



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 75th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOBINA SEKUYI (Ghana)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of General Assembly resolutions 33/182 A to C concerning agenda item 27 (continued)

Financial implications of the decisions and resolutions adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (continued)

Revised estimates under sections 5F, 22D and 25 and income section 1 (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/33/L.10 and L.19-32 concerning agenda item 32

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84/Rev.1, concerning the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

AGENDA ITEM 109: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of General Assembly resolutions A/33/7/Add.32 and Corr.1; A/33/7/Add.32 and Corr.1; A/C.5/33/104 and Corr.1)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the consideration of the administrative and financial implications of the three resolutions adopted by the General Assembly concerning the question of Namibia had been postponed so that further consultations could be held with a view to facilitating the Committee's examination of the documents before it (A/C.5/33/104 and Corr.1; A/33/7/Add.32). In the meantime, the Advisory Committee had issued a corrigendum to its report (A/33/7/Add.32/Corr.1).

Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller) said that he wished to comment on a number of points that had been raised during the debate so far. It was understandable that the reclassification of existing posts should be viewed with some reluctance in the middle of a biennium. He wished to emphasize at the outset, however, that it was not a matter of assigning a rank to individual staff members, but rather of grading posts. If, after study, it was decided that a specific function should be classified at a given level, the decision should be put into effect. The sound performance of the current budget was at stake, as was a balanced presentation of the budget for the coming biennium. The same principle applied to the establishment of new posts: as soon as it was demonstrated that a permanent function existed, the necessary post should be created.

Mr. SEMICHI (Algeria), referring to paragraph 22 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.32), said that his delegation was fully aware of the difficulties involved in reclassifying posts in the middle of a biennium, but that, taking into account the exceptional nature of the Namibian question and its importance for the United Nations, the Committee should resolutely and speedily take a decision on the matter which was, in fact, political. His delegation therefore proposed that the necessary reclassification of posts in the secretariat of the United Nations Council for Namibia should be approved without delay.

Mr. IYER (India) welcomed the changes which the Advisory Committee had introduced into its report. The corrigendum that had been issued (A/33/7/Add.32/Corr.1) constituted further proof of the concern for exactitude which characterized the Advisory Committee. He expressed the hope that the recommendations of ACABQ would be accepted by the Fifth Committee. He endorsed the comments of the representative of Algeria concerning paragraph 22 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.32) and supported his proposal to upgrade the post of Secretary of the United Nations Council for Namibia from the P-5 to the D-1 level. For the reasons adduced by the representative of Algeria, his delegation would support the proposed amendment to that effect.

/...

5. Mr. MARMALAKU (Yugoslavia) said his delegation fully endorsed the amendment proposed by Algeria and supported by India. It was essential for the Fifth Committee to take a decision that would improve the effectiveness of the United Nations Council for Namibia, with a view to ensuring the implementation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.
6. Mr. KAMBIRIGI (Burundi) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Algeria, India and Yugoslavia. Burundi, which was a member of the Council for Namibia, approved of the work carried out by its secretariat and agreed that the post of Secretary of the Council should be upgraded from the P-5 to the D-1 level.
7. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya), recalling that at a previous meeting the representative of Zambia had specifically proposed the reclassification of the post of Secretary of the Council, said that the proposal now commanded broader support, including that of his delegation.
8. Referring to paragraph 17 of document A/33/7/Add.32, he emphasized the importance of implementing Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia and said that the implementation of the Decree called for an exception to be made to paragraph 2 of General Assembly 32/209. He expressed the hope that everything would be done to make consultants available for that purpose. In that connexion, he drew attention to paragraph 21 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.32) and noted that the Committee might make requests for staff resources that did not entail financial implications. He therefore suggested that the Committee should approve the establishment of a P-2 post for an administrative officer on a permanent, rather than on a temporary-assistance basis.
9. The CHAIRMAN said that four proposals had been put forward: the first was for the reclassification of the post of Secretary of the United Nations Council for Namibia from the P-5 to the D-1 level; the second was that an exception should be made to paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 32/209; the third called for the upgrading from the P-5 to the D-1 level of a post in the Lusaka Office; and the fourth called for the establishment on a permanent, rather than temporary-assistance, basis of a P-2 post in New York.
10. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia) expressed gratitude to the Advisory Committee for issuing a corrigendum to paragraph 7 and stated that the text, as corrected, was entirely acceptable to his delegation.
11. Referring to paragraph 29 of document A/33/7/Add.32, he said that he fully supported the proposal made by preceding speakers to upgrade the post of Secretary of the Council. At the serious political juncture which had been reached, every possible step should be taken to strengthen the United Nations Council for Namibia.
12. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that Namibia was one of the rare issues with respect to which there was universal recognition of the full responsibility of the United Nations. It was essential to solve the situation speedily and in the interests of the Namibian people. Given the urgency of the situation, he suggested that the four proposals before the Committee should be adopted by consensus.

13. Mr. RAMZI (Egypt) said that his Government viewed the reclassification of the post of Secretary of the Council from the P-5 to the D-1 level as particularly important. In paragraph 22 of its report, the Advisory Committee had emphasized that there should be no reclassifications half-way through a biennium. However, the Advisory Committee also recognized the merits of the case, since in the same paragraph, it had recommended the inclusion of a request for reclassification in the programme budget proposals for 1980-1981. Thus, the problem was merely one of timing. In paragraph 29 of the same report, the Advisory Committee had suggested that a Secretary at the D-1 level should be provided to the Council through redeployment within the Department. In ordinary circumstances, his delegation would have supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations, but, in its view, the situation in Namibia called for exceptional measures. It was necessary to ensure the continuity of the work of the United Nations Council for Namibia, and that meant providing the staff requested by the Secretary-General. His delegation would therefore not support the Advisory Committee and associated itself with those delegations which had expressed support for the reclassification.

14. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that, at the 72nd meeting of the Fifth Committee, several representatives had criticized a sentence contained in paragraph 7 of the Advisory Committee's report in document A/33/7/Add.32. The Committee had been reproached with having drafted the paragraph in a way which might suggest that the Committee was making a value judgement on developments in Namibia. At the same meeting, he had pointed out that the Advisory Committee had not made the recommendation contained in that paragraph on the basis of its own evaluation of the political situation in Namibia and that the sentence in question could hardly be interpreted in that manner. The Advisory Committee sought to draft reports that were clear and, in so far as possible, unambiguous; nevertheless, the Committee had realized that paragraph 7 might give rise to misunderstandings. His explanation concerning paragraph 7 should, however, have dispelled any such misunderstanding. In any case, it was not normally the custom of the Advisory Committee to revise its reports as a result of comments made in the Fifth Committee. It should be borne in mind that it was the latter's reports, rather than those of the Advisory Committee, which were normally considered at plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

15. Before the controversy concerning paragraph 7 had arisen, he had already informed the Fifth Committee that a technical correction to paragraphs 33 and 34 would be issued. The Advisory Committee had, therefore, taken that opportunity to revise the text of paragraph 7 in the manner indicated in the corrigendum in document A/33/7/Add.32/Corr.1. He must, however, inform the Fifth Committee that the Advisory Committee would not wish to revise its reports or alter its recommendation on the basis of comments made in the Fifth Committee. If the present case was cited as a precedent in the future to call for such revision, the ability of the Advisory Committee to make recommendations and give precise reasons for such recommendations would be compromised, and that would not be in the interest of the Fifth Committee or of the work entrusted to it.

/...

16. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) reviewed the proposals before the Committee and their financial implications, following the order of the relevant paragraphs in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/33/7/Add.32). In the case of paragraph 17, the General Assembly would have to make an exception to the provisions of resolution 32/209. If that exception was approved, the expenditure would amount to \$2,162,600 and the sum relating to staff assessment would come to \$76,300. Amendments had been proposed to paragraphs 22 and 29, providing for the reclassification of two P-5 posts to D-1, one in New York, the other in Lusaka. An additional appropriation of \$4,300 would be needed to reclassify the New York post, and \$800 for the post in Lusaka, making a total of \$5,100; the amount included under staff assessment for the two posts was \$1,500. The proposal to establish the post referred to in paragraph 21 on a permanent rather than a temporary basis would have no financial implications. If all the proposals were approved by the Committee, the total appropriation requested would be \$2,167,700, and staff assessment would amount to \$77,800.

17. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote before the vote, reminded members that the Soviet Union, which was providing assistance in many ways to the Namibian people in their struggle for independence, had supported the resolutions concerning Namibia in the plenary of the General Assembly. The Advisory Committee had quite properly dealt with the question of the financial implications of those resolutions. However, some of its recommendations were not entirely satisfactory, and for that reason, not all the appropriations recommended were fully justified.

18. Moreover, his delegation considered it quite abnormal that at virtually every meeting, for reasons absolutely alien to the rational utilization of United Nations resources, proposals were submitted which sought to revise the justified and well thought out recommendations of the Advisory Committee. His delegation would not, therefore, be able to support proposals which ran counter to the recommendations of ACABQ, and would vote against them. If the four proposals were put to the vote separately, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the reclassification of the post of Secretary of the Council for Namibia from P-5 to D-1, and would vote against the others. In addition, for the reasons he had stated, he could not support the requests for additional funds and would abstain in the vote.

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the four proposals before it and, on the basis of the results, to proceed to vote on the total additional amount requested.

20. The four proposals were adopted by 74 votes to 16.

21. An additional appropriation totalling \$167,700 under sections 3B, 3C and 21A of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, and an amount of \$77,800 under section 25 (staff assessment), offset by a similar amount under income section 1, were approved by 75 votes to 4, with 11 abstentions.

22. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America), also speaking on behalf of the delegations of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom, explained the votes of the four delegations. The four countries actively supported Namibia's accession to independence in accordance with the decisions of the Security Council.

23. They had not approved the additional appropriation requested both out of a concern for economy and for reasons of principle. Paragraph 8 of the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/33/104) said that the Council for Namibia had indicated that expenditure under each of the items included in its work programme would be kept under its direct control. Moreover, the report of the Advisory Committee (A/33/7/Add.32) showed that the representatives of the Secretary-General had given assurances that the spending of the Council for Namibia would be administered in accordance with the Financial Regulations and Financial Rules of the United Nations. Yet it was clear from the report of the Secretary-General that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the basis of document A/33/L.15 authorized financial operations which went beyond the Financial Regulations: in particular, an additional appropriation of \$300,000 to carry out an unspecified programme of activities during the International Year of Solidarity with the People of Namibia (para. 29). The four Governments could not approve an appropriation when the programme it was to finance had not yet been worked out. They were also opposed, in principle, to an appropriation allowing an absolutely inexplicable diversion of funds from the regular budget of the United Nations to the Fund for Namibia (para. 20).

24. With regard to an appropriation of more than half a million dollars requested for the administration of the Nationhood Programme for Namibia (paras. 24 to 26), the Secretary-General had clearly stated that the money was for administrative costs, and the four Governments could not accept the rationale for not using the appropriation to support an operational programme. The Council for Namibia should reimburse the United Nations in an amount corresponding to 14 per cent of the costs of the projects carried out under the Nationhood Programme for support costs, the money to come from the Fund for Namibia. The four Governments had serious reservations about financing any outside organization, however praiseworthy, from funds which were part of the regular budget of the United Nations.

25. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that, having considered the question as a whole in depth, including the administrative and financial implications, his delegation had decided to vote for the Advisory Committee's proposals. Unfortunately, last-minute amendments had made the task more difficult.

26. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that his delegation had voted for the Advisory Committee's proposals because it believed that Namibia would be liberated through concrete action on the part of the United Nations, not by kind words.

27. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) reminded the Committee that his delegation had supported draft resolutions A/33/L.13, 14 and 15, and that his country's support for the Namibian people was unflagging. It would have voted in favour of the appropriation proposed by ACABQ, but had to its great regret been constrained to vote against the proposals modifying the amount recommended and abstain in the vote on the

(Mr. Akashi, Japan)

additional appropriation as amended by the Fifth Committee. Japan respected budgetary procedures and felt in particular that requests for the reclassification of posts should be taken up in the framework of the consideration of the budget, which would take place at the thirty-fourth session.

Financial implications of the decisions and resolutions adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (continued)
(A/33/7/Add.33; A/C.5/33/64 and Corr.1; A/C.5/33/CRP.11)

28. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that at the 73rd meeting, the representative of Egypt had made a proposal to create five permanent posts (2 P-5, 2 G-5 and 1 G-4) which ACABQ had recommended should not be approved when the Secretary-General had requested them for the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. The Egyptian representative had also proposed the approval of six months of temporary assistance for the programme of fellowships on disarmament. The financial implications of those proposals were contained in document A/C.5/33/CRP.11.

29. Mr. RAMZY (Egypt) indicated that he wished his proposals to be adopted by consensus.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that since there were objections from some delegations, the proposals would be put to the vote.

31. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his vote before the vote, stated that, in the light of the priority attached to disarmament questions in United Nations activities, his delegation was prepared to support the Advisory Committee's recommendations concerning the additional amount requested by the Secretary-General, although it believed that he should have financed the activities in question from appropriations already approved for the biennium 1978-1979. Nevertheless, for reasons already stated, his delegation could not support proposals which were contrary to the Advisory Committee's recommendations. If those proposals were adopted, it would have to vote against the additional amount requested.

32. Mr. ANDERSSON (Sweden) said that the Nordic countries would support the compromise proposed by Egypt.

33. The Egyptian proposal was adopted by 70 votes to 14, with one abstention.

34. An additional appropriation of \$1,037,900 under section 2C of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, and an amount of \$127,900 under section 25 (staff assessment), offset by a similar amount under income section 1, were approved by 70 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.

35. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation recognized the importance of disarmament. However, the Advisory Committee had recommended that an effort should be made to effect savings. It was well known that programme directors had a tendency to inflate their requests for appropriations and the case now before the Committee was no exception.

/...

Mr. Pedersen, Canada)

36. The Secretary-General had recognized that it was impossible at the present stage to ascertain fully the level of activity of the Centre for Disarmament in 1979. He had also recognized that his report did not contain objective criteria for determining whether the resources which he might require were indeed limited to 15 work-months. The Advisory Committee had formulated well-grounded and carefully considered recommendations. For that reason his delegation had voted against the Egyptian proposal and had abstained in the vote on the appropriation requested.

37. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said that his delegation had with regret voted against the Egyptian proposal and had abstained in the vote on the appropriation. While it attached great importance to disarmament, it felt that resources should be allocated on the basis of a critical analysis. His delegation would have been willing to accept the establishment of an additional P-5 post, but not the establishment of three more posts in addition to the nine new posts recommended by the Advisory Committee.

38. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that his delegation had been forced to abstain in the vote. With \$400 billion being spent world-wide for arms, the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should not consume another significant portion of the resources which developing countries needed for economic and social development. Furthermore, any increase in the contribution of those countries to the regular budget of the United Nations should be avoided.

39. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) noted that his Government had taken several initiatives which demonstrated its interest in disarmament. However, the Committee should always bear in mind the need to adapt resources to needs; consequently, his delegation would have voted for the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

40. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) pointed out that his Government's participation in the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was only one of many ways in which it indicated the importance it attached to disarmament. However, the Committee was not concerned with disarmament matters, but with whether requests for appropriations to support United Nations activities were justified. The importance of an activity was not measured by its cost. His delegation had therefore not been able to support the Egyptian proposal or the appropriation requested.

Revised estimates under sections 5F, 22D and 25 and income section 1:
Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation
(continued) (A/33/7/Add.34; A/C.5/33/110)

41. The CHAIRMAN indicated that the Secretariat had provided the representative of the United States with a detailed breakdown of the expenditures relating to the Office of the Director-General, using standard costs to compute all expenditures. He drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 16 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/33/7/Add.34) which stated that, if the Committee so desired, it should recommend to the General Assembly that an exception be made to resolution 32/209 concerning additional appropriations requested for the services of experts and consultants, which amounted in the present case to \$120,000.

/...

42. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that an exception be made to the provisions of resolution 32/209.

43. Mr. BLACKMAN (Barbados) asked whether the Committee could not postpone consideration of the matter to the following day, since the Second Committee was to take a decision on the draft resolution concerning the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

44. Mr. BACHROUCH (Tunisia) supported the proposal made by the representative of Barbados, since it was not yet known whether the draft resolution on restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, now the subject of consultations, would have administrative and financial implications. Depending on how it interpreted the draft resolution, the Second Committee might request additional funds for the Office of the Director-General. Therefore, with a view to ensuring that the Director-General had all the support he needed and that the Committee could take an informed decision bearing in mind the entire problem of restructuring, it would be preferable for the Committee not to take a final decision before the Second Committee had taken its decision.

45. After a discussion in which Mr. PIRSON (Belgium), Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America), Mr. IYER (India), Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. BACHROUCH (Tunisia) participated, the CHAIRMAN said that, as far as he knew, the draft resolution now being prepared on restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system would not have financial implications, but in the event that it did, the Secretary-General would prepare a separate report on those implications, which would be submitted to the Advisory Committee for consideration before it came before the Fifth Committee. If necessary, the request for an additional appropriation would then be dealt with as a new item. He therefore proposed that the Committee should now study the revised estimates requested by the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.

46. It was so decided.

47. Mr. IYER (India) said that his delegation was pleased to see that the Advisory Committee had accepted the Secretary-General's proposal concerning the staff needs of the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation. The proposals had been prepared on the basis of team work which would provide the greatest degree of flexibility. The post of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation had been established at the initiative of the developing countries during negotiations in the Special Committee on Restructuring the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System in order to provide the necessary orientation for the economic and social activities of the system towards the economic development of developing countries. The problem of staff resources of the Secretariat was closely linked to that of restructuring the economic and social sectors and his delegation hoped that those close links would be taken into account, in particular the relevant provisions of resolution 33/143, especially with regard to the staffing of the Office of the Director-General.

48. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) requested clarification with regard to paragraph 16 of document A/33/7/Add.34, in which the Advisory Committee seemed to state its recommendation in more categorical terms than similar recommendations it had made calling for an exception to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 32/209.

49. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) pointed out that, when the General Assembly had adopted resolution 32/197 on restructuring the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system in December 1977, it had specified the duties of the Director-General in paragraph 2 of the resolution and had further indicated that "he should be provided with the necessary support and resources". The General Assembly should faithfully implement the consensus which had led to the adoption of the resolution and provide the Director-General with the necessary support and resources. In that connexion the Secretary-General had made completely reasonable proposals and the Advisory Committee's position on the subject was also reasonable. His delegation had no hesitation in voting for the requested appropriations and in asking that an exception be made, if need be, to resolution 32/209. In conclusion, it commended the Director-General who for several months had done his utmost to discharge his responsibilities efficiently.

50. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) expressed his delegation's satisfaction that the Advisory Committee had accepted all of the Secretary-General's proposals concerning the Professional posts; his delegation was confident that the resources allocated to the Director-General would enable him to begin to carry out his responsibilities in the best conditions. His delegation supported the proposal to make an exception to resolution 32/209. It hoped that the services concerned would take the necessary measures to avoid administrative conflicts arising from different interpretations of General Assembly resolutions, as recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 13 of its report (A/33/7/Add.34). His delegation wished to express a slight reservation with regard to the reduction in the number of new General Service posts recommended by the Advisory Committee; his delegation hoped that the reduction would not hamper the operation of the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.

51. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the question raised by the representative of New Zealand, said that the Advisory Committee had examined all the requests for funds relating to consultant services, had proposed reductions in the funds requested where deemed possible and had indicated that the funds would be appropriated only if the General Assembly agreed to make an exception to resolution 32/209. That was the case in document A/33/7/Add.31 (paras. 20 and 21). In other instances (A/33/7/Add.32, para. 17; A/33/7/Add.33, para. 26; and A/33/7/Add.37, para. 10), the Advisory Committee had recommended that the entire amount requested should be appropriated, subject to the General Assembly's waiving the provisions of resolution 32/209.

52. In paragraph 16 of document A/33/7/Add.34, the Advisory Committee had indicated that it was prepared to recommend that the entire amount requested for consultant services be approved, subject to the General Assembly's waiving the provisions of resolution 32/209.

53. Mr. DAVIDSON (Assistant Secretary-General for Administration and Management) stated in reply to questions raised at the 74th meeting by the representative of the United States concerning the possibilities explored for obtaining the resources needed by the Office of the Director-General and more particularly, the possible redeployment of personnel available in the Secretariat to provide staffing for the Office, that a number of options had been examined. One was to break down the staffing pattern of the Office into relatively rigid components and allocate clearly differentiated functions to each constituent element. Another option was to assign specific duties to certain staff members. But in both cases, the result was a far too inflexible structure. On the contrary, the aim had been to achieve the greatest degree of flexibility and the teamwork approach, teams being set up in accordance with the problems to be tackled. The Secretary-General's proposals for the establishment of three interchangeable teams (each basically made up of one D-2, one D-1 and two P-5 staff members) would enable the Director-General to act with the requisite flexibility, particularly at the interdisciplinary level.

54. The Secretariat staff had been utilized to the full extent possible, in terms of available personnel. On the other hand, with regard to the transfer of posts, it had been clearly established at the July 1978 session of the Economic and Social Council that the transfer procedure could not be applied to the Office of the Director-General because of the special nature of the latter's functions and the new responsibilities which he was to assume in the Secretariat.

55. In reply to a question put by the representative of Pakistan on the reduction in the number of General Service posts recommended by the Advisory Committee (A/33/7/Add.34, para. 14), he explained that the Secretary-General had requested 11 General Service posts (i.e., a number equal to the Professional posts plus one additional post) under the usual formula. With the two posts already allocated to the Office of the Director General, that brought the total to 13 General Service posts. As the Advisory Committee had decided to recommend a reduction of two posts, the Director-General would do his best to accommodate that decision, but if the two posts in question proved indispensable, the Secretary-General might provide the Director-General with temporary staff until the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981 came under consideration.

56. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) stated that his questions had been motivated by an impression gained from the report of the Secretary-General that the Office of the Director-General could have been staffed from other divisions of the Secretariat. In point of fact, even before the Office had been established, a certain amount of co-ordination in development and co-operation activities already existed and the staff members involved should have been able to make up at least part of the staff of the new Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation.

57. The United States Government attached great importance to the role of the Director-General and the structure of his Office in achieving greater cohesion and effectiveness in the management of development assistance through the United Nations. It continued to believe that the Director-General must contribute, as the Secretary-General's agent, to the realization of greater efficiency within the

/C.5/33/75

English

Page 12

Mr. Cunningham, United States)

United Nations system, but that did not require the creation of a new body the effect of which was the very negation of the restructuring effort undertaken within the system.

58. Moreover, the staffing pattern proposed, made up of 13 Professionals and senior officials in the Office of the Director-General, would no doubt soon lead to the creation of new posts at lower levels, as already anticipated by the Advisory Committee (A/33/C.5/Add.34, para. 12). The United States delegation considered that existing resources, were sufficient, should be redeployed, and for that reason it could not endorse the proposal of the Secretary-General and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

59. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal by the representative of Panama that the Committee recommend the General Assembly to waive the provisions of resolution 32/209 and authorize an additional appropriation of \$120,000 for consultant services under section 5F of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979.

60. The proposal was adopted by 78 votes to 7, with one abstention.

61. An additional appropriation of \$776,000 under sections 5F and 22D of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979, and an amount of \$209,400 under section 25 (staff assessment), offset by a similar amount under income section 1, were approved by 77 votes to 7, with one abstention.

62. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the question raised by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, explained that the additional appropriation approved by the Commission (\$776,000) would include the appropriation of \$120,000 for consultant services.

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/33/L.10 and A/33/L.19-32, concerning agenda item 32 (A/33/7/Add.37; A/C.5/33/103)

63. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he had nothing to add to the report of the Committee (A/33/7/Add.37).

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84/Rev.1 concerning the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy

64. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya), reverting to the question of allocations for the United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, consideration of which had been concluded the previous week, said that he wished to draw the Committee's attention to a serious oversight which should be remedied. The Secretary-General

/...

(Mr. Okeyo, Kenya)

had requested an allocation for a group of eight experts to be responsible for drawing up the documentation for the Conference, which was to be held in 1981. The Advisory Committee had recommended that only four experts should be recruited from outside and that the services of four others from the Centre for Natural Resources, Energy and Transport should be called upon. As pointed out by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 21 and 28 of its report (A/33/7/Add.31), however, in order to enable the Secretary-General to recruit four outside experts, the General Assembly would have to decide to make an exception to the terms of General Assembly resolution 32/209. Members of the Committee had not raised that point when they had approved the necessary allocations for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy. In the absence of specialized documents on sources of energy, which should be prepared in advance by experts, such a scientific conference would be faced with considerable difficulties. The question was not one of increasing the allocation recommended by the Advisory Committee but simply of remedying an oversight by authorizing an exception to be made to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 32/209 so that the Secretariat could convene a group of experts. His delegation, which attached great importance to the question, hoped that the Committee would take the necessary steps to that end.

65. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to rule 123 of the rules of procedure, which stipulated that "When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be considered at the same session unless the Committee, by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting, so decides." He would give the floor to two speakers opposed to the Kenyan delegation's proposal before putting the proposal to the vote.

66. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was astonished that the Committee should concern itself with a question that was not on the agenda; he could see no reason for raising the question. The Fifth Committee had already taken a decision on the Conference and, if the Kenyan representative wished to raise a question in that connexion, he could do so when the General Assembly considered the corresponding agenda item in plenary.

67. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that he, too, was surprised at the Kenyan delegation's proposal since, when the Fifth Committee had been considering the question of allocations for the Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, the Chairman had clearly drawn the attention of delegations to the problem raised by General Assembly resolution 32/209, and none of them had submitted any proposal which would authorize the Secretary-General to make an exception to the terms of that resolution. Moreover, the Controller had informed the Fifth Committee that he had taken steps to restrict to a considerable degree expenditure on the services of experts and consultants. His delegation therefore doubted whether there was any justification for reopening the debate on the matter.

68. The CHAIRMAN said he proposed to put to the vote the Kenyan representative's proposal that the Committee should take up again the question of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84/Rev.1.

/...

69. There were 56 votes in favour, 16 against and 4 abstentions. Having obtained the required two-thirds majority, the proposal was adopted.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that the question would be placed on the agenda for the following meeting.

71. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, if he had been present when the vote had been taken, he would have voted against the proposal.

72. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he had voted in favour of reopening the debate on the question so that the Committee could examine the matter in depth. He hoped that the question would be fully clarified and that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would express his views on the statement by the Kenyan representative, so that the Committee could take a decision on the substance of the matter in full knowledge of the facts.

73. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) asked why the Committee should not consider the question at once.

74. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that the problem was a simple one, since all that was required was to take a decision on the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 28 of its report (A/33/7/Add.31) without making any allocations other than those recommended in that paragraph; all that had to be done was to authorize the Secretary-General to make an exception to General Assembly resolution 32/209. That was a decision that could be taken by the Committee at its current meeting.

75. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to avoid undue haste and he considered that it would, in his view, be preferable for the Committee to consider the question the following day. He suggested that, if there was no objection, the Committee should defer consideration of the question to the following meeting.

76. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 109: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

77. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Mr. Hou Tung had resigned from the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions with effect from 1 February 1979. The Government of the People's Republic of China had nominated Mr. Tang Jianwen to replace him until his term of office expired on 31 December 1980. He therefore suggested that, if there was no objection, the Committee should revert to agenda item 109 (b) in order to take a decision on the question.

78. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.