

# 1755th meeting

Monday, 1 December 1975, at 8.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1755

## AGENDA ITEM 104

Personnel questions (*continued*) (A/10184, A/C.5/1672 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1716, A/C.5/L.1224, A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1271, A/C.5/L.1272, A/C.5/L.1274):

(a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/10184, A/C.5/L.1224, A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1271, A/C.5/L.1272, A/C.5/L.1274)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the proposals before it.

*Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2*

2. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that the employment of women in the Secretariat of the United Nations was too important a subject to be plagued by dissent. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2 had worked hard to arrive at a text that was broadly acceptable to the vast majority of delegations. His delegation would have liked the text to go further, but had accepted the views of the other sponsors and those of the Group of 77. The text should now stand without substantive amendments.

3. Mr. KIVANÇ (Turkey) noted that the text of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution had been improved and that the sponsors had accepted Turkey's amendment to paragraph 3.

4. While his delegation accepted the substance of paragraph 1, it felt that equitable distribution of the positions between men and women in the Secretariat was not a major principle. More important were the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Article 8 provided that the United Nations should place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs. Article 101 stressed the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity, and the importance of recruiting staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible. His delegation therefore proposed that the word "principle" should be replaced by the word "consideration" in paragraph 1.

5. Mr. HASSANE (Niger) said that his delegation approved the ideal of complete equality between men and women within the Secretariat. A more urgent consideration, however, was that all Member States should be equitably represented. His delegation still had difficulties with draft resolution A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2. Paragraph 38(e) of the report of the Secretary-General (A/10184) stated that competing priorities, such as geographical distribution, had a bearing on the recruitment of women. The draft resolution before the Committee would only heighten the conflict between those two competing priorities to the

disadvantage of the principle of equitable geographical distribution, which greatly concerned the under-represented countries. Those countries had qualified personnel and were prepared to make sacrifices in the interests of the United Nations. The injustice of sexual discrimination should not be remedied at the expense of the principle of equitable geographical distribution. His delegation therefore wished to request the Secretary-General to intensify efforts to respect that principle. The Secretariat stood to benefit from the presence of qualified personnel who had an excellent awareness of particular environments.

6. The long delays in the recruitment process had been justifiably deplored by other representatives and his delegation hoped that situation would soon be redressed.

7. Mr. VON RUCKTESCHELL (Federal Republic of Germany) thanked the sponsors for their attempts to improve the wording of the draft resolution. The new text was more consistent with the wishes of the majority. His delegation, however, still had difficulties with paragraph 3 and wondered whether the 5 per cent quota was adequate and would not later be criticized. The Federal Republic of Germany, in view of its own under-representation within the Secretariat and its large number of qualified men, was concerned about the implications of paragraph 3, which was not completely clear. The paragraph appeared to establish the principle of geographical distribution on a regional basis. That was a dangerous tendency, which was likely to jeopardize the chances of the under-represented countries obtaining additional posts for their nationals.

8. His delegation proposed the deletion of paragraph 3, and supported the Turkish amendment to replace "principle" by "consideration" in paragraph 1.

9. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said that his delegation approved the amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2 and commended the sponsors for their efforts. It would, however, like the meaning of the term "priority" in paragraph 3 to be clarified, and wondered how such priority would be given in practice. It assumed that qualified women candidates from the over-represented countries would be credited in the 5 per cent regional quota. Qualified women candidates from the under-represented countries could be credited in their own national quota and/or in the 5 per cent regional quota. Unless, however, they were credited in the regional quota only, they would not benefit from the proposed system. He would therefore welcome some assurance from the sponsors in that regard.

10. His delegation also wished to know whether women candidates from the over-represented countries would be required to wait until the search for women candidates in the under-represented or unrepresented countries had been

exhausted towards the end of each biennium. That procedure would be essential if the word “priority” was to have any practical meaning.

11. The implications of paragraph 3 deserved close scrutiny. As far as the region of Asia and the Far East was concerned, 5 per cent of the mid-point of the desirable range amounted to 28 posts per biennium or 14 posts per year. Document A/10184 showed that, between 1974 and 1975, appointments from that region to posts subject to geographical distribution had amounted to 27. The adoption of paragraph 3 would therefore mean that half the new Professionals recruited from the region would in the future be women. That requirement could not easily be satisfied, and his delegation feared that the regional quota for Asia and the Far East might eventually apply to only a few countries, such as Australia, where the social status of women was higher than in others. Such a situation was neither fair nor equitable, and his delegation endorsed the strong reservations expressed by various representatives regarding the so-called regional approach. It was also afraid that some stigma might be attached to candidates recruited under the special quota system. That could create an unhealthy and unwelcome situation.

12. His delegation would not oppose the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, but supported the representative of Venezuela in his request for a separate vote on paragraph 3. It supported Turkey’s proposed amendment to paragraph 1.

13. Mr. TALIEH (Iran) said that in operative paragraph 1 “equitable” meant fair and just, and “principle” meant a fundamental truth.

14. The question raised by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany about qualified men from unrepresented and under-represented countries was dealt with towards the end of paragraph 3. That paragraph did not call for the establishment of a regional quota. It envisaged only the employment of women and was limited in application to two biennia. It was establishing no rules or precedents.

15. Replying to the questions put by the representative of Japan, he stated that paragraph 3 clearly explained the meaning of “priority” and that the text did in fact imply that qualified women candidates from over-represented countries would be required to wait until the search for women candidates from the under-represented countries had been exhausted. With regard to the number of women who might be recruited from Asia and the Far East, he drew attention to the words “Requests the Secretary-General to make every effort”. The Secretary-General could not be asked to do more than was possible. However, the fact that 50 per cent of the Japanese candidates who had taken the competitive examination for Secretariat posts were women suggested that Japan had little to fear on that score.

16. The sponsors could not accept the amendment to paragraph 1 proposed by the representative of Turkey.

17. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the beginning of the sixth preambular paragraph had

been amended to read “Noting the limited progress made to date . . .”. The phrase in the middle of paragraph 3 should read “. . . with priority being given to candidates from countries which are not represented or under-represented in the Secretariat”.

18. Mr. LAVAU (Director of the Budget Division) said that the measures envisaged in paragraph 4 would have financial implications. The proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 included an appropriation of \$20,000 for travel expenses and \$5,000 for advertising for recruitment missions. An intensification of regular and publicized recruitment missions would entail more interviews, more advertising and a greater processing of applications. As a result, an additional appropriation of \$14,000 to \$15,000 or, at the minimum, \$10,000 would be required, although for the moment no requests would be made.

19. Miss FORCIGNANÒ (Italy) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for their efforts. Her delegation was prepared to support its adoption by consensus. It would abstain, however, in the separate vote on paragraph 3.

20. Mr. MASCARENHAS (Brazil) said he was amazed that the Committee was still trying to improve on the excellent work done by the sponsors of the draft resolution in reconciling various positions. He intended to abstain in the vote on any proposed amendments and would vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood.

21. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution, since it promoted equitable distribution of the positions between men and women in the Secretariat. He thanked the sponsors for the conciliatory spirit they had shown and for the concessions they had made so that the text would be generally acceptable.

22. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should vote first on the amendment to operative paragraph 1 proposed by the Federal Republic of Germany and Turkey, namely, that the word “principle” should be replaced by the word “consideration”. A separate vote would then be taken on paragraph 3, as requested by the representative of Venezuela. Finally, the Committee would vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

*The amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 28, with 19 abstentions.*

*Paragraph 3 was adopted by 55 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1257/Rev.2 as a whole, as revised, was adopted by 83 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

23. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that, in voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and of paragraph 3 in particular, his delegation trusted that the Secretary-General, in interpreting paragraph 3, would bear in mind that the chief aim of the resolution was to strengthen the position of women in the Secretariat. Other considerations should be given very secondary importance. Although paragraph 3 stated that priority should be given to candidates from countries which were not represented or

were under-represented, it did not say that absolute priority should be given to such candidates. He trusted that in implementing the resolution the Secretary-General would ensure that women from adequately represented countries had a fair chance.

*Draft decision A/C.5/L.1272*

24. Mr. NORBURY (United States of America) noted the particular importance which his delegation attached to the Joint Advisory Committee's Standing Committee on the Employment of Women in the Secretariat. He had also been pleased to hear the statement made by the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services (1754th meeting) concerning the recommendations of the Joint Advisory Committee based on the work of the Standing Committee. In order to commend the Standing Committee on its work and to urge the Secretary-General to give special attention to recommendations that had ensued from it, his delegation was submitting for the Committee's consideration a draft decision (A/C.5/L.1272) which was simple and self-explanatory; it did not duplicate and did not conflict with the draft resolution just adopted. He hoped that the draft decision would be adopted by consensus. The delegations of Australia and Sweden had requested that their names be included among the sponsors.

*Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1274*

25. Mr. TALIEH (Iran) introduced a draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1274), which reflected the concern of the developing countries over the anomalous situation whereby the Secretariat was managed at the senior level of D-1 and above by staff members who were nationals of countries which represented about 27 per cent of the membership of the Organization; nationals of the developing countries occupied only about 35 per cent of the senior posts. The draft resolution could be the first step towards putting an end to that anomaly, and he hoped that the Fifth Committee would adopt it.

26. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) requested information on the expected rate of recruitment during 1976 in order to clarify the meaning of the draft resolution. He also noted that another method of redressing the imbalance in the Secretariat was through promotion, which in turn might give rise to the question of the upgrading of posts, a matter on which the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had already made known its views.

\* \* \*

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adjourn consideration of draft decision A/C.5/L.1272 and draft resolution A/C.5/L.1274 until the following day.

*It was so decided.*

28. Miss FORCIGNANO (Italy) thanked the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services for preparing the conference room paper<sup>1</sup> containing information on the

distribution by nationality of the candidates included in the roster maintained by the Secretariat. However, it did not fully answer her question (1750th meeting). She was interested in knowing both the nationality of candidates and the positions for which they were being considered.

29. Mr. GHERAB (Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services) said that, since nationals of all countries were involved, it would take more time and effort to compile the information requested by the representative of Italy. The Secretariat was prepared to do so, however.

### AGENDA ITEM 98

**Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/10279 and Add.1, A/10280 and Add.1, A/10360, A/C.5/1704)**

30. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew the Committee's attention to section II of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/10360), in which the latter recommended a new approach which seemed to be necessitated by recent developments in the United Nations system with regard to administrative and budgetary co-ordination and programme co-ordination. Although it had been expected that the problem of co-ordination within the United Nations system would have been alleviated with the introduction of programme budgeting and medium-term planning, the improvement had not been as great as had been expected. The reasons for that were given in paragraphs 6, 8, 9 and 10 of the report of the Advisory Committee. The Fifth Committee and the General Assembly obviously did not have time to consider the budgets of each of the agencies in detail. He therefore suggested that in subsequent years the amount of detail included in the Advisory Committee's annual reports on the budgets of the specialized agencies could be reduced. Secondly, since most agencies had already gone over to biennial budgeting, it might be possible to dispense with annual reporting to the Assembly on the agency budgets. It would appear more useful for the Advisory Committee to try to pin-point areas which had system-wide application and bring them to the attention of the Fifth Committee, which could then make appropriate recommendations in that regard. In paragraphs 14 to 20 of its report, the Advisory Committee singled out some areas which could be looked into in future; that list should not be taken as exhaustive but merely as an indication of the kinds of subjects which could usefully be considered. If the Fifth Committee approved the comments in section II of the report, that would constitute a kind of mandate to the Advisory Committee to pursue its efforts along the lines suggested. At its next session, the Advisory Committee would decide how to proceed with its subsequent reports based on the outline in section II and any observations made by the Fifth Committee.

31. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the Secretary-General wanted to bring to the Committee's attention a problem related to General Assembly resolution 2924 B

<sup>1</sup> Conference room paper A/C.5/XXX/CRP.13 of 1 December 1975.

(XXVII), concerning the Joint Inspection Unit. The provisions of paragraph 2 of the resolution caused concern to the Secretary-General in view of developments subsequent to the adoption of that text. At a time when a number of other important bodies had been established to consider the structure and machinery of the United Nations, the Secretary-General was not convinced that it would be appropriate for him to submit his own views on the question to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. The requirements placed on him by a resolution which dated back to 1972 seemed to have been largely overtaken by subsequent events. Unless the Committee decided otherwise, the Secretary-General therefore proposed to concentrate his attention almost exclusively on matters affecting the Joint Inspection Unit and to explain his omissions with regard to resolution 2924 B (XXVII) by the fact that the matters in question were currently *sub judice* in a number of important intergovernmental bodies.

32. Mr. RHODIUS (Netherlands) welcomed the report of the Advisory Committee and the related reports of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, which should be studied by delegations to the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council and also by delegations to the specialized agencies, as well as by their executive heads. Yet, at a time when centrifugal tendencies in the system increased the need for co-ordination, the Fifth Committee gave only cursory treatment to the item on co-ordination, thus preventing the General Assembly from fulfilling its obligations under Article 17, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, in particular in respect of making recommendations to the specialized agencies. The Fifth Committee was the only body which could acquire an over-all view of the work of the United Nations through its consideration of the programme budget and the medium-term plan, and it had many system-wide responsibilities—for example, in respect of salaries and pensions. Apart from the time factor, one reason for the Committee's failure to devote more attention to co-ordination was that delegations tended to concentrate on the United Nations proper, which was only one organization in the system, and on budget figures. He advocated a system-wide approach to the problems under consideration and full use of the possibilities offered by the programme budgeting system.

33. The close relationship between programmes and budgets meant that the Economic and Social Council must be aware of the administrative and budgetary implications of certain proposals, while the Fifth Committee should be aware of the programme contents of certain proposals. The decision-making system could be improved by implementing the proposal of the Working Group on United Nations Programme and Budget Machinery<sup>2</sup> for a close working relationship between the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Advisory Committee.

34. The Advisory Committee in its report had drawn attention to the inadequacies of the current system of co-ordination. He endorsed its useful suggestion that in future the traditional annual reports of the Advisory Committee on the budgets of the specialized agencies should be complemented by reports on specific problems of

administrative and budgetary co-ordination containing appropriate recommendations. He also agreed with the Advisory Committee's suggestion in paragraph 14 of its report that the interaction between activities financed under the regular budgets and those financed from voluntary funds should be studied more closely and systematically; a comparative study by the Advisory Committee would certainly be welcome. In connexion with the comment in paragraph 15 that there were still short-comings in respect of co-ordination between the United Nations Environment Programme and the specialized agencies, he noted that the fourth session of the UNEP Governing Council to be held in the spring of 1976 would review the institutional arrangements for international environmental co-operation and discuss the idea of establishing a standing advisory body to assist it in co-ordination matters; he was confident that such a body would correct any deficiencies. He welcomed the statement in paragraph 16 of the Advisory Committee's report that it would study the possibilities for improving administration and management in the various agencies, and he agreed with the observation in paragraph 17 that there was a need for interagency co-operation in personnel questions. He also welcomed the Advisory Committee's intention to study more closely budgetary problems facing all agencies and, in view of the action taken by the Fifth Committee when, at its 1748th meeting, it adopted draft decision A/C.5/L.1226/Rev.1<sup>3</sup> requesting the Secretary-General and the executive heads to examine the impact of inflation on the budgets of United Nations organizations, he understood that the Advisory Committee would co-ordinate its efforts in that field with ACC.

35. He suggested that the Advisory Committee might study the extent to which specialized agencies had taken action to harmonize their scales of contributions with those of the United Nations. The Committee on Contributions, in its report,<sup>4</sup> had quite correctly drawn the attention of the General Assembly to its resolutions 2190 A (XXI) and 2474 A (XXIII) requesting the Advisory Committee to report periodically on that matter.

36. He expressed the hope that at the thirty-first session, an off-budget year, the Fifth Committee could give in-depth consideration to co-ordination. It was of vital importance that the General Assembly should give central guidance on issues of interest to the system as a whole. He suggested that the Advisory Committee might make specific recommendations on how to improve the process of co-ordination.

37. In conclusion, he endorsed the new approach suggested in the report of the Advisory Committee.

38. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) suggested that, in view of the time factor, the Committee should consider deferring consideration of the item until the following session, or simply take note of the report of the Advisory Committee and postpone substantive consideration of that report.

39. Mr. BACHE (United States of America), supported by Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) and Mr. MASCARENHAS (Brazil),

<sup>2</sup> See document A/10117 and Corr.1, of 17 June 1975, para. 77, recommendation 3 (f).

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 96, document A/10500, paras. 66 and 68.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, *Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 11*, para. 28.

pointed out that some members of the Committee might wish to comment on the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management.

40. Mr. RHODIUS (Netherlands) suggested that delegations might give their views on the suggestions made by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 3 to 21 of its report, without commenting in detail on the administration of the specialized agencies, in order to give the Advisory Committee some guidance.

41. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee would welcome the observations of members of the Committee on the suggestions it had made in paragraphs 3 to 21 of its report, in which it described the new approach which the Advisory Committee wished to take, subject to the endorsement of the Fifth Committee.

42. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, without prejudice to the suggestion by the representative of New Zealand, the Committee should hear statements by delegations on the report of the Advisory Committee and in response to the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, in order to give the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General some guidance, and that the question should be given more in-depth and comprehensive consideration at the thirty-first session.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 96

**Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 and medium-term plan for the period 1976-1979 (continued)\* (for the previous A/... and A/C.5/... documents, see the 1734th meeting; A/10008/Add.6 and 11, A/C.5/1682/Add.1 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1708, A/C.5/1709, A/C.5/1714, A/C.5/1715, A/C.5/1718, A/C.5/1722, A/C.5/1723, A/C.5/1725, A/C.5/L.1240)**

*United Nations accommodation (A/9854 and Add.1, A/10279 and Add.1, A/10280 and Add.1)*

43. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the report of the Joint Inspection Unit which had been submitted at the twenty-ninth session (see A/9854) and to the comments on that report by the Secretary-General (A/9854/Add.1), who had indicated that he proposed to submit a comprehensive report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. The Joint Inspection Unit had since produced two other reports on United Nations accommodation. The first one (see A/10279) concerned office accommodation provided for extra-budgetary staff in the United Nations system; in document A/10279/Add.1 the Secretary-General had transmitted the comments of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, indicating that ACC had decided to refer the matter to the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions for consideration in connexion with its current study on the whole question of programme support costs, and that ACC had intended to resume consideration of the

report at its spring session in 1976. The other report of the Joint Inspection Unit (see A/10280) concerned the utilization of office accommodation at Geneva; the Secretary-General had transmitted his comments on that report, together with those of the Geneva-based specialized agencies, in document A/10280/Add.1.

44. He had been informed by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions that that Committee would not report on the question at the current session. Accordingly, substantive discussion of the question would be postponed until the thirty-first session.

45. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in view of the Secretary-General's statement in paragraphs 10 to 12 of document A/9854/Add.1 that he would submit a comprehensive report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, the Advisory Committee had considered that there would be little point in commenting on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the basis of comments made by the Secretary-General in 1974. The Advisory Committee had similarly decided that there was little point in commenting on the report of the Unit contained in document A/10279, since ACC would be giving further consideration to it in 1976. Brief comments had been submitted by the Geneva-based organizations on the Joint Inspection Unit report contained in document A/10280. The Advisory Committee had considered that the three reports of the Unit were very closely related and that, in order to have a comprehensive picture and to be able to reach useful conclusions, it would be advisable for the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee to defer substantive consideration of the item until the thirty-first session. The Advisory Committee had, accordingly, not reported on the three Joint Inspection Unit reports.

46. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed regret and surprise that consideration of a question of such importance as office accommodation, which accounted for a considerable amount of the expenditure of the United Nations and specialized agencies, should be deferred. He recalled that also at the previous session the Committee had deferred consideration of the Joint Inspection Unit report on office accommodation. While the Secretariat found time to deal with secondary questions, it apparently had no time to give full consideration to questions of such importance as office accommodation. However, in view of the time factor, his delegation had no choice but to agree to the Chairman's proposal.

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Marcuard (Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations) took a place at the Committee table.*

47. Mr. MARCUARD (Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations) said that the question of office accommodation was of interest to his Government, as the Joint Inspection Unit report in document A/10280 dealt with certain aspects of office accommodation at Geneva. Apart from the legal obligations incurred through headquarters agreements, his Government, as host to many international organizations, had many other responsibilities which it intended to continue discharging, as it had over the

\* Resumed from the 1753rd meeting.

past 30 years. There were many matters of principle which he had wished to raise in connexion with the report in question, but as members of the Committee did not apparently wish to comment on the substance of the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit, he felt it would be

more appropriate to make his comments during the consideration of agenda item 100, concerning the pattern of conferences.

*The meeting rose at 10.45 p.m.*

## 1756th meeting

Tuesday, 2 December 1975, at 3.20 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1756

### ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A/L.779 AND A/L.780 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 23\* (A/C.5/1721, A/C.5/1724)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the statements by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1721 and A/C.5/1724) regarding the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.779 and A/L.780, respectively. With regard to both draft resolutions, the Secretary-General had indicated that no additional appropriation would be required at the current stage, although draft resolution A/L.779 would entail potential additional requirements of up to \$36,000 under section 3A of the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.
2. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in document A/C.5/1721, the Secretary-General had costed the programme of work envisaged for 1976 by the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. That programme of work was contained in the report of the Special Committee which the General Assembly would approve if it adopted draft resolution A/L.779. In paragraph 14 of his statement, the Secretary-General indicated that the total cost of the programme of work was estimated by him at \$359,000. However, an amount of \$323,000 was already included under section 3A of the proposed programme budget for 1976-1977 for the programme of work of the Special Committee in 1976. The Secretary-General estimated therefore that, if the Special Committee should carry out all the activities listed in its projected programme of work for 1976, he might subsequently need an additional amount of \$36,000.
3. The programme of work costed by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/1721 included the cost of dispatching visiting missions to several territories which were the subject of draft resolutions and draft consensuses adopted in the Fourth Committee. The details were given in annex I to document A/C.5/1721.
4. When the Advisory Committee had considered that statement, it had borne in mind that the Special Committee's programme of work was often subject to change in the light of decisions taken by the Committee during any given year. Given that uncertainty, the Committee agreed with the Secretary-General that adoption of draft resolution A/L.779 would not call for additional appropriations at the current stage.
5. In paragraph 4 of his statement (A/C.5/1724) regarding the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/L.780 on the dissemination of information on decolonization, the Secretary-General had indicated that no additional financial resources would be required by the Office of Public Information to give effect to the requests contained in the draft resolution. The Fifth Committee might therefore wish to inform the General Assembly accordingly.
6. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/L.779 and A/L.780, no additional financial resources would be required at the current stage.

*It was so decided.*

7. Mr. NORBURY (United States of America) said that, while his delegation did not disagree with the decisions just taken by the Committee regarding the financial implications of draft resolutions A/L.779 and A/L.780, it did have strong reservations regarding the substance of both draft resolutions and would comment further on them at the appropriate time.

\* Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.