

Advisory Committee would be able to enlighten the Fifth Committee.

58. If the seat of the Commission was New York, there should be considerable reduction in travel costs, because the draft budget had assumed that most of the Commission's secretariat would be provided from New York.

59. Mr. NAUDY (France) said he was surprised by the suggestion made by the representative of Algeria that the atmosphere at Geneva might be more harmful than in New York. His delegation had every confidence that the commissioners appointed by the General Assembly would maintain their independence regardless of where the seat of the Commission was located. What was important was to decide where the Commission would be able to discharge its functions most speedily and effectively. He agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the reasons for having chosen Geneva were still valid.

60. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked where it would be cheaper to locate the seat of the Commission. He also wished to know if he was correct in believing that article 7 of the draft statute was the only article still requiring a decision by the Fifth Committee.

61. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had discussed three outstanding points at its meeting the previous day. It had decided not to pursue its original suggestion that it might be necessary to define "staff representatives" more precisely and not to press for the inclusion of a provision empowering the General Assembly to give the Commission general directions. The absence of such a provision did not in fact prevent the General Assembly from giving directions, as could be seen from paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1215.

62. It still remained for the Fifth Committee to decide which of the two texts of article 7 it preferred. The Advisory Committee would have selected alternative 2. The text of the revised draft statute in document A/C.5/L.1217 gave effect to the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

63. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said the only remaining problem seemed to be the question raised by the representative of Algeria. He assured the Committee that the text of the revised draft statute would be suitably amended to avoid any suggestion of sexual discrimination.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

1693rd meeting

Friday, 13 December 1974, at 8.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

A/C.5/SR.1693

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Garrido (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 82

United Nations salary system (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/9738 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/9891, A/C.5/L.1213, A/C.5/L.1215, A/C.5/L.1217);
- (b) Report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board (*continued*) (A/9630, A/9709 and Add.1, A/9919, A/C.5/1652, A/C.5/L.1216)

1. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) asked whether the annual report mentioned in article 17 of the revised draft statute of the International Civil Service Commission (see A/C.5/L.1217) would normally be submitted through the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and then the Fifth Committee as had been the case with the ICSAB report. The words "its decisions and recommendations" in that article no doubt referred to the Commission's decisions. Presumably the protection provided under article 26, which referred to the acquired rights of the staff, did not mean that the Commission would not be able to make appropriate recommendations if it discovered certain anomalies in such

rights. The latter derived from decisions of the General Assembly and the application by the Secretary-General of the powers given to him as the chief administrative officer, and should not be regarded as too sacred ever to be changed. Article 26 should be read in that context. The fact that WHO did not apply the negative post adjustment applied under the common system was the sort of thing that the Commission could look into.

2. With regard to the size of the Commission, it was proposed that there should be 13 members in order to ensure equitable geographical representation under the present arrangement in the Advisory Committee. He wondered what would happen if that arrangement were to be changed.

3. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) said he had proposed that article 22 should be amended to read "The seat of the Commission shall be New York, United States of America" for several reasons. First, the candidates for the Commission had been proposed, *inter alia*, by the specialized agencies and other organizations, which would therefore have an indirect control over the Commission's work. He did not mean to question the integrity of the candidates but felt that the pressures on them would be very great. Secondly, it was a well-known fact that the costs would be

lower if the Commission was located in New York. Thirdly, the members of the Commission would have an opportunity to experience the difficulties which the staff encountered in New York if they themselves were stationed in that city. Fourthly, if the Committee decided to establish the Commission at Geneva it would be departing from the principle of decentralization that it had constantly advocated, and it would be rewarding a country which had always adopted a certain grudging attitude and which had refused to agree to the United Nations budget being calculated in part in Swiss francs. The argument that the specialized agencies would refuse to participate in the Commission if it was located in New York smacked of blackmail and was therefore unacceptable.

4. Finally, referring to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1215, he said that operative paragraph 4, should be worded more specifically since, although the specialized agencies were autonomous, the General Assembly was quite entitled to make recommendations to them. He also wondered which were the organizations members of the common system; it might perhaps be preferable to say "specialized agencies and other organizations".

5. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) pointed out that pressure could be applied both ways and that candidates designated by the specialized agencies could conceivably apply pressure at Headquarters on behalf of the agency that had nominated them. In addition, if the Committee was located in New York it would exert great influence on the Fifth Committee and might rival the Advisory Committee. It would be interesting to know whether the proposal in article 22 of the revised draft statute represented the result of negotiations between the Secretary-General and other members of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, in other words, whether the agreement would fall through if that article were changed. Moreover, he wondered what the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management and his colleagues felt that such a change would mean for the Organization, and how many staff members in the Professional and higher categories there were in New York and Geneva respectively.

6. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina) said that it would be better for the seat of the Commission to be in Geneva as most of the specialized agencies were located in Europe. He agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the fact of the Commission being at Headquarters would not preclude the possibility of influence being exerted. However, article 6 of the draft statute stressed that Commission members would function in full independence and with impartiality and, if they were properly designated, the question of pressure should not become an issue. The financial implications set out in the Secretary-General's report (A/9738/Add.1 and Corr.1) were based on the assumption that the seat of the Commission would be Geneva. The Fifth Committee could not take a decision on the matter until it had detailed information of the costs that would be entailed if the seat of the Commission were to be New York and could compare the two figures. If the General Assembly wished to have a harmonious system, it must have one that suited the purposes of both the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The cost of United Nations participation in the Commission—about 33 per cent of the total cost—was given in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's report. If the

Commission was located in New York, the Fifth Committee would have to consider the financial implications of such a change for the specialized agencies. Finally, the argument that the Committee would be rewarding a country that had adopted a certain position towards the United Nations was not a valid one, as the decision in question was not political but had financial implications for both the specialized agencies and the Organization.

7. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta), in reply to the question put by the representative of Algeria, said that operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1215 should be read in conjunction with paragraph 8 of document A/9147 and Corr.1, which listed the participants in the common system, and article 1 (b) of the revised draft statute. There was then no need to amend paragraph 4.

8. Mr. KIVANC (Turkey) asked which of the two places, Geneva or New York, was better from the budgetary viewpoint.

9. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) noted a certain inconsistency in the fact that one year earlier certain delegations had been critical because there had been some delay in moving the Division of Human Rights to Geneva while those same delegations were now in favour of the International Civil Service Commission being located in New York.

10. Replying to the question put by the representative of Pakistan, he said that the Secretary-General and his colleagues in ACC had decided, after consultations pursuant to paragraphs 3 and 4 of General Assembly resolution 3042 (XXVII), that it was in the interest of the common system that the International Civil Service Commission should be located at Geneva. The Secretary-General would be untrue to his commitment to act as spokesman for the other organizations if he were to take any other position.

11. As to the relative costs, the Advisory Committee had based its recommendation of \$919,800 for the first year of the Commission's operation on the assumption that the Commission would be located at Geneva. The cost of establishing the Commission in New York would be \$905,900; the small difference was due to the fact that the cost of the higher post adjustment in Geneva was offset to a large extent by the higher rentals in New York.

12. In response to the question put by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, who had implied that the Commission's annual report should be submitted to the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee instead of direct to the General Assembly, he pointed out that the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee provided that personnel questions would be dealt with by that Committee only when financial or budgetary aspects were involved. Any proposal that came before the General Assembly and had financial implications would have to be referred to the two committees. With regard to the question of the acquired rights of staff members, he pointed out that article 26 of the revised draft statute merely reflected what was already in regulation 12.1 of the Staff Regulations and that the Assembly had already made a solemn declaration on the matter in approving those Regulations.

13. Finally, in response to the representative of Pakistan, he said that the staff at Geneva was larger but that he was not yet in a position to give exact figures for the number of staff members in the Professional and higher categories in Geneva and New York respectively.

14. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) said that there was no inconsistency in the position taken by his delegation regarding the transfer of the Division of Human Rights to Geneva the previous year—which had been done to encourage the United Nations Environment Programme to move to its headquarters at Nairobi and to enable the Division of Human Rights to work tranquilly without interference from pressure groups—and his position that the headquarters of the International Civil Service Commission should be New York.

15. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) supported the Algerian proposal that the seat of the International Civil Service Commission should be New York, and not Geneva.

16. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) explained that he had not suggested that the statute of the Commission should provide that it should report to the General Assembly through the Advisory Committee, but had merely suggested that the General Assembly might wish to continue the procedure it had followed in considering reports of the International Civil Service Advisory Board when considering future International Civil Service Commission reports—only, of course, if they referred to financial or budgetary questions. He suggested that the Commission might look into the WHO policy of not applying a negative post adjustment. He could not fully accept the view that acquired rights could not be altered in any way.

17. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the alternative wordings of article 7 of the draft statute of the International Civil Service Commission given in document A/C.5/L.1217. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee had indicated his Committee's acceptance of alternative 2. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Fifth Committee accepted alternative 2.

It was so decided.

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment proposed by the representative of Algeria to article 22 of the revised draft statute, to the effect that the seat of the Commission should be New York.

The amendment was adopted by 47 votes to 15, with 22 abstentions.

The revised draft statute of the International Civil Service Commission (see A/C.5/L.1217) as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 85 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

19. Mr. STOBY (Guyana) said that he had abstained in the vote on the Algerian amendment to article 22 because the arguments in favour of New York and Geneva were fairly well balanced. He asked whether it would be possible for the Commission to meet at Geneva from time to time although its seat was to be New York.

20. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), replying to the representative of Guyana, said that the rules applying to the pattern and calendar of conferences were based on the principle that any body of the General Assembly would normally meet at its appointed headquarters, unless the calendar of conferences, approved by the General Assembly, made provision for that body to meet elsewhere.

21. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1215.

22. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), referring to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, in accordance with which the General Assembly would endorse the administrative and budgetary arrangements proposed for 1975 by the Secretary-General, subject to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, said that, in paragraph 44 of its report (A/9891), the Advisory Committee had noted that, in the first year or two of its existence, the attention of the Commission would be focused on the question of salary and related allowances and that it would have little time to devote to other questions; consequently, the proposals by the Advisory Committee that there should be little or no increase in the size of the staff would be acceptable for the first year of the Commission's existence. Under the terms of the draft resolution, the budgetary arrangements for 1975 only would be endorsed. It should be understood, however, that with the staff allotted to it in its first year, the Commission could not be expected to yield many results, particularly as the staff to be mobilized for the Commission was currently working mainly in the field of maintaining the existing system and was not particularly well geared to considering a new system and reviewing the salary system. He also drew attention to paragraph 50 of the same report of the Advisory Committee which, he feared, gave the impression that the Secretary-General was expected to produce a no-growth budget for 1976-1977. That was not a very encouraging start for the Commission in view of the high expectations for its achievements. Accordingly, he expressed the concern of the Secretary-General and his reservations with regard to the advice given him concerning the 1976-1977 budget.

23. Miss BASTOS (Portugal) said that in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1215 the words "head of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination" should be replaced by the words "Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination".

The draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1215), as amended, was adopted by consensus.

24. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his Government had consistently worked towards the establishment of the International Civil Service Commission, welcomed its establishment and looked forward to working with it in the future. He expressed his appreciation to all delegations which had worked so hard to have the draft resolution adopted by consensus.

25. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216.

26. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation would not be able to vote in favour of the 6 per cent increase recommended in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216. His delegation had explained (1688th meeting) the reasons why, under the present circumstances, it could accept only an increase of 3 per cent or 3.5 per cent. As the Advisory Committee had noted, the protection provided for United Nations staff against price increases was more adequate than that provided to most civil servants in national administrations. He also wondered if the international civil servants were justified in asking for an increase without taking into consideration the economic and financial difficulties being experienced by the States Members of the international community. His Government deemed it extremely important that the United Nations salary system should be reviewed as soon as possible by the International Civil Service Commission. He suggested that the Commission might consider a more selective salary system; for example, salaries could be raised in inverse proportion to their size or there could be a scale of increases spread over a certain time; or different salary levels, could be applied for persons working in their home country and for aliens, as was the case in the European organizations. Those were simply suggestions that the Commission might like to consider.

27. His delegation accepted the proposal regarding an increase in the dependency allowance in subparagraph (b) of the draft resolution. Accordingly, he requested separate votes on the subparagraphs of the operative part of the draft resolution.

28. Mr. SAMHAN (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216, which it considered equitable and acceptable.

29. Mr. LEITE DE FARIA (Portugal) associated his delegation with the views expressed by the representative of France. His delegation could not accept the proposed 6 per cent increase and would vote against it. He would not, however, oppose a 3 per cent increase if the Fifth Committee decided to make a recommendation to that effect. His delegation would vote in favour of an increase in the dependency allowance.

30. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) shared the concern expressed by the representative of the United States of America concerning the need for economy, but differed on the approach to be taken. His delegation felt that the United Nations should have the best possible staff and should be a model for the rest of the world. If the staff was not paid adequately and treated properly, standards would fall and demoralization would result. Accordingly, his delegation would support draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216, pending consideration of the salary system by the International Civil Service Commission.

31. Mr. ROMAN (Nicaragua) said that his delegation would, with deep regret, vote against draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216 because it referred only to the base salary of the Professional and higher categories and did not include the General Service and other categories. That was anti-democratic, and it was not equitable. The draft resolution should be more explicit and should provide for salary

increases for lower-paid employees, who needed increases more.

32. Mr. ELIOPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216 because it supported a 6 per cent salary increase for Professional and higher categories and increases in the dependency allowance and the assignment allowances.

33. Mr. OH (Singapore) said that he would vote in favour of the three subparagraphs of the operative part of the draft resolution. He shared the views of the representative of Nicaragua concerning the General Service staff, but he would not press the point as the salary of General Service staff was not part of the agenda item under consideration. He expressed the hope that the International Civil Service Commission, once it was operational, would take up the question of General Service salaries.

34. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote separately on the three subparagraphs of the operative part of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1216.

Subparagraph (a) was adopted by 50 votes to 21, with 14 abstentions.

Subparagraph (b) was adopted by 67 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

Subparagraph (c) was adopted by 67 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution as a whole.

Ethiopia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark.

Against: France, German Democratic Republic, Israel, Italy, Malawi, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Abstaining: Ghana, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Mexico, Sierra Leone, Upper Volta, Albania, Bhutan, China, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt.

The draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1216) as a whole was adopted by 54 votes to 21, with 12 abstentions.

35. Mr. POSSO (Ecuador), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation, acting upon specific instructions from the Ecuadorian Government, had voted against the draft resolution because inflation was putting a heavy strain on the budgets of Member States and it would be wrong to aggravate the situation further by granting an increase to international civil servants who, although they might be in a difficult situation, were better paid than the staff of many national civil services.

36. Mr. MORA (Mexico) said that his delegation had regretfully abstained in the vote because it was awaiting instructions from its Government. It hoped to be able to take a more definite stand in the plenary meeting.

37. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) said that her delegation, although sympathetic to the proposed 6 per cent increase, had found it necessary to abstain because of the austerity measures imposed by the Colombian Government.

38. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) welcomed the results of the voting and said that the adoption of the draft resolution should be considered a tribute to the dedication of the United Nations staff.

39. Mr. CARRASCO (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution even though it would have preferred some differentiation in the increase in base salaries, with a larger percentage for staff in the lower categories and a smaller one for staff in the higher categories. There could be no doubt that the salary system of both Professional and General Service staff was in urgent need of review.

40. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that when the draft resolution was referred to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly it would be accompanied by a detailed schedule showing how the proposal affected the salary scales.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION D SUBMITTED BY THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/9931 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 37* (A/9608/ADD.17, A/C.5/1646)

41. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution D submitted by the Special Political Committee in its report (A/9931, para. 23). According to the statement submitted by the Secretary-General on the question (A/C.5/1646), the adoption of the draft resolution by the General Assembly would necessitate a supplementary appropriation of \$73,000 under section 3 of the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975.

42. Mr. RHODES (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in its report (A/9608/Add.17), the Advisory Committee had

recommended a small saving of \$3,000 on the grounds that travel by representatives of South African liberation movements for consultations at United Nations Headquarters could be combined with the travel envisaged under paragraph 6 of General Assembly resolution 3280 (XXIX). The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that the Fifth Committee inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution would require a supplementary appropriation of \$70,000. In paragraph 4 of its report, the Advisory Committee had indicated that it had had some difficulty with paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, which it felt must be interpreted as suggested in paragraph 4 of its report.

43. Mr. STOBY (Guyana), noting that the Advisory Committee had suggested that if more funds were needed to expand the activities of the Unit on *Apartheid* they should be provided from the resources approved under the programme budget for 1974-1975, said that it was his understanding that, if the Secretary-General found he could not meet the required expansion with the resources approved under the 1974-1975 budget, he should come back to the Fifth Committee to seek additional funds.

44. Mr. LEITE DE FARIA (Portugal) drew attention to a drafting error in paragraph 4 of the report of the Advisory Committee in document A/9608/Add.17. The third sentence should read, "The Committee believes that neither the Special Committee on *Apartheid* nor the Special Political Committee intended this approach . . .".

45. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$70,000 would be required under section 3 of the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975, and that a supplementary appropriation of \$2,000 would be required under section 34, which would be offset by an increase of the same amount under income section 1.

It was so decided.

46. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it concur with the conclusions of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 4 of its report (A/9608/Add.17).

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 81

Personnel questions (continued)* (A/C.5/L.1172):

(b) Other personnel questions: reports of the Secretary-General (continued)* (A/8454, A/8826, A/9608/Add.5 and 19, A/9841 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1600, A/C.5/1601 and Add.1, A/C.5/1639, A/C.5/L.1211/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1212, A/C.5/L.1218)

47. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the Advisory Committee's report (A/9608/Add.19) on the

* Policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa:
(a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*;
(b) Report of the Secretary-General.

* Resumed from the 1691st meeting.

administrative and financial implications of the Secretary-General's proposals in document A/C.5/1601.

48. The Secretary-General, in his note on the question (A/C.5/1639), estimated that in order to implement his proposals a total of \$309,000 would be required in 1975 and a total of \$745,000 would be needed for the biennium 1976-1977. As was stated in paragraph 3 of its report, the Advisory Committee had decided not to recommend the addition of any permanent posts to the manning table in 1975, with the exception of posts for the newly established ECWA, and not to recommend acceptance of any further requests for reclassification in 1975 of posts graded D-1 and below. The reasons for that recommendation were given in the Advisory Committee's report (A/9608/Add.16) on the Secretary-General's progress report on the programme budget. At the same time, the Advisory Committee had not wished to deprive the Secretary-General of the opportunity to commence initiatives for the United Nations personnel programme and had accordingly recommended that temporary assistance in the net amount of \$250,000 should be made available for 1975. The matter would be examined more fully in the context of the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget for 1976-1977.

49. Mr. TALIEH (Iran) announced that Trinidad and Tobago and the Dominican Republic had joined Iran as sponsors of the draft decision in document A/C.5/L.1211/Rev.1.

50. Introducing the revised text of the proposal, he said that the only major change was the addition of the last subparagraph, which had been included to meet the main point raised by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in its own proposal (A/C.5/L.1212). He hoped that that revision would make it possible for the Committee to adopt the draft decision by consensus.

51. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania), referring to the last subparagraph of document A/C.5/L.1211/Rev.1, pointed out that the International Civil Service Commission was expected to give priority to the review of the salary system and might not for some time be able to consider the proposals referred to in the draft decision.

52. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, because of the spirit of compromise displayed by the delegation of Iran, his delegation was able to withdraw its draft decision (A/C.5/L.1212) and the amendments (A/C.5/L.1218) that it had submitted to the original text (A/C.5/L.1211) of the draft decision of Iran. However, his delegation's support of the proposal in document A/C.5/L.1211/Rev.1 was subject to the understanding that the Secretary-General would not act on the proposals made by the Joint Inspection Unit and the Administrative Management Service until the International Civil Service Commission had reported to the General Assembly on the proposals within its competence and until that report had been adopted by the Assembly.

53. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that he would appreciate an explanation of the intent of subparagraph (c) of the revised text (A/C.5/L.1211/Rev.1) of the draft decision, in view of the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union. In

paragraph 63 of its report on personnel questions (A/9841 and Corr.1), the Advisory Committee referred to various matters which it considered fell within the competence of the International Civil Service Commission. It went on to state in paragraph 64, however, that implementation of the reforms in question should proceed in such a way as to enable the Commission to focus on matters with inter-agency implications. He took that to mean that the Secretary-General was free to implement reforms in those areas, provided that such reforms were not inconsistent with any work the Commission intended to carry out. However, the Soviet representative's interpretation appeared to be somewhat different.

54. Mr. TALIEH (Iran) said that his delegation's interpretation of paragraphs 63 and 64 of the Advisory Committee's report was the same as that of the Under-Secretary-General.

55. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that it was clear from the Advisory Committee's report that the implementation of reforms should proceed as outlined by the Under-Secretary-General.

The draft decision (A/C.5/L.1211/Rev.1) was adopted without a vote.

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the recommendation in paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/9608/Add.19).

Supplementary appropriations of \$250,000 under section 28 of the programme budget for 1974-1975 and of \$80,000 under section 34 as well as the inclusion of \$80,000 under income section 1 were approved by 51 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that the amount approved would be included in the revised appropriations to be placed before the Committee at the appropriate time.

AGENDA ITEM 80

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (concluded):*
(d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointments made by the Secretary-General (A/9661)

58. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to a note by the Secretary-General (A/9661) in which he requested the General Assembly to confirm the appointments of the Honourable David Montagu and Mr. Yves Oltramare to the Investments Committee.

59. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) recalled that, at the previous session, his delegation had opposed the practice whereby the Secretary-General appointed the members of the Investments Committee, some of whom, in the past, had not been entirely suitable to act as custodians of the Organization's investments. He asked whether any of the firms or institutions with which the appointees were connected had any direct or indirect ties with South Africa

* Resumed from the 1670th meeting.

or Southern Rhodesia. He also asked where Mr. Oltramare had been born.

60. Mr. ZIEHL (Deputy Controller) said that, as far as he knew, none of the firms or institutions with which the two appointees were associated did any business with South Africa or Southern Rhodesia. Both candidates had been very carefully screened and had been selected for their competence and knowledge of investments. The Honourable David Montagu had been born in the United Kingdom. He could not say for certain where Mr. Oltramare had been born, but he would check and inform the representative of Algeria.

61. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Rapporteur should be requested to report directly to the General Assembly that the Committee recommended to the Assembly that it should confirm the appointments of the Honourable David Montagu and Mr. Yves Oltramare to the Investments Committee for three-year terms, beginning on 1 January 1975.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 10.55 p.m.

1694th meeting

Monday, 16 December 1974, at 10.35 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

A/C.5/SR.1694

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS III TO VIII AND DRAFT CONSENSUSES I AND II SUBMITTED BY THE FOURTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/9748 AND ALSO OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS CONTAINED IN DOCUMENTS A/L.754 AND A/L.755 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 23* (A/C.5/1657, A/C.5/1658)

1. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the programme of work 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, costed by the Secretary-General in the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1657), included the cost of the dispatch of visiting missions to several territories; the details were given in the annex to the document. When the Advisory Committee had been considering the statement it had borne in mind that the programme of work was often subject to change in the light of decisions taken by the Special Committee during the year in question. Given that uncertainty, the Fifth Committee had followed for several years the practice of appropriating an amount based on the past requirements of the Special Committee, on the understanding that should additional resources be required the Secretary-General would seek the concurrence of the Advisory Committee under the provisions of the General Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. The Advisory Committee recommended that a similar procedure be followed for

1975. It agreed that the Special Committee would probably need greater resources in 1975 than in 1974, and estimated that it would be prudent to make provision for double the 1974 figure, namely, \$280,000. Since there was a balance of \$190,000 remaining unspent out of the appropriation approved by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted the draft resolution in document A/L.754, a supplementary appropriation of \$90,000 would be required under section 21 of the programme budget, on the understanding that if additional sums became necessary the Secretary-General would be authorized to incur the additional expenditure under the provisions of the General Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in 1974-1975, with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee.

2. The Advisory Committee was in agreement with the procedure suggested by the Secretary-General in paragraph 4 of the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1658) concerning the implications of draft resolution A/L.755 on the dissemination of information on decolonization.

3. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should draft resolutions A/L.754 and A/L.755 be adopted, a supplementary appropriation of \$90,000 would be required under section 21 of the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975, it being understood that the provisions of the General Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in the biennium 1974-1975 would be invoked, if necessary, when the Special Committee's programme of work for 1975 was finalized.

It was so decided.

* 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.