



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 36th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 117: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Expenditure sections 18, 20, 21, 22 and 23

*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 IX.2.750, 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.5/40/SR.36
22 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 7.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 117: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/40/3, A/40/6, A/40/7, A/40/38 and Add.1, A/40/262; A/C.5/40/9, A/C.5/40/12 and Corr.1)

First reading (continued)

Expenditure section 18: United Nations Environment Programme (continued)

1. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that UNEP's mandate as the co-ordinator of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification was well-known to the Committee, as were the initiatives it had taken to mobilize resources in addition to those earmarked in the Environment Fund for the implementation of the Plan of Action. Those efforts had met with only modest success, however. UNEP had also tried to obtain support in the form of seconded staff, but the financial constraints from which other agencies were also suffering had prevented that. Meanwhile, the problem of creeping desertification continued to expand, causing untold economic damage and human suffering. In his delegation's view, UNEP's efforts to mobilize extrabudgetary resources were highly commendable. Nevertheless, the fact remained that the resources available were grossly insufficient. His delegation felt it would be appropriate and timely, therefore, for the regular budget to contribute modestly to the implementation of the Plan of Action by funding the P-5 post whose transfer to the regular budget was requested in paragraph 18.47. Such action would be in line with the emphasis placed by the General Assembly on the urgent need to combat desertification in all the affected countries.

2. For those reasons, and notwithstanding his delegation's respect for the recommendations of ACABQ, he urged the Fifth Committee to agree that resources for a P-5 post in connection with desertification should be transferred to the regular budget and appropriate action taken to make the necessary resources available.

3. His request for the postponement of the vote on section 18 had been in connection with the request of the Secretary-General that the post of the Chief of the UNEP Liaison Office in New York should be reclassified to the D-2 level. The comparisons made at the previous meeting between that Office and other Liaison Offices had, in his delegation's view, been incomplete. The UNEP Office had to carry out liaison functions covering a wide range of issues, since environment cut across so many areas of United Nations activities. It also served as the Regional Office for North America, which brought it into close contact with United States and Canadian officials. The North American region was particularly important from the point of view of environment, not only for the problems it presented as a highly industrialized area but also because of its many scientific and technical advances which were very helpful to UNEP. In addition, the Liaison Office was constantly exploring possibilities of obtaining financial assistance with the non-governmental community in North America and with other agencies and organizations in the field of environment.

(Mr. Mudho, Kenya)

4. The Liaison Office thus served as a Regional Office and programme support centre, monitoring the ways in which the capacities and resources of the North American region could be employed on UNEP's behalf. He hoped that representatives would agree that the level of the post of Chief of the Office should be sufficiently senior to facilitate his task. His delegation urged the Fifth Committee to approve the reclassification. The additional expenditure would not be large and he believed that the Secretary-General intended to absorb the consequential increase.

5. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) informed the Committee that, if the proposals of the Kenyan delegation were adopted, the cost of retaining the P-5 post would be \$135,200 and the reclassification of the D-1 post to the D-2 level would cost \$14,900. He noted that the UNEP Liaison Office would not be the only one to be headed by a D-2. The UNHCR Liaison Office also carried out representative functions in North America, and the head of that Office was also at the D-2 level because of the enhanced functions. He noted that the present incumbent of the UNEP post was actually a D-2 already. The considered opinion of the senior management had been that the duties of the post required a D-2 official.

6. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation felt that the recommendations of ACABQ regarding section 18 were warranted. It would therefore not support the request for the transfer to the regular budget or the proposal for reclassification. He asked for a vote on the Kenyan proposals, bearing in mind the recommendation of ACABQ. If that recommendation was overturned, his delegation would be unable to endorse the appropriation for the entire section.

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on section 18 in paragraphs 667 and 668 of its report. As no vote had been requested on paragraph 667, and he heard no objection, he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the recommendation.

8. It was so decided.

9. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 668 of the CPC report (A/40/38).

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan,

Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

10. The recommendation of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in paragraph 668 of the report was adopted by 89 votes to 1.

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Kenyan proposal to reclassify the post of Chief of the New York Liaison Office of UNEP from D-1 to D-2.

12. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Kenyan proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cyprus, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Honduras, Liberia, Mexico, Morocco, Romania, Venezuela.

13. The proposal was adopted by 46 votes to 31, with 11 abstentions.

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to decide on the second Kenyan proposal, to transfer one P-5 post from the Environment Fund to the regular budget.

15. The proposal was adopted by 54 votes to 31 with 4 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to a decision on section 18 as a whole. The amounts involved in the proposals just adopted would have to be incorporated into the proposed appropriation.

17. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the amount involved in the proposal already made by the Secretary-General for the transfer of the P-5 post was \$130,200, which should be incorporated immediately into the amount to be voted on. He understood that, according to the representative of Kenya, the reclassification of the D-1 post would not require an additional appropriation.

18. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) understood from the statement of the Director of the Budget Division that the reclassification from D-1 to D-2 had already been effected. He would like to know whether such a decision by the management was in accordance with the Financial Regulations and, if not, what penalty was provided for in them. He also asked whether there had been other similar cases.

19. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that there had been a few other such instances. The Secretary-General had the power to redeploy staff, temporarily or permanently. The prerogative was valuable in affording flexibility. In the case in point, a temporary arrangement had been made in the expectation that his recommendation would be approved.

20. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said that an important question of principle was involved. The Committee understood the need for flexibility, but the question of principle should be examined further. He requested that a study should be made of past occurrences so that the Committee could be informed of the scope of the practice and its justification, as well as the exact import of its own budgetary decisions.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that a study of the kind requested would allow the Fifth Committee to make its decisions in full knowledge of the facts. He invited the Committee to take a decision on section 18 as a whole. On the basis of the ACABQ recommendation, and incorporating the amount of \$130,200 required for the transfer of the P-5 post, he proposed that the Fifth Committee should adopt in first reading an estimate of \$11,032,200 for section 18 of the proposed programme budget.

22. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the proposed appropriation.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman,

Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Greece.

23. An appropriation in the amount of \$11,032,200 under section 18 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 75 votes to 21, with 1 abstention.

24. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the appropriation for the section as a whole because of the excessive rate of real growth and because it included funding for the travel of representatives of national liberation groups.

25. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would have liked to vote in favour of the appropriation for UNEP but had been unable to do so because the recommendation of ACABQ had been turned down. For budgetary reasons, therefore, it had voted against the appropriation for section 18.

26. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation was always uneasy when the Advisory Committee's recommendations were rejected. The Committee was an expert body appointed by the General Assembly and having wide geographical representation. His delegation had voted in favour of the recommendation and had therefore been unable to support the proposed appropriation, although it was strongly in favour of UNEP's programmes.

27. Ms. BYRNE (Ireland) associated her delegation with those of the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy and regretted that she had been unable to vote in favour of section 18 as a whole.

28. Ms. VAN BRUNEN LITTLE (Netherlands) said that her Government supported UNEP and its activities but found the rate of real growth excessive. Her delegation had therefore voted against the section as a whole.

29. Mr. VAHER (Canada) said that his delegation shared the concern of previous speakers regarding the 1.3 per cent rate of real growth. He noted, however, that there was a 10 per cent increase in extrabudgetary funding. Seventy-four per cent of the expected growth was in programme activities, with desertification accounting for half of that figure. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the section, in view of the importance it attached to UNEP's general mandate, although it customarily supported ACABQ's recommendations.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus completed its first reading of section 18 of the proposed programme budget.

Expenditure section 20: International Drug Control

31. The CHAIRMAN said that the estimate submitted by the Secretary-General for expenditure section 20 was \$5,665,300. The Advisory Committee recommended acceptance of the Secretary-General's estimate. The recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the programme aspect were in paragraphs 671 and 672 of its report. He invited comments on the four subsections of section 20.

32. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) said that his delegation would have no difficulty in accepting the proposed estimate. International drug control was a very important activity and the resources requested were modest compared with the problem. Since there were three separate United Nations entities dealing with problems in that field, however, co-ordination and co-operation were crucial for success.

33. He noted that the Secretary-General's request for the creation of a P-4 post in connection with the overall co-ordination of all United Nations activities in the area of international drug control, which was an additional function assigned to the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs, had not met with the Advisory Committee's approval and the Fifth Committee had accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendation. According to paragraph 20.7 of the Advisory Committee's report, the Secretary-General intended to report to the General Assembly on measures to improve co-operation and co-ordination of drug control activities within the United Nations system. He asked whether such a report had been made.

34. He also noted that efforts were being made in the Third Committee to finalize a draft resolution on the World Conference on drug abuse that the Secretary-General had proposed should be convened in the coming biennium. The Fifth Committee would be asked to pronounce on the programme budget implications if that resolution was adopted. For the moment, he would only stress that it was very important that the Conference should be provided with the staff and the resources needed for its proper preparation and completion, including co-ordination at Headquarters. In the context of expenditure section 20, he wished to emphasize that preparations for the Conference should not interfere unduly with the regular activities of the Division of Narcotic Drugs or the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. The Division had its own mandate and a staff tailored to it. Its activities should continue in parallel with the preparations for the Conference, which must not be at the expense of the Division's ongoing work programme.

35. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the problem of drug control was the concern of a particular group of countries and not of the international community as a whole. It was not right, therefore, to burden the whole community with the expense. The programmes in question should be financed by voluntary funds. He requested a vote on the proposed appropriation and said that his delegation would vote against it.

36. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the Secretary-General's report on drug control co-ordination had already been issued, as document A/40/772. His Division would provide the programme budget implications if the resolution on the Conference was approved. It was quite understood that the drug control programme as a whole should not be subordinated to the Conference, preparations for which should go hand in hand with the regular work programme.

37. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation believed that the money spent under section 20 was well spent: everything possible should be done to combat that cancer of the modern age, drug abuse. He had hoped that the estimate would meet with general support and therefore regretted the position adopted by the Soviet Union. The figures before the Committee showed that estimated regular budget expenditures were much less than extrabudgetary resources. It was the duty of the United Nations to do all that it could to fight a terrible sickness which affected youth particularly. That did not, of course, exempt the Secretariat from using the money in the best and most effective way. His delegation would vote in favour of the proposed appropriation.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to a decision on expenditure section 20. As he heard no objection, he took it that the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination were adopted.

39. It was so decided.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that, based on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, he proposed that the Fifth Committee should adopt in first reading an appropriation in the amount of \$5,665,300 under section 20.

41. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Poland.

42. An appropriation in the amount of \$5,665,300 under section 20 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 87 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus completed its first reading of section 20.

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

44. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing section 21 of the Advisory Committee's report, said that with regard to the revised estimates contained in document A/C.5/40/12, the Advisory Committee had noted that the proposals to reclassify the three D-1 posts to the D-2 level had not been included in the initial estimates. The proposals were not for a reclassification of posts, as such, but rather the results of a classification exercise involving all UNHCR posts in the Professional category. As indicated in paragraph 21.3 and 21.4 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7), the Advisory Committee had already considered the results of the classification of Professional posts for UNHCR funded from extra-budgetary resources and had recommended its acceptance to the Executive Committee of UNHCR to accept the classification results.

45. The proposals before the current session of the General Assembly related to that portion of the Professional posts in UNHCR which were financed from the regular budget. In submitting its initial estimates, the Secretariat had omitted from the proposal the three D-2 posts referred to in document A/C.5/40/12. However, between the spring and autumn sessions of the Advisory Committee, the Secretariat had changed its position on the posts, for reasons which were indicated in document A/C.5/40/12. The three posts involved were the Regional Liaison Representative in Ethiopia, the Representative of the High Commissioner in Sudan and the Representative of the High Commissioner in Thailand.

46. The Advisory Committee had had discussions with representatives of the Secretary-General, and it had noted the reasons which had led to the change of position. The Advisory Committee's observation contained in chapter 1, Paragraph 13 of its report, concerned the need to ensure that the initial budget was as comprehensive as possible. The procedure followed by the Secretariat in that matter had called into question the adequacy of the decision-making process which had led to the initial decision not to classify the three posts from D-1 to D-2. The information subsequently given to the Advisory Committee had contained no new element which had not been available to the Secretariat prior to the finalization of the initial estimates under section 21.

(Mr. Mselle)

47. In those circumstances, the Advisory Committee was unable to make a definitive recommendation on the substance of the Secretary-General's request. However, if the General Assembly accepted the proposal to reclassify the three posts, the Advisory Committee would recommend that the related cost be absorbed. The Advisory Committee had not wished to prevent the Fifth Committee from expressing its opinions on the substance of the request contained in the revised estimates of the Secretary-General.

48. Mr. CABRIC (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination), commenting on the recommendations of the CPC on section 21, contained in paragraphs 673-675 of the report of the CPC, said that the question of the reclassifications had been discussed at great length in the CPC. Paragraph 673 of the report of the CPC showed quite clearly that there had been no consensus on the proposed reclassification of posts and transfer of posts from extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget.

49. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the proposals to increase appropriations, reclassify posts and transfer the funding of posts from extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget, were unacceptable to his delegation. It was common knowledge that in recent times a large group of countries had called not only for the freezing but also the reduction of administrative expenditure covered in the regular budget. The proposal was all the more incomprehensible as it had been made at a time of reduced activity by UNHCR. His Government had not supported the transfer of posts from extrabudgetary resources to the regular budget in the past, and would not do so now. It would retain that portion of its contribution for the transfer of the posts in question. His delegation wished a recorded vote to be taken on section 21, and would vote against it.

50. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that he had mixed emotions on the section under discussion. His Government strongly supported the work of UNHCR. The high level of voluntary contributions it made to the Organization reflected the importance which it attached to the Organization's work. Over the past eight years, there had been a tenfold increase in the programmes and in the voluntary funds budget of UNHCR. His delegation also noted that the classification of posts in UNHCR did not reflect the increased responsibility which flowed from increases in the programme budget. Because of its long-held commitment to the principle of budgetary restraint, however, his Government regretted that it was unable to support the 1.7 rate of real growth in the budget for UNHCR for the biennium 1986-1987. Cost increases could be offset by savings elsewhere in the budget of UNHCR. Such arrangements were possible without disturbing the integrity of UNHCR programmes of protection and assistance to refugees.

51. In addition, his delegation objected to the funding of the travel expenses of representatives of national liberation movements to attend meetings of the Executive Committee of UNHCR. It therefore requested that a recorded vote be taken on the recommendation contained in paragraph 675 of the CPC report, and that a separate recorded vote be taken on the appropriations for section 21.

52. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that he had not fully understood the views of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the proposals for reclassification. A clarification of those views would assist the Committee in taking a decision in full knowledge of the facts.
53. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that if three D-1 posts had been included in the initial estimates of the Secretary-General, it was doubtful whether the Advisory Committee would have rejected them. During the current year the Advisory Committee had recommended the approval of all re-classification proposals financed under the regular budget and which had been included in the initial estimates of the Secretary-General. The Advisory Committee was, however, dissatisfied with the procedure followed by the Secretariat in first removing the three D-1 posts from the initial estimates and then resubmitting them via the revised estimates. It was therefore for reasons of procedure that the Advisory Committee had said that it was unable to make a definitive recommendation. If the Fifth Committee accepted the reclassification, then the opinion of the Advisory Committee would be that it would not be necessary to appropriate additional funds.
54. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that, having regard to the answer provided by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, he wondered whether the decision on the question of reclassification would be based on the recommendation of the Secretary-General or on the report of the Advisory Committee.
55. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that it was quite clear in his mind how the Fifth Committee should proceed. There was a proposal of the Secretary-General and a non-definitive recommendation of the Advisory Committee before the Fifth Committee. Unless a member of the Fifth Committee made a different proposal, then, in his view, the Chairman of the Fifth Committee would then call on its members to decide whether to accept or reject the proposal of the Secretary-General.
56. The CHAIRMAN said that there were three decisions before the Committee: the recommendation of the CPC, the reclassification of the three posts, and the decision on section 21 as a whole. If the Fifth Committee accepted the three reclassifications, those posts would be absorbed and there would be no need for additional resources.
57. Mr. ANNAN (Director of the Budget Division) said that the Secretariat had indeed been rather clumsy in its handling of the question of the reclassification of posts. It had omitted the reclassification of posts in order to keep such proposals to a minimum. He wished to stress, however, that all those members of the Secretariat staff who had worked on the proposal of UNHCR, had been convinced that the reclassifications were justified both on merit and in terms of job content. The original decision had, unfortunately, been made in a mechanical way. After the decision had been made, the High Commissioner for Refugees himself had come from Geneva to have discussions with officials at Headquarters, including the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Annan)

58. It must be recalled that UNHCR was an organization with two sources of income, namely, extrabudgetary resources and the regular budget. The Executive Committee had an important role in the approval of programmes and activities financed from extrabudgetary resources. Two years previously, it had requested a complete reclassification exercise for the first time in the history of UNHCR. The Advisory Committee had, itself, endorsed the outcome of that exercise. In approving the extrabudgetary portion of the reclassifications, however, the Executive Committee had requested that its recommendation be implemented in tandem and held in abeyance until the regular portion of the budget had been approved. After the High Commissioner had appealed to Headquarters, the Secretary-General had reconsidered the issue and had decided to put the three D-2 posts forward. The CPC would have no difficulty in absorbing the costs if the Fifth Committee adopted the proposals.

59. He wished to add that UNHCR was an expanding organization which, in recent years, had had programmes as high as \$500 million. It could not be described as a top-heavy organization since, at the senior level, there were only one Under-Secretary-General, one Assistant Secretary-General, and six D-2 posts, four of which were financed from the regular budget and the other two from extrabudgetary resources.

60. He regretted the clumsiness of the procedure followed by the Secretariat. The proposal of the Secretary-General as submitted in the revised estimates was, however, a responsible one and he hoped that members of the Fifth Committee would endorse it.

61. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in paragraph 675 of the report of the CPC.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

62. The proposal contained in paragraph 675 of the report of the CPC was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

63. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against the recommendation contained in paragraph 675 of the CPC report because section 21 of the budget had provided for the funding of the travel expenses of national liberation movements.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve paragraph 674 of the CPC report without a vote.

65. It was so decided.

Implementation of the results of the job classification exercise in the office of UNHCR - reclassification of three field posts from D-1 to D-2 level (A/C.5/40/12 and Corr.1)

66. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) wondered how the Committee's decision on the matter should be interpreted; the reclassification in question would not be included in the proposals unless a decision was taken accordingly following a request in the Committee.

67. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) agreed. As he saw it, the Committee did not have before it any proposal about reclassification.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that the reclassification proposal contained in document A/C.5/40/12 and Corr.1 required a decision by the Committee.

69. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Committee did, in fact, have before it a proposal by the Secretary-General; since no member had submitted a contrary proposal, the Chairman was correct in inviting the Committee to take a decision on it.

70. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) supported that view, and proposed that the Committee should act on the Chairman's invitation.

71. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in the light of the explanation given by the chairman of ACABQ, his delegation wished for a vote on the Secretary-General's proposal, and would vote against it.

72. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that to reject the proposed reclassification could be damaging to the morale of field personnel, especially in view of the upgrading of certain Headquarters posts already agreed to by the Committee.

73. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) agreed with the previous speaker. The reclassification, moreover, would be commensurate to the exceptional management calibre required for the post in question.

74. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal contained in documents A/C.5/40/12 and Corr.1.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: None.

75. The proposal was adopted by 77 votes to 18.

76. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had been able to support the proposal in the context of the overall management structure and the overall increase in appropriations.

77. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that although his delegation strongly supported UNHCR activities it had serious reservations about the procedure followed in regard to the proposed reclassification. He endorsed the comments by the Chairman of ACABQ about the adequacy of the decision-making process, and noted that the additional information and justification had not been detailed. In his view, moreover, the Committee had not had a definitive proposal before it.

78. Mr. NODA (Japan) said that, although the importance his country attached to UNHCR, and its concern about the latter's financial problems, were well known, his delegation had been unable to support the proposal. It was also concerned about the considerable shortfall, reflected in the accounts, in the voluntary funds administered by the Office.

79. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his delegation had supported the proposal, for the reasons expressed by the representatives of Sweden and Pakistan.
80. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had opposed the proposals, for the reasons expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.
81. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on section 21 (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987.
82. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries usually took a generous view of the transfer of expenditure to the regular budget, although they remained aware of the distinction to be observed between the two forms of funding. They could support the proposals contained in section 21, which were balanced and reasonable.
83. Mr. GITSOV (Bulgaria) said that, despite his delegation's frequent disagreement, in general budget debates, on proposed rises, additional posts and transfer of expenditure to the regular budget, it had usually refrained from objecting to proposals of a modest nature. But the section to be voted upon contained proposals involving an increase of roughly \$500,000 in respect of two large operations. The rise of some 1.7 per cent was high compared to the expenditure related to the regional commissions for Latin America, Western Asia and Africa, for example, and unjustified in the current world economic situation. His delegation, therefore, could not support the proposals.
84. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: None..

85. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$32,154,100 under section 21 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 85 votes to 10.

86. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, although his country supported the activities of UNHCR, his delegation could not approve a 1.7 per cent rise in expenditure or an appropriation for the travel of representatives of national liberation movements.

87. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said his delegation had voted in favour of the appropriation as a whole, but had voted against the proposed reclassification of posts since it felt that the procedure had been inadequate and should have been better monitored.

Section 22 - Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator

88. The CHAIRMAN referred the Committee to the appropriation proposed by the Secretary-General, and recommended by ACABQ, of \$5,187,100 for the biennium 1986-1987, and to the relevant recommendations contained in paragraphs 676 and 677 of CPC's report (A/40/38). He invited the Committee to take a decision on section 22 as a whole.

89. Mr. MONIRRUZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that his country, being in a disaster-prone region and having recently suffered from natural catastrophes, attached great importance to UNDR0's work. His delegation particularly welcomed programme elements 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2, and felt that the latter two should be accorded due priority.

90. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that his country too was in a region prone to natural disasters and greatly appreciated UNDR0's efforts, particularly in disaster preparedness. It nevertheless stressed the need to guard at all times against duplication of effort, and noted the Secretariat had taken heed. Subprogramme 3 did seem to reflect some degree of overlapping between prevention and preparedness; he urged the Secretariat to do its utmost to ensure that funds were used to the best effect.

91. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), replying to a question by Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America), said that the Secretariat was not aware of any recent departure from the guidelines adopted for the use of grants for emergency assistance.

92. Mr. JEMAIEL (Tunisia) said that his country, which had been stricken by floods a few years previously, greatly appreciated UNDR0's efforts and could support the proposed appropriation, which reflected only a modest increase in expenditure.
93. Mr. ORTEGA (Mexico) said that his country, which had recently suffered a violent earthquake, realized how vitally important UNDR0's work was. He hoped the Committee would approve the appropriation requested.
94. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) supported the previous speakers.
95. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the request and recommendations contained in paragraphs 676 and 677 of the CPC report.
96. It was so decided.
97. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$5,187,100 under section 22 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading without a vote.

Section 23 - Human Rights

98. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the appropriation in the amount of \$9,776,800 proposed in the draft programme budget, the additional revised estimate of \$557,900 proposed in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/40/9), giving a total of \$10,334,700, and the amount of \$9,776,800 recommended by CPC in Paragraph 678 of its report.
99. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), in introducing the report of the Advisory Committee on section 23, Human Rights, said that he wished to draw attention to paragraph 23.5 of the report of the Advisory Committee, which dealt with the new procedures that the Advisory Committee would follow in cases involving unforeseen or extraordinary expenditure in the implementation of the recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights.
100. Concerning the revised estimates, the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/40/9) dealt with the requirements of the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus for the biennium 1986-1987. In his report, the Secretary-General had requested a total of \$557,900 in additional appropriations under section 23. That estimate included a total of \$263,700 for consultants' fees and travel, general temporary assistance, contractual services, travel of staff, general operating expenses and research grants.
101. With regard to the payment of a daily fee of \$260 to the third member of the Committee, to which reference was made in paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report, the Advisory Committee understood that the fee had been negotiated and that the rate was the same as that paid to the previous third member of the Committee. The fee was not expected to change during the biennium 1986-1987.

(Mr. Mselle)

102. For the current biennium, resources totalling \$347,600 were available to the Committee. As at August 1985, \$208,700 had been obligated or expended. The sum of \$340,000 was expected to be spent by December 1985. Although the Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus had commenced its work in 1984, there had been little experience with regard to the level of resources required to service the substantive activities of the Committee for a full biennium. In those circumstances, the Advisory Committee was convinced that the full provision of \$550,900 was not warranted at the current stage. It therefore recommended that \$500,000 be authorized.

103. Mr. KRAMER (United States of America) said that although his delegation supported much of the work carried out by the Commission on Human Rights, it objected to the levels of expenditure on such activities as those related to the Second United Nations Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The United States Congress had recently decided that the country would no longer contribute to such activities. Although almost six pages of CPC's report was devoted to the Commission's activities, CPC had failed to agree on a single recommendation relating to the furtherance of human rights.

104. Since the Centre for Human Rights was based at Geneva, there was no reason for policy-making organs to meet in New York; yet one P-2 post had already been transferred from Geneva, and another P-2 post in New York was envisaged, as a result of such activities. His delegation also doubted whether the revised estimate contained in document A/C.5/40/9 was fully justified. Lastly, it objected to meeting the travel costs of the representatives of so-called national liberation movements.

105. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the recommendation contained in paragraph 678 of the CPC report.

106. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

107. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$9,776,800 under section 23 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 97 votes to 1.

108. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on section 23 as a whole, based on the CPC recommendation, just adopted, in the amount of \$9,776,800 and the revised estimate of \$557,900 contained in document A/C.5/40/9. He also invited the Committee to approve, under the heading of revised estimates, an appropriation of \$21,300 in the expenditure section 31 (staff assessment), to be offset by a similar amount under income section 1.

109. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

110. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$9,976,800, together with the amount of \$500,000 under the heading revised estimates under section 23, and for an appropriation in the amount of \$21,300 under section 31, for the biennium 1986-1987, was approved in first reading by 97 votes to 1.

111. Mr. HERIJANTO (Indonesia) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting on the appropriations on the sections 15, 16 and 19, it would have voted in favour.

112. Miss DURRANT (Jamaica) said that, had her delegation been present during the vote on the appropriation under section 19, it would have voted in favour of the appropriation and the relevant CPC recommendation.

The meeting rose at 10.15 p.m.