



FIFTH COMMITTEE
69th meeting
held on
Friday, 16 December 1983
at 8 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 69th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KUYAMA (Japan)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 12 (continued)

Job classification of the General Service category in Geneva

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 80 (a)

Revised estimates under section 5B, Centre for Science and Technology for Development, arising from the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development in its resolution 4 (V) (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.5/38/SR.69
21 December 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 8.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 12 (continued) (A/C.5/38/94)

1. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the issues before the Committee were of great import, since they involved the solution of the economic and technical problems of African countries. The Soviet Union was making strenuous efforts to develop trade and economic and scientific co-operation with African States, including, in particular, the development of industry and transport, which were of critical importance to economic development and genuine independence. However, such activities were not within the purview of the United Nations and should not be funded from the regular budget. His delegation therefore requested a vote on the Secretary-General's estimates in document A/C.5/38/94, and would vote against them.
2. Mr. FORAN (Controller), replying to questions that had been put, said that the amount of \$1 million referred to in document A/C.5/38/94, paragraph 20, would finance all the activities listed under items (a), (d), (e) and (f), and would also enable work to begin on the activities listed under (b) and (c). Additional, voluntary contributions of \$1,307,000 would be needed to complete the activities under the latter two items.
3. Mr. HANSEN (Assistant Secretary-General for Programme Planning and Co-ordination) said that the programme elements included under item (a) in paragraph 20 were not covered in the proposed programme budget, so that other sources of funds were needed. The various meetings to be held under items (d), (e) and (f) would receive Secretariat support services from the regular budget. The studies referred to in items (b) and (c) would be partly covered by the regular budget, as such studies often were. For example, a number of manpower studies and training workshops in areas such as inland waterways transport, port workers and air transport would be so financed. In addition, a number of training and survey activities - for example, the training of railway staff - were being financed from funds raised for the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.
4. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that the Decade was of great importance to his country, which found it unacceptable that an arbitrary ceiling of \$1 million should have been placed on the activities referred to in paragraph 20. There had not even been any consultations to decide what proportion of the costs could be absorbed. His delegation proposed that the General Assembly should be informed that the additional appropriation of \$1 million should remain open and should be subject to review by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its next session.

5. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation strongly objected to the way in which a ceiling had been placed on the allocations for the Decade. Such a situation was quite unacceptable and should not be allowed to recur. His delegation wished to know exactly where it was expected that the additional resources of \$1,307,700 would come from. Which countries were expected to donate that amount? His delegation agreed that the activities which were not covered by the \$1 million should be submitted for consideration by CPC and then examined by the Fifth Committee at the thirty-ninth session.
6. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that it was quite irrational for a figure of \$1 million to have been imposed. It would be interesting to know whether any of the additional amount required could be absorbed. The procedure followed was irresponsible and regrettable, and his delegation trusted that it would not be used again.
7. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) said that the Fifth Committee was witnessing for the first time an attempt to impose conditions on it. The situation was quite unacceptable. No authority other than the Fifth Committee had the right to impose a ceiling on activities carried out under a resolution. It was particularly scandalous in view of the fact that problems of transport and communications in African countries were of critical importance. Africa, which had been so much exploited, had a right to international assistance in solving its problems. The Fifth Committee should reject the statement of administrative and financial implications before it.
8. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that his delegation was angered by the situation in which the Committee found itself. Attempts had been made in the past to impose a ceiling on the budget, but the concept had been democratically rejected by Member States. Now efforts were being made to impose a ceiling indirectly. The situation was utterly scandalous. His delegation endorsed the views expressed by the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon.
9. Mr. MADAR (Somalia) endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of the United Republic of Cameroon, Kenya, Morocco, Benin and Egypt. It was unacceptable that another Committee should tell the Fifth Committee what to do. Given the importance of transport and communications to Africa's development, the placing of an arbitrary ceiling on the amount to be allocated for that item must be rejected.
10. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) asked where the additional \$1 million would come from if savings could not be achieved. His delegation strongly supported the recommendations of ACABQ, as amended by the United Republic of Cameroon.
11. Mr. RALLIS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the ten States members of the European Economic Community, said that the EEC countries were concerned at the tenor of the debate on the question. The intent of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which specified that no resolution involving expenditure should be recommended by a committee for approval by the General Assembly unless it was accompanied by an estimate of expenditures prepared by the Secretary-General, was surely that the committees and other bodies should take into

(Mr. Rallis, Greece)

account the financial implications of draft resolutions. If committees chose to impose limits, that was an expression of their view of the priorities involved. Rule 153 also stated that the Fifth Committee must have had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon the budget estimates of the United Nations, but it did not give the Fifth Committee exclusive power as to the manner of financing. Moreover, the difficulties being faced by the Committee were partly due to the transitional period in which it found itself.

12. Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said that the representative of Greece had misunderstood the situation. It was evident that the Fifth Committee was the only committee which had the power to decide on budgetary ceilings.

13. Miss DEREGIBUS (Argentina) disagreed with the statement by the representative of Greece. Those who had drafted the rules of procedure of the General Assembly had given the Fifth Committee the power to decide on resources for activities programmed by other committees. The cost of potential programmes should not be a factor in the negotiation process in the substantive committees.

14. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) said that his delegation would support the proposal, as it had done in the Second Committee, but it did not support the practice of adopting specific figures. Other committees could not express their views on budgetary priorities without understanding the issues involved. Rather than setting budgetary limits, the substantive committees should spell out their priorities more clearly. Certain flexibilities were built into the system so that the Secretary-General could transfer funds, with the approval of ACABQ, without General Assembly approval. In certain cases, the Secretary-General could also modify expenditures on his own authority.

15. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that it was dangerous to apply a double standard. If the substantive committees had the authority to apply budgetary standards, then the Fifth Committee should be allowed to deal with substantive matters. His delegation was also concerned about the phrase "within existing resources", which had been used in certain draft resolutions, because, if new activities had to be financed within existing resources, the three months' work of the Fifth Committee might be rendered worthless.

16. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that he was extremely upset by the statement of the representative of Greece because the latter had changed the subject under discussion, namely, the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa. His delegation endorsed the view that no committee other than the Fifth Committee had the right to pass judgement on financial matters.

17. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the delegations for which the representative of Greece had spoken had acted in bad faith during the negotiations in the Second Committee. From the outset, certain delegations had tried to undermine the substantive decisions and to transfer questions within the purview of the Fifth Committee to other committees. Knowing that their arguments would not stand examination in the Fifth Committee, they had sought to portray the decision concerning financing as a consensus which had been reached elsewhere. Such conduct was not befitting the Organization and did not warrant the time it was taking up.

/...

18. Mr. FIRSON (Belgium) said that he was concerned at the accusation by the representative of Morocco that some delegations were acting in bad faith. Having studied the process of negotiation on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30, he had no doubt that an agreement had been reached with the African Group on the package of \$1 million. It was on the basis of that agreement, arrived at in good faith, that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Second Committee.

19. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that his delegation had no difficulty in supporting the additional appropriation of \$1 million and had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Second Committee. The Fifth Committee should return to the specific issue at hand and take a decision on the proposal of the representative of the United Republic of Cameroon and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

20. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that he had made his proposal because he felt that the matter should be monitored very closely and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should be given the opportunity of recommending changes. If the issue was to be put to the vote, his delegation would request a recorded vote.

21. Mr. FORAN (Controller), replying to a point raised by the representative of Kenya, said that, since paragraph 10 of the draft resolution was addressed to the Secretary-General, it would rest with him to appeal to Member States and other parties for voluntary contributions to support the activities.

22. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and in the light of the proposal by the United Republic of Cameroon, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30, as orally revised, an additional appropriation of \$1 million would be required under section 13 of the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985, on the understanding that the implementation of the activities foreseen in the draft resolution would be the subject of a report to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session through the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

23. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus and his delegation did not wish to break that consensus. The request for a vote was itself a breach of the consensus reached in the Second Committee, and he hoped that the recorded vote would show exactly who had broken that consensus and who had gone along with it.

24. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that, since his delegation had voted against the draft resolution in the Second Committee, it was incorrect to say that there had been a consensus. It would vote in exactly the same way on the Chairman's proposal.

25. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposal. The Fifth Committee should not, however, be put in such a situation again.

26. A recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

27. The proposal was adopted by 83 votes to 9.

Job classification of the General Service category in Geneva (A/C.5/38/92 and Corr. 1).

28. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that document A/C.5/38/92 and Corr. 1 contained the report of the Secretary-General on the results of the job classification exercise carried out for all posts in the General Service category at Geneva and the proposed measures to implement those results. Paragraphs 2 to 6 gave the background to the exercise and described the results. The Secretary-General proposed to convert 11 General Service posts to the Professional category; to transfer 72 General Service Principal level posts between budget sections to reflect the new distribution of General Service posts classified at the Principal level, and to provide 27 "temporary Principal level" posts to accommodate the situation whereby 29 posts currently occupied at the Principal level had been classified below that level. A tabular summary of the Secretary-General's proposals was provided in paragraph 9.

29. Of the 11 posts classified at the Professional level, only 1 was currently vacant. In paragraph 10, the Secretary-General stated his belief that, since the incumbents of the remaining 10 posts had been exercising the functions concerned prior to the introduction of competitive examinations, they should be considered for promotions to the Professional level notwithstanding the requirements of General Assembly resolution 33/143. In that connection, he pointed out that the competitive examination had applied to the filling of vacant posts. He stated that first consideration for promotions would be given to those persons who had discharged the higher-level functions for more than four years. The vacant post would be filled through external recruitment.

(Mr. Mselle)

30. As stated in paragraph 12 of the report, the financial implications of reclassifying the 11 posts amounted to \$58,000 under section 10, \$113,400 under section 15, and \$22,800 under section 28I, for a total of \$194,200 for 1984-1985. Staff assessment under section 31 and income from staff assessment under income section 1 would decrease by \$84,000. The Advisory Committee had been informed that that decrease was due to the fact that standard costs included staff assessment calculated on the total net salary for General Service staff but only on the net base pay, not including post adjustment, for Professionals.

31. In paragraph 17, the Secretary-General indicated that every effort would be made to absorb the costs of reclassifying 11 General Service posts to the Professional level and that no appropriation was being requested at the current stage. On that basis, and in view of the special circumstances involved, the Advisory Committee recommended, as an exception to the requirements of General Assembly resolution 33/143, acceptance of the Secretary-General's proposals for dealing with the 11 General Service posts at Geneva which had been reclassified at the Professional level.

32. The Advisory Committee also recommended approval of the transfer of the 72 posts at the Principal level between the various sections of the budget to meet the requirements shown in table (b) of paragraph 9 of the report. Since the total number of Principal level posts would not change as a result of the redeployment, no additional appropriation would be required for the budget as a whole.

33. As for the requested 27 "temporary Principal level" posts to accommodate the 29 staff members whose posts had been reclassified below the Principal level, the Advisory Committee noted that the temporary arrangement would be entirely phased out by January 1990, in the manner indicated in paragraph 16 of the report. The estimated costs of maintaining the 27 lower-level posts as "temporary Principal level" posts were \$216,000 for 1984-1985, \$149,000 for 1986-1987 and \$85,000 for 1988-1989. The Secretary-General indicated in paragraph 17 that every effort would be made to absorb those costs and that he was not requesting any appropriation at the present stage. On that basis the Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's request to provide 27 "temporary Principal level" posts.

34. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should accept the proposals of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/38/92 and Corr.1.

35. It was so decided.

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1, as orally revised, concerning agenda item 80 (a) (A/38/7/Add.20; A/C.5/38/86)

36. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew the Fifth Committee's attention to paragraph 5 of document A/38/7/Add.20, in which the Advisory Committee noted that it was the third time

/...

(Mr. Mselle)

that the General Assembly was being requested to give some assistance to the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). The Advisory Committee referred to resolutions 35/53 and 36/75, by which grants-in-aid amounting to \$658,300 had been given. The proposal recommended by the Second Committee was to advance a loan to UNITAR of \$886,000 to cover the deficit in its budget for 1983. In paragraph 6 of its report, the Advisory Committee stated its view that UNITAR should have done more to manage the limited resources available to it. The Advisory Committee was not convinced that the kind of reorganization which had taken place should have led to the additional expenditure which had been part of the deficit. In paragraph 7, the Advisory Committee noted that, if the present difficulties continued, they would cast doubts on UNITAR's future financial viability. It was therefore really doubtful whether the advance would ever be paid back.

37. The Advisory Committee's opinion was that the time had come for all parties concerned to re-examine the future role of UNITAR. The Advisory Committee recommended that the report which the Secretary-General would be submitting to the General Assembly on the long-term financial arrangements of UNITAR should also take into account the institutional developments which had taken place since UNITAR had been established. Some of the areas to be taken into account were mentioned in paragraph 7 of the Advisory Committee's report.

38. The fact that the amount to be loaned was specified in the draft resolution proposed by the Second Committee had circumscribed the role of the Advisory Committee in determining whether \$886,000 was the actual deficit. The Committee was, however, constrained to recommend that, if the amount was accepted or if the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee was adopted by the General Assembly, the \$886,000 should be obtained from the savings realized in the 1982-1983 programme budget.

39. The performance report on that question (A/C.5/38/49) had indicated an amount of \$4,074,000 in net decrease in requirements, out of which \$240,000 for UNDR0 had been taken, leaving a balance of \$3,834,000. The Advisory Committee recommended that the loan should come from that amount and that on that basis there should be no additional appropriation for the 1984-1985 budget.

40. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly opposed the request for a loan of \$886,000 to UNITAR. Whatever the source of the funds, it was still an assessment to Member States. An advance of that type undermined the voluntary funding of United Nations operational activities, and his delegation had consistently rejected the notion that voluntarily funded organizations could look to the regular budget to bail them out. His delegation appreciated the honest assessment made by the Chairman of ACABQ that there was little probability that the money would be repaid. In seeking such an advance, the normal procedure would have been to seek a loan from the Working Capital Fund. However, that idea had not been put forward, no doubt in order to protect the Working Capital Fund itself.

(Mr. Keller, United States)

41. The answer to UNITAR's problem of insufficient funding was to adjust its programmes to economic realities. The lack of resources for a voluntarily funded organization such as UNITAR was strong evidence that the organization or its programme lacked the support of donors. The United States had supported UNITAR generously in the past and had earmarked \$422,000 from its 1984 budget for the Institute. However, if the request for the loan - or grant, as it actually was - were to be approved, the United States Government would give serious consideration to reducing the voluntary contribution for 1984 by \$221,500, or 25 per cent of the full loan amount.

42. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation particularly appreciated the highly relevant comments made in paragraph 6 of the Advisory Committee's report and supported the recommendations made by ACABQ, especially in paragraph 7. UNITAR should re-examine the programmes it intended to carry out and should limit its aspirations to its possibilities, concentrating on training and on research related to training. His delegation was concerned at the size of the advance requested, when the Institute's total budget was barely double that amount. To fill the deficit, savings would have to be taken from the United Nations programme budget for 1982-1983, an action which the Fifth Committee had so far refused to approve for more important issues.

43. Mr. NUÑEZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation attached great importance to the activities of UNITAR and viewed its economic problems with concern. It believed that there was a pressing need to give the Institute the financial resources required to carry out its work, and it was therefore in favour of the Secretary-General's proposals.

44. Mr. van HELLENBERG HUBAR (Netherlands) said that the content of the Advisory Committee's report was not a cause for optimism. It might have been possible for the previous management to predict more accurately the level of resources that it could expect from voluntary contributions. In view of the Advisory Committee's assessment of the future financial viability of UNITAR, his delegation supported the proposal made in paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report. That proposal would cost some money, but it was more honest than trying to meet the deficit through a grant or a loan, which would probably not be repaid.

45. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, UNITAR, having experienced a deficit since 1970, had continued to expand its activities without regard for reality. It should have changed the orientation of its programmes in order to retain the interest of States. The JIU report on UNITAR (A/35/181, annex) had highlighted the problems facing the Institute and had recommended that consideration should be given, for instance, to closing its Geneva office. Since the Soviet Union did not believe that organizations financed on a voluntary basis should receive funding from the regular budget, he proposed that the appropriation referred to in document A/C.5/38/86 should be put to a vote, and his delegation would vote against it.

46. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that an organization established on a voluntary basis should not rely on the regular budget for financing. His delegation could not, therefore, support the proposal contained in document A/C.5/38/86. It shared the doubts of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee as to the prospects of repayment of the advance. Furthermore, since the figure requested was rather high in relation to the Institute's budget, he wondered how UNITAR had continued operations with so substantial a deficit. In most organizations, remedial action would have been taken long before such a situation had arisen.
47. Mr. FORAN (Controller), replying to the question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom, said that, broadly speaking, UNITAR had two funds - a General Fund, which was in deficit, and a Special Purpose Fund, which was not. The Special Purpose Fund had been used to cover the deficit in the General Fund.
48. Mr. BANGURA (Sierra Leone) said that UNITAR was of great importance to the United Nations, and its activities had helped the developing countries and the international community as a whole. His delegation therefore supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee so as to enable the Institute to continue its work on behalf of the international community.
49. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, according to paragraph 6 of the Advisory Committee's report, \$160,500 of the increase in the Institute's 1983 expenditure budget related to the expansion of the staffing establishment in the Office of the Executive Director. She would like to know how it had been possible to expand the staffing establishment at a time when streamlining was supposed to be taking place.
50. Mr. ANDEMICHAEL (United Nations Institute for Training and Research) said that, on assuming office in 1983, the Executive Director had felt that the Institute's deficit had forced it to reduce staff to such an extent that any further reduction would jeopardize its ability to fulfil its mandate. He had decided that the best way of improving UNITAR's future was to build a solid foundation and had recommended to the Board of Trustees at its special session the preparation of a new programme that would be attractive to Member States and would be likely to convince donors to increase their contributions. In order to prepare a new programme, it had been necessary to strengthen the Institute's secretariat and its planning capacity. For that purpose, the former Director of Training had been transferred to the Office of the Executive Director and a bilingual expert had been appointed to help to improve UNITAR's communication capability. At the same time, the Executive Director had hoped to make some savings through reorganization, particularly in the Finance and Administration Section, which was staffed mainly by General Service staff with permanent contracts. He had hoped that those staff members could be reabsorbed into the United Nations Secretariat, thus saving the Institute \$180,000. Those savings had not materialized, but a solution was imminent. Savings had been realized in other areas; a P-5 post had been abolished, and \$160,000 had been saved by freezing the post of Director of Research at the D-2 level and leaving vacant a D-1 post in the Division of Research, which would be filled when resources were available.

51. Mrs. DORSET (Trinidad and Tobago) said that she was not satisfied with the reply given. She did not understand how it was possible to expand the Office of the Executive Director in order to convince donors to contribute to UNITAR's programmes, when it was necessary to retrench in other areas.

52. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1, as orally revised, the advance to UNITAR should be financed by an additional appropriation of \$886,000 under temporary section 33 of the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983. Consequently, no additional appropriations would be required for that purpose in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985. Reimbursement to the United Nations of the advance would be in the manner proposed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 4 of his statement (A/C.5/38/86).

53. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the proposed advance. Although some delegations might find it difficult to agree to the loan in view of the doubts expressed by the Advisory Committee as to the future of UNITAR and repayment of the funds, his delegation believed that, when a patient was ill, measures should be taken to stabilize his condition so that a cure could be found.

54. The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 59 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions.

55. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries had voted in favour of the advance. However, they were concerned about the financial situation of UNITAR, especially its financial management in recent years, and they shared the views expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The ratio of special purpose grants to the General Fund was too high and meant that a large part of UNITAR's work fell outside the priority-setting of the Board of Trustees. The growth of the Special Purpose Fund complicated the problems of financial management and contributed to the precarious financial situation of the Institute. The Nordic countries wished to stress that the advance was of a non-recurrent nature and should not serve as a precedent either for UNITAR or for other organizations of the United Nations system.

56. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Chairman's proposal. New Zealand had made voluntary contributions to the Institute but was not sure whether it was simply sick or terminally ill.

57. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

58. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that, now that the advance had been approved, he had no objection to a general investigation of the financial condition of UNITAR.

59. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should endorse the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that the report of the Secretary-General on the question of long-term financing arrangements for the Institute to be submitted to the Assembly at its thirty-ninth session, as called for in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, should also take into account institutional developments since its inception - in particular, the establishment of the United Nations University and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research - and that account should also be taken of earlier observations and recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit in its report on UNITAR (A/35/181, annex).

60. It was so decided.

Revised estimates under section 5B, Centre for Science and Technology for Development, arising from the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development in its resolution 4 (V) (continued)
(A/C.5/38/64 and Add.1)

61. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, at the 64th meeting, he had informed the Fifth Committee that the Secretariat had provided the Advisory Committee with detailed information on the programme elements to be financed from an amount of \$87,400 relating to the additional activities arising from resolution 4 (V) of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development. That information was now before the Fifth Committee in document A/C.5/38/64/Add.1. The only slight difference between that document and the information provided to the Advisory Committee was that paragraph 2 stated that every attempt would be made to carry out the additional activities within the resources available under section 5B on the understanding that the activities already approved by the Fifth Committee would not be curtailed for the purpose of undertaking the additional activities contained in resolution 4 (V). If the resources available under section 5B were insufficient, the Secretary-General would bring the matter before the Advisory Committee. The mention of document A/38/7/Add.16 might give rise to some misunderstanding as to whether the Fifth Committee had approved the procedure set forth in that document. Even if that procedure had not been approved by the Fifth Committee, the Secretary-General, in accordance with the appropriations resolution of the General Assembly, would still have to go before the Advisory Committee when expenditure involved transfers between sections.

62. Mr. KHALEVINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation understood that the activities involved would be financed entirely within existing resources, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Intergovernmental Committee. If the document before the Committee suggested that additional appropriations might be sought, his delegation would request a vote and would vote against it.

63. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/38/64 and Add.1 and concur with the procedure outlined in paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/38/64/Add.1.

64. It was so decided.

65. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus with the expectation that the cost of the additional activities would be absorbed within existing resources.

66. Mr. EL SAFTY (Egypt) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the understanding that it objected to the notion of "within existing resources".

67. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's understanding was the same as that of the United States delegation.

The meeting rose at 11.45 p.m.