



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. OKEYO (Kenya)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 54

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 139

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 63

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 66

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 64 (e)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.2 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 64

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 submitted by the Special Political Committee concerning agenda item 77

Review of travel and related entitlements of representatives attending United Nations meetings (continued)

Standards of accommodation for air travel (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.5/43/SR.41
7 December 1988

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 (continued)
(A/43/7/Add.9)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 54 (A/C.5/43/38)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 139 (A/C.5/43/39)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 63 (A/C.5/43/46 and Add.1)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 66 (A/C.5/43/47)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 64 (a) (A/C.5/43/48)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.2 submitted by the First Committee concerning agenda item 64 (A/C.5/43/49)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that table 1 in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) (A/43/7/Add.9) summarized the requirements arising under the six draft resolutions submitted by the First Committee. The full cost amounted to \$3,122,600, including \$964,900 for non-conference-servicing requirements. The requirement under section 2B was \$391,100, but the Secretary-General indicated that \$60,500 could be covered from extrabudgetary resources in 1989, leaving an additional appropriation of \$330,600 in the programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989. The conference-servicing requirement for 1988-1989 under section 29 was estimated at \$719,300, and no additional appropriation was proposed by the Secretary-General.

2. For the biennium 1990-1991 the Secretary-General estimated that the resolution would give rise to expenditure of \$573,800 under section 2B and \$1,438,400 under section 29 of the programme budget. Those amounts would be considered by the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session in the context of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991.

3. ACABQ had examined the additional requirements under section 2B and it indicated in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of its report the level of appropriations already approved for consultants, ad hoc expert groups, and staff travel to official meetings. In paragraph 8 the Advisory Committee recalled the concern expressed by the General Assembly in the past concerning expenditure on those three items and its call for restraint. In the light of information provided by representatives of the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee had decided not to

(Mr. Maella)

recommend a reduction of the amounts proposed by the Secretary-General, but it requested him to administer the funds with maximum economy, with the expectation of some savings in the 1988-1989 appropriations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 and Corr.1

4. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/43/38) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would cover the additional costs from extrabudgetary resources and that no additional appropriation would be required under section 2B for the biennium 1988-1989.

5. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75

6. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

7. The Advisory Committee's recommendation on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.75 was adopted by 97 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

8. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had no difficulty with the substance of the draft resolution but it questioned the need for any additional appropriation under the programme budget for either the current or the next biennium. If agreement had been reached in 1987 on a contingency fund, no additional appropriation would now be necessary.

9. Mr. BAZAN (Chile), Mr. SOTO (Colombia), Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait), Mr. EL AMRANI (Morocco), Mr. DINU (Romania), Mr. HASHI (Somalia), Mr. NHLEKO (Swaziland) and Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia) said that had their delegations been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of the proposal.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1

10. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/43/46) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and of the Committee on Conferences (A/C.5/43/46/Add.1), the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$60,500 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989, and that the Secretary-General should be authorized to reconvene the group of six qualified experts appointed by him in 1988 under General Assembly resolution 42/37 C as an exception to resolution 40/243.

11. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.54/Rev.1

12. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/43/47) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, the additional costs involved would be covered from extrabudgetary resources and that no additional appropriation would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

13. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46

14. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana,

Greece, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, Portugal.

15. The Advisory Committee's recommendation on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.46 was adopted by 98 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

16. Mr. BROCHARD (France) said that his delegation had intended to abstain and not to vote in favour.

17. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) and Mr. HASHI (Somalia) said that had their delegations been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of the proposal.

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.2

18. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/43/49) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, no additional appropriation would be required under section 2B for the biennium 1988-1989.

19. It was so decided.

20. Mr. HOH (United States of America) said that the programme budget implications of the six First Committee resolutions just considered totalled over \$3 million, on a full-cost basis, over a three-year period. Although the United States supported appropriate activity by the United Nations in the fields of arms reduction and security, it believed that expenditure of that magnitude required careful review. His delegation was concerned at the nature of some of the appropriations requested and of the impact on the budget outline for the biennium 1990-1991. The Secretary-General had requested an additional \$330,600 under section 2B, (Disarmament affairs) for 1989. As noted in paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/43/7/Add.9), the sum consisted of \$244,100 for experts, \$55,300 for consultants and \$31,200 for staff travel. By exercising the restraint called for by the General Assembly in regard to expenditure of that kind, the

(Mr. Hoh, United States)

Secretariat should be able to absorb most of those additional costs. Moreover, the Secretary-General estimated that additional requirements would also arise under sections 2B (\$573,800) and 29 (\$1,438,400). While the recommendations of CPC concerning the budget outline for the biennium 1990-1991 left room for programmatic decisions taken by intergovernmental bodies in 1988 owing to the transition to a new budget process, that did not exempt the Secretariat from the requirement to absorb additional costs as far as possible. His delegation would expect most of any additional costs that might arise to be met within the overall level proposed by the Secretary-General for the biennium 1990-1991, in accordance with the intention of General Assembly resolution 41/213.

21. In the two recorded votes taken, his delegation had voted against the proposals because they involved substantial additional appropriations for 1989.

22. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said, with reference to the decision just taken on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.22/Rev.2 (A/C.5/43/49), that he wished to recall the statement made on behalf of the sponsors when the draft resolution was introduced in the First Committee, namely, that the projected expenditure for the biennium 1990-1991 would, as far as possible, be absorbed within the figure in the budget outline for that biennium.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26 submitted by the Special Political Committee concerning agenda item 77 (A/C.5/43/51)

23. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the programme of work called for in the draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee was similar to that covered in previous resolutions. Since those activities were regarded as perennial they had been included in the programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989. The non-conference costs of the programme of work were expected to total \$332,800 and conference-servicing costs were estimated at \$519,000. As indicated in paragraphs 19 and 20 of the Advisory Committee's report, it was estimated that no additional appropriation would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

24. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General, contained in document A/C.5/43/51, and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/43/L.26, no additional appropriation would be required under the programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989.

25. At the request of the representative of Israel, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central

African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

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

26. The proposal was adopted by 87 votes to 2, with 23 abstentions.

27. Mr. AZAZY (Yemen) said that if he had been present during the voting, he would have voted in favour of the proposal.

Review of travel and related entitlements of representatives attending United Nations meetings (continued) (A/43/7/Add.8; A/C.5/43/31)

Standards of accommodation for air travel (A/43/7/Add.8; A/C.5/43/4 and Corr.1)

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the informal consultations held on the items he believed that the Committee was in a position to take a decision. He therefore proposed that the Fifth Committee should endorse the recommendation of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 9 of its report (A/43/7/Add.8), to the effect that the payment of an allowance of \$US 8 to eligible members attending meetings of bodies and subsidiary bodies of the United Nations while travelling by a direct route, by ship, aeroplane or train, should be discontinued with effect from 1 January 1989, and that action on the other issues dealt with in documents A/C.5/43/4 and Corr.1, A/C.5/43/31 and A/43/7/Add.8 should be deferred. He further proposed that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Standards of accommodation for air travel" (A/C.5/43/31).

29. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.