



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 76th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados)

later: Mr. KOBINA SEKYI (Ghana)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/33/L.10 and
A/33/L.19-32 (continued)

Revised estimates under section 5 C, Department of International Economic and
Social Affairs

Comprehensive study of the question of honoraria payable to members of organs
and subsidiary organs of the United Nations (A/33/7/Add.39; A/C.5/31/2, A/C.5/33/54)

AGENDA ITEM 109: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUBSIDIARY
ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued)

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)
Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/33/L.10 and A/33/L.19-32 (continued) (A/33/7/Add.37; A/C.5/33/103)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, as he had already introduced the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.37) on the question under consideration, he would merely draw to the attention of the Fifth Committee paragraphs 9 and 10 of that report. He hoped that the members of the Committee would refer in their statements to the contents of those paragraphs.
2. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that the question before the Committee was both political and financial in nature. Its political aspect had received thorough study in the appropriate bodies, and he recalled that Morocco and the Maghrebian countries had offered full support to the Azanians fighting against the apartheid régime in South Africa.
3. With specific reference to draft resolution A/33/L.26, he said that Member States seriously questioned the effectiveness of Secretariat information activities. The Belgian representative had already pointed out, for example, that the radio broadcasts designed to support the people of South Africa were not listened to simply because the reception was bad owing to the unsuitability of the frequencies that had been selected. The Secretariat unfortunately did not seem to have concerned itself with that matter. A much less expensive procedure than the one currently used would be to transmit the broadcasts by telephone from the United Nations to neighbouring African countries, which would retransmit them to South Africa. Besides having technical problems, the broadcasts in question were unsuitable in content. If they were to be effective, they must be prepared with the co-operation and participation of the African fighters themselves. Only if those shortcomings were remedied would the Office of Public Information be able to allay the distrust felt by Member States.
4. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that he shared the concern expressed by the representative of Morocco. The Special Committee against Apartheid had hundreds of thousands of dollars available for information activities on apartheid, all of which was spent on broadcasts to southern Africa, without a single appropriation for publicizing the evils of apartheid in other parts of the world. It should be recalled that, less than two weeks before, the United States State Department had denied a visa to a representative of the apartheid régime. The promoters who had hired the person in question to engage in sports activities in the United States had taken steps to achieve their purposes, but the Committee against Apartheid, which could have publicized the incident, had done nothing. In view of those instances of inefficiency, his delegation found it very difficult to support the budgetary requests for information activities on apartheid.

/...

5. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that his delegation associated itself with the comments made by the representative of Morocco. It felt that the Fifth Committee should not support the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General for information activities on apartheid should be reduced by \$22,000. Although it was proper for the Advisory Committee to try to effect economies, the United Nations should not spare resources where something as important as apartheid was concerned.
6. His delegation supported the Advisory Committee's other recommendations on the matter.
7. Mr. MONTHE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the representatives of Morocco and Guinea and felt that the Moroccan representative's comments on the problems of radio broadcasting in support of the people fighting against apartheid were very pertinent. If the requested appropriations were approved, it was essential for the Office of Public Information to overcome the technical problems involved, particularly those relating to the frequencies used for broadcasting.
8. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that there seemed to be a misunderstanding regarding the Advisory Committee's recommendation for a reduction of \$22,000 in the appropriation requested under section 21; that reduction related to 12 work-months at the G-5 level. The Advisory Committee had recommended that all the other funds requested by the Secretary-General for the dissemination of information should be granted. However, it considered that the Office of Public Information, which had considerable staffing resources, should be able to absorb the additional work to be performed by the new G-5 post. It should be noted that an amount of \$277,700 had been allocated to radio programmes for southern Africa the previous year, of which \$277,255 had been expended, and that practically double that amount was being recommended by the Advisory Committee for the current year. Moreover, the reduction of \$4,700 recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 15 related to section 22 of the programme budget and did not affect radio programmes.
9. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) said that he shared the concern expressed by other delegations regarding the need for funds appropriated for activities relating to apartheid to be used as effectively as possible so as to bring about the early elimination of that abhorrent practice.
10. It was interesting to note that, of the \$613,000 requested for the dissemination of information on apartheid, \$573,000 was for the production of radio programmes to be broadcast to southern Africa and that the Advisory Committee had not recommended a reduction in the funds allocated for programme preparation. His delegation had studied the programmes in question, since at one time it had felt that their cost, as indicated in paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/33/103), was somewhat high. It therefore could now assure members that the programmes were of high quality. Their cost should nevertheless be reduced so that the same resources could be used to produce a great many more programmes.

/...

11. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by previous speakers. In particular, it associated itself with those who were opposed to the \$22,000 reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee in the appropriations for the dissemination of information on apartheid, particularly since the Office of Public Information did not have sufficient staff to make up for the loss of the essential G-5 post.

12. With regard to the recommendation that consultant services should be obtained for a period of six months for work relating to the draft International Convention against Apartheid in Sports, he wondered if the Secretariat could not provide those services, so that there would be no need to hire additional staff.

13. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, in estimating the financial implications of draft resolution A/33/L.31, the Secretariat had been of the opinion that consultant services would be required and had calculated the duration of such services.

14. The Advisory Committee had recalled General Assembly resolution 32/209, which requested that no supplementary estimates should be presented in respect of experts and consultants during the current biennium. In the case under discussion, however, the Secretary-General had been of the opinion that he was obliged, by virtue of the Special Committee's recommendation, to place the question before the Fifth Committee, so that it might decide whether to recommend an exception to resolution 32/209. If the funds for recruiting the experts were not forthcoming, the Office of Legal Affairs would necessarily carry out the work with its existing resources, in conditions that would yield less speedy results.

15. With regard to the Advisory Committee's recommendation for a reduction of \$22,000 in the Secretary-General's request for funds for the dissemination of information on apartheid (A/33/7/Add.37, para. 6), he said that, if the reduction was approved, the Office of Public Information might be able to absorb the 12 work-months at the G-5 level by using a staff member at that level for the periods required, without actually transferring a post.

16. Mr. KHAMIS (Algeria) said that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention against Apartheid in Sports should be able to complete its work quickly. In view of the explanations provided by the Under Secretary-General for Administration and Management, he felt that the Fifth Committee should recommend making an exception to the rule laid down in General Assembly resolution 32/209.

17. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that the technical activities of the Office of Public Information were experiencing the growth indicated in paragraphs 14, 15, 17 and 18 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/33/103), which could not be covered with existing staff. OPI would have to maintain its contacts with no fewer than 25 national broadcasting organizations.

18. It should also be recalled that the present General Assembly coincided with International Anti-Apartheid Year, and under those circumstances he regarded as unacceptable any reduction, even of a token nature, in funds for information on

(Mr. Kouyate, Guinea)

apartheid. He therefore proposed that the Committee should approve the total appropriation of \$573,000 requested by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/33/103, paras. 16-21).

19. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the representative of the Secretary-General had stated that the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee would not impede fulfilment of the plans involving the necessary work-months. If the Secretariat itself considered that some of the funds requested were dispensable, it hardly seemed reasonable for the Fifth Committee to reject that conclusion.

20. Mr. SEALY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he supported the view expressed by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and observed that the problem should be dealt with exclusively from a financial standpoint. There was no question about the intensity of United Nations efforts to liberate the peoples of southern Africa, and if the Secretariat felt that the proposed programmes could be carried out with the resources recommended by the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should approve that recommendation.

21. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) expressed surprise at the idea that the Fifth Committee should approve recommendations on which the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat had agreed. It was, on the contrary, the Fifth Committee which had responsibility for the decision.

22. If the Secretary-General felt that one of the posts mentioned in his report was unnecessary, it was difficult to understand why he had requested it. The Advisory Committee had perhaps approached the question from a purely financial and technical standpoint, but he felt that United Nations activities regarding southern Africa must be strengthened and he therefore supported the proposal made by the representative of Guinea.

23. Mr. SEIFU (Ethiopia) said that the explanations provided by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had convinced his delegation that the Advisory Committee's report took a sound position on the matter (A/33/7/Add.37, para. 6). There was no reason to insist on an appropriation if its aims could be achieved without it. He urged the representative of Guinea not to press his proposal, which the Ethiopian delegation would not be able to support if a vote was taken.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Algerian proposal that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it make an exception to its resolution 32/209 in respect of the implementation of draft resolution A/33/L.31.

25. The proposal was adopted by 57 votes to 12, with 10 abstentions.

26. Mr. AYENI (Nigeria) observed that, while paragraph 5 of the draft resolution on the programme of work of the Special Committee against Apartheid (A/33/L.27) contained a request to the Secretary-General to strengthen the Centre against

/...

(Mr. Ayeni, Nigeria)

Apartheid in the light of the recommendations of the Special Committee, the statement of financial implications seemed to make no provision for the strengthening of the Centre. The matter had been postponed indefinitely pending a survey by the Administrative Management Service.

27. He was concerned about the need to ensure that the Centre had sufficient resources to carry out its intensive programme of activities for 1979, and requested the Secretariat to take immediate steps to make sure that those efforts were not impeded, pending completion of the report by the Administrative Management Service.

28. With regard to paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/33/L.27, according to which the post of the head of the Centre against Apartheid would be upgraded to the level of an Assistant Secretary-General, he was surprised to see that ACABQ had observed (A/33/7/Add.37, para. 16) that the question of upgrading would be examined by the Administrative Management Service and that the Secretary-General would formulate his proposals in that regard after the survey had been completed. That part of the draft had been proposed by the Special Committee against Apartheid after consultation with the Secretary-General, and the Special Committee considered it very important for the performance of the Centre's functions. Consequently he could not understand why ACABQ, instead of providing for immediate implementation of the measure, made it conditional upon an examination which would postpone it for a year and left open the possibility that it would not take place. It would be highly irregular for a decision to upgrade a post, taken by the General Assembly for political reasons, to be examined by a technical service.

29. If the Secretary-General's proposal was that the implementation of the measure should be postponed for a year, the proposal should be submitted to the Special Committee against Apartheid and to the sponsors of the draft resolution, who would consider it in the light of their well-known respect for the Secretary-General's authority. Another possible solution would be to amend the draft so as to allow the Secretary-General to upgrade the post later in the year, after studying the matter.

30. With regard to the dissemination of information (A/33/L.26), he supported the proposal that a sum of not less than \$573,000 should be approved for the implementation of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

31. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) recalled that the Special Committee against Apartheid had recommended that the post of the head of the Centre against Apartheid should be reclassified to the level of Assistant Secretary-General, together with a request that the Centre against Apartheid should be strengthened. In addition, the Working Group established by the Special Committee had recommended that the three posts immediately below that of the head of the Centre should be reclassified from P-5 to D-1. The Secretary-General considered that those recommendations posed the question of determining how the Centre could best be strengthened. It would be recalled that a few years earlier the post of head of the Centre had been reclassified from D-1 to D-2; whether such procedures constituted the best way of

/...

achieving the desired strengthening of the Centre deserved consideration. The Special Committee had further requested the establishment of a liaison office at Geneva in order, in particular, to attend to relations with the specialized agencies. The Secretary-General had decided to include the establishment of the liaison office in the 1979 revised programme budget proposals. However, as the reclassification proposals had caused the Secretary-General and the competent Department some concern, the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs had requested that the Administrative Management Service should carry out a survey, as an urgent matter. The first steps in that direction had already been taken, even though it was impossible to give the survey priority over other tasks already undertaken by the Service.

32. In the view of the Secretary-General, therefore, the reclassification proposal made by the Special Committee against Apartheid should be considered in the light of a survey of the structure and requirements of the Centre against Apartheid. As soon as the survey had been completed, the Secretariat would make proposals in that regard. Circumstances did not permit that to be done during the current session of the General Assembly. He would point out, however, that the strengthening of the Centre might depend not so much on the reclassification of its senior posts as on the fulfilment of the ambitious plans recommended by the Special Committee against Apartheid and supported by the Advisory Committee.

33. The CHAIRMAN first put to the vote the Guinean proposal concerning the restoration of the sum of \$22,000 under section 21A, Public Information, requested by the Secretary-General to cover 12 work-months at the G-5 level for assistance in the production of the programmes (A/C.5/33/103, para. 18), the elimination of which had been recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

34. The Guinean proposal was adopted by 51 votes to 21, with 10 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/33/7/Add.37, para. 18), with the amendment already adopted by the Fifth Committee.

36. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote before the voting, said that the USSR had always actively supported the struggle against apartheid, but that after carefully studying documents A/C.5/33/103 and A/33/7/Add.37, he could find no justification for the additional resources requested for that purpose. It should be possible to derive from existing resources the funds needed for a high priority activity of that type.

37. Consequently, and in accordance with the position it had taken regarding supplementary appropriations during a budget period, his delegation would abstain from voting.

38. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly that, if draft resolutions A/33/L.10 and A/33/L.19 to A/33/L.32 were adopted, an additional appropriation of \$688,400 would be required

/...

(The Chairman)

under sections 3A, 3D and 21A, and an additional appropriation of \$29,100 for staff assessment under section 25, offset by an equivalent amount in income Section 1.

39. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by 64 votes to 3, with 15 abstentions.

40. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said he had voted against exclusively for budgetary reasons, relating mainly to draft resolution A/33/L.27 and the additions made by the Fifth Committee to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee with regard to draft resolutions A/33/L.26 and A/33/L.31. His country's opposition to apartheid remained unchanged.

41. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados) said he had abstained from voting on the Guinean proposal because he felt that the Department of Public Information, which had an operational budget of over \$30 million for the biennium and a staff of several hundred, should be able to provide 12 work-months at the G-5 level out of existing resources. He had voted for the recommendation as a whole, with the Guinean amendment, because Barbados had always opposed both apartheid in South Africa and racism wherever it existed in the world.

42. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said he had voted in favour because the best way of collaborating with the peoples of southern Africa was to undertake united action against all those who supported the apartheid régime, and because the funds which the United Nations used for those purposes were far from being comparable to those allocated to disarmament, for example, although the developing countries in general considered that the highest priority should be given to the question of southern Africa, especially during the current International Anti-Apartheid Year.

43. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said Canada fully agreed that apartheid must be eliminated, but had abstained from voting for financial reasons, because it considered that public information activities could be funded from existing resources and that savings could have been effected with regard to the Centre against Apartheid.

44. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) reaffirmed his country's opposition to apartheid and said he had voted against because he considered that the additional appropriations recommended were excessive, in view of the Secretariat's capacity to finance the envisaged activities from existing resources.

Revised estimates under section 5C, Department of International Economic and Social Affairs (A/33/7/Add.38; A/C.5/33/94)

45. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.38), said that the Advisory Committee was recommending the approval of the Secretary-General's request for a new D-1 post in the Executive Office of the Department.

/...

46. With regard to the organizational component responsible for development research and policy analysis, the Advisory Committee had adopted a more conservative position and was recommending, for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 9 to 11 and 13 to 18 of its report, that the request for two new posts at the P-5 and D-2 levels and two supporting General Service posts not be approved.

47. With respect to the organizational component for programme planning and co-ordination, the Advisory Committee was recommending that, of the 12 new posts requested by the Secretary-General (two P-1, three P-5, one P-4 and six General Service), eight should be approved (one D-1, three P-5, one P-4 and three General Service) and that they should be deployed flexibly and effectively among the Evaluation, the Joint Planning and the Programme Planning Units, for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 20 to 24 of its report.

48. The Advisory Committee was recommending that the additional appropriation for travel sought by the Secretary-General should be reduced to \$14,000. It was likewise recommending that the appropriation of \$97,410 requested by the Secretary-General under section 22 for common services should be reduced to \$50,000.

49. The Advisory Committee's recommendations were recapitulated in paragraph 28 of its report (A/33/7/Add.38).

50. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said his delegation was prepared to accept the recommendations of the Advisory Committee concerning the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. It would have liked the restructuring to produce a more rational and modern structure, but had the impression that what was being created was a top-heavy superstructure that was unlikely to be efficient. In particular, it feared that problems of overlapping, excessive compartmentalization and lack of cohesion might arise. In that context, it fully agreed with the Advisory Committee's warning concerning the tendency toward the proliferation of posts, which was not conducive to the optimum use of available staffing resources.

51. Attention should also be paid to the need to strengthen the Department through the assistance of other sectors of the system, in accordance with paragraph 61 (a) of the annex to resolution 32/197. As many new functions relating to planning, co-ordination and evaluation of programmes had arisen, the necessary resources should be incorporated gradually, making use of existing possibilities. Similarly, his delegation trusted that the posts recommended would be used with the greatest flexibility in order to reduce to the minimum the need to create new posts.

52. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he found the recommendations of the Advisory Committee acceptable for the reasons set forth in the report in document A/33/7/Add.38.

53. His delegation agreed with the Japanese delegation concerning the need to rationalize the units of the United Nations. In that connexion, he said that he thought insufficient information had been provided concerning the deployment

(Mr. Pirson, Belgium)

of posts in one of the units which had been abolished and suggested that in the programme budget estimates the situation of the Office for Inter-Agency Affairs and Co-ordination should be clarified.

54. Mr. RIPERT (Under-Secretary-General for International Economic and Social Affairs) said that his Department, in seeking to contribute to the process of restructuring, was bearing in mind the provisions of resolution 32/197 and the need to establish effective and economical structures. Accordingly, it was at all times aware of the need to avoid duplication and to make maximum use of the resources already available to the United Nations system.

55. With regard to the proposals in document A/C.5/33/94, he said that although the Advisory Committee had not agreed to all the requests of DIESA, the latter had the resources which it needed to begin its activities in 1979. In its future work the Department would adapt itself to the principles clearly set forth in the resolution adopted by the Second Committee with regard to the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations (A/C.2/33/L.104) and would bear in mind the observations of the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee.

56. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan), referring to the recommendation in paragraph 24 of the Advisory Committee's report, asked how the assigned posts would be flexibly deployed and whether a staff member from another sector would be reassigned to the unit which would not have a staff member at the D-1 level as a result of the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

57. Mr. RIPERT (Under-Secretary-General for International Economic and Social Affairs) said that provisionally the D-1 post would be intended for the Joint Planning Unit, while the Evaluation Unit would be headed, at least at the beginning, by a staff member at the P-5 level. Later the Department would again raise the question in the context of the programme budget estimates for the biennium 1980-1981.

58. Mr. Kobina SEKYI (Ghana) took the Chair.

59. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reaffirmed his delegation's position of principle that all activity undertaken in the course of the budgetary exercise should be financed from savings, reassignments or funds resulting from the termination of activities. Consequently, he thought it was entirely wrong to request the recruitment of new staff, as that would entail an unjustified and unreasonable increase in the budget. The aim was not to expand the manning table but to make better use of available resources and increase their productivity. Therefore, when the vote was taken on the revised estimates under section 5C and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the matter, his delegation would vote against them.

60. Mr. NER (India) said that the Government of India had always hoped that the restructuring would lead to more effective use of resources and a more economical way of providing assistance and it would accordingly support the Advisory Committee's recommendations. It should be emphasized that when staff was recruited

/...

(Mr. Ner, India)

for the new posts the interests of the developing countries should be the paramount consideration. Similarly, it was important to take into account the limitations of the reassignment of resources and to respect the views of the Secretary-General.

61. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should approve an additional credit of \$423,300 under sections 5C and 22 of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, as well as a credit of \$106,700 under section 25 for staff assessment, offset by an equivalent sum under section 1 of income.

62. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by 81 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

Comprehensive study of the question of honoraria payable to members of organs and subsidiary organs of the United Nations (A/33/7/Add.39; A/C.5/31/2, A/C.5/33/54)

63. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.39), said that the Secretary-General had prepared a further report (A/C.5/33/54) in response to a request by the General Assembly. In essence the Secretary-General stated in his report that he could not make any forthright recommendation as to whether the existing exceptions to the rule on the payment of honoraria should be maintained, extended to other organs or eliminated. It should be noted that the proposals relating to an increase in the honoraria of the members of the International Law Commission, the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, the International Narcotics Control Board and the Human Rights Committee were still under consideration by the General Assembly. In paragraph 9 of its report the Advisory Committee indicated the amount which would be required if it was decided to extend the payment of honoraria to other bodies in addition to the four bodies whose officers and members were at present receiving honoraria.

64. With respect to the proposal of the Secretary-General to increase the amounts now being paid to officials of the four bodies, the Advisory Committee was maintaining its previous position. In the absence of a policy decision by the General Assembly the Advisory Committee was also not in a position to make a recommendation regarding the possibility of extending the exceptions to other bodies; nor could it make recommendations on the possibility of eliminating the payment of honoraria.

65. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) asked if the Chairman of the Advisory Committee could, speaking for himself, say whether in his opinion there were obstacles which would preclude maintaining the existing situation.

66. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom), reviewing the background of the problem, said that in August 1975 the Secretary-General had recommended increases in the scale of honoraria averaging approximately 60 per cent for the three organs whose members were authorized to receive them (A/C.5/1677). The General Assembly had adopted resolution 3536 (XXX) in which it had decided to maintain at their then current levels the amounts of honoraria paid and had requested a comprehensive study of the question. In 1976 the Secretary-General had submitted document

/...

(Mr. Stuart, United Kingdom)

A/C.5/31/2 in which he had reached the conclusion that there were no considerations making it imperative to change the existing system; the Secretariat had, however, made a more comprehensive study of the matter at the request of the Advisory Committee, while the Fifth Committee had deferred consideration of the question each year. In the Secretary-General's new report (A/C.5/33/54) it was asserted that, logically, either all of the bodies in question or none of them should be recognized as having the right to receive honoraria. The Advisory Committee thought that the General Assembly should decide for itself whether the system of exceptions should be maintained (A/33/7/Add.39, para. 8) and recalled that the Secretary-General's proposals concerning increases in the amounts of the honoraria were still being considered by the General Assembly.

67. With regard to the first of those questions, he felt that there were sound reasons for maintaining the system of exceptions. Two of those exceptions were based on international agreements ratified by many Member States and adopted by the General Assembly. That would make it extremely difficult, from the practical standpoint, to eliminate the honoraria of the members of the Human Rights Committee and the International Narcotics Control Board, an action which would probably also be contrary to the wish of the majority of Member States. The payment of honoraria to the members of the International Law Commission and the Administrative Tribunal was also based on a long-standing tradition and had won the tacit approval, as it were, of the General Assembly.

68. With the regard to the possibility of extending the payment of honoraria to the members of all the bodies concerned, he felt there were decisive arguments against such action. The cost would be either \$254,000 or \$388,000, depending on the amount of the honoraria, and the need to economize at the present time made that solution even more inopportune.

69. He therefore thought that the four existing exceptions should be maintained and that the only question was to determine whether the amount of those honoraria should be increased. In his view, the time which had elapsed since they were fixed made it necessary to bring them up to date, in accordance with the proposals made by the Secretary-General in 1975, beginning with 1979. He hoped that the Secretariat could give the Committee precise information concerning the financial implications of such action.

AGENDA ITEM 109: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued)
(A/C.5/33/17/Add.1)

70. The CHAIRMAN said that because of the resignation from the Advisory Committee, effective from 1 February 1979, of Mr. Hou Tung of the People's Republic of China, it would be necessary to appoint a candidate to fill the resulting vacancy until the expiry of the term on 31 December 1980. The Government of the People's Republic of China had proposed the candidature of Mr. Tang Jianwen. Under rule 92 of the rules of procedure, all elections should be held by secret ballot. However,

/...

(The Chairman)

in accordance with the precedent set by the General Assembly and the Fifth Committee, the secret ballot could be dispensed with if there was not more than one candidate. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to dispense with the secret ballot.

71. It was so decided.

72. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend that Mr. Tang Jianwen be appointed to membership in the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as of 1 February 1979, to fill the vacancy of Mr. Hou Tung until the expiry of the latter's term, in other words, until 31 December 1980.

73. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.