

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records*



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
701 (WWRR)

FIFTH COMMITTEE
73rd meeting
held on
Monday, 14 December 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 73RD MEETING **UN LIBRARY**

Chairman: Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan)

JAN 11 1982

UN/SA COLLECTION

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 107: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.25 concerning agenda item 67

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1 concerning agenda items 69 (j) and 99

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/36/L.68 concerning agenda item 12

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.27/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 66

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.139 concerning agenda item 69 (p)

/...

* 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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.5/36/SR.73
30 December 1981

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

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.12/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 60

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.32/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 60

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 107: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Respect for the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and the specialized agencies (continued) (A/C.5/36/L.16 and L.16/Rev.1)

1. Mr. HICKEY (Australia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, recalled that, at the Committee's 59th meeting (A/C.5/36/SR.59), the Soviet representative had made a totally unwarranted attack on the Australian Government. The Soviet representative had clearly been attempting to discredit the Australian delegation as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.16 by engaging in an extraneous propaganda exercise involving a minor bilateral difference between the two countries. It was with considerable reluctance that he was exercising his right of reply, since there was an unwritten rule that the Committee never discussed substantive political issues. The Soviet attack had been so baseless and intentionally mischievous, however, that it could not be allowed to go unchallenged. The Soviet delegation had held not only Australia but also the Fifth Committee in contempt, demonstrating once again that the Soviets operated in the belief that there was one set of rules for them and another for everyone else.
2. He wished to emphasize that his delegation's support for draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.16 had in no way been affected by Soviet tactics and intimidation and that, along with the other sponsors, his delegation had remained amenable to reasonable amendments in the hope of achieving a consensus, even when some of the amendments proposed had clearly been red herrings.
3. His delegation had concluded from the Soviet outburst at the 59th meeting that the Soviet Union was angry because there had been some delay in issuing an Australian visa to a United Nations official of Soviet nationality and a visa had been denied to a so-called United Nations consultant of Soviet nationality when the two Soviet citizens had applied for visas to attend the United Nations-sponsored regional seminar on human rights guarantees in the administration of criminal justice, to be held in Australia in December 1981. He wished to state at the outset that his delegation considered the issue of visas to be totally irrelevant to the draft resolution in question. Besides, it should be clear from its position on the draft resolution that his delegation was quite prepared for questions to be raised in the Committee concerning any cases in which genuine problems of functional immunity for United Nations staff arose in connexion with Australia.
4. With regard to the actual circumstances surrounding the question raised by the Soviet delegation, he wished to point out that the United Nations official in question, Mr. Pissarev, had been granted a visa and had arrived in Canberra two days prior to the seminar, a fact of which the Soviet delegation had been aware when it raised the issue in the Fifth Committee. That Mr. Pissarev had arrived in Australia in good time and had performed his duties made nonsense of the Soviet charge. Even

/...

(Mr. Hickey, Australia)

if there had been any undue delay in issuing his visa, which was not the case, delegations would appreciate that delays in processing visas for Soviet nationals were not uncommon. The main point that he wished to make, however, was that that was a bilateral matter which had no connexion with the draft resolution considered at the 59th meeting.

5. Mr. Bykov, the second Soviet applicant, was a senior Soviet official and President of the Moscow Collegium of Lawyers. The decision to refuse him a visa was irreversible, however, since Mr. Bykov was not in any sense a United Nations official, nor could sections 25 and 26 of the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations be considered to apply to him. In his application for a visa Mr. Bykov had wrongly attributed to himself diplomatic status in what had later been explained as "a foolish error". It was difficult to accept such an excuse. He personally regretted that Mr. Bykov had not attended the seminar since, if he was one of his country's experts on human rights, he would have gained from the frank and open exchange of views which occurred at seminars of that nature. The Soviet delegation was now maintaining that Mr. Bykov was a United Nations consultant, a status which had presumably been conferred only very recently, since the Australian Government had only just been informed about it, and since in his application Mr. Bykov had stated that he was a Soviet official and not a United Nations official.

6. His delegation believed that the Soviet Union, having failed to get its way through the appropriate bilateral channel, had decided to use the Fifth Committee and the resolution on the privileges and immunities of United Nations officials to raise the issue, in an attempt to embarrass the Australian Government. If there had been any cause for complaint as far as the United Nations was concerned, the complaint should have come from the Organization, but the latter had simply requested that the matter be expedited, which it had been.

7. While it was no secret that bilateral relations between Australia and the Soviet Union were at a low level, and had been since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, he deeply regretted that such differences had surfaced in the Fifth Committee through no fault of his own delegation.

8. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked on what grounds the Committee had begun to discuss a matter which was not on its agenda for the current meeting. Such an initiative violated the rules of procedure and the Chairman should have known better than to permit it. If the Australian representative was simply exercising his right of reply, he should have spoken at the end of the meeting. Since the Chairman had disregarded the Committee's rules of procedure, his delegation was entitled to respond to the Australian statement. He personally wished to ask the Australian representative to think carefully before he used certain words. He should know that no one had occupied Afghan territory and should be aware of the implications of what he said.

9. The CHAIRMAN observed that, under the rules of procedure, he had the right to allow any member of the Committee who wished to make a statement to do so. It was not the first time that a delegation had been given the chance to speak on an item which was not listed on the Committee's agenda for the meeting in question.

10. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Australian delegation had finally seen fit to respond to the statement made by the Soviet delegation on 1 December 1981 concerning the refusal on the part of the Australian Government to grant visas to two Soviet citizens, Mr. Pissarev and Mr. Bykov, who were to travel to Australia not as part of a Soviet delegation but in an official United Nations capacity to attend the seminar in question. Unfortunately, the representative of Australia had juggled the facts and had indulged in demagoguery. The fact that the Australian Government had decided to limit its contacts with the Soviet Union was its own affair. Usually such contacts were in the interests of both parties. His delegation had drawn attention to the case in question on 1 December 1981 because the Australian delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.16 on respect of the privileges and immunities of officials of the United Nations and specialized agencies. Evidently the Australian Government was not well acquainted with the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations of 13 February 1946 and the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies of 21 November 1947. It should in particular take note of sections 25 and 26 of the Convention of 1946.

11. Mr. Pissarev, who had been invited to attend the seminar by the United Nations Division of Human Rights, had initially been denied a visa. At first he had been told in a letter from the Second Secretary of the Australian Embassy in Switzerland that the reasons for the denial were confidential. Finally, after the United Nations Director-General in Geneva had sent a telegram explaining the situation to the Australian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Canberra, a visa had been granted to Mr. Pissarev, so that he was able to attend the seminar.

12. Mr. Bykov, the President of the Moscow Collegium of Lawyers had been invited by the United Nations Division of Human Rights to present a paper at the seminar in question. The Australian Ministry of Foreign Affairs had refused to grant him a visa. The officials of the Ministry had not given any clear reasons for doing so and the statement made by the representative of Australia in the Committee was just as unintelligible in that regard.

13. The Soviet delegation expressed hope that those facts would be reflected in the annual report of the Secretary-General to be submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/36/L.16/Rev.1. The Secretary-General had already been informed of the two cases in question. His delegation had brought those facts to the attention of the Committee because it was amazed at the hypocrisy shown by the Australian delegation in sponsoring a draft resolution designed to uphold the provisions of the Conventions on Privileges and Immunities, on one hand, and undertaking action which was in clear violation of those Conventions, on the other.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1982-1983 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.25 concerning agenda item 67 (A/36/7/Add.20; A/C.5/36/86, A/36/7/Add.20)

14. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) noted that draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.25 called for the implementation

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

of various projects under the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. In the statement of administrative and financial implications contained in document A/C.5/36/86; the Secretary-General had indicated that the cost of implementing those projects would require an additional amount of \$912,600, of which \$772,400 would come under section 27 and \$140,200 under section 28D.

15. It should be noted that the Advisory Committee's recommendation on those financial implications (A/36/7/Add.20) did not cover the expansion of United Nations short-wave broadcasts referred to in paragraphs 11 and 12 of document A/C.5/36/86, since additional appropriations were not being requested for that item until the General Assembly had determined the priority to be given to the short-wave broadcasts.

16. In paragraph 4 of document A/36/7/Add.20, the Advisory Committee explained why it could not endorse the request for the establishment of a P-5 post and a G-4 post for JUNIC and recommended a consequential reduction of \$125,800 in the estimates. In paragraph 12, it explained why it could not support the request for a G-4 post to strengthen services to the pool of non-aligned news agencies and recommended deletion of the corresponding estimate of \$63,400. In paragraph 13, it explained why it could not support the request for \$93,000 to strengthen the United Nations information centres, while in paragraph 14 it explained why it recommended deletion of the estimate of \$43,400 for the establishment of a G-4 post to strengthen the Non-Governmental Organizations Section.

17. The Advisory Committee was therefore recommending that, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.25, additional appropriations would be required in the amounts of \$502,100 under section 27 and \$84,900 under section 28D of the programme budget for 1982-1983. An amount of \$58,600 would also be required under section 31 (Staff assessment), to be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1.

18. Mr. MARTORELL (Peru) observed that his delegation was generally guided by the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. On the present occasion, however, it could not endorse the approach adopted by the Advisory Committee and the reductions that it had proposed. At a meeting of the Group of 77 held that morning, the Chairman of the Committee on Information had put forward very clear and sound arguments for strengthening United Nations public information activities and the goals described in document A/C.5/36/86 could not be achieved if the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee were made. The recommended reductions would, inter alia, undermine efforts to enhance the effectiveness of JUNIC, to expand the very important services to the pool of non-aligned news agencies and to strengthen the Non-Governmental Organizations Section. The work of DPI demanded every possible support and no effort should be spared to meet its requests for resources.

19. He therefore proposed formally that the appropriations requested in document A/C.5/36/86 should be totally restored.

/...

20. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) endorsed the comments made by the representative of Peru. He did not see how the Advisory Committee could propose reduced appropriations for DPI when the latter's activities needed to be strengthened. Such reductions could affect the Department's work and also certain vital services to the developing countries and the non-aligned news agencies pool. He therefore endorsed fully the Peruvian proposal to restore the Secretary-General's estimate of \$912,600 and regretted that, for once, he could not support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.
21. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, while his delegation was not totally satisfied with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee since it was opposed to the recruitment of any additional staff, it would endorse those recommendations. It could not therefore support the proposal to reverse those recommendations and instead requested a vote on them.
22. Mrs. LISBOA (Venezuela) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Peru and Algeria as well as the Secretary-General's requests in document A/C.5/36/86. She noted that part of the resources would be used to strengthen DPI's Spanish language services.
23. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) observed that it was very rare for his delegation to oppose the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. In the light of the position of the Committee on Information, however, the Group of 77 had decided to adopt a common position on what was almost an emergency situation. The activities of the United Nations information centres and the dissemination of information to regional news agencies and non-governmental organizations would all be seriously threatened if the Organization's information activities were undermined by lack of resources. He therefore endorsed the proposal to restore the recommended appropriation of \$912,600 so that DPI could continue its valuable work of providing information on the United Nations to developing countries.
24. Mr. BRAINARD (United States of America) said that the consensus that had emerged after months of negotiations, both in the Committee on Information and in the Special Political Committee, was based on the understanding that the measures proposed in draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.25 were to be carried out within current budgetary resources. Much could be done through redeployment and the termination of marginal or obsolete programmes. The amount already allocated for DPI was 25 per cent higher than the appropriation for 1980-1981; such an increase was extraordinary at a time when Governments were slashing their national budgets in response to an unfavourable international economic situation. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee were extremely sound and he urged the Committee to approve them.
25. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) recalled that at the preceding session the Under-Secretary-General for Public Information, replying to questions regarding the strengthening of the African Unit in the Radio and Visual Services Division, had stated that he had been preparing an over-all plan for the Division as a whole and felt no need for action at that time. The addition to the Unit of a P-3 writer/producer of radio programmes in Swahili would be a welcome step, but at the same time it should be remembered that there were many countries in Africa and

(Mr. Tommo Monthe, Cameroon)

and many languages were spoken there. He wondered why, for example, no provision had been made for the Portuguese-speaking countries of Africa. The African Unit seemed to be the poor relation in comparison with the other regional units. He emphasized the importance of publicizing United Nations activities in the developing countries and expressed the hope that, in pursuing the plan for the regionalization of the Radio and Visual Services Division, DPI would give Africa due attention.

26. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that, in view of the importance of effective public information activities, his delegation supported the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/36/86.

27. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) welcomed the practical proposals of the Secretary-General with regard to the financial implications of the draft resolution on questions relating to information and supported the appropriations requested. He hoped that the lack of details in the Secretary-General's statement of administrative and financial applications regarding the strengthening of the Arabic Unit was simply an oversight and not a conscious omission. The Arabic Unit should be brought up to the level of the African Unit and Anti-Apartheid Programmes Section, and he was confident that that could be done through redeployment, specifically by transferring to it on a permanent basis the two posts established at the thirty-fourth session for the Visual Service.

28. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the Department of Public Information was politically important because of its efforts to promote co-operation and communication among peoples and States, and endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of the United Republic of Cameroon, Panama and the Syrian Arab Republic.

29. Mr. QUTAISH (Democratic Yemen) noted with satisfaction the provisions in the draft resolution relating to the strengthening of the Arab Unit in the Radio Service and endorsed the proposal to establish a separate Caribbean Unit. He supported the views expressed by the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Morocco and hoped that the Committee would give favourable consideration to them.

30. Miss FRANK (Netherlands) noted that paragraph 12(a) of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to ensure a balance in the use of official languages in DPI publications and asked why, in his statement of administrative and financial implications, the Secretary-General had singled out only one publication. She also asked why an additional \$46,000 would be necessary for that purpose.

31. With regard to the expansion of United Nations short-wave broadcasts, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had stated that the General Assembly should determine the priority to be accorded to that measure and she asked whether the total amount of \$1,385,300 referred to in paragraph 11 of the Secretary-General's statement was required at the current stage.

32. Both paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report and the statement of financial implications submitted to the Special Political Committee were unclear with regard to the strengthening of JUNIC, and the estimated requirement of \$125,800 seemed excessive in view of the existing staff of DPI.

/...

33. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that the draft resolution contained important measures to remedy the inadequate flow of information between the United Nations and the public, especially in the developing countries. If the matter was put to vote, his delegation would vote in favour of the Secretary-General's estimate of financial implications.
34. Mr. SUEDI (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation would support the Peruvian proposal and urged that it should be put to a vote without delay.
35. Mr. AKASHI (Under-Secretary-General for Public Information) said that he understood the concerns expressed by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon over the number of States which the African Unit had to service. It was quite possible that the additional posts requested might not be adequate to the needs. However, the African Unit already comprised one P-4 post, two P-3 posts and two G-5 posts. Thus, the addition of two posts represented a considerable strengthening and would enable the Unit to provide radio programming in Swahili on a regular basis. He was conscious of the Unit's lack of capability in Portuguese. However, services in that language were currently provided by the Latin American Iberian Unit, and when the budgetary situation improved it might be possible to propose a further strengthening of the African Unit to include the production of programmes in that language. He was pleased that the Advisory Committee had seen fit to approve the Secretary-General's request regarding the strengthening of the African Unit.
36. Replying to the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, he observed that the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to consider the expansion of the Arabic Unit, bearing in mind the possibility of redeploying existing resources. The matter was under active consideration and it was to be hoped that, in co-operation with the Committee on Information, it would be thoroughly reviewed in 1982 so that the General Assembly would be in a position at its thirty-seventh session to deal with more specific proposals.
37. The representative of the Netherlands had asked why a Russian version of the Monthly Chronicle had been singled out in connexion with paragraph 12 (a) of the draft resolution. The Monthly Chronicle was already issued in English, French and Arabic, and the Secretary-General's proposal was modest in so far as he intended to utilize an existing post and was requesting funds for the publication of only four issues a year.
38. With regard to the financial implications of expanding short-wave broadcasts, he said that no resources were requested at the current time, pending a study by DPI, in co-operation with the Committee on Information, of the relative priority to be accorded to such expansion.
39. On the subject of JUNIC, he said that no DPI staff were assigned exclusively to that body; instead, it had been serviced on a part-time basis. The amount of work involved in servicing JUNIC, which had some six subsidiary bodies, had been steadily increasing and additional posts were needed to service it on a full-time basis.

40. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the Peruvian proposal, whereby the General Assembly would be informed that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.21/Rev.1, the full amount required by the Secretary-General should be approved, namely, an additional appropriation of \$912,600, of which \$772,400 would be provided under section 27 and \$140,200 under section 28, together with an additional appropriation of \$98,600 under section 31, to be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1.

41. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote said that his delegation considered the Peruvian proposal reasonable and would vote in favour of it.

42. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community (EEC), said that the EEC countries would vote against the Peruvian proposal because they were opposed in principle to disregarding the advice of the Advisory Committee, which had happened too frequently during the current session, and because they considered that the cuts recommended by the Advisory Committee were too moderate. Section 27 of the budget had very ample resources at its disposal. The proposal of the Secretary-General showed that much too little effort had been made to absorb extra costs by the redeployment of existing resources.

43. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation was not opposed to strengthening the information services of the United Nations, but felt that the resources required by the Secretary-General were excessive and that even the recommendations of the Advisory Committee were generous. Therefore, it could not support the Peruvian proposal.

44. Mr. WANG Chengwei (China) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.25 and stressed the importance of paragraph 12 (a) of that draft resolution, which requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the Department of Public Information made a more strenuous effort to ensure balance in the use of official languages in the publications and programmes of the Department.

45. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Peruvian proposal because the Secretary-General had requested the appropriations in question in accordance with the principle of zero-growth budgeting. Any reduction in those appropriations would impair the activities of the Department of Public Information.

46. Mr. NUNEZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation supported the Peruvian proposal and would vote in favour of it.

47. The proposal of Peru was adopted by 74 votes to 22, with 8 abstentions.

48. Mr. BETTINI (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation was not opposed to strengthening the information services of the United Nations, but had voted against the Peruvian proposal because it sought to restore the budget proposals of the Secretary-General against the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

49. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon), said that, after hearing the reply of the Under-Secretary-General for Public Information, his delegation wished to propose that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.25, it was understood that the measures contemplated for the strengthening of the African Unit of the Radio Service were partial and should be supplemented at a later stage.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the proposal made by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon.

51. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1 concerning agenda items 69 (j) and 99 (A/C.5/36/65)

52. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution in document A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1 would authorize the convening of a session of a special character of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to be held at Nairobi from 10 to 18 May 1982. According to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide that it should be implemented with due regard to the need for economy in respect of the preparations and arrangements for the session of a special character.

53. The statement by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/36/65, while recalling the decision of the General Assembly in 1980 in resolution 35/74, provided background information on the item, including information submitted by the Executive Director of UNEP to the Governing Council and the Council's decision 9/2 at its ninth session. The Secretary-General stated that the holding of the session of a special character would give rise to expenditure estimated at \$668,100, of which \$169,800 would relate to the preparatory work for the session. The Secretary-General stated in paragraph 7 of document A/C.5/36/65 that the preparatory work in 1981 would involve 24 months' of consultancy costed at \$133,200, three expert group meetings - two in Geneva and one in Nairobi - at an estimated cost of \$30,000, and official travel of staff to service meetings of the expert group costed at \$6,600. The Secretary-General also stated that information activities in support of the session of a special character required expenditure of \$43,000 in 1982. The total net conference-servicing costs of the session were estimated at \$449,400, of which \$403,200 would be for 1982. The Secretary-General stated that in 1981 an amount of \$239,600 had been incurred for pre-session documentation (see A/C.5/36/65, annex, p. 1), and of that sum an amount of \$193,400 had already been absorbed. The balance of \$46,200 would also be absorbed. An additional amount of \$5,900 was required for hosting a reception by the President of the session of special character. Consequently, in 1982-1983 the amount being sought as an additional appropriation would be \$43,000, for information, \$403,200 for conference servicing, and \$5,900 for the reception, totalling \$452,100. The Secretary-General stated in paragraph 12 that an amount of \$216,000 for 1980-1981 would be reflected in the final performance report for 1980-1981.

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

54. No additional appropriations were required for 1980-1981, since the performance report, which would be discussed at a later date by the Fifth Committee, showed a surplus of just over \$6 million. Accordingly, the additional amount required for the special session would be \$452,100 under section 18 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

55. The Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1 recommended by the Second Committee would require the appropriation of an additional amount of \$452,100 under section 18. As to conference servicing, there was no need to wait for the consideration of the consolidated statement because for 1982 conference-servicing costs for UNEP were appropriated directly under the budget section for UNEP.

56. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Second Committee contained in document A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1 be adopted, additional appropriation of \$452,100 would be required under section 18 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

57. It was so decided.

58. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation wished to enter reservations regarding the decision just taken. If the proposal to allocate additional funds in the amount of \$452,100 had been put to the vote, his delegation would not have supported it, believing that the Secretary-General had the capacity to cover the expenditure concerned from the existing allocations.

59. Mr. BRAINARD (United States of America) said that the views of his delegation about additions to the budget resulting from decisions taken by Main Committees of the General Assembly at the thirty-sixth session had already been stated. He noted that the draft resolution in document A/C.2/36/L.21/Rev.1 stated in paragraph 6 that "the present resolution should be implemented with due regard for the need for economy in respect of the preparations and arrangements for the session of a special character". The decision to include an amount of \$43,000 for an expanded information exercise, in spite of what was already provided in the programme budget, as supplemented by the decision just taken about information questions, and an amount of \$5,900 for a reception did not coincide with his delegation's interpretation of due regard for economy. If a vote had been taken on the appropriation, his delegation would have abstained from voting.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/C.3/36/L.68 concerning agenda item 12 (A/C.5/36/88)

60. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the General Assembly, by adopting the draft resolution in document A/C.3/36/L.68, would authorize the Working Group to elaborate an international convention on the protection of the rights of all migrant workers to hold an inter-sessional meeting in New York for two weeks in May 1982 immediately after the first regular session of the Economic and Social Council. The General Assembly would also authorize the Working Group to hold a sessional meeting during

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The Secretary-General stated in document A/C.5/36/88 that holding an inter-sessional meeting in New York would give rise to conference-servicing costs not exceeding \$296,000, and that there would be travel costs of \$5,400 which he would try to absorb.

61. But the intersessional meeting in New York would constitute an exception to the rule (General Assembly resolution 31/140) that intergovernmental bodies of the General Assembly and all United Nations bodies should meet where their secretariats were located. In the case of the Working Group, the inter-sessional meeting should be in Geneva, where the Division of Human Rights was located. If it met in Geneva the conference-servicing costs would be \$228,700 instead of \$296,000, and no travel costs would be incurred. The Secretary-General stated that the sessional meeting of the Working Group during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly would give rise to conference-servicing costs of \$273,800.

62. The General Assembly should therefore be informed that the adoption of the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee would give rise to conference-servicing costs not exceeding \$569,800, which would be broken down into \$296,000 for the inter-sessional meeting in New York and \$273,800 for the sessional meeting during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

63. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Third Committee contained in document A/C.3/36/L.68 be adopted, conference-servicing costs would arise estimated on a full-cost basis at \$569,800. The actual supplementary appropriations that might be required would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs for 1982, to be considered at a later stage during the current session.

64. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.27/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 66 (A/C.5/36/94)

65. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the General Assembly, by adopting the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee, would establish a Group of Governmental Experts of 17 members whose expenses would as a rule be borne by each nominating State.

66. The Secretary-General was assuming in document A/C.5/36/94, despite that recommendation by the Special Political Committee, and in a flexible interpretation of the words "as a rule shall be borne by each nominating State", that there would be certain experts who would require their expenses to be borne by the United Nations. When the Advisory Committee had asked about the basis for that conclusion, it had been told that the Secretary-General's conclusion was merely an assumption. The Secretary-General had been unable to say categorically that there would or would not be such a requirement by any of the experts. The Advisory Committee had been told that the amount of \$10,000 required for the purpose was, to quote the representative of the Secretary-General, "entirely theoretical".

(Mr. Mselle, ACABQ)

67. The Advisory Committee was recommending that, since that amount was not based on previous experience, there was no need for an immediate appropriation of \$10,000, and that should there be a need to incur expenditure as foreseen by the Secretary-General, then it should be reflected in the Secretary-General's performance report for the biennium 1982-1983.

68. The Fifth Committee could therefore inform the General Assembly that the adoption of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.27/Rev.1 would give rise to conference-servicing costs not exceeding \$99,800.

69. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee contained in document A/SPC/36/L.27/Rev.1 be adopted, no additional appropriation would be required for the biennium 1982-1983 at the present stage. Conference-servicing costs would arise, estimated on a full-cost basis at \$99,800. The supplementary appropriations that might be required in that respect would be taken into account in the context of the consolidated statement of conference-servicing costs, to be considered at a later stage during the current session.

70. It was so decided.

71. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the proposal without a vote, on the understanding that the Secretary-General would find a way of absorbing the sum of \$99,800 within available resources.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.139 concerning agenda item 69 (p)
(A/C.5/36/95)

72. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had gone along with the request in the Secretary-General's statement in document A/C.5/36/95 without suggesting any change. The total amount involved was \$1,390,100, made up of the following amounts: \$202,000 under section 5A; \$170,900 under section 11; \$264,900 under section 13; \$82,200 under section 14; \$670,100 under section 15; and \$255,400 under section 31, to be offset by \$255,400 under income section 1.

73. Additional conference-servicing costs would arise in 1985 in the amount of \$670,200. They would be considered at the thirty-eighth session in the context of the proposed programme budget for 1984-1985.

74. The number of posts recommended for approval in the context of the appropriations suggested would be: under section 15, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 1 D-1, 2 P-4, 2 P-3, and 3 General Service posts; under section 11, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), 1 P-5, 1 P-3 and 2 local-level posts; under section 13, Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), 1 P-5 and 2 P-3 posts and 1 local-level post; under section 5A,

/...

(Mr Mselle, ACABQ)

Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, two temporary posts (1 D-1 and 1 General Service) for 24 months each; and under section 14, Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA), 1 P-3 and 1 local-level post.

75. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation had supported work to help the least developed countries in various bodies, regarding it as very important, but was disturbed by the size of the financial implications now before the Committee. Canada believed that the required staff could be found by redeployment of existing staff. His delegation did not see why UNCTAD and the regional commissions required resources for the compilation of statistical information and economic, social and sectoral analyses of the problems of the least developed countries. That seemed to involve an unnecessary duplication of effort. Much activity was already being undertaken by the agencies concerned using existing resources. UNCTAD and the regional commissions seemed intent on building capacity to respond to requests from the least developed countries for aid in preparing country reviews. However, few of the countries at the present time lacked mechanisms for country reviews through the World Bank, UNDP or the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel. It had been agreed that there should be no duplication of existing mechanisms. The number of times when UNCTAD or the regional commissions would be asked to service country review meetings appeared likely to be quite small, especially as UNDP had also offered to help organize meetings for the least developed countries. His delegation believed that the amount requested to provide assistance to review meetings was too large. It appreciated the pressures on the Director-General's office, but believed that resources could be found through redeployment in other areas. One week appeared quite adequate for the mid-term review. Moreover, his delegation saw no need for pre-sessional documents of an estimated length of 132,000 words, especially as UNCTAD was seeking additional resources to provide information on a continuing basis. Country review documents and reports on proceedings of country review meetings should suffice to describe activities at the country level, since the meetings were designed, inter alia, to serve as a preparation for the mid-term review.

76. He requested a vote on the financial implications of the draft resolution.

77. Mr. WANG Chengwei (China) said that his country regarded the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, adopted in 1981, as an important development, and supported all efforts to help the least developed countries. His delegation accordingly endorsed the Secretary-General's proposals in document A/C.5/36/95, and the views of the Advisory Committee.

78. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had made a detailed statement on the subject in the Second Committee. The Soviet Union attached great importance to the question of assistance to the least developed countries, but considered that the funds requested were excessive and unjustified. His delegation could not support the proposed expenditure on additional staff, temporary or permanent, or the substantial amount requested for experts and

(Mr. Palamarchuk, USSR)

consultants. He drew the attention of the Fifth Committee to the fact that the UNCTAD programme for 1982-1983 included requests for 10 additional UNCTAD posts in respect of the programme for the least developed and land-locked countries. The request for additional staff was counter to the Soviet Union's position of principle, and his delegation could not therefore support the expenditure proposed in document A/C.5/36/95.

79. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal that it should ask the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Second Committee in document A/C.2/36/L.139 be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$1,390,100 would be required, as indicated in paragraphs 21 and 22 of document A/C.5/36/95.

80. The proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

81. Mr. BRAINARD (United States of America) said that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.139 had been adopted in the Second Committee by consensus, in which the United States had joined. However, he agreed with the Canadian representative about the financial implications, and had accordingly abstained from voting on the proposal just adopted.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.12/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 60 (A/C.5/36/96)

82. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.12/Rev.1 requested the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures, including a functional feasibility study, for establishing the University at Jerusalem. The Secretary-General stated in document A/C.5/36/96 that the feasibility study would require six weeks of preparatory work and that a team of two consultants would be needed, with supporting staff consisting of one Professional at the P-5 or P-4 level, and one General Service staff member. The costs involved would be \$32,800 for consultants, and \$9,700 for travel of staff, making a total appropriation of \$42,500 under section 1 of the proposed programme budget for 1982-1983. The Advisory Committee endorsed the Secretary-General's request.

83. Mr. ORON (Israel) said that his delegation opposed draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.12/Rev.1, in accordance with the position already explained in the Special Political Committee, and asked for a vote on the financial implications.

84. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal that it should ask the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee contained in document A/SPC/36/L.12/Rev.1 be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$42,500 would be required under section 1 of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

85. The proposal was adopted by 82 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/SPC/36/L.32/Rev.1 concerning agenda item 60 (A/C.5/36/97)

86. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in document A/C.5/36/97 the Secretary-General stated that to prepare and submit to the General Assembly a study on the Israeli Canal and its effects on the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Palestinian territories occupied since 1967 would require a team of consultants and supporting staff consisting of one P-4 or P-5 and one General Service staff member. The appropriation required, including miscellaneous costs, would be \$86,200. The Advisory Committee endorsed the Secretary-General's request.

87. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the discussion in the Special Political Committee his delegation had objected to the proposed expenditure of \$73,000 for consultants and \$12,000 for staff travel and subsistence. Such allocations would be unjustified and the Soviet Union could not support them. It would accordingly vote against the proposal if a vote was taken.

88. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report direct to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee contained in document A/SPC/36/L.32/Rev.1 be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$86,200 would be required under section 1 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983.

It was so decided.

Mr. PERON (Israel), speaking in explanation of his position, said that if a vote had been taken on the proposal, his delegation would have voted against it.

Mr. BRAYNARD (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/SPC/36/L.32/Rev.1 in the Special Political Committee, because he felt that the resolution and the cost of its implementation bore no relation to reality and would not contribute to peace in the region. If a vote had been taken, his delegation would have voted against the proposal.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.