. An appropriation of \$612,800 under section 23 for the activities of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories was approved in first reading by 66 votes to 2, with 15 abstentions.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Committee decided to endorse the conclusions and recommendations of the

(The Chairman)

Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning section 23 (A/42/16 (Part I), paras. 187-191 and (Part II), paras. 21 and 22).

8. It was so decided.

9. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$13,798,900 under section 23 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without a vote.

10. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), Mr. FIGUEIRA (Brazil), Mr. KABIR (Bangladesh), Mr. AFRIDA (Pakistan), Mr. JOSHI (Nepal), Mr. NHLEKO (Swaziland), Mrs. CUCALON (Colombia), Mr. KHALEEL (Maldives), Mr. MONAYEIF (Kuwait), Mr. OUSSEINI (Niger), U SWE (Burma), Mr. NASSER (Egypt), Mr. DESSALEGN (Ethiopia), Mr. ZSOHAR (Hungary) and Mr. DRAKAKIS (Greece) said that if their delegations had been present during the vote, they would have voted for the appropriation of \$612,800 for the activities of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories.

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

11. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that, if his delegation had been present during the vote on that section, it would have voted in favour.

Section 15. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (continued)

12. Mr. HUBAS (Turkey) and Mrs. CUCALON (Colombia) said that, if their delegations had been present during the vote on that section, they would have voted in favour.

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

13. Mrs. CUCALON (Colombia) said that, if her delegation had been present during the vote on that section, it would have voted in favour.

Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

14. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, under that section, the Secretary-General had requested an appropriation of \$31,147,100 and that the request transmitted by the Advisory Committee was the same amount.

15. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, as in previous bienniums, the budget estimates for section 24 had been drawn up and presented after adjustment for inflation. Paragraph 24.2 of the Advisory Committee's report broke down the resources between sectoral advisory services and regional and subregional advisory services. The subsection relating to industrial development had been eliminated after the transformation of UNIDO into a specialized agency. As paragraph 24.3 of the report explained, the special adjustment of \$596,100 resulted from a review of expenditure in previous bienniums and did not represent an increase in real terms. The Advisory Committee had noted

(Mr. Muelle)

that for the first time, a description by subprogrammes of the activities expected to be undertaken had been provided. As was its custom, the Advisory Committee transmitted the estimates to the General Assembly for appropriate action.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should approve the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination concerning section 24, as they appeared in paragraphs 193-195 of the report of CPC (A/42/16 (Part I)).

17. It was so decided.

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the appropriation requested in section 24.

19. Mr. HOH (United States of America) recalled the well-known reservations of his delegation regarding the financing of operational activities for the assessed contributions of Member States. He noted that the operational activities under consideration had been the subject of a report by the Joint Inspection Unit and of a study by a former Under-Secretary-General which had been discussed in length in the Second Committee during the current session, as well as of other studies which the Secretariat was currently preparing on the co-ordination of field operations. His delegation considered that such evaluations were important to ensure the best use of the resources provided in that section. It was also concerned by the scale of staff costs and other expenses at Headquarters when compared with those of the field offices. In his view, it would be advisable to transfer greater resources to the regional level as that would be in closer conformity with General Assembly resolution 32/197.

20. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve in first reading an appropriation of \$31,147,100 under section 24 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

21. It was so decided.

22. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, bearing in mind that the Secretary-General had requested that there should be the broadest possible consensus on the budget, his delegation was not opposed to the adoption in first reading of the appropriation requested under section 24. It nevertheless must draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that, under the Charter, the budget or the Organization could not be used to finance technical co-operation activities. Those should be excluded from the regular budget and should only be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

23. Mr. BOUR (France) said that his delegation, in a spirit of compromise, had joined the consensus but nevertheless considered that the financing of operational activities under the regular budget was not in conformity with the Charter and did not contribute to a rational use of the Organization's resources in that field.

24. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom), Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) and Mr. GITSVOV (Bulgaria) expressed similar reservations and the representative of Belgium also extended those reservations to section 7 of the proposed programme budget.

Section 25. International Court of Justice

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General under that section amounted to \$11,191,300 while the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee came to \$11,012,100. He also drew the Committee's attention to a note by the Secretary-General regarding the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Publications of the International Court of Justice" (A/41/591 and Add.1). The Chairman recalled that, at its 18th meeting, the Committee had decided to consult the Sixth Committee in that connection. Accordingly, on 6 November 1987, he had addressed a letter to that effect to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee but he had not yet received a reply.

26. Mr. HARAN (Israel) requested an assurance that current policy in regard to the publications of the International Court of Justice would not be modified until the Sixth Committee had considered the issue.

27. The CHAIRMAN confirmed that there would be no change until the General Assembly had considered the relevant report of the Joint Inspection Unit.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Committee had decided to adopt the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination regarding section 25 (A/42/16 (Part I), para. 200).

29. It was so decided.

30. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$11,012,100 under section 25 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without a vote.

Section 26. Legal activities

31. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that section 26 had not been affected by the structural changes proposed by the Secretary-General in his progress report and update. The Advisory Committee recommended an appropriation of \$15,390,400. Its comments on the publication schedule for the United Nations Treaty Series appeared in paragraph 26.5 of its report. The Secretary-General had been asked to submit a progress report on the subject to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. The Advisory Committee did not believe that a progress report would be necessary in the current year.

32. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) said that a reading of paragraph 26.31 of the proposed programme budget made it clear that the resolution regarding the equality of languages had not been respected.

33. Mr. BOUR (France) asked whether there was any justification for the annual report of the International Law Commission to be published twice.

34. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Secretariat had noted the comments of the delegation of Yemen regarding publications and wished to point out that, in the proposed programme budget, the rules in force had been strictly applied. In regard to the question raised by the representative of France, the Secretariat would look into the extent to which the duplicate publication of the same report was necessary and the extent to which it was possible to avoid such duplication.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Committee had decided to adopt the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination regarding section 26 (A/42/16 (Part I), paras. 203 to 205).

36. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$15,390,400 under section 26 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading, without a vote.

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/42/L.33, A/42/L.34 and A/42/L.35 concerning agenda item 38 (Question of Palestine) (A/C.5/42/45 and Corr.1)

37. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the programme budget implications of the three draft resolutions relating to the question of Palestine were presented by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/42/45 and Corr.1. The proposed activities of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People in draft resolution A/42/L.33 were summarized in paragraph 6 of the Secretary-General's statement and detailed in the proposed programme budget, as indicated in paragraph 7. The activities by the Division for Palestinian Rights called for in draft resolution A/42/L.34 were summarized in paragraph 9, where the Secretary-General stated that, with the exception of the resources for the substantive servicing of one seminar in Europe in 1989, which was estimated to cost \$48,200 in total, all activities had been programmed in section 1 of the proposed programme budget. The Advisory Committee noted, nevertheless, from paragraph 10 that no additional appropriation would be needed to finance the seminar. Draft resolution A/42/L.35 concerned public information activities relating to the question of Palestine, which were summarized in paragraph 12. The adoption of that draft resolution would not require any additional appropriation. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/42/L.33, A/42/L.34 and A/42/L.35, no additional appropriation would be required under either section 1 or section 27 (Public information) of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

38. Mr. MELTKE (Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Conferences) said that on 23 November the Committee on Conferences had discussed the draft resolutions contained in documents A/42/L.33 and A/42/L.34 as well as the related programme

(Mr. Meltke)

budget implications contained in document A/C.5/42/45 and Corr.1. The Committee had met in accordance with paragraph 6 of resolution 35/10 A.

39. The Committee had been informed that the proposed programme of work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People for 1988-1989 included a number of meetings to be held away from its headquarters, representing a departure from paragraph 4 of section I of resolution 40/243. In response to questions from delegations, the Secretariat had replied that the Committee had considered it necessary to hold its meetings away from headquarters to maximize the impact on public and governmental opinion in support of the Palestinian cause.

40. The Secretariat had stated further that, for reasons beyond its control and that of the Committee, it had not been possible to hold all the events approved by the General Assembly during the 1986-1987 biennium but that it was intended to hold all the meetings scheduled for the next biennium. At the same time every effort would be made to reduce the volume of documentation required.

41. In addition, the Secretariat had stated that efforts would be made to secure invitations from host Governments for those meetings and that the staff required for the servicing of the events scheduled would be reduced to the bare minimum.

42. Two delegations had referred to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/42/L.33 by which the General Assembly would authorize the Committee to make necessary adjustments to its programme. The Secretariat had indicated that no financial implications would be involved.

43. Several delegations, noting that the Committee on Conferences had already discussed that question under the terms of paragraph 6 of resolution 35/10 A, had objected to the application of technical considerations to bodies whose work was of great political significance and sensitivity. The Committee had decided to place the question of its role under paragraph 6 of resolution 35/10 A on the agenda of its 1988 substantive session.

44. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the programme of work of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People and that it grant an exception to paragraph 4 of resolution 40/243, section I, to allow the Committee to meet away from its established headquarters, notwithstanding the fact that some venues for the proposed events had not yet been specified. With respect to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/42/L.33, it was the understanding of the Committee on Conferences that any adjustments which the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People would make to its programme of work would not constitute intersessional departures from the calendar of conferences and consequently did not require a decision by the Committee on Conferences.

45. One delegation had entered a reservation with regard to the above recommendation.

46. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that the financial implications of the activities under consideration were quite substantial but he did not intend to enter into a discussion of them. Needless to say, the meetings to be held would do nothing to advance the search for a peaceful and negotiated settlement to the problem. In that connection, it was quite telling that no Government had offered to host any of the meetings, although it was planned to hold meetings in every region.

47. His delegation regretted that the information activities of the Department were based on tendentious and biased resolutions. It could not endorse the statement of programme budget implications to be submitted to the General Assembly and requested a recorded vote on the matter. His delegation would vote against.

48. Mr. TERZI (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said he was pleased that the financial implications of the draft resolutions under consideration were minimal and not controversial. Given the amount of money which the Organization was spending to deal with the consequences of the situation, the activities in question were a good investment. By way of example, he pointed out that the invasion of Lebanon by Israel had cost the United Nations \$15 million a month, not \$3 million over two years.

49. The PLO was convinced that what the United Nations had achieved through such meetings had helped a great deal to improve the prospects for a peaceful settlement. The international conference envisaged in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly was the best means of solving the problem.

50. Israel had no business casting aspersions on the activities of the Department of Public Information (DPI), since it had consistently refused to participate constructively in efforts undertaken by the United Nations.

51. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the statement of programme budget implications in document A/C.5/42/45 and Corr.1.

In favour: Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, France, Israel, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.

52. The statement of programme budget implications in document A/C.5/42/45 and Corr.1 was adopted by 81 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.

Section 27. Public information

53. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the amount recommended by the Advisory Committee (\$73,426,800) was based on a slight revision of the Committee's recommendation as presented in its first report (A/42/7), where it had recommended an appropriation of \$73,546,800 as against the \$75,869,600 initially requested by the Secretary-General.

54. As paragraph 27.7 of the Committee's report stated, the 1988-1989 estimate under section 27 included, for the first time, resource requirements for public information activities concerning the questions of Palestine and Namibia.

55. Paragraph 27.8 attempted to give an idea of the total resources devoted by the United Nations to public information activities. The grand total of \$11,359,500 appearing in the table in paragraph 27.8 was a very rough estimate.

56. Paragraphs 27.9 to 27.12 of the Committee's report provided information on the Yearbook of the United Nations, showing that the production and publication of the Yearbook were still behind schedule. The Advisory Committee had been studying the problems associated with the publication of the Yearbook for many years, and had made recommendations on the subject from time to time. The last such recommendation had been submitted in the context of its review of the programme budget for 1986-1987. Although that recommendation had been endorsed by the General Assembly it seemed, unfortunately, that no progress had been made towards publishing the Yearbook on time. Accordingly, in paragraph 27.12, the Advisory Committee once again recommended that the Secretary-General should implement without further delay the decision of the General Assembly that abbreviated editions of the Yearbook should be produced until the backlog had been eliminated.

57. Paragraphs 27.13 and 27.14 provided information on the publication entitled Development Forum. The Advisory Committee noted that the resources available for that publication continued to decline. It had nevertheless received assurances, as stated in paragraph 27.14, that uninterrupted production of Development Forum during 1988-1989 was envisaged subject to continuation of the United Nations contribution.

58. The reforms now in train would affect section 27. When considering the Secretary-General's progress report (A/42/234), the Advisory Committee had noted that, as paragraphs 34 to 38 of that report indicated, the changes would have a

(Mr. Mselle)

considerable impact not only on the Department of Public Information itself but also on the way it carried out its mandate. Paragraph 38 indicated that the Department was the subject of a three-phase study. It was hoped that the new structure of the Department would be in place by the end of 1987.

59. The progress report had also been discussed in detail by CPC, which had likewise considered section 27, and its observations and recommendations were given in paragraphs 206 to 216 of document A/42/16 (Part I). As paragraph 210 of that report said, "The Committee considered that the review that was currently being undertaken on the rationalization of the activities and the organizational structure of the Department of Public Information would afford an opportunity to examine the whole public information programme ... the major changes in the programme structure would be presented to the Committee at its resumed session so that issues related to both programme content and resources could be discussed together". Thus, at its resumed session, CPC had taken up a report issued as E/AC.51/1987/17. The debate on that question by CPC at its resumed session was summarized in paragraphs 23 to 30 of document A/42/16 (Part II). The main conclusion reached appeared to be that presented in paragraph 30: "The Committee decided to review the question of the programme structure of the Department of Public Information at its twenty-eighth session in the context of its consideration of the proposed programme budget and the proposed revisions to the medium-term plan". The Secretary-General had been requested to take account of the views expressed by CPC.

60. It was no secret that many things had happened since the consideration of section 27 by CPC and the Advisory Committee. The programme budget implications indicated in document A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1, the update of the Secretary-General's progress report, covered only a minor change described in paragraph 42 of that document: the transfer of certain functions and two General Service posts from section 27 to section 1, owing to the establishment of the new Office for Research and the Collection of Information. The bulk of the programme budget implications for section 27 stemming from changes pursuant to resolution 41/213 had not yet been presented to Member States for examination and comment. It might, therefore, be useful to seek detailed information from representatives of the Secretary-General, including the Under-Secretary-General for Public Information, as to the current status of the Department of Public Information. He had before him a Secretary-General's bulletin dated 2 November 1987, and wondered whether it would not have been possible to delay the issuance of that bulletin pending consideration of the structural changes proposed in the Department. He did not intend to pass judgement on the matter, but felt that the representatives of the Secretary-General should provide additional information.

61. Likewise, it was no secret that changes within the Department of Public Information had been proposed with the assistance of external experts and consultants. He did not recollect the General Assembly approving the use of consultants under section 27 for the biennium 1986-1987. It might be useful for the Secretariat to provide some clarification regarding the use of consultants and the projects on which they had been employed. The Secretariat should also provide any other information which it felt might allay representatives' misgivings.

(Mr. Mselle)

62. Section 27 was an important section which delegations should examine in detail and on which they might wish to hear the views of other bodies, such as the Committee on Information.

63. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) expressed surprise that no provision had been made for consultants in the revised estimates for 1986-1987 or in the proposed programme budget for 1988-1989. He asked how the matter had been dealt with. How had consultancies in 1986-1987 been financed? Had extrabudgetary or specific-purpose contributions been used?

64. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that, like the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, he felt that the Under-Secretary-General for Public Information could make a useful contribution to the Committee's consideration of the section. He endorsed the steps taken to improve the image of the United Nations, provided that they would not detract from the implementation of programmes called for by Member States. He found it somewhat contradictory that the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General and recommended by the Advisory Committee should be less than the revised estimates for 1986-1987 at a time when the workload of DPI was increasing.

65. As a firm supporter of linguistic pluralism, his delegation was pleased that certain press releases were now being issued in French, especially those relating to the Fifth Committee. There was room for improvement as far as the accuracy of press releases was concerned. His delegation encouraged the Under-Secretary-General for Public Information to pursue the reforms which she had initiated, but wished to stress that reform should not affect programmes mandated by Member States. The radio programming on apartheid and the special regional television magazine for Africa, and the television magazine for Latin America, were examples of programmes which should not be abolished. In general, regional activities should be developed and emphasis placed on pluralism, in accordance with the wishes of the Fifth Committee and CPC. Referring to the recommendation cited by CPC in paragraph 212 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)), he called for the United Nations information centres to be given the resources they needed for their activities.

66. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) asked why the special regional television magazines (programme element 1.4) would not be broadcast in Europe. He noted that publication of the 1984 and 1985 editions of the Yearbook of the United Nations (programme element 2.17) was once again behind schedule. He endorsed the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee on that subject in paragraph 27.12 of its report and called for highest priority to be given to that activity.

67. Mr. EL-MEKKI (Sudan) said he agreed fully with the comments made by the representative of Morocco. There was a need for an in-depth information programme which was in keeping with the recommendations made by CPC in paragraphs 211 and 212 of its report and which advanced the main objectives of the Organization. He reserved the right to revert to the matter when the Secretariat had commented on the situation and called for the Department to be provided with the resources it needed.

68. Mr. WANG Jun (China) pointed out that the recommendations of CPC and the proposals of the Advisory Committee had been made on the basis of the initial programme budget proposals, i.e., before the restructuring of DPI. However, the reform would affect the Department's programmes, structure and staffing table in many ways. According to the information provided by the Secretary-General in paragraph 38 of document A/42/234, the first two phases of the reorganization should have been completed. It would be sensible, therefore, to examine the Department's new requirements, as reflected in the planned studies. The only information given in the Secretary-General's updated progress report (A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1) related to the transfer of two General Service posts from section 27 to section 1 of the budget. The appropriation requested for DPI had therefore not really been justified. His delegation would like to know when the Secretariat would submit revised estimates and a new staffing table for the Department. If the Secretariat could not provide exact figures, it should at least give an estimate of the resources which would be needed in 1988 and 1989 in the light of the reorganization.

69. His delegation wished to emphasize a number of points. First, the provisions governing programming and the preparation of the budget, in particular regulations 3.2 and 3.4 of the Regulations governing Programme Planning and the Programme Aspects of the Budget, must be applied strictly to all departments, without exception. Second, the new manning table of DPI must be based on the principle of equitable geographical distribution, especially at the senior levels. Third, the restructuring of DPI must not adversely affect regional and special programmes, such as those concerning Namibia and apartheid. The programme of assistance to Africa should be widely publicized, in accordance with the high priority assigned to it. Moreover, his delegation would like to know whether the number of divisions in DPI would be changed as a result of the restructuring and, in the case of the Bureau of Programme Operations, for example, what rank its head would have (Assistant Secretary-General or D-2).

70. Lastly, he endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Morocco and the Sudan.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.