

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1518th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 2 November 1972,  
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

Chairman: Mr. Motoo OGISO (Japan).

**AGENDA ITEM 71**

Financial reports and accounts for the year 1971 and reports of the Board of Auditors (*concluded*)\*:

- (a) United Nations (*concluded*)\*;
- (b) United Nations Development Programme (*concluded*)\*;
- (c) United Nations Children's Fund (*concluded*)\*\*;
- (d) United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (*concluded*)\*\*;
- (e) United Nations Institute for Training and Research (*concluded*)\*\*;
- (f) Voluntary funds administered by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (*concluded*)\*\*

*Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.4 and Corr.1)*

1. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (Rapporteur) introduced the draft report of the Committee (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.4 and Corr.1) and drew attention to a slight amendment whereby, in paragraph 10, the word "reservations" would be replaced by the word "objections".

2. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee approved the text of the draft report, as amended.

*It was so decided.*

**AGENDA ITEM 79**

Joint Inspection Unit (*continued*) (for the A/. . . and A/C.5/. . . documents, see 1512th meeting; A/C.5/L.1078, A/C.5/L.1081, A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1084, A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1089, A/C.5/L.1090, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.5 and 6/Rev.1):

- (b) Question of the continuation of the Joint Inspection Unit: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (for the A/. . . and A/C.5/. . . documents, see 1512th meeting; A/C.5/L.1081, A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1084, A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1089, A/C.5/L.1090, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.5 and 6/Rev.1)

3. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in view of the amendment submitted by Argentina, Indonesia and Yugoslavia (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1) and of the opinions expressed in the Committee, the Soviet delegation had decided to withdraw the amendments (A/C.5/L.1082/Rev.2) it

had submitted to operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its report (A/8835 and Corr.1, annex).

4. Mr. SLIWKA (Poland) said that the Ghanaian amendment (A/C.5/L.1081) coincided exactly with his delegation's point of view and its constant concern to increase the Unit's efficiency while ensuring respect for the Fifth Committee's decisions. He would therefore support that amendment with the reservation entered by the representative of Italy at the 1515th meeting.

5. In his statement at the 1508th meeting, he had expressed regret that, contrary to the clear and unequivocal decision taken by the Fifth Committee and approved by the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, the Unit's report on the use of consultants in the various United Nations services had not been submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session. Observing that in its interim report (see A/8811) the Unit had said that the delay was partly attributable to difficulty in obtaining the necessary information, the delegations of Poland and Czechoslovakia had requested the Secretariat to provide the Committee with more detailed information on the material reasons for the delay and to indicate which services had not supplied the information requested by the Unit in time. He requested the Secretariat kindly to reply to that question, because he considered it his duty to ensure that the Committee's decisions were carried out as it wished and that funds to finance the Unit's work were used to the greatest advantage. That was why he endorsed the Ghanaian amendment.

6. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) thanked those delegations which had endorsed his amendment, adoption of which would result in significant progress in implementing the Unit's recommendations. Unlike those who wanted the proposed reporting procedure to apply to the United Nations system as a whole, he felt that it would be better to limit it, at the present stage, to those of the Unit's decisions which concerned the United Nations, since the Economic and Social Council had already requested the United Nations bodies concerned to ensure that the Unit's recommendations were implemented and to submit regular reports on the status of such implementation. He would be prepared to delete the word "major" if the majority of delegations so wished, but hesitated to do so because his informal consultations seemed to indicate that the general opinion favoured the existing text of the amendment.

7. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) thanked the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

\* Resumed from the 1507th meeting.

\*\* Resumed from the 1506th meeting.

lics for having withdrawn his amendments. He would vote for the Ghanaian amendment (A/C.5/L.1081) for the reasons already given by those members who had spoken before him. He would also vote for the amendment contained in document A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1. It would have been difficult to accept the amendment submitted by India and Indonesia (A/C.5/L.1087) in French, because it made the amended text very confused. He could not therefore have endorsed it. The over-all review proposed in the second of the amendments submitted by the 16 Powers (A/C.5/L.1084) seemed absolutely necessary because in his opinion the machinery of the United Nations and of its system for control, investigation and co-ordination formed a whole and the question of the Joint Inspection Unit should be considered in the context of the re-examination and of its conclusions. Should it prove that the Unit had no *raison d'être*, it would be difficult to justify its continuation. He would therefore vote for the amendment in question. Turning to the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/L.1089), he wondered whether it was desirable to raise the question of rotation of the Unit's membership at the present stage. He would be prepared to support China's participation in the Unit and, bearing in mind the statement of the representative of China to the Committee, wondered whether it would not be better for Pakistan to withdraw its amendment on the understanding that China would be able to participate in the Unit when it so wished.

8. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) regretted the fact that the Soviet Union had withdrawn its amendment to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, but decided to retain his own (A/C.5/L.1089), which called for the amendment of the Soviet text, because the principle of rotation of membership of the Unit seemed essential. Nevertheless, since Argentina, Indonesia and Yugoslavia had proposed another amendment (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1) to operative paragraph 1 and the Soviet Union had withdrawn its amendment, he would submit his amendment in the form of a separate paragraph.

9. Mr. OUATTARA (Ivory Coast) said that there were three facets to the question of the continuation of the Unit: the continuation proper of the Unit the length of the Unit's mandate, and its membership. His delegation favoured the continuation of the Unit and would therefore vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee. That draft did not, however, settle the question of the length of the Unit's mandate because it did not stipulate whether the Unit was to continue in being on a permanent or an experimental basis. He would therefore vote for the amendment contained in document A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1, which established that the Unit should continue in being for four years. As to the question of the Unit's membership, he favoured the principle of rotation of membership and would vote for the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/L.1089). He would also vote for the second of the 16-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084) because it seemed necessary to conduct an over-all review of the whole system of control, investigation and co-ordination. Lastly, he would vote for the Ghanaian amendment (A/C.5/L.1081), but would prefer the word "major" to be deleted from the text.

10. Mr. BOUCHOUAREB (Algeria) thanked the representative of Belgium for the explanations he had given at the 1517th meeting and assured him that his delegation had never intended to associate itself with any bloc. The sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.1084 had been motivated solely by the legitimate desire to ensure the efficiency of United Nations machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination. Moreover, no delegation had advanced a substantive objection to the amendments and any divergence of views there might have been had related solely to questions of form.

11. The Ghanaian amendment (A/C.5/L.1081) was very important, for it was essential that the General Assembly should be informed every year of follow-up action taken on the Unit's recommendations. His delegation would therefore vote for that amendment.

12. It also considered that the principle of rotation, the subject of the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/L.1089), was very important, for China must be afforded an opportunity of becoming a member of the Unit if it so wished. Membership of the Unit should not be a privilege reserved for certain Member States.

13. His delegation would also vote for the Indonesian amendment (A/C.5/L.1090) and for the three-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1).

14. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) recalled that some delegations had felt that the 16-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084) were out of place in a resolution on the question of the continuation of the Unit. His delegation felt, on the contrary, that there was an undeniable link between the question of the Unit and the question of the machinery of the United Nations and of its system for control, investigation and co-ordination. The Netherlands representative had, moreover, emphasized the fundamental role of the Economic and Social Council in the review. That was unquestionable but, in the opinion of his delegation, the General Assembly could perfectly well put forward recommendations on the subject without encroaching on the Council's terms of reference.

15. His delegation endorsed the three-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1) for the reasons it had given at the 1509th meeting. Turning to the Indonesian amendment (A/C.5/L.1090), he said that his delegation preferred the original text of operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. In so far as the Ghanaian amendment was concerned (A/C.5/L.1081), it would have preferred the word "major" to be deleted, but would nevertheless vote for the text. As to the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/L.1089), his delegation had no objection to the principle of rotation and hoped that it would be able to support the new text to be submitted by the Pakistan delegation.

16. His delegation was prepared to support the text the Yugoslav representative had proposed for inclusion in the report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.5), but considered that the word "favourable" was inappropriate. His delegation fully

supported the text proposed by the Canadian delegation in document A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.6/Rev.1.

17. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that there were two main facets to the second of the 16-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084): firstly, it posed the principle of an over-all review of the whole machinery of the United Nations and of its system for control, investigation and co-ordination; secondly, it established the procedures whereby the review was to be conducted. His delegation had no objection to the review but considered that it was hardly the moment to deal with that question. Despite that reservation, his delegation would vote for the amendment. It also endorsed the amendments of Ghana (A/C.5/L.1081), Pakistan (A/C.5/L.1089), Indonesia (A/C.5/L.1090) and the three-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1). Further, it supported the text proposed by the Canadian delegation in document A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.6/Rev.1.

18. Mr. RADLEY (United Kingdom) said he fully endorsed the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee. He would feel obliged to vote against the second of the 16-Power amendments (A/C.5/L.1084) for the reasons advanced by the French delegation at the 1517th meeting. To establish a link between the question of the continuance of the Unit and the projected general re-examination was to confuse two different issues and to leave many questions unanswered. Like the representative of Denmark, his delegation felt that the question of the general re-examination should be taken up under agenda item 78, which dealt with the administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and IAEA.

19. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said, in a statement reflecting the line of thought of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, that for reasons stated earlier he would vote against the 16-Power amendment, but would vote for the draft resolution as a whole in order to register strong support for continuing the existence of the Joint Inspection Unit as a useful instrument for increasing the effectiveness of the resources of the United Nations.

20. Mr. McENTYRE (Canada) said that his delegation was in favour of the continuation of the Unit and endorsed the draft resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee, paragraph 6 of which in particular contained some extremely constructive suggestions.

21. His delegation supported the Ghanaian amendment (A/C.5/L.1081). It was also prepared to accept the three-Power amendment (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1), although it would have preferred to leave the question of the duration of the Unit's extended term more open. His delegation would also endorse the Indonesian amendment (A/C.5/L.1090). It had reservations concerning the 16-Power amendment for the reasons given by the delegations of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Denmark. It wished to reserve its position on the Pakistan amendment (A/C.5/L.1089).

22. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that he would not retain his amendment (A/C.5/L.1089) if the Committee was prepared to accept a paragraph in its report referring to the principle of rotation among the members of the Unit. The paragraph might read:

“The Fifth Committee agrees that evaluation of the Joint Inspection Unit at the thirty-first session should also include the application of the principle of rotation of the membership of the Unit.”

23. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania), supported by Mr. BUTLER (Australia), Mr. CLELAND (Ghana), Miss FORCIGNANÒ (Italy), Mr. LEVIDES (Greece) and Mr. FERNÁNDEZ LONGORIA (Spain), commended the delegation of Pakistan for its spirit of accommodation and supported the text which it had just proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections concerning the proposal to include in the Committee's report the text just proposed by the representative of Pakistan, he would take it that the proposal was adopted.

*It was so decided.*

25. Mr. DRUMMOND (South Africa) said that his delegation basically approved the draft resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee and would also vote in favour of any amendments which enhanced the effectiveness or clarified the scope of the final resolution. Accordingly, it favoured the Ghanaian amendment (A/C.5/L.1081), although, like a number of other delegations, it favoured the deletion of the word “major”, for it was important that the General Assembly should be presented with succinct reports on all the recommendations of the Unit which had not been implemented.

26. Since there was to be a thorough evaluation of the Unit's work at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the three-Power proposal (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1) that the Unit's term should be extended for a further period of four years was well-founded and his delegation would vote in favour of it.

27. While aware of the need for a general re-examination of the United Nations machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination, his delegation was not amenable to linking that general re-examination with the evaluation of the Unit's work, as the Committee had not had the opportunity to debate the former question, and would consequently feel bound to vote against the amendment on that subject, in its present form, contained in document A/C.5/L.1084. His delegation would support the Indonesian amendment (A/C.5/L.1090). It welcomed the fact that the representative of Pakistan had withdrawn his amendment (A/C.5/L.1089) and endorsed the paragraph he had proposed for insertion in the Committee's report.

28. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) announced that India had become a sponsor of the amendment contained in document A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1.

29. Mr. COÏDAN (Director of the Budget Division), replying to the question put by the delegation of Poland, said that it was true that the Unit's interim report on the use of consultants in the United Nations (A/8811) stated that the inspectors had had difficulties in eliciting replies to some of their questions. In some 30 to 40 cases, the questions had related to missions of experts involving very diverse kinds of projects. The long time it had taken to receive those replies was due primarily to the fact that some of the activities were remote from Headquarters and it had taken quite a while for the information to be forwarded to New York. The Secretariat had realized the difficulties being experienced and had placed a staff member at the disposal of the inspector for four to five weeks to assist in procuring the necessary information. In no case were the delays attributable to any ill will on the part of the Secretariat which, on the contrary, had always done all in its power to facilitate the work of the inspectors.

30. With regard to the question raised by the delegation of Pakistan, he remarked that the appointment of an additional inspector would bring the membership of the Unit from its present level of 8 up to 9. Since the General Assembly itself had set the number of inspectors, it was for the Assembly to take a decision in the matter. If it took such a decision, the financial implications would be in the amount of \$46,000 per year, of which the main items would be salary and post adjustment, common staff costs and travel. Only a part of the total would be borne by the United Nations because the expenditure involved would be shared by all the organizations participating in the inspection system.

31. Mr. SLIWKA (Poland) thanked the Director of the Budget Division for his explanations and assured him that his delegation had not thought for a moment that the Secretariat had displayed any ill will. His question had been prompted solely by a legitimate desire to ensure that the work of the Unit was being carried on as effectively as possible.

32. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that his delegation would vote in favour of all the amendments before the Committee and regretted that the Soviet Union had decided to withdraw its amendment.

33. It was unfortunate that there was some confusion as to the exact number of sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.5/L.1084 owing to the fact that no addendum had been issued.

34. Mr. HOFFMAN (Secretary of the Committee) explained that one of the means by which the Secretariat was helping to reduce the volume of documentation was not to issue an addendum to a draft text when the original sponsors were joined by other delegations, if the text had not been amended.

35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the different amendments to the draft resolution

recommended by the Advisory Committee (A/8835 and Corr.1, annex).

*At the request of the representative of the Philippines, a recorded vote was taken on the first of the amendments of the 16 Powers (A/C.5/L.1084).*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Abstaining:* Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Gabon, Ghana, Indonesia, Liberia, Malaysia, Portugal, Rwanda, United States of America.

*The amendment was adopted by 70 votes to 16, with 11 abstentions.*

*The amendment submitted by Argentina, India, Indonesia and Yugoslavia (A/C.5/L.1086/Rev.1) was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*The second of the amendments of the 16 Powers (A/C.5/L.1084) was adopted by 68 votes to 16, with 13 abstentions.*

*The third of the amendments of the 16 Powers (A/C.5/L.1084) was adopted by 69 votes to 16, with 12 abstentions.*

*The amendment submitted by Ghana (A/C.5/L.1081) was adopted by 98 votes to none.*

*The amendment submitted by Indonesia (A/C.5/L.1090) was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee (A/8835 and Corr.1, annex), as amended.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

37. Miss FORCIGNANÒ (Italy) said that she had voted for the draft resolution as amended by the 16 Powers, as that was the only way to ensure the con-

tinuation of the Joint Inspection Unit. However, she pointed out that her delegation was still opposed to establishing any link between the evaluation of the Unit and the general review of the machinery for control, investigation and co-ordination.

38. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because it considered that the Advisory Committee had prejudged the views of the Fifth Committee by preparing a draft resolution. If the Fifth Committee had not had that text before it it would have prepared its own draft resolution. However, the Pakistan delegation accepted the draft resolution as amended.

39. Mr. OFER (Israel) said that he had voted for the 16-Power amendments because of the need to determine an appropriate place for the Joint Inspection Unit in the whole machinery of the United Nations for control, investigation and co-ordination. Duplication and waste of resources should be avoided. However, the link between a review of that machinery as a whole and the question of the Joint Inspection Unit should not create the impression that the review was necessary only because of the existence of the Joint Inspection Unit.

40. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the texts which had been proposed for inclusion in the report of the Committee by the representatives of Yugoslavia (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.5) and Canada (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.6/Rev.1).

41. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that the second paragraph of the Canadian text was somewhat narrow. Regarding paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/8835 and Corr.1), he said that in some cases the inspectors might play a part in the implementation of the recommendations if the competent authorities invited them to do so. He would accordingly not vote for that second paragraph.

42. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he did not oppose the text proposed by Yugoslavia. In the Canadian text he proposed that the reference in the second paragraph to "the first 10 lines of paragraph 19" of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit should be replaced by a reference to "the first four sentences".

43. Mr. McENTYRE (Canada) accepted the change proposed by the Soviet representative, as it would make the text clearer in all the language versions.

44. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that he accepted the text proposed by Yugoslavia.

45. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said he accepted the text proposed by Canada. He would like further clarification on the text submitted by Yugoslavia; was it only the re-election of the Chairman that was to be based on a favourable vote by the majority, or was he also to be elected on that basis?

46. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that perhaps the text could be made clearer by inserting the words

"elected or" between the words "may be" and "re-elected".

47. Mr. McENTYRE (Canada) said that the French representative's point might perhaps be met by changing the second paragraph of the Canadian text to indicate that the Fifth Committee, with one exception, agreed that there should be no involvement by inspectors in the implementation of their recommendations.

48. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) asked the representative of Yugoslavia if he could not delete the word "favourable" in the last sentence of the text that he proposed should be included in the Fifth Committee's report.

49. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said he accepted the suggestion of the representative of the Philippines.

50. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that regarding the re-election of the Chairman of the Joint Inspection Unit, he thought the new Chairman should be elected from among those inspectors who had not yet occupied the office of Chairman, instead of the re-election of the existing Chairman being envisaged.

51. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Fifth Committee's position on paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/8835 and Corr.1) did not emerge clearly from the text proposed by the representative of Canada, and he asked the latter if he could not propose a revised version of the present text so that the Fifth Committee could more easily take a decision on the Canadian proposal.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the differences of opinion, he would suggest that the Committee should defer any decision on the text proposed by Canada.

53. Mr. CHERPOOT (India) said he had no difficulty in accepting the text proposed by Yugoslavia.

54. Mr. STOTTLEMYER (United States of America) said he saw no contradiction between paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report and the second paragraph of the Canadian text. The two texts were complementary.

55. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said he did not share that view, and hoped that the Canadian representative would redraft his text to make it clearer.

56. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that he had suggested that the Fifth Committee should confine its consideration for the time being to the text proposed by Yugoslavia.

57. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that he would abstain from voting on the text proposed by Yugoslavia because the inspectors themselves had taken the view that the principle of rotation should be observed with respect to the office of Chairman. His delegation thought that such rotation should be yearly, and could not accept the principle of an elected

Chairman, a principle to which the inspectors themselves were opposed.

58. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) proposed the deletion of the last sentence of the text proposed by Yugoslavia.

59. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that the Fifth Committee had already taken a decision on the question of the re-election of the Chairman of the Unit, and therefore could not go back to the question. He accordingly asked the Pakistan representative not to press his proposal.

60. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) agreed to withdraw his proposal.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would consider that the Fifth Committee had adopted the text (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.5) that the representative of Yugoslavia had proposed should be included in the Committee's report, as it had been amended on the proposal of the representative of the Philippines.

*It was so decided.*<sup>1</sup>

*The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.*

---

<sup>1</sup> See A/8895, para. 13.