

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 13th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

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

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 92: MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1983 (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 17: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS:
- (b) APPOINTMENT OF SIX MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS
 - (c) APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS
 - (d) CONFIRMATION OF THE APPOINTMENT OF THREE MEMBERS OF THE INVESTMENTS COMMITTEE
 - (e) APPOINTMENT OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
 - (a) APPOINTMENT OF SIX MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

80-56540

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/35/SR.13
14 October 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 92: MEDIUM-TERM PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 1980-1983 (continued)
(A/35/6 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, A/35/7, A/35/38; A/C.5/35/1 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/35/2, A/C.5/35/3 and Corr.1, A/C.5/35/4 and Corr.1; A/C.5/35/L.7)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (chaps. XXVIII and XXXVI (A/35/3/Add.28 and 36))

1. Mr. CULLEN (Argentina) said that his delegation wished to join the other delegations which had objected to the proposed revision to paragraph 4.47 of the medium-term plan relating to the subprogramme on international marine political and security problems (A/35/6 and Corr.1). Adoption of the proposed revision might affect the legitimate exercise by States of their sovereign rights over their maritime space. It was inappropriate, moreover, for the Committee to take a decision on a matter which was still the subject of negotiations at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.
2. Mr. PAL (India), introducing draft decision A/C.5/35/L.7, pointed out that, owing to a technical error, the Netherlands, one of the original sponsors of the draft decision, had not been listed as such in the document before the Committee. Barbados, Burundi, Sweden and Trinidad and Tobago had also joined as sponsors.
3. The sponsors wished to make a number of revisions to the draft decision. In paragraph 2 the words "in CPC, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly" should be added after the word "report". A new subparagraph (b) should be added reading: "The recommendation in paragraph 364 (b) on human settlements". Existing subparagraph (b) would become subparagraph (c). In paragraph 7, the word "Requests" should be replaced by the word "Invites". In paragraph 10, the words "in resolution 31/93 and resolution 2003 (LX) of the Economic and Social Council" should be added after the word "Assembly".
4. Referring to paragraph 1, he recalled that during the debate almost all delegations had expressed their dissatisfaction with the current system of establishing relative real growth rates. There had been some feeling that the relative growth rates should be excluded from the conclusions and recommendations of CPC that the General Assembly would endorse, but a handful of delegations were sincerely convinced that the existing system served a useful function. The sponsors of the draft decision had, accordingly, agreed to accommodate that view since the budget had in the past been drawn up in the light of the relative real growth rates set by CPC and, if no guidance at all was given with regard to priorities, it would be difficult to prepare the programme budget proposals for the next biennium. Paragraph 1, therefore, would have the General Assembly merely take note of the rates set by CPC.
5. Paragraphs 4 and 5 requested the Secretariat, in revising the medium-term plan, to include not only modifications necessitated by changes in legislative mandates

/...

but also such refinements as might be necessary to ensure that programmes conformed more closely to existing mandates. That, of course, could not be achieved without the active involvement of the specialized agencies and, consequently, in paragraph 5, intergovernmental bodies were requested to establish lines of communication with CPC.

6. Paragraph 6 reflected the concern that CPC should set programme priorities rather than relative real growth rates and requested that Committee to determine new criteria and methods for setting the programme priorities.

7. Paragraph 9 reflected the concern expressed by almost all delegations that had taken part in the debate that the budget proposals must be made available in time for consideration by CPC.

8. It had been felt for some time that the CPC/ACC joint meetings in their existing form were not serving a useful purpose, and paragraphs 10 to 12 contained a series of provisions designed to make those meetings more productive.

9. The draft decision commanded the support of almost all delegations and he hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

10. Mr. OKEYO (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination), replying to the question asked by the representative of India at the preceding meeting, said that CPC had followed the practice of establishing relative real growth rates for the past six years. The setting of such rates was, as had been noted by some delegations, a blunt instrument, but it was the only means CPC had of providing guidance on how resources might be allocated among programmes. It was the understanding of CPC that the growth rates it set were relative and that they would be applied in relation to the over-all level of the budget.

11. Mr. BERTRAND (Joint Inspection Unit) said that the recommendation of CPC that the General Assembly should invite the Joint Inspection Unit to participate in a study on the impact on the Secretariat of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 32/197 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system was at once ambitious and vague. As the Chairman of the Joint Inspection Unit had stated before the Economic and Social Council, JIU welcomed the suggestion by CPC, but did not interpret it as requiring the Unit to express an opinion on the way in which the Secretariat was helping to establish the new international economic order. That was a broad task which went far beyond the Unit's terms of reference. As a result, the Chairman of JIU had indicated to the Economic and Social Council that the Unit intended to respond to the CPC recommendation by including in its work programme for the years 1981-1982 studies on the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development and on the role of resident field co-ordinators. The Economic and Social Council had not, however, formally indicated whether it considered the Unit's plans to be an adequate response to the CPC recommendation.

12. He noted that paragraph 2 of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.7 would exclude paragraph 365 (b) (ii) of the report of CPC from among the conclusions and

/...

(Mr. Bertrand)

recommendations that would be endorsed by the General Assembly. That subparagraph referred, however, to the appraisal in which JIU was to be invited to co-operate. Accordingly, it might be necessary to amend paragraph 2 to take into account the implications of deleting paragraph 365 (b) (ii) or, alternatively, the Committee could indicate whether it was satisfied with the plans of JIU as outlined by the Chairman of the Unit before the Economic and Social Council.

13. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said it was his understanding that the analysis referred to in paragraph 8 of draft decision A/C.5/35/L.7 would relate to the programme rather than the budgetary aspects of the programme budget. As was well known, the Advisory Committee was the body responsible for analysing the proposed programme budget and making recommendations to the General Assembly on the allocation of resources to the various programmes.

14. Mr. PAL (India), referring to the comments made by Inspector Bertrand, said that the study envisaged by CPC was first mentioned in paragraph 365 (b) (i) of that Committee's report. The only provision of the recommendation which would be deleted was the request that the General Assembly should formulate guidelines for the preparation of a questionnaire to be used in carrying out the study. That did not mean, however, that the appraisal would not be carried out. As to the way in which JIU intended to respond to the recommendation of CPC, the Unit was responsible for setting its own tasks and work programme.

15. Paragraph 8 of the draft decision, to which the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had referred, stated in clear terms that CPC should analyse the proposed programme budget in order to assess whether programme priorities had been respected, while paragraph 6 requested CPC to determine new criteria and methods to be employed in setting programme priorities. Paragraph 8 should, therefore, be read in conjunction with paragraph 6.

16. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that draft decision A/C.5/35/L.7 was in line with his delegation's thinking and he favoured its adoption. He wondered, however, whether the heading of the draft decision was appropriate, since the scope of the CPC report went well beyond the medium-term plan for the period 1980-1983.

17. He would welcome a further explanation from the sponsors concerning the considerations which had prompted them to exclude paragraph 365 (b) (ii) of the report of CPC from among the conclusions and recommendations to be endorsed by the General Assembly. The expression "lines of communication" in paragraph 5 was excessively vague. The paragraph should be amended to make it clear that intergovernmental bodies were responsible for establishing contacts with CPC. His delegation would like to see the draft decision include some reference to the provisions of paragraphs 322, 331 and 340 of the report of CPC.

18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representative of Morocco should consult with the sponsors of the draft decision with a view to the submission of a revised text which took into account the views he had just expressed.

/...

19. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation would like wording in paragraph 5 to the effect that intergovernmental bodies should be requested to consider programmes falling within their sphere of competence on a regular basis, with a view to timely transmittal of their comments and observations to CPC. Wording along those lines would be much clearer than the reference to establishing lines of communication. Communications between CPC and other bodies were often somewhat primitive, representatives being called upon to make oral reports. His delegation believed that intergovernmental bodies should submit written reports, including progress reports on programmes and details of programmes that were completed, of marginal usefulness or ineffective. With respect to paragraph 6, he supported the view expressed by the Chairman of CPC that that body should continue to set relative real growth rates until the new criteria and methods for priority-setting had been prepared. It was difficult to envisage how CPC would be able to set programme priorities, as requested in paragraph 7, unless relative real growth rates had first been established. He hoped that the sponsors of the draft decision would take the views of his delegation into account.

20. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation preferred the original version of paragraph 2. The recommendation contained in paragraph 36⁴ (b) of the CPC report should not be excluded, because the problem of human settlements was urgent. With respect to paragraph 6, he was aware that a number of delegations found it increasingly difficult to accept relative real growth rates; it was therefore only to be expected that CPC would be asked to determine new criteria and methods for priority setting at its next session. He hoped that those States which were in favour of new criteria would work on the problem and make constructive suggestions to CPC.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that further informal consultations between the sponsors of the draft decision and interested delegations were obviously necessary. The Committee would therefore return to the matter at a subsequent meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 17: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN SUBSIDIARY ORGANS AND OTHER APPOINTMENTS

22. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that in paragraph 16 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly had decided that the practice of dispensing with secret ballots for elections to subsidiary organs when the number of candidates corresponded to the number of seats to be filled should become standard, unless a delegation specifically requested a vote on a given election. If he heard no objection, therefore, he would take it that in all cases where the number of candidates equalled the number of vacant seats, the Committee agreed to dispense with a secret ballot.

23. It was so decided.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF SIX MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONTRIBUTIONS (A/35/212; A/C.5/35/24)

24. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had been informed that the Government of Panama had *withdrawn the candidature* of Mr. Marco Fernández. The candidates were therefore the remaining six listed in document A/C.5/35/24. Since the number of

/...

(The Chairman)

candidates equalled the number of vacancies, he suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of

Mr. Hélio de Burgos-Cabal (Brazil), Mr. Leoncio Fernández Maroto (Spain), Mr. Lance Joseph (Australia), Mr. Japhet G. Kiti (Kenya), Mr. Rachid Lahlou (Morocco) and Mr. Atilio F. Molteni (Argentina) to the Committee on Contributions for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1981.

25. The recommendation was adopted.

26. The CHAIRMAN paid tribute to the outgoing members, Mr. Abdel Hamid Abdel-Ghani, and Mr. Angus J. Matheson.

(c) APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF AUDITORS (A/35/213; A/C.5/35/20 and Add.1)

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, as indicated in documents A/C.5/35/20 and Add.1, the Government of the Philippines had nominated the Chairman of the Commission on Audit of the Philippines to fill the vacancy which would arise in the membership of the Board as a result of the expiry on 30 June 1980 of the term of office of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of Bangladesh. The Government of Bangladesh had presented the candidature of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of Bangladesh for reappointment to the Board of Auditors.

28. Mr. PADUA (Philippines) said that, although his Government believed that its nominee possessed all the requisite qualifications and experience, it appreciated the desire of the Government of Bangladesh that its Comptroller and Auditor-General should serve another term. With a view to preserving unity and co-operation in the Group of Asian States, his Government had therefore decided to withdraw the candidature of the Chairman of the Commission on Audit of the Philippines. He thanked all delegations which had expressed support for that candidature, which his Government intended to present again when next a vacancy arose.

29. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, since there was only one candidate, the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of Bangladesh to the Board of Auditors for a term of three years beginning on July 1981.

30. The recommendation was adopted.

31. Mr. RAHIM (Bangladesh) thanked members of the Committee for their overwhelming support in recommending the reappointment of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of Bangladesh to the Board of Auditors. He also expressed deep appreciation to the Government of the Philippines for its friendly gesture in withdrawing its candidate. Such an action would certainly further consolidate and strengthen friendly relations between the two countries.

/...

(d) CONFIRMATION OF THE APPOINTMENT OF THREE MEMBERS OF THE INVESTMENTS COMMITTEE (A/35/214; A/C.5/35/15)

32. The CHAIRMAN said that, as indicated in document A/35/214, a vacancy had arisen as a result of the death of Mr. Hamza Mirghani and two further vacancies would arise upon the expiry of the terms of office of two other members on 31 December 1980. In addition, Mr. R. Manning Brown, Jr., had indicated that he would be unable to complete his term, which expired on 31 December 1981.

33. In accordance with the provisions of article 20 of the regulations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund, the Secretary-General, after consultation with the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board and ACABQ, had submitted for confirmation the appointment of Mr. David Montagu, Mr. Yves Oltramare and Mr. Emmanuel Noi Omaboe (also known as Wana Wereko Ampem II) to serve for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1981, and of Mr. George Johnston to serve for a one-year term beginning 1 January 1981.

34. He suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should confirm the appointment by the Secretary-General of Mr. David Montagu, Mr. Yves Oltramare and Mr. Emmanuel Noi Omaboe to the Investments Committee for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1981, and of Mr. George Johnston, for a term of one year beginning on 1 January 1981.

35. The recommendation was adopted.

(e) APPOINTMENT OF TWO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL (A/35/215; A/C.5/35/8 and 14)

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, as indicated in document A/C.5/35/14, the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of the United States of America had nominated Mr. Arnold Wilfred Geoffrey Kean and Mr. Herbert Reis, respectively, to fill the vacancies in the United Nations Administrative Tribunal arising from the death of Sir Roger Bentham Stevens and the expiry, on 31 December 1980, of the term of office of Mr. Francis T. P. Plimpton. Since the number of candidates equalled the number of vacancies, he suggested that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of Mr. Arnold Wilfred Geoffrey Kean and Mr. Herbert Reis as members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal for a term of three years beginning on 1 January 1981.

37. The recommendation was adopted.

38. The CHAIRMAN expressed thanks to the outgoing member, Mr. Francis Plimpton.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF SIX MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (A/35/211; A/C.5/35/21)

39. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Government of Brazil had decided to withdraw the candidature of Mr. Roberto Gasparry Torres. The candidates for the six vacancies were therefore the remaining seven persons listed in document A/C.5/35/21.

/...

40. Mr. HOMAI NEJAD (Iran) confirmed the withdrawal of the Iranian candidate, and assured members of his delegation's continued co-operation with ACABQ.

41. The CHAIRMAN observed that, since the number of candidates exceeded the number of posts to be filled, it would be necessary to hold a secret ballot.

42. Mr. DORJI (Bhutan), speaking on behalf of the Group of Asian States, urged the Committee to bear in mind the need for a geographical balance in ACABQ, and pointed out that the Asian Group had decided to endorse all three candidates from Asian countries.

43. Mr. HURRE (Somalia), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, commented that it was a tradition for regional groups to put forward agreed candidates for vacancies in subsidiary organs, and called for further informal consultations to allow the Group of Western European and Other States to endorse two out of the three candidates from that Group nominated for appointment.

44. Mr. GALLEGOS (Chile), speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American States also emphasized the need for a proper geographical balance in ACABQ and stated that the Latin American Group had agreed to endorse the candidacy of Mr. Williams.

45. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States, said that despite the consultations the Group had held, all three candidates from the Group wished to maintain their candidacies; in the interests of balance, however, and in accordance with the long-standing gentlemen's agreement on the subject of representation in subsidiary bodies, he urged members to vote for no more than two of the three Western European candidates.

46. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, said it did not seem reasonable for disagreement within one regional group to pose a threat, as under the rules of procedure it could, to the interests of the other regional groups. He suggested that the Committee should vote only on the candidates from the Group of Western European and Other States, declaring the other candidates elected by acclamation.

47. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the proposal by the Byelorussian representative.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that to follow the course suggested by the Byelorussian representative would be tantamount to revising the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which was not within the powers of the Fifth Committee: the ballot would cover all the candidates.

49. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Brotodiningrat (Indonesia), Mr. Muriithi (Kenya), Mr. Martorell (Peru), and Mr. Al-Jaber (Qatar) acted as tellers.

50. A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers: 143

Invalid ballots: 1

Number of valid ballots: 142

Abstentions: none

Number of members voting: 142

Required majority: 72

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Kuyama 130

Mr. Williams 130

Mr. Garrido 127

Mr. Tang 125

Mr. Brochard 103

Mr. Amnéus 96

Mr. Stuart 83

51. Mr. Henrik Amnéus (Sweden), Mr. Michel Brochard (France), Mr. Ernesto Garrido (Philippines), Mr. Sumihiro Kuyama (Japan), Mr. Tang Jianwen (China) and Mr. Norman Williams (Panama) having obtained the highest numbers of votes, the Committee decided to recommend their appointment as members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1981.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.