

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



UN/SA COLLECTION

FIFTH COMMITTEE  
24th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 22 October 1979  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PIRSON (Belgium)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme (continued)

Section 20. International drug control

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

Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/34/SR.24  
26 October 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 98: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIIUM 1980-1981 (continued)  
(A/34/6 and Add.1, A/34/7)

First reading (continued)

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme (continued)

1. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) asked for assurances from the Secretariat that, if the reduction in the estimate for documents distribution recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 18.6 of its report (A/34/7) was adopted, the Secretariat could nevertheless distribute documentation for the Governing Council of UNEP to Member States in good time, as required by the rules of procedure; also that, should the allocations approved for that purpose prove inadequate, so that funds had to be redistributed within UNEP, resources would not be taken away from programmes benefiting developing Member States.
2. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that, in the light of the total appropriation requested under section 18 and the size of the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee, he could assure representatives that their concerns would be taken into account and that documents would be dealt with expeditiously. Should it be necessary, for that purpose, to have recourse to allocations approved for other items, the Secretariat would ensure that such transfers did not affect the programmes to which the Kenyan representative had referred.
3. In order to avoid any misunderstandings concerning the scope of the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General on the use of extrabudgetary resources, he stressed that the intention was not to report on the rationale used for distributing posts between extrabudgetary and regular budgetary resources, or that governing the transfer of posts from extrabudgetary funds to the regular budget. The report would deal with the services provided by the United Nations to activities funded from extrabudgetary resources, the Advisory Committee's stated intention of reverting to the procedures for the creation of extrabudgetary posts (A/34/7, para. 59) notwithstanding.
4. Mr. ELHOUDERI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, having received assurances that full services would be provided, he was prepared to withdraw the proposal he had made at the 23rd meeting.
5. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$10,678,200 under section 18 was approved in first reading without objection.
6. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that had a vote been taken on section 18 his delegation could not have supported the appropriation

/...

(Mr. Belyaev, Byelorussian SSR)

requested. The estimate for section 18 clearly demonstrated the reasons for concern amongst Member States at the lack of adequate management and control over resources in individual programmes and sections of the budget, and provided a concrete example of the shortcomings in the planning methodology used. An increase of 22.2 per cent in the resources for UNEP had been requested two years earlier - an increase not in accordance with the General Assembly's decisions on the medium-term plan - and the increase currently proposed amounted to 19.9 per cent over the revised appropriations for UNEP, as compared with an 11.3 per cent increase in over-all resources proposed for the budget as a whole. The Secretary-General's claim, in table 18.1, that the Programme had a negative rate of real growth of 1.2 per cent showed that the Organization was losing all conception of what real growth meant.

7. He noted a marked increase in the resources requested for liaison and regional representation which, as paragraph 18.32 of the proposed budget indicated, would cover only the liaison offices in New York and Geneva, the rest being financed from extrabudgetary resources. He wondered what the total amount would have been if the cost of the offices of the regional representatives at each of the regional commissions had also been charged to the regular budget. Moreover, an amount of \$48,800 was requested for temporary assistance, an item for which the Advisory Committee provided a partial explanation in paragraph 18.11 of its first report. It was not, however, clear whether the amount was for the recruitment of additional staff or to cover services provided by staff in established posts. In his delegation's view, the budget proposals should have mentioned the transfer, approved in 1977, of five Professional posts and four General Service posts from extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget. Under the current proposals the manning table financed by the regular budget did not change, but the staff financed from extrabudgetary resources were to be increased.

8. In his delegation's view, the Advisory Committee had adopted a somewhat liberal approach to the estimate for UNEP and had recommended a minimal reduction.

9. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that his delegation remained convinced that the increases recommended in various parts of section 18 were unjustified, and had joined in the consensus primarily in order to help the Committee in its work.

#### Section 20. International drug control

10. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had accepted the Secretary-General's proposal for one new post under section 20, as explained in paragraph 20.3 of its first report. It had, however, recommended a reduction of \$140,800, in accordance with its views on the percentage to be applied for calculating common staff costs at Vienna (para. 20.4).

11. Mr. SWEGER (Sweden), noting that section 20 displayed a negative rate of real growth of 0.7 per cent, stated that his delegation attached great importance

/...

(Mr. Sweger, Sweden)

to international drug control activities and believed they should receive a higher than average priority. In particular, the resources provided under the regular budget for staff costs should be increased, so that extrabudgetary funds could be used exclusively for operational projects.

12. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation would have no difficulty in supporting the recommended appropriation under section 20, and asked how activities financed from extrabudgetary resources were distributed regionally.

13. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) commented that international drug control was one of the few areas in which genuine budgetary restraint had been applied, and in which the relocation of a secretariat unit had been of financial benefit to the Organization. Further reductions could be damaging to the operational projects, the cost of which should not be met from extrabudgetary resources alone. His delegation would support any attempt to strengthen the international drug control programme and give it a higher priority.

14. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) asked whether the various meetings scheduled for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and INCB were in keeping with the decision of the Economic and Social Council to rationalize the meeting schedules of its subsidiary bodies.

15. His delegation supported the recommendations of ACABQ. It welcomed the fact that the budget proposals actually reported the completion of programme elements (A/34/6, para. 20.11); such honesty was not common.

16. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation agreed on the importance of international drug control, since the spreading use of drugs led to crime and health problems. He inquired as to the meaning of paragraph 20.23 of the proposed programme budget.

17. Mr. OUATTARA (Ivory Coast) asked whether the negative growth rate of 0.7 per cent was advisable in view of the importance of international drug control. It had to be borne in mind that the activities undertaken by the United Nations in that field affected the young people and workers of many Member States. His delegation strongly supported the Secretary-General's proposals under section 20. It did, however, understand the reasons that had led the Advisory Committee to recommend a reduction in the percentage used to calculate common staff costs, and could therefore support that recommendation, as set out in paragraph 20.4 of the Advisory Committee's first report.

18. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his Government had consistently supported the programme of international drug control, to which it attached considerable importance. The significant voluntary contributions it had made were evidence of that support. He noted that the estimate for the

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

biennium 1980-1981 was less than the revised appropriations for the current biennium; that was in large part due to reduced staff costs as a result of the transfer from Geneva to Vienna. The slight reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee in the percentage used for the purposes of calculating common staff costs was a technical adjustment which would have no adverse impact on the programme of activities. His delegation therefore supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations, including the recommendation to approve the additional post that had been requested for the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board.

19. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division), replying to a question from the representative of the Philippines on the distribution of extrabudgetary resources, said that he could not give an answer immediately since, by definition, extrabudgetary resources did not fall within the proposed programme budget, and any reference to them was included merely for information purposes. Replying to the question raised by the representative of Indonesia, he explained that the sixth special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had been approved by the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session in 1979 and had been included in the calendar of conferences. He regretted that paragraph 20.23 of the proposed programme budget was unclear, as the representative of Italy had pointed out.

20. In reply to the comments made by the representatives of the Ivory Coast and of Sweden, he said that the negative growth rate might appear somewhat paradoxical, especially when an extra post was being recommended. He wished to stress in that connexion paragraph 20.6, which indicated that it was by strict control on expenditure for travel that it had been possible to propose estimates showing a slight decrease and thereby compensate for the additional post requested. In certain cases, a small percentage of negative growth was not incompatible with the strengthening of a secretariat unit to carry out the programmes required of it.

21. Mr. PAL (India) criticized the use, in respect of travel, of an inflation figure of 11.2 per cent in table 20.6. Since the special sessions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs were held early in the year, it did not seem accurate to use the projected inflation rate for the full year. He was surprised that the Advisory Committee had not made a recommendation similar to that in paragraph 17.18 of its first report with respect to the Third General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

22. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) observed that the comments made by the representative of India were fully justified. The use of an annual inflation figure did, of course, work well in the case of permanent posts, but its use in respect of conferences was obviously debatable. However, it had not been the practice to apply monthly inflation rates. In some cases, an adjustment had been made to take account of the month in which a conference was to be held but, in the case in point, that had not been done.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that in the case of large conferences it was clearly very important to take account of the month in which the event was to be held.

/...

24. Mr. PAL (India) said that he was very concerned to see the large appropriation being requested for consultants in paragraph 20.12 of the proposed programme budget. He believed that there should be sufficient expertise within the Office of Legal Affairs to deal with the legal aspects of treaty provisions.

25. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) said that it was his understanding that the consultants were being requested to deal with highly specialized legal matters. However, he would endeavour to obtain more details for the representative of India, if he so desired.

26. Mr. PAL (India) said it was somewhat surprising that the Office of Legal Affairs had experts on the rather arcane subject of the law of outer space, but had no one to deal with the legal aspects of narcotics control.

27. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$5,904,200 under section 20 was approved in first reading without objection.

28. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that had the estimates under section 20 been put to a vote, his delegation would have voted against, based on its position of principle with respect to the inclusion of funds to compensate for inflation and any proposal to increase staff costs.

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

29. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee recognized the heavy responsibility of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in the light of the world refugee situation. It had therefore accepted virtually the entire appropriation requested by the Secretary-General, except as outlined in paragraph 21.12 of its first report, where it had recommended that the Department of Public Information should assist the High Commissioner in the field of public information, particularly in respect of contractual services for the production of films. It had therefore proposed to reduce the estimates in that connexion by \$11,400, and also to recommend against the request for \$9,800 for public information consultants.

30. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), referring to paragraphs 21.2 and 21.3 of the proposed programme budget, said that he was curious to know who decided which posts should be financed from extrabudgetary resources; his comment applied not only to section 21 but to many other sections of the budget. In view of the humanitarian character of activities for refugees, his delegation supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

31. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that it was not necessary to point out the increasing importance of the functions of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in the current international refugee situation and expressed the sincere appreciation of his delegation for the work that was being done to assist refugees. His own

(Mr. Kuyama, Japan)

Government had given both moral and financial support to the humanitarian work being carried out by the High Commissioner and, although it noted that the estimate for the biennium 1980-1981 showed an increase of 16.9 per cent, with a real growth rate well above average, it would be prepared to accept that increase in view of the explanations given in paragraphs 21.1 to 21.6 of the proposed programme budget.

32. On the question of the transfer to the regular budget of posts previously financed from extrabudgetary resources, his delegation took the view that such transfers should in principle, be limited to the greatest possible extent. However, in view of the current international refugee situation, it could accept the transfer of five posts to the regular budget, as recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 21.4 of its first report, together with the transfer of the 12 posts already authorized for the current biennium. The transfers being requested were six fewer than those originally planned, but he took it that the additional six posts would be proposed for transfer during the biennium 1982-1983. In paragraph 21.3 of its first report, the Advisory Committee had mentioned that there was a possibility that the Secretary-General would propose the transfer of additional posts in subsequent biennia. His delegation endorsed the Advisory Committee's position as set out in paragraph 21.4 that it would consider any future requests for the transfer of posts in the context of its examination of the Secretary-General's proposals for future biennia. It could also support the Advisory Committee's recommendation with respect to the reclassification of the post of Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees to the level of Assistant Secretary-General (para. 21.7), as well as all the other recommendations of the Advisory Committee on section 21.

33. Mr. Marios EVRIVIÁDES (Cyprus) said that, in the view of his delegation, it was vital to provide the necessary funds for the work of the High Commissioner for Refugees; it therefore fully endorsed the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General. It would have been preferable if the Advisory Committee had done likewise, although it had obviously taken into account the humanitarian nature of the activities when recommending reductions. From 490 projects in 1976, the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees had handled some 900 projects in 1978 at a cost of \$145 million. The human drama of refugees was increasing at an alarming rate, and it was particularly regrettable that a large number of the refugees in the care of the Office of the High Commissioner were in that situation, not because of natural disasters beyond human control, but because of territorial expansionism and the efforts of those who would re-establish long-lost empires. If countries refrained from expansionist policies and turned their attention to domestic matters, the expenses of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees would be greatly reduced, and human resources too would be released to cope with natural disasters, such as those which had recently hit the Caribbean area. His delegation was grateful to the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees for its efforts to improve the lot of the afflicted.

34. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that his Government agreed with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the importance of assistance to refugees. It had consistently supported the humanitarian activities of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. The reductions being recommended by the Advisory

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

Committee under section 21 were really quite modest, a mere \$21,200 out of a total estimate of \$25.7 million.

35. Given the complications which arose from the need to transfer posts financed from extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget, his delegation implored the financial officers of the Secretariat and the High Commissioner for Refugees to rethink the methodology currently being followed, with a view to proposing an arrangement in future budgets whereby new posts would be provided directly from the appropriate resources, so as to avoid having to transfer posts from one form of financing to another at a later stage. His delegation noted that the above-average real growth rate of 3.3 per cent in the estimate under section 21 was a result of the current international refugee situation and the consequential increase in demand for the services of the Office. The two reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee both applied to the field of public information where, it was believed, the Department of Public Information should be able to provide the necessary assistance to the Office of the High Commissioner.

36. The post reclassifications being requested by the Secretary-General were further examples of the "grade gallop" phenomenon to which his delegation had already drawn the Committee's attention. It was opposed in principle to such reclassification, as it was to the transfer of posts previously financed from extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget.

37. Mr. DE FACQ (Belgium) said that his delegation held the work of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in high esteem. He requested clarification in respect of the requests for permanent posts; he wondered whether the staff concerned would receive permanent contracts. Given that refugee problems were, in theory, temporary, the Organization might be creating difficulties for itself if it granted permanent contracts for posts which were also, in theory, temporary.

38. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) requested clarification on the meaning of the term "substantive advice" in paragraph 21.55 of the proposed programme budget. At first sight, her delegation would have preferred the money to be spent on substantive activities to aid refugees. She had noted the Advisory Committee's recommendation for a reduction in the estimate for public information activities on the ground that the Department of Public Information (DPI) could provide the necessary assistance. She wondered, however, whether the Secretary-General's request for experts implied that there were doubts as to the ability of DPI to carry out the tasks in question.

39. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) said that he could not understand why it should be so difficult to prepare estimates of extrabudgetary resources in view of the fact that the scope and nature of the refugee problem were so well known. He asked whether the transfer of posts from voluntary financing to the regular budget was necessitated by a reduction in voluntary contributions, or whether there was some other cause.

40. He noted the Advisory Committee's concurrence in the proposal in paragraph 21.36 of the proposed programme budget to reclassify from P-5 to D-1 the

/...



(Mr. Jasabe, Sierra Leone)

post of the regional representative of the High Commissioner for Refugees in South-East Asia. He wondered what the effects of that action might be on staff morale in other regions where the post of the regional representative was at the P-5 level. He did not understand why the South-East Asia region should be particularly favoured.

41. With regard to the reduction in the estimates recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 21.12 of its first report, he asked why the Secretary-General had not entrusted the information tasks in question to the Department of Public Information, and had wished instead to have recourse to outside contractors.

42. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees should be provided with all the means it needed to play its due part in an increasingly troubled world. He was not in favour of the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee; indeed, he hoped that funds for the High Commissioner's Office would increase as its responsibilities grew.

43. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia), referring to the proposed reclassification of the post of Deputy High Commissioner (A/34/6, para. 21.12), said that he was in no way opposed to promotions where they were merited; however, bearing in mind the fact that the level of posts in the higher echelons of the Secretariat was a political as much as a functional matter, and that the Commissioner's staff must be motivated at least to some extent by a sense of faith and vocation, he felt that the proposed reclassification needed a far more detailed and specific justification than had been given. For example, was it the case that the incumbent had reached the ceiling of his grade and could not therefore receive a promotion which he deserved? He asked that section 21B (Executive direction and management), should be put to a separate vote.

44. Mr. RUEDAS (Assistant Secretary-General for Financial Services) said that the incumbent had been only a few years in the post in question, so that he had not yet reached the upper limit of his grade.

45. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) asked what would be the benefit to the refugees of the proposal to reclassify the post.

46. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee defer its decision on section 21 to a subsequent meeting.

47. It was so decided.

#### Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

48. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee transmitted the estimate to the Fifth Committee for appropriate consideration and decision.

/...

49. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the Advisory Committee had merely transmitted the request for funds, without making any recommendation.

50. Mr. BAUCHARD (France) said that his Government generally supported technical assistance programmes, but did not think that they should be financed by contributions compulsorily levied on all Member States. Technical assistance activities should be financed by voluntary contributions administered by UNDP. His delegation would therefore vote against an appropriation under section 24.

51. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted with surprise that the title of the section referred to "technical co-operation" rather than "technical assistance", which he thought was the preferable term. He felt that the manner in which the Advisory Committee had transmitted the request for funds to the Fifth Committee was significant.

52. He recalled that his delegation had already stated its view that the United Nations budget could not be used to finance technical assistance programmes, which should be financed solely by voluntary contributions, so that in accordance with past practice the Soviet Union would provide its share of the funds for technical assistance as a voluntary contribution in national currency (A/C.5/34/SR.18, para. 21). He reaffirmed that view, and added that the whole question of the financing of technical assistance should have been settled long since.

53. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that discussions about ways of financing technical co-operation tended to lose sight of the fact that regardless of whether the funds were administered by the United Nations, UNDP or any other agency, the expenditures involved were insignificant in comparison with the needs of the developing countries.

54. Mr. BUNC (Yugoslavia) said that, if it were borne in mind that three quarters of the world's population needed technical assistance, the figure of \$27 million proposed for the United Nations regular programme of technical co-operation was simply not credible. He asked for an explanation of how the figure had been arrived at.

55. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) agreed that the figure was small, because the section in question had been retained in the budget as a "sleeping" section showing no growth. The section should not be in the regular budget at all, and the funds in question should be put together with those given to UNDP through voluntary contributions.

56. The consequence of retaining the technical assistance section in the regular budget was that some countries withheld their contribution under the section and others made it in non-convertible currency. The section should be deleted altogether from future proposed programme budgets and, with that consideration in mind, his delegation would not be able to support the request for funds under section 24, which, he noted, had not been endorsed by the Advisory Committee.

(Mr. Majoli, Italy)

57. He preferred the term "technical co-operation" to "technical assistance", which had a paternalistic ring about it. All countries were interdependent and co-operated in one way or another when giving and receiving technical services.

58. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that, although the amount requested under section 24 was small, the question of technical co-operation itself was nevertheless one of great importance. It was not the provision of technical co-operation itself which was in dispute, but the manner in which the funds provided should be administered. He of course supported the provision of funds through UNDP, but emphasized that the allocations being requested under the United Nations regular budget were to be regarded as additional. The fact that they were provided under the regular budget meant that they could be used to cover urgent needs, for which the UNDP procedures would be too time-consuming. Many small States emerging into full sovereignty would deplore any move to deprive them of a means of rapid response to their particular needs. For those reasons, his delegation felt strongly that section 24 should be retained in the proposed programme budget.

59. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that the views of his Government with regard to the financing of technical assistance activities under the regular budget were well known. In 1978 the United States Government had, in fact, faced a specific legislative prohibition against the funding of technical assistance under the regular budget. That prohibition had been overcome in 1979 through the strenuous efforts of the President, the sympathetic support of broad segments of the United States public and the understanding of many members of the United States Congress. Thus, his Government was in a position to meet in full its 1979 assessment.

60. Nevertheless the United States Government still favoured the elimination of technical assistance activities from the regular budget. If more complete details on those activities were provided to the Fifth Committee, his delegation believed that considerable support would exist for the exclusion of section 24 from the regular budget. There was little point in referring to the annual reports on United Nations technical assistance activities that were submitted to the UNDP Governing Council, since the information they contained was inadequate. The Committee had recently spent considerable time on an estimate for \$40,000, and yet it was rushing to take a decision on a request for \$27.2 million under section 24 on the basis of very sketchy information.

61. His delegation firmly believed that technical assistance should be financed by voluntary contributions and administered by UNDP, which had proper procedures for the effective utilization of resources.

62. Mr. OUATTARA (Ivory Coast) said that very early in its history the United Nations had decided to include in the regular budget a section devoted to technical assistance as a symbol of the co-operation among States in the post-war period. His delegation attached great importance to the continued inclusion in the regular budget of an appropriation for technical assistance, however modest. If developed countries were prepared to finance technical assistance through voluntary contributions, they could certainly provide the modest sum requested under section 24.

63. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that section 24 symbolized the General Assembly's concern to deal with the most urgent problems facing the international community and to provide the resources needed for that purpose. The regular programme of technical co-operation was of great importance, and his delegation opposed any suggestion that it should be removed from the budget. The more co-operation was expanded, the greater the need would be for resources. If co-operation was strengthened within UNDP, there was no reason why it could not also be stepped up within the framework of the United Nations itself.

64. Mr. DOWSE (United Kingdom) said that his country supported international activities in the field of technical assistance as evidenced by the fact that it was a major contributor to UNDP. His delegation's well-known position of principle was that technical assistance should be financed from voluntary contributions and co-ordinated through UNDP. In accordance with that position, his delegation would vote against the appropriation requested under section 24.

65. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that his delegation attached great importance to section 24 of the budget and the programmes which it financed. The appropriation for technical assistance, however modest, was a token of international solidarity in an area of great importance to the developing countries.

66. He did not agree with the opinion of the United States representative concerning the annual reports on United Nations technical assistance activities submitted to the UNDP Governing Council; and believed that the reports should be submitted to the Fifth Committee for its information.

67. There were numerous references in the budget narrative to the strengthening of various programme components under section 24. However, he did not see how, if the global appropriation was maintained roughly at the 1978-1979 level, it would be possible to strengthen any part of the programme. Accordingly, he inquired whether there had been any changes in the allocation of resources among the various programme elements.

68. He asked how the Secretariat had distributed over the three programme components the amounts contributed by Member States in non-convertible currencies. He noted that under sectoral advisory services no funds contributed in non-convertible currencies had been used in 1978-1979 for training or short-term advisory services, and he asked whether the reason was that the Secretariat had been unable to find ways of using those funds.

69. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said that his delegation supported the retention of section 24 in the regular budget, since the technical assistance programmes financed from voluntary contributions overlooked some areas which were of crucial importance to the developing countries. He had doubts, however, regarding the provision of technical assistance in the field of human settlements, now that the Centre for Human Settlements was operational.

70. The CHAIRMAN observed that the programme narrative under section 24 was woefully inadequate and extremely vague. He was surprised that the annual reports on technical assistance activities financed under the regular budget were not considered by one of the Main Committees of the General Assembly.

71. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America), referring to table 24.4 of the proposed programme budget, asked to what extent the allocation of resources for sectoral advisory services in 1980-1981 of Governments concerning the relative priorities to be assigned to the various sectors. He wished to know, in particular, whether that allocation had been patterned on the actual allocation for 1978-1979.

72. Mr. AYADHI (Tunisia) said that the fact that only 21.8 per cent of the total resources proposed were to be allocated to regional and subregional advisory services showed the extent to which the Secretariat had shown restraint and to which it was still under pressure from certain quarters. His delegation considered those services to be one of the most important components of technical assistance under the regular budget in view of the trend, encouraged by the United Nations itself, towards greater regional and subregional co-operation and integration. His delegation would, therefore, have preferred an estimate that was more commensurate with actual needs.

73. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) asked whether reports on the programming and use of funds provided for regional and subregional advisory services were submitted to the governing bodies of the regional commissions, which, as indicated in paragraph 24.9 of the proposed budget, were responsible for administering that programme component, and, if so, whether they could be submitted for the consideration of the Fifth Committee in the budget approval process.

74. Mr. DE FACQ (Belgium) requested clarification concerning the meaning of the words "group training on an interregional basis" in paragraph 24.11 (c) of the proposed programme budget.

75. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) suggested that the Committee should defer its decision on section 24 until a future meeting in order to give delegations an opportunity to reflect on the considerations put forward by the representatives of developing countries.

76. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.