

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 7 November 1989
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic)

later: Mr. VAHER (Canada)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEMS 123 AND 124: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991 AND
PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

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

Section 20. International Drug Control

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 corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/44/SR.30
13 November 1989

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 123 AND 124: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/44/3, A/44/6/Rev.1, A/44/7 and Corr.1 and A/44/16 and Add.1)

First reading (continued)

Section 18. United Nations Environment Programme

1. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) pointed out that the secretariat of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR) in Vienna, while not, properly speaking, part of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), had been included in section 18 because of its administrative links with UNEP. The activities of the UNSCEAR secretariat were described in paragraphs 18.21 to 18.28 of the proposed programme budget. The estimate for the secretariat was slightly in excess of \$1 million. A programme on regional representation, which was described in paragraphs 18.29 to 18.34, dealt with UNEP activities in New York, Geneva and regional offices located at Bahrain, Bangkok, Mexico City and Nairobi. The costs of the programme were met from extrabudgetary resources amounting to \$6.7 million, except for the offices in New York and Geneva which were funded in part by the regular budget in the amount of approximately \$1 million.
2. In regard to the environment programme itself, a new subprogramme had been added, namely subprogramme 7, on natural disasters, for which \$11,000 had been requested under the regular budget, while extrabudgetary resources of \$1.1 million were expected to be available for that purpose.
3. Other subprogrammes were quite similar to those of 1988-1989. There were 29 programme elements, as in the previous biennium. Two programme elements had been added to subprogramme 8. The number of outputs would be 617, or seven more than in 1988-1989. Programme element 1.2, on assessment of outer limits, had been proposed for highest priority, while programme elements 2.3, on working environment, 3.8, on lithosphere and 7.1, on natural disasters, had been given the lowest priority.
4. Extrabudgetary resources under section 18, estimated at some \$124 million, far exceeded the regular budget resources requested, which amounted to \$12 million. Of those extrabudgetary resources, \$1.5 million would be used for support costs, \$29 million for substantive activities and \$94 million for operational projects.
5. Posts funded from the regular budget totalled 87, as against 321 from extrabudgetary resources. The distribution of posts by major activity was given in tables 18.5, 18.8, 18.10, 18.12, 18.14, 18.16, 18.18 and 18.20 respectively.
6. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had calculated that the rate of real growth for section 18 was 0.1 per cent. The bulk of resources for the United Nations Environment Programme came from extrabudgetary sources which, as indicated

(Mr. Mselle)

in paragraph 18.2 of the Advisory Committee's first report, totalled \$124,305,400. Table 18.5 of the proposed programme budget showed a decrease of 22 posts on the extrabudgetary side as compared with the previous biennium. The Executive Director, in his proposals to the UNEP Governing Council, had indicated a decrease of 21 posts. The Advisory Committee assumed that that difference arose because the tables had been prepared at different times. It was not, however, fully satisfied on the point and hoped that in future similar discrepancies would not occur.

7. The Advisory Committee accepted the proposal for the reclassification of the post of Chief, Library and Documentation Centre, from the P-3 to the P-4 level.

8. In paragraph 18.8 of its report, the Advisory Committee had noted that because of the financial crisis, staff who had worked overtime had not in the past been compensated fully in cash and had been given compensatory time off for the balance. The Advisory Committee had noted however that UNEP had reverted to the established United Nations practice of cash payment for all overtime.

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the attention of the Committee to paragraphs 203 to 207 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (A/44/16), which concerned section 18.

10. Ms. OLDFELT HJERTONSSON (Sweden) said that her delegation had already expressed disappointment in CPC that greater resources had not been allocated to emerging issues of substantial concern to the United Nations, such as the environment. During its current session the General Assembly would consider the question of convening a second United Nations conference on the environment in 1992. A great deal of preparatory work would be required to ensure the success of such a conference. In view of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 43/196, a decision to convene such a conference could be expected in 1989. It was, therefore, unfortunate that no provision had been made in the programme budget for the preparatory work for the conference. In that connection, the question of the inability of the Secretariat to allocate resources unless it had a specific mandate called for review.

11. In section 18 resources had been cut to a proportionately greater extent than in other sections of the budget, with the result that the rate of real growth was only 0.1 per cent. It was particularly unfortunate that reductions had been made in areas relating to the co-ordinating function of the United Nations in matters relating to the environment. That function was vital for the preparatory work of the conference and, in addition, was necessary for the effective implementation of the role assigned to the United Nations at the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Staffing for the environment programme should, therefore, be strengthened.

12. Her delegation would not oppose adoption of the Advisory Committee's recommendation. However, in the light of paragraph 206 of the CPC report and decisions expected to be taken in the Second Committee at the current session, her delegation would go along with the decision in first reading only on the

(Ms. Oldfelt Hjertonsson, Sweden)

understanding that subsequent decisions to be adopted by the General Assembly regarding the 1992 conference might affect programme content and the estimate for section 18. Those points should be the subject of informal consultations and discussed during the second reading.

13. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that a consensus had emerged that the United Nations had an important role to play in promoting efforts to protect the environment. The resources proposed for the programme in the 1990-1991 biennium did not reflect the high priority given to the issue by Member States.

14. At the forty-third session, his delegation had pointed out that post reductions proposed by the Secretary-General for UNEP represented 17.9 per cent of posts against an average level of 12 per cent for the Secretariat as a whole. As the Advisory Committee had pointed out in paragraph 18.4 of its report, even the extrabudgetary staffing establishment for UNEP for 1990-1991 showed a decrease compared with 1988-1989. The level of resources was clearly inadequate to prepare and service a major conference. In 1988-1989 one D-2 post in UNEP had been eliminated, even though the functions of the post were related to policy and co-ordination. That action was a clear violation of General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII), which provided that the costs of servicing the Governing Council of UNEP and providing the small secretariat should be borne by the regular budget of the United Nations, and could have adverse effects on preparations for the proposed conference.

15. Mr. SHITAKHA (Kenya) shared the view that the proposed programme budget did not reflect the importance of the issue of the environment. In particular, his delegation was concerned at the inadequate rate of real growth. The high rate of post reductions gave rise to concern over the ability of UNEP to carry out its mandate in regard to preparations for the 1992 conference.

16. Noting that, as a result of the abolition of three translator/reviser posts in UNEP at the end of 1989, the requirement for contractual translation would increase by \$50,000, he asked how the cost of retaining those three posts would compare with the increased cost of external translation.

17. His delegation hoped that the Secretary-General would review the estimates for section 18 in the light of the 1992 conference.

18. Mr. SEIM (Norway) said that, in the light of the challenge presented by the proposed conference, his delegation was concerned at the modest real growth in the estimates under section 18. Sufficient financial resources must be made available for the preparatory work and follow-up of the proposed conference.

19. Mr. CHEN Xu (China) said that his delegation had no objection to the recommendations of CPC and ACABQ that the Secretary-General's estimates for section 18 should be approved. Since the 1972 Stockholm Conference, the environment had become a major challenge to all Member States and the General Assembly was to decide at its forty-fourth session on the holding of a second

(Mr. Chen Xu, China)

conference. The Secretary-General's estimates, however, made no provision for the expenses of the preparatory work for such a conference and the question arose as to how those expenses would be met. Consultations should be held with a view to reaching agreement regarding proper funding for the conference.

20. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that the environment was one of the most important issues facing the United Nations, especially when viewed within the context of development. Vital issues such as desertification and drought must be recognized as important aspects of environment protection and adequate resources must be made available to assist developing countries in the area of environmental protection.

21. His delegation shared the views expressed by representatives of Kenya and India. The latter had raised the question of the advisability of reducing the number of D-2 posts. That in turn led to the broader issue of the advisability of eliminating other key posts. His delegation would therefore welcome information from the Secretariat regarding the specific posts to be eliminated as part of the retrenchment exercise and the reasons for the abolition of posts in question within the context of the budget as a whole.

22. The omission of any provision for the preparatory work for the 1992 conference represented a major shortcoming in the estimates. The Committee would no doubt revert to the issue when the Second Committee had made its recommendations. His delegation was reluctant to accept that financing for the preparatory work should come from the contingency fund. Appropriate financing should be provided from the regular budget.

23. His delegation supported the recommendation in paragraph 206 of the CPC report that, when considering section 18, the General Assembly should take into account appropriate mandates adopted by the Governing Council of UNEP at its fifteenth session. It was important that delegations should bear in mind the very important co-ordinating role of UNEP.

24. Ms. FRIESSNIGG (Austria) said that her delegation shared the concern expressed by the representatives of Sweden and India regarding post reductions, bearing in mind the co-ordinating function of UNEP. She also shared the concerns which had been expressed regarding the financing of the proposed conference in 1992. It might be best to take up those issues during the second reading.

25. Ms. BROINOWSKI (Australia) endorsed the views expressed by previous speakers. The outcome of the 1992 conference could be jeopardized if the necessary financial resources and staff were not provided.

26. Mr. Vaher (Canada) took the Chair.

27. Mr. LOPEZ (Venezuela) remarked that reductions in some parts of the section appeared to require increases in others, such as consultant services and contractual translation. The additional costs generated by budgetary reform should be compared with the costs of leaving the original establishment as it was. On the

/...

(Mr. Lopez, Venezuela)

other hand, the decision to halve the frequency of UNEP Governing Council sessions seemed to promise only minute savings. He would like to know what annual savings, if any, were expected.

28. While he could see advantages in avoiding bureaucratic sprawl, the responsibilities of UNEP were growing, as were the extrabudgetary funds it was expected to administer, and the environmental agreements which it was best suited to monitor. Those points should be borne in mind as the reform process was evaluated.

29. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that the question of the environment was of considerable importance to the whole of mankind. Prominent among the symptoms of environmental deterioration was desertification in Africa, which would, he hoped, attract expressions of solidarity from the international community.

30. He found it regrettable that the resources requested for UNEP showed almost no real growth. His delegation would like more information on the proposed reduction in posts financed from extrabudgetary resources, particularly in the light of the preparations for the 1992 conference.

31. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, except where up- and downgradings of posts were proposed, the staffing requirements for 1988-1989 and for 1990-1991 shown in the budget proposals were largely the same. That was because the figures given for the past biennium were those accepted by the General Assembly in the revised estimates for 1988-1989, which included reductions in costs and posts made as part of the reform process.

32. As several speakers had pointed out, extrabudgetary resources for environmental activities were likely to rise. In the best judgement of the Executive Director of UNEP, however, rational use of the increased resources was compatible with a reduction in the number of posts they supported. The planned reduction in extrabudgetary staff certainly did not imply any reduction in programme activities.

33. When the Second Committee began to discuss a draft resolution explicitly calling for a conference on environment and development, the Secretariat would prepare a statement of programme budget implications indicating what resources should be drawn from the contingency fund, what resources could be redeployed from other parts of the budget, and what alternative sources of funds might be drawn on. There was no conflict between approval of the estimates for section 18 in first reading and later consideration of such a statement.

34. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that environmental questions were an emerging priority which should, given a flexible and responsive enough budget process, be reflected in increased appropriations within an agreed total volume of resources. As had been pointed out, cuts in staff under the section were largely the result of decisions by the General Assembly at the previous session. His delegation still had questions about the resultant distribution of resources,

(Mr. Kinchen, United Kingdom)

particularly in the case of conference services, but the decision had been taken, and the overall targets set in resolution 41/213 should be respected. Nevertheless, he supported the right of the Swedish representative to call for informal consultations on the level of resources proposed under section 18.

35. He was perplexed by the apparent absence of a statement of programme budget implications to accompany UNEP Governing Council resolution 15/4, calling for a special session of the Council in 1990. Perhaps the resolution had been too imprecise to warrant the preparation of such a statement. The problem was that, in the absence of preparatory dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat, decisions might be taken without due regard for the optimum use of resources.

36. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Secretariat had had a compelling reason not to make provision in the proposed programme budget for preparations for the 1992 conference: in resolution 43/196 the General Assembly had not decided to convene such a conference, but merely "to consider at its forty-fourth session the question of the convening" of a conference, with a view to taking an appropriate decision on various details including the financial implications.

37. The question raised by the United Kingdom representative illustrated the difficulties associated with preparing statements of programme budget implications. The practice of preparing such statements needed to be extended to decisions taken at all levels, including the regional commissions and other bodies. Still, the ultimate decision authorizing the Governing Council of UNEP to hold an additional session in 1990 would be taken by the General Assembly, and the Secretariat would prepare a statement of programme budget implications to accompany that decision.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the recommendations contained in paragraphs 206 and 207 of the report of CPC.

39. It was so decided.

40. An appropriation in the amount of \$11,939,400 under section 18 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991 was approved in first reading without objection, on the understanding that the recommendation made by CPC in paragraph 206 of its report and questions relating to posts under the section would be further discussed in informal consultations.

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

41. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the section comprised a single programme divided into eight subprogrammes, containing a total of 31 programme elements and 314 outputs. Five of the programme elements were new, arising out of changes in emphasis, but the overall number of elements had been reduced from 37 by regrouping, as he had explained in the context of earlier sections. The Secretary-General proposed one programme element for priority; but that, like three of the four elements proposed for low priority, was

/...

(Mr. Baudot)

supported by extrabudgetary resources. The volume of extrabudgetary resources was large in relation to the proposed regular budget appropriation, and would support 95 of the 176 established posts of the Centre. The vacancy rate at the Centre stood at 27 per cent for Professional posts, but there were slightly more General Service and other staff than there were posts, making for an overall vacancy rate of roughly 14 per cent. In the context of the revised estimates, the General Assembly at its forty-third session had approved a 19 per cent reduction in Professional posts under the section.

42. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) remarked that, in a few budget sections, the Advisory Committee had found that general temporary assistance funds were being used to fund posts on a continuing basis. In the case of section 19, they were used to meet the cost of local-level staff assigned to the UNEP documents reproduction unit. The Advisory Committee's general observations on the subject were given in chapter 1, paragraph 60, of its report. The Secretary-General had informed the Committee that such departures from established policy were due to special circumstances, and that efforts would be made to rectify the situation.

43. The Advisory Committee indicated in paragraph 19.5 of its report its concurrence with the conversion to established status of seven recurrent temporary posts. It dealt with the general question of common services in Nairobi in paragraphs 28J.1 to 28J.5 of its report and, in the light of those comments, agreed to the proposed continuation of the 13 non-recurrent temporary posts discussed in paragraph 19.6.

44. As stated in paragraph 19.10, resource requirements for policy-making organs estimated at \$1,064,900 included \$966,100 transferred from budget sections 28F and 29B. He emphasized that the transfer was of funds, not of posts: it had been decided to consolidate the Habitat conference-servicing requirements under section 19, but the interpreters and other officials needed for conference servicing would continue to be obtained from Geneva and other locations, as appropriate. The new arrangement was consistent with the recommendations which the Advisory Committee had made in chapter 2, paragraph 99, of its first report on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 (A/42/7).

45. Mr. SHITAKHA (Kenya) said that the question of human settlements was very important to the developing countries. His delegation was therefore concerned at the negative rate of growth of -1.1 per cent for section 19 and at the 19 per cent reduction in posts for Habitat. The vacancy rate of 17 per cent noted by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 19.9 of its report was also very high and his delegation would welcome an explanation from the Secretariat of the reasons for that situation and the measures envisaged to rectify it.

46. Mr. GROSSMAN (United States of America) wished to record his delegation's strong objections to the inclusion of activities and resources concerning the living conditions of the Palestinian people in section 19 of the budget. While his delegation would not insist on a vote, its position in that regard remained unchanged.

47. Mr. ABDULLAH (Iraq) said that his delegation wished to express its support for the activities relating to the Palestinian people and its hope that they would be increased. Currently, they were far from matching the level of suffering endured by the Palestinian people.

48. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) expressed his delegation's strong support for the activities in question, which it regarded as the least that the United Nations could do for the Palestinian people who had suffered for so many years.

49. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that he could not for the time being provide the details requested by the representative of Kenya. The representative of the Office of Human Resources Management would return to the Committee with more details at a later stage.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the conclusions and recommendations of CPC regarding section 19, contained in paragraphs 211 to 212 of its report (A/44/16).

51. It was so decided.

52. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$10,528,200 under section 19 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991 was approved in first reading without objection.

Section 20. International Drug Control

53. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Division of Narcotic Drugs would continue to implement four subprogrammes in the biennium 1990-1991. There would be 17 programme elements, as opposed to 16 in the biennium 1988-1989, resulting from a regrouping for technical reasons. The number of outputs, however, represented a marked increase over the last biennium. The fact that there was no change in programme structure did not mean that the amount of work-load was unchanged. That was especially true of the area in question where problems were developing so rapidly and the concern of Member States was so great. The priorities proposed by the Secretary-General were technically in line with the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning. About 11 per cent of resources was earmarked for activities of highest priority and about 12 per cent for those of lowest priority. The extrabudgetary resources included in section 20 were essentially those of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. They amounted to about \$130 million, as compared with regular budget estimates of about \$8.5 million.

54. The estimates represented a real rate of growth of 1.6 per cent. Expenditures included an amount of \$652,000 for four non-renewable temporary posts, three Professional and one General Service. The introduction to the proposed programme budget contained the Secretary-General's proposal to create seven non-renewable temporary Professional posts in all. Three of those posts were included under section 20. As far as the vacancy rate was concerned, there were no vacancies in Professional posts for the section and a slight excess in regard to the General

(Mr. Baudot)

Service, giving a rate of -2 per cent. The rate of post reduction was 22 per cent. He would point out, however, that several of the posts in question had not actually been cut but rather transferred to the office of the Director of the Vienna Office, who performed an important co-ordinating function in respect of activities for international drug control.

55. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that there were two policy-making organs concerned with international drug control, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board. There were also three organizational units, the Division of Narcotic Drugs, the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board. In view of the importance of international action against drug abuse, it was perhaps time to look again at the possible need for organizational streamlining. The question had been discussed already on many occasions, in the Economic and Social Council, the Advisory Committee and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. Unfortunately, those States which were most vocal in calling for proper co-ordination and harmonization of efforts and resources seemed to have decided that it was probably better to continue the existing arrangement. In its discussion of section 20 of the programme budget over the years, the Advisory Committee had brought out clearly and frankly the need to decide whether it was really necessary to have three organizational units involved in the area of international drug control.

56. The bulk of the expenditures referred to in section 20 came from extrabudgetary sources, in particular the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. As indicated in paragraph 20.2 of the Advisory Committee's report, extrabudgetary resources for international drug control in 1990-1991 were estimated to be \$130.7 million. The comparable figure for the United Nations Environment Fund was \$124.3 million. The first amount was undoubtedly very small compared with the resources that would be needed internationally to fight drug abuse. The point he wished to make, however, was that the operations of the United Nations Environment Programme were subject to oversight by its Governing Council and by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee reported to the Governing Council on the programme support and administrative costs incurred by the Environment Fund. There was, however, no such arrangement in regard to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and the Advisory Committee, in paragraph 20.9 of its report, called that situation to the attention of Member States, the implication being that the time had come to rectify it. There were a number of recommendations in that connection in chapter I of the Advisory Committee's report.

57. Paragraph 20.4 of the report indicated a number of the things that would emerge if the Advisory Committee were to consider the Fund's administrative and programme support costs. For example, as far as the desired transparency was concerned, table 20.5, Post requirements, indicated that the number of posts financed from extrabudgetary resources was 21. Questioning by the Committee, however, had revealed the existence of a further 57 posts which were not shown anywhere. The question of transparency and proper presentation had also come up in

(Mr. Mselle)

connection with paragraph 20.8 of the report, which described how, after inquiry, the Committee had learned that the United Nations Office at Vienna provided the Fund with considerable support. To date, the Fund had not been requested to reimburse the regular budget for the provisions of the services in question. That situation, in which activities financed by extrabudgetary resources were being subsidized to a considerable extent from the regular budget, should have been made clear.

58. It was partly in the light of those discoveries that the Advisory Committee had decided, when considering the estimate for travel, that, on the basis of previous patterns of expenditure, a slight reduction was warranted in the amount for travel to meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and of the International Narcotics Control Board. It therefore recommended a reduction of \$100,000 in the Secretary-General's estimate for section 20.

59. Mr. MONTHE (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination) said that section 20 had been the subject of wide discussion in CPC. The Committee's conclusions and recommendations, set out in paragraph 217 of its report, consisted of five elements. The importance attached by the Committee to the subject was shown by the first sentence, which underlined the importance of international co-operation in carrying out the programmes in section 20. The Committee had then recommended that the Secretary-General should increase his efforts to provide the resources needed to implement the relevant mandates. It followed up that recommendation by stressing the importance of effective co-ordination. The need for transparency was addressed in the recommendation that future programme budgets should include more information on the programmes and management of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. Finally, the Committee recommended approval of the programme narrative for section 20.

60. Ms. OLDFELT HJERTONSSON (Sweden) said that her delegation believed that activities for international drug control had unfortunately not received their due share of the budget, particularly in view of the added responsibilities expected to devolve on the units concerned. The share of 0.4 per cent of the total budget was the same as that for the biennium 1988-1989, and staff had been reduced by 22 per cent, which was the largest cut proposed for any section. Despite the Secretary-General's proposal for the creation of four temporary posts on a non-recurrent basis, the reduction was considerable.

61. The world-wide increase in the production, trafficking and use of narcotic drugs was a matter of great concern. The worsening situation constituted a major threat, especially to young people, in many countries. The illegal trade was increasingly well-organized and difficult to tackle. A world-wide offensive against narcotic drugs was needed, therefore, and a global action programme should be put into effect. A dramatic reinforcement of efforts was needed that would allow the United Nations to offer greater support to countries and regions in developing effective measures against drugs than was currently the case. Furthermore, direct measures against narcotics must be supplemented by measures against the economic, social and political distortions of societies caused by the drug menace.

(Ms. Oldfelt Hjertansson, Sweden)

62. It would be difficult, however, to put a global action programme into effect within the existing organizational framework. Her delegation echoed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and CPC regarding the need for streamlining and effective co-ordination between the units of the United Nations system concerned. Nevertheless, the main constraint faced by those units was a lack of resources. The regular budget and extrabudgetary resources combined which were available for anti-drug activities were very little compared to the magnitude of the problem and the gigantic resources of illegal drug dealers. The negative trend could not be effectively reversed with such marginal resources, and her delegation stressed the importance of supplementing the resources provided in the regular budget in order to respond to the increasing challenges that would undoubtedly have to be faced in the near future, as well as the need to strengthen and co-ordinate all the units involved. Her delegation hoped that the special session to be held in 1990 would give the political impetus needed, create more resources, and provide for a considerably strengthened United Nations role in the international struggle against narcotic drugs.

63. Ms. FRIESSNIGG (Austria) said that the Secretary-General's estimate for section 20 provided for a real rate of growth of 1.6 per cent. However, in the light of the many additional responsibilities stemming from new mandates in the area of international control of narcotic drugs and of the enhanced role envisaged for the United Nations, her delegation believed that the units concerned were not adequately financed. Only some 0.4 per cent of the regular budget, and \$60 million contributed to the Fund for International Drug Control, were devoted to anti-drug activities. Furthermore, as the tables in the budget document showed, section 20 had been subjected to the highest rate of post reduction of all the budget sections. She understood that the apparent rate of 22 per cent was to some extent the result of internal transfers but would like to know the actual figure.

64. Several delegations had recently made statements in the Third Committee stressing the extreme staffing and financial constraints facing the units concerned and asking for drug control activities to be given higher priority in the budget. Her delegation hoped that those bodies would be strengthened and ways explored of securing an appropriate level of resources to carry out the tasks entrusted to them by Member States. She asked the Secretariat how the additional activities expected, especially in connection with the 1988 Convention and the follow-up to the international conference, would add to the work-load and whether they could be accomplished with the four additional non-recurrent posts mentioned in paragraphs 20.14 and 20.30 of the proposed programme budget.

65. Her delegation concurred in the recommendation of CPC that the Secretary-General should increase his efforts to provide adequate means for the timely implementation of the relevant mandates and looked forward to further progress in the matter. Regarding the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee in the resources for travel of representatives to meetings of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board, she asked what effect the cuts would have on the participation of delegations in those meetings and what other implications they might have.

66. Ms. BROJNOWSKI (Australia) said that, wherever the Organization was presented with a new mandate of pressing importance, resources should be mobilized from within the system. Her delegation did not want simply to see one large-scale conference give rise to another, without any tangible result. The system-wide plan of action recommended at the joint meeting in 1989 of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and CPC was the best available means in that context and should be supported by appropriate resources. Her delegation also looked forward to further discussion of appropriate links between the activities of the three units responsible for drug control. The crucial nature of drug-related issues required that the Secretariat, besides resorting to extrabudgetary resources, respond to successive resolutions calling for the reallocation of resources from within the system. Of particular concern to her delegation was the decline, in real terms, in budgetary allocations to the Division of Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board, as well as the above-average staff reductions in those bodies. While welcoming the assurances provided by the representative of the Secretariat, it feared that the resources were insufficient to meet identified needs.

67. Mrs. MBELLA (Cameroon) noted the need to enhance the co-ordination of drug control activities and emphasized that the United Nations Office at Vienna had a crucial role to play in that regard. Her delegation insisted that an agreement must be reached concerning reimbursement for services provided at Vienna, as mentioned in paragraph 20.8 of the Advisory Committee's report. It also requested further clarification of the programme narrative of drug control activities, in order to permit more detailed consideration of the question of transparency, as well as the extent to which programmes matched appropriated funds and took account of the concerns expressed by all members of the Fifth Committee.

68. Mr. SEIM (Norway), while recognizing the valuable work of United Nations bodies in the international effort against drug abuse, noted that much more could be done. With only 0.4 per cent of regular budget resources devoted to drug control activities, it was impossible for such activities to succeed. The bodies concerned must be provided with sufficient resources in order to be able to take on new tasks. Even if resources were to increase, as proposed, by 1.6 per cent in real terms, much more substantial growth would be required in the future.

69. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that his delegation, like others, was concerned over excessive staff reductions but noted the Secretary-General's attempt to alleviate the situation by establishing four non-recurrent temporary posts. While agreeing with the view that there should be a greater increase in the resources allocated to drug control activities, it did not believe that the increase could be very substantial, given the many important demands on regular budget resources. Any real increase must be funded from extrabudgetary resources, entailing efforts on the part of Member States and the United Nations units concerned.

70. The costs incurred by the United Nations Office at Vienna, as referred to in paragraph 20.8 of the Advisory Committee's report, required further investigation. While recognizing that the activities of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control were of benefit to many Member States, his delegation wished to reiterate

(Mr. Gupta, India)

its request, earlier expressed in CPC, for clarification and an item-by-item breakdown of the Fund's allocations to specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations, amounting to \$84.2 million.

71. Mrs. ARCHINI (Italy) said that her delegation agreed with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee that voluntary contributions would never be sufficient to combat the drug menace and the enormous resources at the disposal of drug traffickers. A certain degree of flexibility should continue to be allowed to units funded by voluntary contributions, whose task it was to respond immediately to major threats against the health of the world population.

72. While considering the parallel drawn by the Advisory Committee between the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control and UNEP in paragraph 20.9 of the Advisory Committee's report, her delegation felt that their roles were perhaps different. It did, however, hope that every effort would be made as soon as possible to rationalize efforts in that area and to achieve transparency in the presentation of activities. It agreed with the related conclusions of CPC and hoped that more attention would be devoted to that question in the future.

73. Mr. ETUKET (Uganda) said that the remarks of earlier speakers had highlighted an issue which had been of interest to his delegation throughout its reading of the proposed programme budget, namely, the need for programmes and resources allocated to priority areas to be consistent with the priority attached to those areas. His delegation agreed with most of the views concerning the level of resources required for drug control activities.

74. The question of the balance between extrabudgetary resources and regular budget resources in allocations to priority areas continued to be a cause of concern. Noting that total extrabudgetary resources of \$124,102,000 were expected to be available for the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control during the biennium 1990-1991, he agreed with the Advisory Committee's view that an effective mechanism was needed to control and manage those resources. It therefore took very seriously the remarks made in paragraphs 86 and 88 of chapter I of the Advisory Committee's report, as well as the specific reference in paragraph 20.9 of chapter II of that report.

75. As the representative of India had stated, any proposal to increase resources should be considered in the context of the overall budget, bearing in mind other equally important priorities. The Secretary-General should take care, in reviewing the level of regular budget resources, to ensure that other activities were not adversely affected. Noting the problems arising in connection with the United Nations Office at Vienna, it was his hope that due attention would be given to those issues during the Committee's subsequent consideration of the subject. He also hoped that the representative of the Secretary-General would provide information to allay the concerns raised in connection with the problems referred to in paragraph 20.4 of the Advisory Committee's report.

76. Mr. GROSSMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly supported United Nations work in the area of drug abuse control and was encouraged by recent decisions to increase the Organization's role in such activities. His country, among others, had been attempting to persuade the United Nations to devote more resources and staff to its drug control units, but with relatively little success. While not wishing to increase the level of the regular budget, his delegation did feel that greater priority should be given to regular drug control programmes, which accounted for minimal proportions both of the overall budget and of total staff requirements. While grateful to the Secretary-General for his proposal to establish non-recurrent temporary posts for such programmes, it believed that permanent posts should have been created through redeployment, given the ongoing nature of the work to be undertaken.

77. The addition of non-recurrent posts would partly offset the staff reduction proposed under section 20, and it was also his delegation's understanding that the transfer of five General Service posts to the central administrative unit at Vienna would ensure the provision of a consistent level of resources to drug control programmes. His delegation endorsed all efforts to maximize efficiency through the consolidation of functions. However, administrative services at Vienna had been subject to substantial staff reductions, and his delegation would therefore appreciate information concerning the arrangements made between drug control units and the Vienna administrative unit, as well as guarantees from the Secretariat that all drug control programmes would not be negatively affected as a result of administrative restructuring.

78. Mr. LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that the concerns expressed by the Advisory Committee in chapter I, paragraph 88, and chapter II, paragraph 20.9, of its report had prompted members of the Fifth Committee to consider how such important problems might be resolved. In that connection, the remarks made by the representative of Uganda were most pertinent, and it was to be hoped that the Secretariat would submit corresponding proposals to the Committee during the Assembly's forty-fifth session.

79. There were obviously many ways of increasing resources for priority activities and, in the context of the regular budget, any measure which served to improve the financial situation must be seen as useful. The reimbursement suggested in paragraph 20.8 of the Advisory Committee's report was a specific case in which funds thus released might be used to support other activities. It should therefore be emphasized that the importance of any individual problem or activity should not be allowed to conceal the possibility of making savings in respect of certain administrative functions.

80. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said, in response to questions concerning staff reductions, that the redeployment of five posts to the Office of the Director-General at Vienna, as reflected in sections 1 and 28, would bring the overall level of staff reduction for drug control activities down from 22 per cent to 13.5 per cent.

(Mr. Baudot)

81. With regard to levels of resources, budget proposals for activities such as those under consideration were based only partly on an assessment of needs and much more substantially on an assessment of what was possible. Rationalization and better co-ordination would undoubtedly help to ensure that programmes mandated under section 20 were properly implemented. The concerns raised by the representative of Austria with respect to the effect on programmes of staff reductions in the Division of Narcotic Drugs and the International Narcotics Control Board were understandable, but it was the Secretary-General's conviction that, given the resources requested, better co-ordination and the provision of extrabudgetary resources, it would be possible to implement the mandated programmes.

82. If the General Assembly were to take a decision, at the special session on narcotic drugs to be held in 1990, to change the role or mandate of the Secretariat, an appropriate request for resources would then be presented to the Assembly.

83. The Secretariat would respond to the question of the representative of Cameroon relating to the programme narrative and the question of the representative of India concerning a breakdown of allocations to specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations in due course.

84. With regard to the questions raised by the representatives of, *inter alia*, Uganda and Venezuela, concerning extrabudgetary resources, the Secretary-General would shortly be providing information to the Fifth Committee. As agreed, the Advisory Committee would report to the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly concerning intergovernmental consideration of extrabudgetary resources. The first opportunity for the Fifth Committee to evaluate progress made in the presentation of extrabudgetary resources in the proposed programme budget would occur with the submission for the biennium 1992-1993.

85. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) requested, for the sake of consistency, that any decisions on section 20 should be taken on the explicit understanding that the issues raised in paragraph 217 of the report of CPC, as well as questions relating to posts, should be subject to consultations.

86. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee wished to approve the conclusions and recommendations of CPC contained in paragraph 217 of document A/44/16.

87. It was so decided.

88. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$8,378,800 under section 20 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1990-1991 was approved in first reading without objection, on the understanding that issues raised in paragraph 217 of document A/44/16 and questions relating to posts would be subject to consultations.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.