

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FIFTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
19th meeting
held on
Monday, 4 November 1996
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 19th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. SENGWE (Zimbabwe)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

Proposed medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001 (continued)

Programme 1. Political affairs

Programme 2. Peacekeeping operations

Programme 3. Outer space affairs

Programme 4. Legal affairs

Programme 5. Policy coordination and sustainable development

Programme 6. Africa: New Agenda for Development

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 the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/51/SR.19
4 November 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 114: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/51/6 and A/51/16 (Parts I and II))

Proposed medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001 (continued)

Programme 1. Political affairs

1. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and of Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Romania and Slovakia, said that the proposed medium-term plan must be viewed as a whole and that all of its components must reflect the views of all Member States in a balanced fashion. He fully supported the structure of the proposed plan, which had been prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) and of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and with General Assembly decision 50/452.

2. Programme 1 was a high priority for the European Union, since it covered activities which were central to the Organization's role under the Charter. With regard to subprogramme 1.3, a number of legislative mandates for the subprogramme - including General Assembly resolutions 2992 (XXVII), 42/45, 50/76 and the resolutions providing for the establishment of regional disarmament centres - should be subjected to intergovernmental review in order to determine their continuing relevance. Apart from those considerations, the European Union supported the adoption of programme 1 as drafted by the Secretary-General.

3. Mr. OVIA (Papua New Guinea) supported the statements made by the representatives of Costa Rica, on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and Colombia, on behalf the Non-Aligned Movement. He did not agree that the activities 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 should be included under subprogramme 1.6; instead, they should constitute a separate subprogramme 1.8, entitled "Decolonization". On behalf of the Special Committee, his delegation had previously proposed language for the new subprogramme in a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/C.5/51/10, appendix). Although his delegation supported the current efforts to streamline the Organization's operations, those reforms should not affect the substantive work of ongoing programmes, such as that of the Special Committee on decolonization. Pursuant to its resolution 46/181 on the International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism, the General Assembly must ensure that the Special Committee had the funds it needed to achieve the full implementation, for the 17 remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories, of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

4. Mr. GUTTERØD (Norway) said that he welcomed the reorganization of the Secretariat to adapt the departmental units to the nature and structure of the various programmes. Moreover, he supported the "framework for coordination"

/...

whereby the Departments of Political Affairs, Peacekeeping Operations and Humanitarian Affairs took an integrated approach to the planning and conduct of peacekeeping operations. That mechanism should be further developed into a system-wide network for policy development and programme coordination.

5. With respect to subprogramme 1.2, the Department of Political Affairs should rationalize the compilation of background material, inter alia through coordination with other departments and via the Internet. Similar considerations applied to the Centre for Disarmament Affairs (subprogramme 1.3), which had the potential to build its expertise to a level of competence that could attract the interest of organizations outside the United Nations system, inter alia in the field of post-disarmament problems. With respect to subprogramme 1.5, the Security Council could not carry out its urgent tasks without the high-quality, effective and continuous services of its support staff; Member States must be prepared to pay the price for those services. Lastly, concerning subprogramme 1.6, the General Assembly should adopt resolutions only on issues which were truly relevant to the international community and which were within the competence of the Organization as a whole. The Secretary-General's efforts to simplify ways and means of reporting on General Assembly decisions should be supported.

6. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) supported the proposal regarding the inclusion of a separate programme on disarmament in the proposed medium-term plan. The text of subprogramme 1.3, as currently drafted, was not sufficiently balanced in terms of its treatment of conventional versus nuclear disarmament. She hoped that the Committee would reach consensus on new language in informal consultations. She had no objection to the proposal regarding the inclusion of a separate subprogramme on decolonization.

7. Mr. IRAGORRI (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that disarmament should be given due priority in the proposed medium-term plan. The Secretary-General's draft did not fully reflect the relevant mandates and resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. Disarmament should be dealt with in a separate programme, apart from programme 1, and should include, as its highest priority, further efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons through negotiations aimed at progressive nuclear disarmament within a specific time-frame, as well as measures to eliminate chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction. The programme should also reflect the urgent need to restrict the overproduction, development and stockpiling of conventional weapons through global and regional agreements. In that connection, he was concerned about the Secretariat's view of disarmament as an instrument of preventive diplomacy and peace-building, since that approach could draw attention away from the implementation of existing agreements.

8. The countries of the Non-Aligned Movement fully supported the proposal detailed in the letter dated 15 October 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea addressed to the Chairman of the Fourth Committee (A/C.5/51/10, appendix) that decolonization should constitute a separate subprogramme 1.8.

/...

9. Mr. ATIYANTO (Indonesia) agreed with the representative of Colombia that subprogramme 1.3 on disarmament should become a separate programme under the proposed medium-term plan.

10. Mr. FATTAH (Egypt) endorsed the position of the Colombian delegation. He had reservations about some of the statements made in subprogramme 1.7 on the question of Palestine, which failed to reflect the real situation in that regard, and he trusted that appropriate amendments would be introduced.

11. Mr. GOKHALE (India) supported the remarks made by the representative of Colombia on subprogramme 1.3. With respect to the other subprogrammes, a number of amendments had been agreed upon during the meetings of CPC, and his delegation would participate in informal consultations aimed at formalizing those areas of agreement.

12. Ms. BUERGO RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) recalled that, at its fiftieth session, the General Assembly had decided to authorize the Secretary-General to begin preparation of the new medium-term plan, but had not taken any decision regarding the new format and structure of that plan; the Fifth Committee must take an explicit decision on the matter. She shared the Colombian delegation's position on subprogrammes 1.3 and 1.6. Programme 1, as currently drafted, did not reflect the interests of all Member States in a balanced manner. In particular, disarmament, decolonization and the question of Palestine were not given due importance in the draft. Subprogramme 1.3 placed too much emphasis on conventional weapons, minimizing the importance of nuclear disarmament and making no reference at all to weapons of mass destruction. She agreed with the Colombian delegation that disarmament should be a separate programme under the proposed medium-term plan.

13. Her delegation supported the proposal of Papua New Guinea that decolonization should constitute a separate subprogramme. As the representative of India had noted, the proposals and amendments put forward in the wide-ranging debates in CPC could serve as a useful basis for the Fifth Committee's deliberations.

14. Mr. ZHANG Wanhai (China) supported the statements made by the representatives of Papua New Guinea and Colombia. He hoped that the General Assembly would reach consensus, at its current session, on the many sensitive issues, such as preventive diplomacy and rapid-response forces, which had not been agreed upon in CPC. He asked whether the Committee secretariat could brief the Fifth Committee on the deliberations of the other Main Committees concerning elements of programme 1.

15. Mr. SULAIMAN (Syrian Arab Republic) supported the statements made by the Colombian and Indonesian delegations. With respect to subprogramme 1.3, he did not share the optimism expressed in the draft regarding the progress made in terms of disarmament, since nuclear weapons continued to threaten international peace and security. Despite the tradition of including disarmament as a subprogramme under the programme on political affairs, the issue was important enough to become a separate programme. Moreover, subprogramme 1.7 seemed to underestimate the importance of the still-unresolved question of Palestine,

/...

which had been a matter of concern to the Organization for 50 years. His delegation would submit specific proposals in that regard at a later stage.

16. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) said, with regard to the review of programmes by intergovernmental bodies, that efforts had been made to seek the views of relevant bodies, but that many programmes did not have a specialized reviewing body. Information was being circulated in an informal paper. In addition, document A/C.5/51/10 contained a letter from the Chairman of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) addressed to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, transmitting the views of several delegations, as well as the proposal by Papua New Guinea that decolonization should constitute a new subprogramme 1.8. There had, however, been no agreement within the Fourth Committee on programme 1.

17. Mr. ATIYANTO (Indonesia) said that further clarification was needed. His delegation had already raised the issue in the First Committee, and had requested that its views should be circulated as an official document.

18. Mr. ELMONTASER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) agreed, with respect to subprogramme 1.3, that disarmament should, in view of its importance, constitute a separate programme. He supported the views of Egypt and the Syrian Arab Republic on subprogramme 1.7. The United Nations should give more importance to efforts to promote a just and lasting settlement of the question of Palestine.

19. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) said that the Chairman of the First Committee had written to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee transmitting the views of a number of delegations, including those of Indonesia.

Programme 2. Peacekeeping operations

20. Mr. IRAGORRI (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, noted the important work of CPC in reaching agreement on programme 2. The Non-Aligned Movement supported the recommendations contained in paragraph 53 of the report of CPC (A/51/16 (Part II)).

21. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and of Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Romania and Slovakia, said that peacekeeping activities were a priority from a programmatic viewpoint. It was necessary to maintain and strengthen the Organization's capacity to plan, mount and operate new and existing peacekeeping missions. The European Union supported the proposed programme of work of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, as outlined in programme 2. However, the summation of activities in paragraph 2.6 should make more explicit reference to the need to develop a capacity to respond quickly to crises. The European Union welcomed the proposal for the development of a rapidly deployable headquarters capability, based in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. The need for a rapid reaction capacity should be clearly identified as an objective under subprogramme 4.

22. With regard to subprogramme 2.3, greater attention could have been devoted to strengthening the Organization's capacity to provide effective support in the start-up and expansion phases of peacekeeping missions. In that regard, the European Union had supported the establishment of the United Nations Logistics

/...

Base at Brindisi and it placed emphasis on the early formulation of a comprehensive policy of asset management and inventory control.

23. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that her delegation had no objection to the conclusions and recommendations of CPC contained in paragraph 53 of its report (A/51/16 (Part II)).

24. Mr. GUTTERØD (Norway) said that peace-building and peacekeeping activities were a cornerstone of the Organization's responsibilities. A point of serious concern was that budgetary constraints made it difficult for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to respond adequately to new challenges. The Secretary-General must be provided with the necessary resources to carry out existing mandates and to meet the backstopping requirements of the liquidation of peacekeeping operations.

25. With regard to subprogramme 2.1, one significant challenge was to strengthen professional capacity; in that connection he welcomed the efforts to develop training, manuals, guidelines and procedures, and the use of evaluation as a means of increasing efficiency. Accordingly, he was concerned that the Lessons Learned Unit was totally at the mercy of voluntary contributions. He welcomed the steps taken to strengthen coordination with other Secretariat units; that coordination should be extended to other United Nations bodies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) so as to assure a global approach including preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance and reconstruction.

26. With respect to subprogramme 2.2, the amount of resources allocated should adequately reflect the mandate. The preparation and updating of standard procedures for operations was important in improving efficiency.

27. Regarding subprogramme 2.3, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations was governed by relatively old-fashioned administrative rules and regulations, for example, with regard to the authorization of costs. It was important to consider whether administrative procedures could be simplified, as had happened in the case of the regulations on the reimbursement of contingent-owned equipment. The handling of outstanding reimbursement claims should be expedited.

28. With regard to subprogramme 2.4, there was an obvious need to strengthen the planning of operations. The multifunctional nature of operations, where peacekeeping must fit into a broader context of preventive diplomacy, humanitarian assistance and reconstruction, made planning particularly challenging. The planned new rapidly deployable headquarters team was important in that regard.

29. Resource needs at Headquarters should be funded through the regular budget as a reflection of the priority that the international community attached to peacekeeping activities.

30. Mr. SIAL (Pakistan) asked when the information, including detailed financial implications, would be provided on the use of loaned officers. A

/...

report was to have been issued by September 1996. His delegation emphasized the importance of reimbursing States which participated in peacekeeping operations. Pakistan, which was the largest troop contributor, was currently owed \$70 million.

31. Mr. JONAH (Sierra Leone) also asked when the report on loaned officers would be issued.

32. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) said that the use of loaned staff was a major issue, not confined to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and the Secretary-General had decided that it should be dealt with in a comprehensive report. It was, in fact, primarily a personnel policy issue which had both programmatic and financial implications, and affected the character of the Secretariat itself. The report in question was being finalized, but it should be understood that the issue was very complex. It would perhaps be preferable for the Secretariat to provide data on the situation in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, and later issue a full report dealing with the broader policy issues.

33. Mr. JONAH (Sierra Leone) said that he was well aware that loaned officers were widely used throughout the Secretariat. It appeared that the situation had reached outrageous proportions; for example, some 83 per cent of the staff of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations were on loan. The issue could not wait until a full report could be prepared. The use of such staff meant that Governments with pet projects could fund them by providing loaned personnel; that was an unacceptable state of affairs.

34. Mr. ODAGA-JALOMAYO (Uganda) said that his delegation shared the concern over the use of loaned personnel. The issue was not new, and a full report had long been promised. It was surprising that the Committee was now being told that the Secretariat needed more time. He wished to know under which items the report would be issued, and what the current situation was.

35. Ms. SANTIPITAKS (Thailand) agreed with previous speakers that the issue of loaned officers was of vital concern and that there was a need for the report to be expedited. She supported the views of the representative of Pakistan regarding reimbursement to troop-contributing countries.

36. Mr. GOKHALE (India) said that the request for a report on loaned officers had first been made at the forty-eighth session. It was therefore hard to believe that the Secretariat was still gathering information.

37. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) said that the practice had begun with the loaning of military officers. The Secretary-General had determined, however, that it was not simply an issue affecting peacekeeping operations, but that it constituted a broad issue of personnel policy involving many departments of the Organization. From the departmental viewpoint, that perspective was generally not a primary concern. In the circumstances, it was difficult to develop a common position; as the Committee was aware, the views of Member States differed. The report would embrace several agenda items, principally human resources management, but also the administrative aspects of peacekeeping operations and the programme budget for the biennium 1996-1997, as well as the

/...

financing of the international criminal tribunals. Data could be provided relatively quickly, but the policy paper would require more time.

38. Mr. ODAGA-JALOMAYO (Uganda) agreed that it was a policy issue. The international character of the United Nations must not be undermined because of the financial crisis, and every effort must be made to address the issue. He asked exactly when the comprehensive report was expected to be issued.

39. Mr. JONAH (Sierra Leone) said that the issue was a serious one in that some Governments were selecting certain United Nations programmes for support, while neglecting others. In many instances, the Secretary-General was not aware of the number of loaned officers or of the extent to which they were used. Governments should not be allowed to undermine the United Nations by resorting to practices such as those described. He therefore asked whether the programme could be placed on hold pending clarification.

40. Mr. SIAL (Pakistan) said that the issue was not one of human resources management. The Secretariat was currently considering an offer made by a number of Member States for the establishment of a rapidly deployable headquarters team at no cost to the Organization. Further information was needed in order to enable the Committee to take a decision. He thanked the representative of India for reminding the Committee that information had been requested as early as the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly and pointed out that, at the resumed fiftieth session, the Secretary-General had been asked to provide such information by 1 September 1996 (resolution 50/221 B (para. 13)).

41. The CHAIRMAN said that the problem was a systemic one that had to be addressed. He invited the Controller to provide further clarification on the issues that had been raised.

42. Mr. TAKASU (Controller) said that the first question that had been raised concerned programme 2 and the question of loaned officers. That was a matter for the Committee to decide, but he suggested that it would be unfair to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations to delay approval of the programme because of that issue.

43. The second question concerned the timing of the report that was expected from the Secretary-General. His Office had been asked to coordinate the report and the timing would depend on the work programme, bearing in mind that his Office consisted only of himself and one assistant. He hoped that the report would be ready in time to enable the Fifth Committee to take a decision at the current session, but it was difficult to give any precise indication of the date when it would be issued, particularly since it was necessary to coordinate with a number of Secretariat departments.

44. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the proposal by the representative of Sierra Leone that the Committee should not proceed with programme 2 until it had received information concerning the position with regard to loaned officers, said he took it that the Committee wished to keep programme 2 on hold until further clarification had been provided by the Secretariat.

/...

Programme 3. Outer space affairs

45. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that her delegation endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of CPC contained in paragraph 58 of its report (A/51/16 (Part II)), and would like those conclusions and recommendations to be incorporated in the draft resolution.

46. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union and of Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Romania and Slovakia, said that the European Union continued to support the work performed by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space within the framework of the United Nations system. If that Committee was to remain a focus for United Nations activities relating to the peaceful exploration of outer space, it must engage in a process of reform, including the streamlining of its organization of work so as to reduce significantly the duration of its sessions. The European Union therefore encouraged the Committee to continue with its reform efforts, which were necessary to ensure the continued relevance of the programme.

47. Mr. GOKHALE (India) supported the programme submitted by the Secretary-General, as amended by CPC.

48. Mr. JAREMCZUK (Poland) said that his delegation endorsed the statements made by the representative of Ireland concerning programmes 1, 2 and 3.

49. Ms. BUERGO RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) said that her delegation fully supported the proposal on programme 3 as submitted by the Secretariat, together with the conclusions and recommendations of CPC.

Programme 4. Legal affairs

50. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that her delegation endorsed the conclusions and recommendations of CPC contained in paragraph 63 of its report (A/51/16 (Part II)).

51. Ms. BUERGO RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) said that, in general, her delegation supported the programme but recalled that the Chairman had written to the Chairman of the Sixth Committee requesting additional information which was still awaited. She suggested that, before concluding its consideration of programme 4, the Committee should await the input from the Sixth Committee, particularly since the information had been specifically requested by the Fifth Committee.

52. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union would have comments to make on programme 4 but was not in a position to do so at the present stage because the Sixth Committee had been engaged in other matters and had only begun consideration of the matters referred to it by the Fifth Committee the previous week. He might, however, be in a position to make a statement on the matter, taking into account the input from the Sixth Committee, at the following meeting that afternoon.

/...

53. The CHAIRMAN said that two suggestions had been made: one by the representative of Cuba to the effect that the Committee should await the input from the Sixth Committee, and the other by the representative of Ireland that the issue might be taken up that same afternoon.

54. Mr. HANSON (Canada) agreed with the representative of Cuba. As a general rule, the Committee should not take a decision on any matter on which it was still awaiting a reply from the Chairman of another Main Committee.

55. Mr. KELLY (Ireland) said that that afternoon was the earliest time by which the input from the Sixth Committee might be received. He could therefore support the statements by the representatives of Cuba and Canada to the effect that the Committee should await receipt of the input that was expected from the Chairman of the Sixth Committee.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee seemed to be in agreement that it should await the input from the Chairman of the Sixth Committee before proceeding with its consideration of programme 4. He pointed out that the same problem would arise with programmes 5 to 8 because input relating to those programmes from the Second Committee was not yet available.

57. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) recalled that, some years previously, concern had been expressed by delegations about the timing of consideration of input from other committees and the taking of the related decisions. Rather than leave the programmes open pending receipt of information from other committees, her delegation would be in favour of continuing discussion on the matter and then, as on the earlier occasion, taking a decision when the letters from the chairmen of the other committees were available. On that occasion, such decisions had been taken all together at the end of the general debate. If that solution were adopted at the current session, it would have the advantage of fully utilizing the conference services available to the Committee.

58. Mr. ODAGA-JALOMAYO (Uganda) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico.

59. Ms. BUERGO RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) said that her delegation had no difficulty in proceeding on the basis suggested by the representative of Mexico. Her intention had not been to hold up work on the consideration of the programmes. She asked the Chairman whether he would contact the Chairman of the Sixth Committee and ask him to obtain the input from that Committee as soon as possible in order to expedite the work of the Fifth Committee.

60. Mr. ODAGA-JALOMAYO (Uganda) agreed with the representative of Cuba and suggested that the Chairman should contact the Chairmen of all the other Main Committees from which comments were expected and ask them to submit their comments as soon as possible.

61. Mr. REPASCH (United States of America) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Uganda. His own delegation had no problem with keeping the programmes open but would like to have some indication of a timetable for the Committee's consideration of the item so that the members of the Committee would

/...

have an idea of when it would likely be in a position to conclude its discussion.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that he would report back to the Committee on the likely timing after he had approached the Chairmen of the other Main Committees concerned.

Programme 5. Policy coordination and sustainable development

63. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that her delegation agreed with the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraph 74 of the report of CPC (A/51/16 (Part II)).

64. Ms. BUERGO RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) said that her delegation would reserve its comments on programme 5 until the Second Committee had completed its consideration of the item.

65. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that he wished to make some preliminary remarks covering all the programmes in the economic and social field. The European Union believed that the medium-term plan should reflect the political parameters established at the recent global conferences, promote their integrated implementation and assess the organizational needs, including the administrative and budgetary resources required to facilitate the implementation of the commitments undertaken. In that context, the European Union noted that, in its resolution 50/227, the General Assembly had agreed that the role and working methods of CPC should be reviewed with a view to finding ways of improving programme coordination functions (Annex I, para. 73). The European Union attached importance to the convening of a special session of the General Assembly for the purpose of an overall review and appraisal of Agenda 21, including the future role of the Commission on Sustainable Development. In that respect, it understood that the medium-term plan might need to be revised in line with the decisions taken at the special session.

66. Commenting generally on the organization of the Secretariat, he said that the role of the United Nations in the field of development activities would be substantially strengthened if the three Secretariat departments with responsibilities in the area were to be merged under the authority of a single Under-Secretary-General responsible for policy formulation and coordination in the fields of sustainable development and economic cooperation. Coherence and coordination of operational activities should also be appropriately enhanced through the strengthening of the relevant Secretariat function. The European Union had put forward proposals to that effect within the framework of the negotiations taking place in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole of the General Assembly for the Mid-term Review of the Implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s. Acceptance of those proposals would, of necessity, require the rewriting of the programmes to which he had referred.

67. Turning specifically to programme 5, he noted that it made only passing reference to the central coordinating function of the Economic and Social Council and little to the key role of the Administrative Committee on

/...

Coordination. Even though it had been drafted before the adoption of General Assembly resolution 50/227, the omission of any more detailed reference to those bodies was surprising. Subprogramme 5.1 should therefore be revised accordingly.

68. With regard to subprogramme 5.2, the European Union encouraged the Division for the Advancement of Women and other parts of the United Nations system to continue to develop the analytic and conceptual basis for system-wide mainstreaming of a gender perspective.

69. Subprogramme 5.4 addressed the purpose and functioning of the Division for Sustainable Development, which had a key role to play in the follow-up to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and to the other major conferences on development issues. More emphasis should have been placed, however, on the people-centred nature of sustainable development. The Division for Sustainable Development should complement the work of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in monitoring developments related to the implementation of the intergovernmental conventions on the various aspects of sustainable development which had been agreed to in recent years. The European Union also believed that the objective of ensuring support for the Commission on Sustainable Development should be clearly stated in the medium-term plan.

70. Mr. ODAGA-JALOMAYO (Uganda) noted that the representative of Ireland had just put forward specific proposals which would entail the rewriting of several programmes. While he would await the formal presentation of the proposals in writing, as a preliminary reaction he would note that the reason why the High-level Open-ended Working Group on the Strengthening of the United Nations System had been appointed was precisely to examine that type of proposal. Moreover, given the large number of pending issues, the Committee was hardly in a position at present to discuss the proposal.

71. Mr. KELLY (Ireland) said that he wished to reassure the representative of Uganda that it was not the intention of the European Union to pursue the proposal to which he had just referred in the context of the medium-term plan, although, if accepted, it would entail some revisions to programmes 5, 7 and 8. The proposals had been put forward in the negotiations on the New Agenda for Development and the European Union was prepared to pursue them in such other forums as it considered appropriate.

72. The CHAIRMAN said that the general debate on programme 5 would continue when the Second Committee had completed its consideration of the item and reported its conclusions to the Fifth Committee.

Programme 6. Africa: New Agenda for Development

73. Ms. PEÑA (Mexico) said that her delegation supported the conclusions and recommendations of CPC on programme 6.

74. Mr. CHUINKAM (Cameroon), supported by Mr. ATIYANTO (Indonesia), noted that the mid-term review of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s (UN-NADAF) had recently been completed and its results

/...

should have been taken into account in the formulation of the programme under consideration.

75. Mr. TOYA (Japan) said that his delegation fully supported the conclusions and recommendations of CPC on programme 6. However, it shared the view of the representative of Cameroon that the results of the mid-term review of UN-NADAF should be reflected in the proposed medium-term plan.

76. Mr. KELLY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union fully supported the objectives of UN-NADAF. For the remainder of the period of the New Agenda, emphasis should be placed on implementation of the various programmes and initiatives, including the United Nations System-wide Special Initiative on Africa. The European Union had some concerns, however, about the possible duplication of activities in subprogrammes 6.1 and 6.3, both of which were concerned with the mobilization of international support for, and awareness of, the critical economic situation of Africa.

77. Mr. ODAGA-JALOMAYO (Uganda) agreed with the suggestion made by the representative of Cameroon that the results of the mid-term review of UN-NADAF should be reflected in the proposed medium-term plan. Indeed, the Committee's discussions on the programme could benefit from the views expressed in the Second Committee.

78. Mr. GOKHALE (India) said that his delegation supported the conclusions and recommendations of CPC on programme 6, which should also incorporate elements of the mid-term review of UN-NADAF.

79. Mr. HANSON (Canada) said that one result of the incorporation of the mid-term review of UN-NADAF into the programme would be the streamlining of the implementation of the New Agenda. The cause of African development would not be served by the adoption of competing strategies. The System-wide Special Initiative on Africa, for example, should complement the New Agenda, which continued to provide a sound basis for pursuing the objectives of African development in the years ahead.

80. Mr. ALOM (Bangladesh) said that his delegation supported the programme under consideration, as well as the conclusions and recommendations of CPC thereon. He agreed with those delegations which had called for both the views of the Second Committee and the conclusions of the mid-term review of UN-NADAF to be reflected in the proposed programme.

81. Ms. BUERGO RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) said that there appeared to be general agreement within the Committee that its consideration of the various programmes of the proposed medium-term plan would be greatly facilitated by inputs from the other Main Committees.

82. Mr. IRAGORRI (Colombia) said that there was a clear consensus on the need for the United Nations to maintain its commitment to the development of Africa. His delegation therefore supported the programme under consideration and the conclusions and recommendations contained in paragraph 81 of the report of CPC (A/51/16 (Part II)). It also agreed with the representative of Cameroon that

/...

the programme should take into account the results of the mid-term review of UN-NADAF.

83. Mr. FAGUNDES (Brazil) also supported the suggestion made by the representative of Cameroon, given the importance of the New Agenda to African development. His delegation unreservedly supported the conclusions and recommendations of CPC.

84. Mrs. SEALY MONTEITH (Jamaica) said that her delegation fully supported the New Agenda for the Development of Africa and agreed that the results of the mid-term review thereof should be taken into account in the formulation of the programme under consideration.

85. Mr. ELMONTASER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that programme 6 was of vital importance to the African continent. His delegation reserved the right to speak again on the item after the report of the Second Committee had been received.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.