

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

FORTY-SECOND SESSION

**Official Records\***



**FIFTH COMMITTEE**  
**31st meeting**  
held on  
Friday, 13 November 1987  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING**

**Chairman:** Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden)

later: Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago)

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

**CONTENTS**

**AGENDA ITEM 122: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)**

**AGENDA ITEMS 115 AND 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNium 1988-1989 AND**  
**PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)**

F-ret reading **(continued)**

Section 2A. Political and Security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities

Section 2B. Disarmament affairs activities

Section 3. Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2.750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

**Distr. GENERAL**  
**A/C.5/42/SR.31**  
**25 November 1987**

ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

/...

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

AGENDA ITEM 122: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued) (A/41/640 and A/C.5/41/14; A/42/636 and Corr.1; A/C.5/42/3, 7, 14, 24, 28 and 37)

1. Mr. AHTISAARI (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), introducing the report of the **Secretary-General** on the establishment of an **Office of Ombudsman** in the **Secretariat** and streamlining of the appeals procedure (A/C.5/42/28), said that the **Secretariat** had given that question high priority and had taken various measures, described in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report, to identify, analyse and address the problems that existed. Effective consultations had been held with staff representatives to that end and the staff had accepted the seriousness of the administration's intentions.

2. Dealing properly with staff grievances was an important role of management in any large concern. The establishment of a fair, economical and speedy redress system should not be a complicated task. Underlying problems were, perhaps, rather more intractable. The difficulties were structural, procedural and attitudinal and the changes made must be in the general context of the current process of reconstruction and staff reductions.

3. The Organization already had a very complex redress system and care should be taken not to make unnecessary changes. For instance, regarding the establishment of an Ombudsman institution, there was for the time being no consensus, and although the idea had not been abandoned, the Secretariat considered that it was important to focus first on getting the existing machinery to work. Again, before eliminating the Discrimination and Grievance Panels and appointing an Ombudsman with very similar duties in their place, it was necessary to find out why they had not been more successful. Further support should also be given to the processes of administrative review and conciliation under the staff rules.

4. The Joint Inspection Unit had recommended that a permanent chairperson should be appointed to the Joint Appeals Board, instead of the current panel of part-time chairpersons at the D-1 or D-2 level. Although the Secretariat did not reject that idea outright, it felt it was impractical to redeploy such a senior-level post to that task. It must first be proved that the existing system was not yielding satisfactory results. The suggestion that an office for the administration of justice should be established seemed an exaggerated response. Responsibility for co-ordinating the redress and appellate system had been entrusted to the Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, that should greatly shorten the post-appellate decision-making process since that Office already advised the Secretary-General on such matters. As to procedures. A number of deficiencies, which had for example allowed time limits to be disregarded with the result that cases dragged on for years, were being corrected.

5. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in considering the matter, the Advisory Committee had taken into account, in addition to the two reports of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/41/14 and A/C.5/42/28), the information on appeals procedures in the specialized agencies referred to in the report on co-ordination submitted to the General Assembly at its

(Mr. Maelle)

preceding session (A/41/671), the opinion of the Board of Auditors referred to in paragraph 67 of the report of the Advisory Committee in document A/42/579, and the comments made by the Joint Inspection Unit in its report (A/41/640).

6. The Advisory Committee had felt that while the reports of the Secretary-General indicated his intention to take steps to reform the current system of administration of justice in the United Nations, few tangible achievements in that regard had been indicated. More than two years had gone by since the matter had been raised and the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts had indicated, in recommendation 60, that corrective measures should be taken as rapidly as possible. Consequently, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Secretary-General's report to the forty-second session of the General Assembly should include specific information on what had already been done to simplify rules and procedures; the steps taken to identify those aspects of staff administration which gave rise to an inordinate number of appeals; and the steps taken to provide for the quick settlement of minor disputes prior to the appeals stage and to establish a mechanism to reject frivolous applications for review. The report should also propose steps for a more efficient handling of cases that reached the judicial bodies, provide information on the results of the consultations between the staff and the Administration on establishing an office of Ombudsman, including a complete statement of the administrative and financial implications, and indicate what steps had been taken to correct the deficiencies in the established process for disciplinary action.

7. Mr. EL-MEKKI (Sudan) said that, according to the instructions of the General Assembly, the introduction of reforms to make the Secretariat more efficient was to be carried out without a negative impact either on the staff or on programme execution. The staff representatives had expressed the staff's concern about reductions in the manning table that did not give due consideration to such questions as the seniority of the staff members affected. There were two elements which might seem contradictory: on the one hand, the need to achieve an efficient organization which would require only the essential resources and, on the other, the need for an adequate complement of experienced and capable staff. The Secretary-General must act with the Advisory Committee's comments in mind and in such a way that no staff member's post was abolished unless that was truly necessary, so that no one would be hurt. At a time when so much was being said about balanced geographical distribution of the staff and about financial crisis, the organization would find itself in a dilemma if it did not adopt a global perspective and if it did not have the necessary resources.

AGENDA ITEMS 115 AND 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1988-1989 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/42/3, 6 and Corr.1, 7 and Add.2, 16 (Part I) and Add.1 and 16 (Part II), 512, 532 and 640; A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1 and 17)

#### First reading (continued)

#### Section 2A. Political and security Council affairs; peace-keeping activities

H. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary

(Mr. Mselle)

Questions) said that the Secretary-General had originally requested appropriations totalling \$82,448,400 and the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction to \$79,043,900 for that section of the proposed programme budget. Paragraph 2A.3 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/42/7) referred briefly to the information provided to the Advisory Committee regarding the reform measures affecting that section, described by the Secretary-General in his progress report (A/42/234) and in the updated report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213 (A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1), in particular paragraphs 17 to 23 of the latter document. In the light of those measures, which had programmatic and budgetary implications, the Secretary-General had submitted a revised estimate in the amount of \$79,025,100. The Advisory Committee recommended that it should be reduced to \$75,731,800.

9. Mr. EL-MEKKI (Sudan) asked whether the objectives of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean had changed and what the consequences of the reduction in the appropriations for that subsection would be for peace in the Indian Ocean region.

10. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean had not been changed in any way. It was simply that the Committee had been transferred from section 2B, Disarmament affairs activities, to section 2A, Political and Security Council affairs. The change had some programmatic consequences in the sense that the subprogramme and programme element corresponding to that activity had been amended to reflect its transfer from one section of the budget to another. The transfer had been made solely on practical grounds and there had been no change in the resources for the Committee.

11. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation opposed the appropriation included under subsection C of section 2A for activities relating to the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Red Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The costs of the Preparatory Commission should be borne by the countries which were parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, because the Commission had been created by a treaty separate from the United Nations Charter. Its costs could not therefore, be assessed against all Member States, since they did not represent legitimate expenses of the Organisation within the meaning of Article 17, (paragraph 2,) of the United Nations Charter.

12. During the review of section 2A of the proposed programme budget by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, his delegation had entered a reservation regarding those activities, which appeared in paragraph 54 of part I of the CPC report (A/42/161). He therefore requested a recorded vote on expenditure under subsection C of section 2A of the proposed programme budget related to those activities.

13. Mr. HÜRPAS (Turkey) said that the Government of Turkey had not signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and had on many occasions noted that it reserved the right not to contribute to the financing of the mechanism established to apply the Convention, the cost of which should be borne by the signatories. His delegation again reserved that right and consequently supported the request of the United States delegation for a separate vote on the expenditure in question.

14. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) recalled, with reference to the cost of consultants and expert groups, recommendation 35 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations that expenditure on outside consultants should be reduced by 30 per cent (A/41/49). In section 2A, the only expenditure envisaged for consultants came under subsection C, Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea. The Advisory Committee referred to that expenditure item in paragraph 2A.18 of its report (A/42/7), noting that it reflected a reduction of only 9.9 per cent. Moreover, in paragraph 2A.55 of section 2A of the proposed programme budget (A/42/6), a provision of \$18,200 was requested for a meeting of experts in specialised technical fields of the law of the sea.

15. His delegation was not satisfied with the explanation given in that paragraph for the need to hold such a meeting of experts. He believed that recommendation 35 should apply also to groups of experts, even though that had not been indicated explicitly, but it should be borne in mind that expert group meetings were also convened by the Secretary-General without a legislative decision and that an expert could be considered a type of consultant. He would like clarification from the Secretariat on that question.

16. Mr. Murray (Trinidad and Tobago) took the Chair.

17. Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica) asked if there had been any change in the Secretary-General's mandate as approved in General Assembly resolution 37/66 on the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. That resolution provided for the assumption by the Secretary-General of the responsibilities entrusted to him under the Convention. Unless the Secretary-General's mandate had changed, there was no need to change the name of the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea to Office for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea.

18. Mr. Amneus (Sweden) resumed the Chair.

19. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation shared the reservations expressed by others regarding the inclusion in the proposed programme budget of costs for servicing the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. In that connection, he would like information on the results of the review, recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 2A.22 of its report (A/42/7), of the number of non-conference-servicing staff sent to service the session of the Preparatory Commission.

20. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) observed that revisions had been made in section 2A.C of the budget proposals which should perhaps be reviewed in greater depth before the second reading of the proposed programme budget. He therefore suggested that section 2A should be adopted in first reading, on the understanding that the questions raised regarding subsection C would be resolved in the plenary Assembly.

21. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budgeting Division) said, in response to the question of the representative of Poland, that the Secretary-General had interpreted recommendation 35 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts as applying solely to consultants, not to groups of experts. In his view, there were fundamental differences between consultants and experts. For example, experts did not receive remuneration, only reimbursement of expenses. Moreover, there were some expert group meetings which were convened by legislative decision.

22. In answer to the representative of Jamaica, he said that the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Law of the Sea, which would now be called the Office for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, had been renamed to comply with the recommendation of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts that Secretariat units should be consolidated. There had been no change in the Secretary-General's mandate as to activities relating to the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, but it was essential to rename the Office in order to reflect the Secretary-General's consolidation of functions in that sector.

23. Responding to the representative of the United Kingdom, he said that while the review of the number of staff to be sent to the Preparatory Commission sessions was still under way, there was a clear justification for the number of trips indicated. When the review was completed, more detailed information would be provided to the Committee regarding such travel.

24. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco), noting that the mandate of the Secretary-General regarding law of the sea affairs had not changed, said that he thought that question should be discussed in the appropriate political body, namely, the General Assembly proper. In that case, the adoption of any decision on subsection C should be deferred until the General Assembly had taken a position on the matter.

25. Referring to the comment by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 2A.7 of its report (A/42/7) that savings could have been made if the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had held one of its sessions in New York instead of Geneva, he asked why such a decision had not been taken and the proper priority given to the matter.

26. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) noted that expert groups included both those established by legislative decision and those convened on the initiative of the Secretary-General. He wondered whether the meeting of experts referred to in paragraph 2A.55 of the proposed programme budget had been set up by legislative decision or on the initiative of the Secretary-General.

(Mr. Abraszewski, Poland)

27. He also wished to know the ratio between the estimated costs for the expert groups convened on the initiative of the Secretary-General and for those convened by a decision of the legislative bodies, since two different types of expert groups were actually involved even though they were included together under the same heading. Thus, even if the strictest interpretation was given to recommendation 35 of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts, it could be reasonably argued that at least the expert groups set up on the initiative of the Secretary-General should be reduced by 30 per cent. Recommendation 35 was one of the clearest recommendations, and it was important to know how the Secretary-General was carrying it out.

28. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that when the Secretary-General had established the Office of the Special Representative for the Secretary-General of the Law of the Sea, he had assigned it the very specific function of servicing the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and subsequently the Preparatory Commission. His report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213 (A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1, para. 21) stated that the Secretary-General had decided to consolidate in that Office activities to implement various programmes and also that its name would be changed. Under the circumstances, the logical thing would be to decide if the original function of the Office had the same priority as before, or if it should be performed with other priorities borne in mind. The Secretary-General should submit the proposed restructuring to the General Assembly so that it could confirm its approval of the changes and of the priorities set for the new Office. Thus, a clearer view was needed before deciding on the programmatic content of the budget in second reading, and he supported the suggestion of the representative of Morocco.

29. Mr. NGAIZA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation was prepared to take a decision on subsection C, on the understanding that it would be considered again before the second reading, when the organ concerned - the plenary General Assembly - had taken a decision on it.

30. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) confirmed that the group of experts referred to by the representative of Poland had been proposed by the Secretary-General. Groups of experts did not have different mandates depending on whether they had been established by legislative decision or on the initiative of the Secretary-General; once they had been included in the programme budget, their status was the same.

31. Referring to the Moroccan representative's comment, he said that the Legal Sub-Committee met alternately in New York and in Geneva, it was true that there was additional expenditure when the meeting was held in Geneva. In 1986, that expenditure had amounted to \$18,000.

32. Mr. JEMAIL (Tunisia), referring to subsection E (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) in section 2A of the proposed budget, noted that the Secretary-General had proposed a reduction of \$369,800 in the estimate for the Agency (A/42/6, table 2A.43) compared with the revised appropriations for the biennium 1986-1987. His delegation would like to know how that reduction had been calculated.

33. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the calculation had been based on the turnover rate generally applied throughout the United Nations.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in paragraph 55 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

35. It was so decided.

36. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriation in the amount of \$2,274,900 under section 2A, sub-section C, for the servicing of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Turkey, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

37. An appropriation in the amount of \$2,274,900 under section 2A, sub-section C, for the servicing of the Preparatory Commission for the International Sea-Bed Authority and for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea was approved in first reading by 95 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to approve the Advisory Committee's recommendation on section 2A of the proposed programme budget, on the understanding that the Committee would revert to subsection C of that section before the second reading.



39. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$75,731,800 under section 2A for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without objection.

40. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) expressed concern at the number of recorded votes being requested on various sections of the programme budget.

Section 2B. Disarmament affairs activities

41. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the difference between the original estimates proposed by the Secretary-General and those recommended by the Advisory Committee derived from the latter's general recommendations in respect of the turnover rate, unliquidated obligations, consultants and publications.

42. As indicated in paragraph 28.2 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/42/7), and in paragraph 24 of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/213 (A/C. 5/42/2/Rev. 1), primary responsibility for servicing the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was to be assigned to the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs. However, judging from the Secretary-General's report, it would appear that the matter with which the Ad Hoc Committee was concerned was to be dealt with by that Department and by the Department for Disarmament Affairs. It was to be hoped that that would not result in duplication of activities and that, in the course of the review of the Department for Disarmament Affairs referred to by the Secretary-General in paragraph 23 of document A/42/234, that point would be borne in mind. The reforms indicated by the Secretary-General in his report, were not expected to have any implications as far as his initial estimates or the original recommendations of the Advisory Committee were concerned.

43. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco), supported by Mr. LADJOUI (Algeria), asked whether the studies on activities related to disarmament had been completed, whether they had been started or whether it was planned to initiate them before the end of the year.

44. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said that, in order to avoid duplications much as that mentioned by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee in connection with the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, it would be necessary to follow the recommendation in paragraph 31 of the report of the Group of Intergovernmental Experts (A/41/49) on the consolidation of offices, departments and other units. It would be essential to know what the Secretary-General was going to do in that regard before the end of the year.

45. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that in table 2R.9 of the proposed programme budget (A/42/6) consultants and ad hoc expert groups appeared separately, as two expenditure items. On the other hand, in the annexes to that document and particularly in annex VI, they appeared together. He wondered what was the reason for that difference. He reiterated his request for information on the ratio, in percentage or in monetary terms, of the expenditure on ad hoc expert groups established under mandates from policy-making organs to the expenditure on groups established on the initiative of the Secretary-General.

46. Mr. GOMEZ (Controller), reply inq to the quest ion of the representative of Morocco, said that the studies in question had not been finalized but that the partial results from che material already available were being studied. Although he doubted whether the results could be applied before the end of the year, he was sure that any proposals derived from the studies would be available at the beginning of 1988, in time to be considered during the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Some of the repercussions of the studies would undoubtedly be reflected in the revised estimates and in the manning tables.

47. With regard to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, substantive staff and staff from the administrative sectors had studied the situation in detail. It had been concluded that it was better not to make changes for the time being, partly because there were no budgetary implications and no possibility of duplication or overlapping.

48. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that all the ad hoc expert groups mentioned in section 2B had been established under resolutions of policy-making organs. With regard to the programme budget as a whole, it was not possible at that stage to ascertain the ratio of expert groups originating from initiatives of the Secretary-General to those resulting from initiatives of policy-making organs, but the Secretariat would consider the matter and provide the requested information in due course. Table 2B.9 was a summary. The expenditure for consultants and for ad hoc expert groups was broken down at the beginning of each facicle.

49. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that in 1986 it had been decided to review the question of the studies on disarmament and to reassess their usefulness. He asked whether the results of that review were available and whether they were reflected in the proposed programme budget. In connection with the World Disarmament Campaign, the United Kingdom had some reservations regarding the resources allocated to the Campaign and in particular regarding its financing under the regular budget. It had originally been said that the Campaign would be financed from voluntary contributions, but in practice the ratio of expenditure financed under the regular budget to that financed from voluntary contributions was 2 to 1. He asked whether the situation had varied at all over the past two biennia.

50. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) endorsed the consents made by the United Kingdom delegation and asked what percentage of extrabudgetary resources the United Nations expected to receive in convertible currencies.

51. Mr. GOMEZ (Controller), replying to the question by the United Kingdom representative concerning the studies on disarmament, said that the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies had considered the matter carefully and had reiterated, in paragraph 37 of its report (A/42/300), the importance of the studies and research in the area of disarmament. The First Committee had just welcomed that report.

52. Mr. BAUDOT (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that there was very little difference between the resources allocated to the world Disarmament Campaign and those for the biennium 1986-1987. Estimates for the biennium

(Mr. Baudot)

1988-1989 amounted to approximately \$1.3 million under the regular budget and half 4 million dollars from extrabudgetary resources, while the figures for the current biennium were \$1.5 million and \$600,000 respectively. That showed a slight decrease in the share of extrabudgetary resources in the total estimates for the Campaign. The Secretariat would ascertain whether there was a sizeable difference compared with the figures for the biennium 1984-1985. With regard to the information requested by the United States representative, he indicated that the proportion of extrabudgetary resources which the United Nations expected to receive in convertible currencies varied between 20 and 25 per cent.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in paragraphs 61 and 62 of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

54. It was so decided.

55. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning section 2B of the proposed programme budget.

56. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$8,755,500 under section 2B for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in the first reading without objection.

57. MR. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/42/17) dealt with the programme budget implications of the recommendations of the Board of Trustees of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, for a subvention. The principle of the procedure adopted by the Fifth Committee for recommending subventions was that the amount should not exceed half the guaranteed income of the Institute. In 1986, owing to the United Nations financial crisis, the Board of Trustees of the Institute had requested a subvention that was considerably less than half its guaranteed income and it had now indicated that the amount authorized by the General Assembly had placed the Institute in a very difficult position. Consequently, it had been obliged to request the maximum subvention for the current year, and its representatives had told the Advisory Committee that if the amount was not approved considerable damage would be caused to the operations of the Institute. The Advisory Committee was informed that the Institute's guaranteed revenue for 1988 was estimated at \$379,500 and it therefore recommended that a subvention of half that amount, i.e. \$169,700, should be included under section 2B.

58. MR. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that programmes funded from voluntary contributions should not be subsidized out of the regular budget. He requested a recorded vote on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

59. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the additional appropriation of \$169,700 under section 28 for the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Italy.

60. An additional appropriation of \$169,700 under section 28 for the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, was approved in first reading by 90 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.

61. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote, said that disarmament studies were very important but it must be pointed out, for the sake of budgetary discipline, that the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research had originally been set up on the understanding that it would be funded from voluntary contributions. His delegation had therefore been unable to vote in favour of the proposed additional appropriation.

### Section 3. Political affairs, trusteeship and decolonization

62. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in connection with the reform measures taken by the Secretary-General, his Office had been transferred from section 1 to section 3 of the proposed programme budget. The Offices in question were referred to in paragraphs 3.21 and 3.22 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/42/7) and in paragraphs 25 and 26 of the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/42/2/Rev.1). The changes made in section 3 had programme budget implications which had made it

(Mr. Maelle)

necessary to increase the Secretary-General's original estimate from \$30,301,700 to \$31,326,600, and the amount recommended by the Advisory Committee from \$29,533,500 to \$30,503,700.

63. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the responsibilities of the United Nations in the area of decolonization had been greatly reduced except in the case of Namibia, for there were not only 19 Non-Self-Governing Territories, many of which were not actively seeking independence. The level of resources allocated to decolonization activities, however, was still excessive, especially in the case of resources for servicing meetings of the Special Committee on decolonization. The intergovernmental decision-making process in that area needed to be, and could be, streamlined while maintaining the responsibilities of the United Nations in the area of decolonization.

64. His country condemned the apartheid system and believed it must be abolished, but it did not support sane United Nations programmes and expenditures in that area. It also opposed regular-budget funding of the New York offices of two national liberation movements, and would not support the request contained in paragraph 3.26 of the proposed programme budget (A/42/6). On the other hand, it had given considerable financial support to programmes providing direct benefits to the peoples of southern Africa, being one of the major contributors to the United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa and the United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa, and it reiterated its support for the rapid implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) on the subject of Namibia. However, the common goal of independence for Namibia should not prevent an open discussion of the budgetary aspects of United Nations programmes on Namibia. His delegation and others had objected to the financial implications of decisions by the Council for Namibia and opposed the high level of spending on travel, public information activities, conferences and the financing of the New York office of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the United Nations Fund for Namibia.

65. The United States was legally required to withhold from its assessed contribution to the regular budget a share proportionate to the cost of activities benefiting SWAPO. Paragraph 67 of the report of CPC (A/42/16 (Part I)) reflected the reservation entered by his delegation on SWAPO participation in the execution of programmes funded out of the regular budget. His delegation therefore requested a recorded vote on the appropriations called for in paragraphs 3.26 and 3.93 of the proposed programme budget.

66. Mr. EL-MEKKX (Sudan) said that the points raised by the representative of the United States were of no relevance to the Fifth Committee, because they were political in nature and the Committee was not the appropriate place to discuss them. He would be grateful, on the other hand, if during the second reading of the proposed programme budget it were possible to present all the various sections of the budget in a single paper which could be dealt with in one go.

67. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) observed that, despite efforts by the United Nations Council for Namibia to cut costs, delegations still complained about it, ignoring the fact that during the year the Council had decided to hold no special meeting<sup>3</sup> in 1988 in view of the grave financial situation of the United Nations. The budget was 4 vehicle for carrying out a series of activities born of need. The need was not always perceived by all Member States, but each State must make an effort to understand and make concessions to the needs of other countries. If reservations and withholdings continued, the spirit of resolution 41/213 which, it had been hoped, would begin a period of renewal, would be undermined; every Member State might ask for vote<sup>3</sup> on different sections of the budget and decide which parts it preferred to fund or not, leaving the Organization in a very serious position.

68. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his country had no complaint about incurring expenditure in connection with Namibia, but believed that the resources should go to activities which did more to benefit the people living in the Territory of Namibia. As for withholdings from his country's contribution to the regular budget, they did not apply to all activities, but definite amounts were withheld in accordance with specific legislation passed by the United States Congress. The United States was firmly committed to the principle of consensus, and had joined the consensus on sections 1, 2A and 2B. It did not, however, believe that consensus should be used to gag delegations. Disagreeing with the inclusion of 4 particular item in the budget was consistent with the letter and spirit of General Assembly resolution 41/213. Finally, his country respected the right of Viet Nam to request a recorded vote on certain sections of the budget, and hoped that other delegations would respect its own right to request recorded votes.

69. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) said that the utility of many activities under section 3B, on decolonization, had declined substantially. Decolonization was no longer the burning issue it had been in the 1960s and 1970s, and only 19 Non-Self-Governing Territories remained. Still, the future of those Territories was ritually discussed in the Sub-Committee on Small Territories, the Special Committee on decolonization, the Fourth Committee and the plenary Assembly. One must wonder whether the costs involved were warranted, given that the majority of those territories were not even trying to win independence. Although his delegation would vote in favour of section 3 of the budget, it believed that the activities and outlays covered by that section should be looked at carefully.

70. Mr. VU VAN MIEN (Viet Nam) said he objected to the appropriations relating to the question of Kampuchea and requested a recorded vote on subsection<sup>3</sup> 3E.1 (Ad Hoc Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea) and 3E.3 (Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Co-ordination of Humanitarian Assistance Programmes to Kampucheans).

71. Mr. CHUA (Singapore) said he was surprised at the request by Viet Nam for a recorded vote on the appropriation<sup>3</sup> relating to the question of Kampuchea, since in the plenary Assembly the majority of Member States had voted in favour of the item.

72. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee endorsed the **recommendation** made by **the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination** in paragraph **70** of its report (A/42/16 (Part I)).

73. It was so decided.

74. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriations of \$589,200 and \$839,700 for the activities described in paragraphs 3.26 and 3.93 respectively of the proposed programme budget.

In favour: Algeria, **Angola**, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, **Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic**, Cameroon, Canada, **Central African Republic**, Chile, **China**, **Colombia**, Congo, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, **Denmark**, **Egypt**, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German **Democratic Republic**, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, **Hungary**, **Iceland**, India, Indonesia, **Iran** (Islamic Republic of), **Ireland**, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, **Mongolia**, **Morocco**, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, **Nigeria**, **Norway**, **Oman**, Peru, Philippine, Qatar, **Romania**, **Rwanda**, Saudi Arabia, **Senegal**, Singapore, **Somalia**, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet **Socialist Republics**, United Arab Emirates, **United Republic of Tanzania**, Uruguay, **Venezuela**, **Viet Nam**, **Yemen**, **Yugoslavia**, Zaire, **Zimbabwe**.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, France, **Germany**, Federal Republic of, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal.

75. Appropriations of \$589,200 and \$839,700 for the activities described in paragraphs 3.26 and 3.93 respectively of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989 were approved in first reading by 94 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

76. At the request of the representative of Viet Nam, a recorded vote was taken on the appropriations of \$110,300 under subsection 3E.1 and \$481,400 under subsection 3E.3 of the proposed programme budget.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burma, **Cameroon**, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, **Costa Rica**, **Côte d'Ivoire**, **Denmark**, **Egypt**, Fiji,

**Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Leaotho, Liberia, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand- Two, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire.**

**Against: Anaola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam.**

**Abstaining: Benin, Burkina Faso, India, Madagascar, Mexico, Nicaragua, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen.**

**77. Appropriations of \$110,300 under subsection 3E.1 (Ad Hoc Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea) and \$481,400 under subsection 3E.3 (Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Co-ordination of Humanitarian Assistance Programmes to Kampuchea) for the biennium 1988-1989 were approved in first reading by 75 votes to 14 with 8 abstentions.**

**78. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on section 3 as a whole.**

**79. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$30,503,700 under section 3 for the biennium 1988-1989 was approved in first reading without objection.**

**The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.**