

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1324th
MEETING**

Friday, 7 November 1969,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 78. Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (<i>continued</i>)	187
Agenda item 74. Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (<i>continued</i>) First reading (<i>continued</i>)	189
Section 4. Common staff costs	189
Income section 1. Income from staff assessment	189
Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolu- tion submitted by the Sixth Committee on document A/7747 on agenda item 90	190
Agenda item 81. Implementation of the recommendations of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budg- etary Questions (<i>continued</i>)	190

Chairman: Mr. David SILVEIRA DA MOTA
(Brazil).

AGENDA ITEM 78

**Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses
of the United Nations: report of the Committee on
Contributions (*continued*)* (A/7611 and Corr.1 and
Add.1, A/C.5/L.994, A/C.5/L.995, A/C.5/L.997-999)**

1. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) introduced a draft text (see A/C.5/L.999) which the delegations of Australia, Canada, Denmark, New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom were proposing for inclusion in the report of the Fifth Committee. The sponsors would not ask for their text to be put to the vote; they merely wished it to be given the same treatment as the draft texts in documents A/C.5/L.994, A/C.5/L.995, A/C.5/L.997 and A/C.5/L.998.

2. U TIN PE (Burma) commended the Committee on Contributions for its comprehensive analysis of its terms of reference, and of the criteria currently used in establishing the scale of assessments. However, his delegation did not agree with that Committee's conclusion that the various guidelines or criteria laid down by the General Assembly permitted the establishment of a balanced and equitable scale; it felt that the criteria conflicted with reality. His delegation accordingly hoped that the Committee on contributions, in preparing the next scale of assessments, would bear in mind the observations contained in its report

* Resumed from the 1321st meeting.

(A/7611 and Corr.1 and Add.1), including those in paragraphs 30, 31, 32 and 38, and would endeavour to give special consideration to the developing countries, taking into account their economic and fiscal problems, and also to any country facing unusual economic and fiscal difficulties. His delegation would furthermore like to be assured that the scale of assessments would hold an equitable balance between the interests of Member States and would reflect the realities of their economic situation. It hoped, lastly, that the Committee on Contributions would give due consideration to the desirability of raising from 50 to 60 per cent, the maximum allowance for low *per capita* income granted to Member States with a *per capita* income below \$1,000, and that it would continue its studies related to the establishment of the scale of assessments and report on the matter as appropriate.

3. His delegation was glad to note that the differences of opinion reflected in the report of the Committee on Contributions and in the Fifth Committee's discussions were narrowing, and that some agreement seemed to be emerging on the question under consideration; though there might be different views on the question, there was certainly no rational basis for confrontation. He reserved the right to revert to the question at a later stage.

4. Mr. FASCELL (United States of America) said that the proposal submitted in document A/C.5/L.999 was in accord with his delegation's views on the matter, and his delegation would have supported it if it had been put to the vote. That indicated how far his delegation had gone, when submitting its own proposal (see A/C.5/L.994), in an attempt not simply to present its own point of view but rather to focus attention on the concerns of the developing countries. The United States, of course, still adhered to the position that the existing guidelines, including the ceiling principle, should be maintained and respected.

5. He paid a tribute to the Rapporteur whose efforts were largely responsible for the fact that the Committee was about to arrive at a generally agreed conclusion to the current debate.

6. Mr. SERUP (Denmark) said he thought that the text contained in document A/C.5/L.999 of which his delegation was one of the sponsors—was reasonable and balanced, and he hoped that the Committee would agree to its inclusion in the report.

7. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria), Rapporteur, read out the text of the paragraphs which he was proposing for inclusion in the Committee's report. The text had been drafted in a spirit of co-operation, and it was a compromise formula which—he hoped—would meet with the Committee's approval. He observed that the symbol of the document

introduced by the United Kingdom representative (A/C.5/L.999) should be added to those mentioned in the text he had just read out.¹

8. Mr. MEYER PICÓN (Mexico) thought that the second sentence of the text proposed by the Rapporteur was too categorical and seemed to rule out any hope of agreement. The assertion in that sentence—that no agreement could be reached on revision of the guidelines used by the Committee on Contributions for the establishment of the scale of assessments—should be qualified by relating it to the present time only. He accordingly proposed that the sentence should mention that it had become evident that “at this time” no general agreement could be reached on revision.

9. He also felt that the words “criteria or” before the word “guidelines” in the same sentence should be deleted, as the use of both terms might create confusion. In his opinion, the term “criteria” introduced an element of judgement and might therefore be taken to refer to the discretion which the Committee on Contributions exercised in applying the guidelines and principles laid down for the establishment of the scale. By using the word “criteria” the Fifth Committee might give the impression that it wanted to restrict that discretionary power, though its intentions were in fact quite the opposite, as it attached great importance to the discretion exercised by the Committee on Contributions.

10. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation, which had been consulted by the Mexican representative, had earlier accepted the amendment proposed by the latter, and still accepted it although, on re-reading the report of the Committee on Contributions, he had noticed that words “criteria”, “guidelines” and “terms of reference” were used interchangeably. The essential thing, in his view, was to agree that the term “guidelines” embraced such principles as the ceiling and floor principles, the maximum allowance of 50 per cent and the \$1,000 limit for granting relief. His delegation did not see that the word “criteria”, if retained, would in any way limit the discretion of the Committee on Contributions.

11. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) also noted that the report of the Committee on Contributions made no distinction between the terms “criteria” and “guidelines”. His delegation, which had likewise been consulted by the Mexican representative, was not opposed to the deletion of the word “criteria”. What was most important was to mention the absence of agreement on the idea of revising the established criteria or guidelines.

12. Mr. ESTABLIE (France) observed that the draft text proposed by the Rapporteur had not been circulated in French, and his delegation therefore reserved the right to revert to the matter when it had been able to study the text in its own working language. Even at the current stage, however, he could say that the text seemed to be acceptable, and he congratulated the Rapporteur on producing it.

13. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria), Rapporteur, said that the Committee’s draft report containing the proposed text would be issued shortly, and that any questions concerning the translation of the two terms could be raised during the discussion on the draft report.

14. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) expressed his appreciation to the Rapporteur for his dexterity in finding a formula which would enable the Committee to conclude its consideration of the question of the scale of assessments without having to proceed to a vote that would divide the membership. On an item such as the one under consideration, it was only natural that there should be a wide divergence of views since, in spite of the general desire to be impartial, members represented different countries which inevitably approached the problem in different ways. The Committee should therefore be glad that the discussions had been conducted in a spirit of mutual tolerance and understanding and could be concluded on a note of conciliation. The members of the Fifth Committee expected the Committee on Contributions to take due account of the views they had expressed, particularly concerning the importance of the balance-of-payments factor and the effect of external indebtedness. Many delegations, including his own, had stressed that point, to which attention was also drawn in one of the texts to be included in the Fifth Committee’s report through reference to a paragraph in the report of the Committee on Contributions.

15. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) said that he had not taken an active part in the debate on the item; he had approached it with an open mind and found that no case had been made for solving the problem by means of formulas applicable to whole groups of countries. It should therefore be left to the Committee on Contributions to determine the cases in which relief should be given, and to decide the amount of relief. As the text contained in document A/C.5/L.999 neatly summarized that conclusion, his delegation had wished to be included among its sponsors; the inclusion of the text in the Committee’s report would help to give an accurate and full idea of the views expressed in the course of the debate. His delegation would welcome any amendment which might have the effect of alleviating the financial burden to be borne by countries with financial difficulties.

16. With regard to the Mexican representative’s amendment relating to the terms “criteria” and “guidelines”, he observed that the report of the Committee on Contributions used one or the other term indiscriminately, and he personally doubted whether the two terms could be strictly defined. There were certain well-defined areas in which the Committee on Contributions used its own discretion, and no member of the Fifth Committee wished to restrict that prerogative. It did not seem to him that the retention of the word “criteria” would be likely to lead to any such restrictions. The fact was that the Fifth Committee had not reached agreement on the idea of revising the criteria and guidelines for the establishment of the scale of assessments. He had no clearly defined views on the matter, but would prefer the text proposed by the Rapporteur, with the first amendment submitted by the Mexican delegation.

17. Mr. SABIK (Poland) said that he also preferred the text submitted by the Rapporteur, which did not appear to

¹ This text, as amended by the insertion of the words “at this time” (see para. 21 below), subsequently appeared in the Committee’s report (A/7816) as paragraphs 14 and 15.

restrict the discretionary power of the Committee on Contributions in any way. The words "guidelines" and "criteria" were used to refer to the principles which the Committee took as a basis in establishing the scale of assessments, namely the ceiling principle, the floor principle and the allowance principle.

18. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) wondered whether, instead of deleting the word "criteria", it would not be better to state in the text that no agreement could be reached on revision of all the "criteria" or "guidelines" used by the Committee on Contributions. There were some strictly established criteria, and there were on the other hand some guidelines under which the Committee used its discretion to make certain changes. The formula he proposed would make it possible to retain both terms: "criteria" and "guidelines".

19. Mr. MEYER PICÓN (Mexico) said that, if the Committee so wished, the word "criteria" could be retained and the Rapporteur could be asked to add at the end of the paragraph a sentence to the effect that the definition of the words "criteria" and "guidelines" had given rise to differences of opinion and that in any event there had never been any question of restricting the discretionary power exercised by the Committee on Contributions. If that compromise formula was acceptable, he would not press for the deletion of the word "criteria", and he asked the Hungarian delegation not to press its proposal either.

20. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Australia), Rapporteur, said that as far as he could see there were no essential differences of opinion among the members of the Committee; it would perhaps be sufficient to state in the summary record of the meeting that the use of the words "criteria" and "guidelines" did not in any way imply that the Committee wished to place any limitation on the discretionary power of the Committee on Contributions.

21. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should decide to approve the draft text submitted by the Rapporteur, amended by the first proposal by the representative of Mexico—namely, that the text should specify that "at this time" no general agreement could be reached on revision of any of the criteria or guidelines—on the understanding that the Rapporteur would add at the end of the text a sentence on the meaning of the words "criteria" and "guidelines", indicating that the use of the word "criteria" did not imply any intention of restricting the discretionary power of the Committee on Contributions.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 74

Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (continued)
(A/7606, A/7608, A/7710, A/7726, A/C.5/1230, A/C.5/1231 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1233, A/C.5/1234, A/C.5/1245, A/C.5/1248, A/C.5/1249, A/C.5/1253, A/C.5/1254, A/C.5/L.990, A/C.5/L.993)

First reading (continued) (A/C.5/L.990)

22. Before the Committee began its discussion on section 4 Mr. ROGERS (Canada) said that he would like the

Controller to indicate whether it would be possible to provide the Committee, in response to a request made by his delegation at the 1306th meeting, with a list of the known or probable additional sums which would have to be included in the budget estimates. His delegation had suggested that, starting in mid-November, revised lists should be submitted once a week, so that the Committee would be able to keep abreast of the situation and would be forewarned of the possible magnitude of the additional expenditure which would have to be taken into account.

23. Mr. TURNER (Controller) assured the Committee that he was intending to provide such a list, perhaps when the first reading of the budget estimates had been completed. An initial list could be ready by the following week. He could not guarantee, however, that he would be able to submit a list every week thereafter: he could only undertake to do so periodically, and as frequently as possible.

SECTION 4. COMMON STAFF COSTS (A/7606, A/7608)

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider on first reading section 4, for which the Secretary-General, in the budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (A/7606), had requested an appropriation of the financial year 1970 (A/7606), had requested an appropriation of Questions, in its main report (A/7608, para. 171), had recommended a reduction of \$51,000, which would reduce the estimates to \$17,300,000.

25. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the estimates under section 4 were and Budgetary Questions) said that the estimates under section 4 were security payments, recruitment, transfer and separation costs and certain staff training programmes for all departments and units of the Secretariat provided for under section 3.

26. The level of the estimates under section 4 depended on the number of staff members involved; it was based on the experience of previous years and adjusted to reflect any known factors affecting the requirements. Accordingly, if the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee under section 3 was approved, it would automatically reduce the estimate for section 4. The Advisory Committee estimated that the reduction would amount to \$51,000, thereby reducing the estimate to \$17,300,000.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/7608, para. 171) for an appropriation of \$17,300,000 under section 4 was approved on first reading by 58 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

INCOME SECTION 1.

INCOME FROM STAFF ASSESSMENT (A/7606, A/7608)

27. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in the budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (A/7606), the Secretary-General had estimated an amount of \$19,000,000 under that income section. The Advisory Committee, in its main report (A/7608, para. 369), had recommended a reduction of \$72,000, which would bring the amount to \$18,928,000.

28. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, if

the Fifth Committee approved the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the total credit requested under section 3 for new posts should be reduced, there would be a consequent reduction of \$72,000 in income from staff assessment.

29. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve on first reading an estimate of \$18,928,000 under income section I, as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

It was so decided.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/7747 ON AGENDA ITEM 90* (A/7748, A/C.5/1244)

30. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that under the terms of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee (A/7747, para. 38), the General Assembly would approve in principle the publication of a yearbook of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and would request the Commission to consider at its third session, in April 1970, the question of the timing and content of the yearbook.

31. The Secretary General, in his note (A/C.5/1244), assumed that the Commission would in fact decide to publish its first yearbook in 1970. The Advisory Committee, in its related report (A/7748), agreed to the addition of that new item to the publications programme for 1970 on the understanding that, should the Commission decide to postpone publication of the yearbook, any sum so appropriated could not be used for other purposes.

32. As to the size of the yearbook, the Advisory Committee agreed with the suggestion made by the Secretary-General in his note that alternative A—the less expensive—should be adopted for its publication; furthermore, as alternative A was based on a careful selection of documents, the Advisory Committee was of the opinion that there was no need to make any financial provision for a margin of 10 per cent for possible additional documentation.

33. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the credit of \$26,800 requested by the Secretary-General under section 11 for the publication of the yearbook in English, French, Russian and Spanish should be reduced to \$25,000.

34. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not accept the Advisory Committee's recommendation regarding the publication of the yearbook of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law because the Secretariat appeared to have acted somewhat hastily and prematurely in prejudging that Commission's decisions.

35. The General Assembly had approved the establishment of the yearbook in principle only. The final decision as to

its timing and content would not be taken until the Commission's third session. Furthermore, his delegation did not fully understand why the figure of 100 copies had been taken as a basis for the publication of the Russian edition of the yearbook. That was another premature decision by the Secretariat, which had prejudged the Commission's findings. It would therefore be wiser to defer a decision on the matter.

36. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) said that his delegation was prepared to support the Advisory Committee's recommendations because, in the first place, it was highly likely that the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law would decide to publish its yearbook in 1970 and, mainly, because the Fifth Committee itself had requested the Secretariat to include all foreseeable expenditure in the budget estimates so that supplementary estimates could be avoided as far as possible. On the other hand, his delegation agreed with the Soviet Union representative that the Secretariat should not attempt to impose any ceiling on the publication of a document in a given language.

37. Finally, he would accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations if only to comply with the guidelines laid down by the Fifth Committee itself with regard to the elimination of supplementary estimates.

38. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation found itself in something of a dilemma. While it was true, as the Soviet Union representative had pointed out, that the final decision as to the timing and content of the yearbook had yet to be taken, it was also true, as the Nigerian representative had pointed out, that all foreseeable expenditure should be included in the budget estimates and supplementary estimates should be avoided as far as possible. On balance, therefore, his delegation was prepared to accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations on the clear understanding that, if publication of the yearbook was deferred, the credit would not be used for any other purpose.

39. Mr. WEI (China) pointed out that no provision had been made for the publication of a Chinese edition of the yearbook. His delegation hoped that the request would cover the cost of publication in all languages, including Chinese; otherwise it would find it difficult to approve the request.

40. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly directly that, should it approve the Sixth Committee's draft resolution, the additional appropriation under section 11 for 1970 would amount to \$25,000 and that, should the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law decide at its third session not to publish its yearbook in 1970, that credit could not be used for any other purpose.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 81

Implementation of the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies: report of

* Report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its second session.

the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (continued)* (A/7728, A/7738, A/C.5/1241, A/C.5/1242)

41. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation had welcomed the report (A/7728) of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit and the emphasis of the inspectors on technical assistance activities. All the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit were of equal importance because they enabled delegations to study the numerous unresolved problems facing the United Nations system. It was to be hoped that the reports would soon be made available to delegations and that the Fifth Committee would be able to discuss them freely. The report on documentation would be particularly useful in the consideration of agenda items 76, relating to the pattern of conferences, and 82, on the publications and documentation of the United Nations. The report on documentation circulated in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had been incomplete. His delegation hoped that that would not be the case for the report to be circulated in the Fifth Committee.

42. As to the handling of the Joint Inspection Unit's reports, his delegation agreed with that of India that Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII) of 8 August 1969, should be implemented speedily. At the third session of CFC, in the spring of 1969, dissatisfaction had been expressed with regard to the present arrangements for the handling of such reports—as the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had rightly recalled during the general discussion. Under the existing arrangements, the Joint Inspection Unit's reports on economic and social programmes were not necessarily submitted directly to the Economic and Social Council through CPC and the Advisory Committee. It was somewhat disturbing to note that the Advisory Committee—as indicated in paragraph 78 of its report (A/7608) on the budget estimates for 1970—considered that it would be premature to make any substantial changes in the existing procedures. The recommendations made by CPC concerning the handling of the reports were fully justified in view of its responsibility with regard to the issues involved in economic planning, programming and co-ordination. It was to be hoped that the General Assembly would approve Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII).

43. In 1966, planning had been given new impetus by the recommendation made by the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in its second report² calling for further development and application by the United Nations family of organizations of an integrated system of long-term planning on a programmed basis to improve their programming and budgetary processes and to ensure throughout the United Nations system the most rational use of available resources. His delegation would like to know what had been the effect of that recommendation and it looked forward with interest to the relevant report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

44. It also attached considerable importance to the report which the Secretary-General was to submit at the twenty-fifth session on progress made in implementing the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee regarding the use of financial resources by the United Nations, the specialized agencies and IAEA.

45. Mr. SIŁKWA (Poland) recalled that his delegation attached great importance to the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit; it had supported the creation of the Unit in the hope that it would make it possible to utilize the funds available to United Nations bodies more efficiently and to achieve some savings.

46. The Joint Inspection Unit appeared to have fulfilled the hopes placed in it. The inspectors' reports contained recommendations of undisputed value, which should be promptly implemented. However, certain difficulties were apparently being encountered. It might legitimately be asked, for instance, why only 3 of the 7 reports prepared by the Joint Inspection Unit in June 1969 had been submitted to the competent governing bodies and only 1 had been subjected to a complete examination procedure. His delegation entirely shared the concern expressed by other delegations regarding the delay in distributing those reports. It was hard to understand why it had been necessary to wait eight or nine months for important reports to be considered by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and transmitted to the bodies directly concerned, thus causing undue delay in the implementation of the proposed recommendations, which therefore could no longer produce all the desired effects.

47. His delegation was therefore gratified by the measures recently taken to remedy that situation. However, administrative regulations alone would not be sufficient to change the situation radically. They could be effective only if they were accompanied by a change in attitude which would eliminate the bureaucratic delays noted in the past. It was to be hoped that such a change would not be long in coming, and that, in that connexion, the example of the World Health Organization, which was currently the only organization to have considered the report of the Joint Inspection Unit relating to it, would be followed.

48. Mr. GANEM (France) pointed out that the Joint Inspection Unit had carried out many extremely important studies during the three years of its existence. There had been some apprehension that the activities of the inspectors would overlap with those of the auditors, certain subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council or the Advisory Committee. For its part, his delegation considered that the Joint Inspection Unit had been very efficient and it had no doubt that the General Assembly would extend the Unit's mandate at the twenty-sixth session.

49. It was evident that certain difficulties had delayed the handling of the inspectors' reports. In order to remedy that situation, the Economic and Social Council had adopted resolution 1457 (XLVII). The quality of the inspectors' reports made them particularly valuable to the executive heads of the United Nations agencies, as well as to the governing bodies and Governments concerned. It was therefore essential to ensure that the reports, conclusions and recommendations of the inspectors would be trans-

* Resumed from the 1321st meeting.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes*, agenda item 80, document A/6343, para. 68.

mitted as quickly as possible to all concerned; that should contribute to the solution of co-ordination problems.

50. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to express his delegation's views on the documents before the Committee, namely, the report on the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/C.5/1241 annex), the note (A/C.5/1242) by the Secretary-General on supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit and the observations of the Advisory Committee (A/7728 and A/7738). He pointed out that one of the main tasks of the Fifth Committee was to ensure the implementation of the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. Delegations took great interest in the work of the Joint Inspection Unit and in the forthcoming report by the Secretary-General concerning measures taken to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat. The way in which the Joint Inspection Unit had organized its work demonstrated that it clearly understood its role. Both in the secretariats and in ACC there had been attempts to modify or to limit the Unit's functions. His delegation was opposed to all such attempts.

51. The Joint Inspection Unit was concerned about the delay in some cases in circulating the reports of its members. In its view, the "consultation" procedure developed by ACC could not be transformed into an examination in depth of the reports of the inspectors, to be carried out prior to their consideration by the competent bodies of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. In that connexion, attention should be drawn to the fact that members of the United Nations Secretariat and the Advisory Committee had recently emphasized that it was not desirable to publish and circulate certain documents prepared by the supervisory bodies of the secretariats and by various committees and groups, alleging that those documents would give rise to duplication of work and would waste the time of officials. In their view, there should be co-ordination in such matters. His delegation therefore had some misgivings concerning the substance of paragraph 80 of the report (A/7608) of the Advisory Committee on budget estimates for 1970. In the circumstances, attention should be drawn to Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII), which provided for supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit. Since, under the United Nations Charter, the Economic and Social Council was responsible for co-ordinating the activities of the Organization in the economic and social field, it would be advisable to have the reports of the inspectors submitted without delay to the specialized agencies and to the Economic and Social Council through CPC. Thus, observations concerning the need for "co-ordination" or the risks of "duplication" should not divert attention from the objective to be attained, namely, the implementation of the recommendations unanimously adopted by the General Assembly. In his delegation's view, the mandate of the Joint Inspection Unit, as laid down in the second report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee adopted by the Assembly, should be scrupulously respected.

52. The role of the Advisory Committee should also be reviewed, because it had been entrusted by the General Assembly, in its resolution 2150 (XXI), with certain functions relating to the Joint Inspection Unit. It was stated in

the report (A/7728, para. 11) of the Advisory Committee that informal consultations had recently taken place between the Committee and members of the Joint Inspection Unit. Since the Joint Inspection Unit was a fully independent body, it should find solutions in co-operation with the Advisory Committee; neither of the two bodies could be subordinated to the other. The Advisory Committee was undoubtedly an important body. For some time, however, it had been experiencing increasing difficulties in accomplishing its task. Consideration should be given to measures to strengthen its role, make its recommendations more constructive and enable it to exercise more effective control over administrative and budgetary questions. It had been proposed that it should meet more frequently and for longer periods, but that would not solve the problem; the United Nations budget was not ready until May, and the Advisory Committee had to finish considering it in June. The delegation of the United States of America had suggested (1309th meeting) that the functions of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee should be expanded and that he should carry out his duties throughout the year. The Soviet delegation wished to know what those duties would be between sessions of the Committee, and whether the Chairman would become, in a sense, the executive director of the Committee. It would point out that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee could act only on behalf of the Committee. He must express its point of view, providing explanations if necessary; his personal opinion did not count. Unfortunately, it had to be said that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had been taking it upon himself to speak on his own behalf for some time. Thus, the problem was not to be solved by expanding his functions.

53. In order to break the deadlock, his delegation proposed the following measures. In the first place, the Advisory Committee should be freed from all tasks which were extraneous to it, that is, investigatory activities. The Committee should concentrate on budgetary and administrative questions; with respect to all other questions, it should confine itself to submitting comments and recommendations on the investigations carried out by other bodies. In the second place, it should be noted that the reports of the Committee reflected only the opinion of the majority of the members; the views of the other members, which might be equally valid, were not made known, thus forfeiting the benefit deriving from the principle of equitable geographical representation, which was respected in the composition of the Committee. In that connexion, some representatives had recently said that members who disagreed with the majority should have an opportunity to make their views known. In opposition to that suggestion it had been argued that the members of the Advisory Committee were members of delegations and, in the latter capacity, could express their views before the Fifth Committee. However, in that case the point of view expressed would be that of a delegation and not of a member of the Advisory Committee. Moreover, it was important for the members of the Fifth Committee to learn what was the opinion of each member of the Advisory Committee; otherwise, there would be no point in nominating the members of that Committee in their individual capacities. In the view of his delegation, it would be desirable to broaden the role of the Advisory Committee by conferring more authority on its members. Each of them

should be able to express his opinion in the Fifth Committee. That would make it possible to consider administrative and budgetary questions with greater objectivity. Thirdly, not all the members of the Advisory Committee could attend every one of its meetings, for reasons which were quite understandable. A member who could not attend should be able to designate an alternate to act in accordance with his instructions, as was done in the Committee on Contributions. The members could also have advisers.

54. The measures proposed by his delegation would make it possible for the role and influence of the Advisory Committee to be strengthened; it could thus assist the Fifth Committee, and, consequently, the General Assembly, in solving the United Nations' administrative and budgetary problems, which were of vital importance for the effectiveness of the Organization, particularly in economic and social matters.

55. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) said he was happy to note that General Assembly resolution 2150 (XXI) establishing the Joint Inspection Unit had been fully implemented and he wished to commend the inspectors on the quality of their work in the field of co-ordination, which was outlined in their report (A/C.5/1241, annex). In his view, there were two issues in particular which warranted attention: the role of the Advisory Committee in its relations with the other co-ordinating bodies, and the question of direct reporting to the General Assembly.

56. With regard to the first point, it appeared that the Committee's attention had on several occasions been drawn to paragraph 80 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/7698) on the budget estimates for 1970. Some delegations had interpreted that paragraph as meaning that the Advisory Committee intended to assume responsibility for co-ordinating the work of the bodies in question. His delegation felt that the paragraph in no way restricted the independence and authority of the Joint Inspection Unit. Like many other developing countries, Nigeria was anxious that the resources available to the Organization should be used mainly for programmes in the economic and social fields, and his delegation shared the Advisory Committee's concern to ensure that overlapping and duplication were, in so far as possible, avoided. Referring to a statement by the representative of Pakistan on that question at the 1322nd meeting, he said that he too wondered whether the savings which would be made possible by implementation of the recommendation of the investigating and co-ordinating bodies would warrant the expenditure incurred in connexion with their activities. Accordingly, his delegation felt that the Advisory Committee had performed a useful service in calling the Fifth Committee's attention to the desirability of ensuring co-ordination between the work of the Joint Inspection Unit, the Board of Auditors and any *ad hoc* committees established by the General Assembly.

57. The second important problem raised in the course of the debate was that of the Joint Inspection Unit's direct responsibility to the General Assembly. Several delegations maintained, perhaps rightly, that the General Assembly should have access to all the reports of the Unit and that in that connexion the Advisory Committee created a bottleneck, as it were. He thought that it should be recognized

first of all that the existing difficulties were in large part attributable to the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts, which had decided that the inspectors' reports should be transmitted by the executive heads of the organizations concerned to the executive or governing bodies of those organizations, or, in the case of the United Nations, to the Advisory Committee. During the debate on that question at the twenty-first session, some delegations had said they considered it anomalous that a body established by the General Assembly should not report directly to it. His delegation had been of the opinion that the Member States had a right to see those reports and to be informed of the action taken on them. In the circumstances, it was regrettable that the General Assembly, in its resolution 2150 (XXI), had approved the recommendations contained in the second report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee without making any amendments to them. The very nature of the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit made it essential to change the method of reporting. A large part of the Unit's work had dealt with economic and social programmes and activities in the field; therefore, it had become necessary for CPC the body established specifically to examine and co-ordinate the programmes of the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies, to have access to those reports. His delegation welcomed those developments and noted with satisfaction the decision taken in that connexion at the joint CPC/ACC meetings and subsequently endorsed by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1280 (XLIII) of 4 August 1967. He also noted with satisfaction the supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1457 (XLVII), whereby the reports of the Unit concerning the activities of any United Nations programmes would be submitted without delay to the Council by CPC. Lastly, he welcomed the fact that the Trade and Development Board and the Industrial Development Board would in future have the opportunity to comment on any report of the Joint Inspection Unit dealing with their activities.

58. In his report on the matter (A/7738), the Advisory Committee had fully endorsed the recommendation of the Economic and Social Council. He sincerely hoped that, in co-operation with the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee would make the necessary arrangements to forward the reports to CPC and to the Economic and Social Council more quickly and that it would make its comments on the reports in good time, so as not to delay their transmittal. The Advisory Committee had rightly called attention to the financial implications of full distribution of the reports in all the official languages but, as a matter of principle, his delegation felt that all the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit should be made available to every Member State. The Advisory Committee had not always handled those reports as quickly as it should have. He recalled in that connexion the case of the report on ECA, which had been transmitted to the Economic and Social Council almost a year late and without comment of any kind by the Advisory Committee, although the problems relative to decentralization, for example, had appeared to merit detailed study.

59. It was for the Advisory Committee to make arrangements with the other co-ordinating bodies to avoid overlapping and duplication. In that connexion, he welcomed

the fact that there had been joint meetings of the Joint Inspection Unit and the Advisory Committee. The latter should adopt a flexible approach in relation to the other investigating bodies. He hoped that it would recognize that the Joint Inspection Unit, in view of its terms of reference and freedom of movement, was in a better position to fulfil certain responsibilities, especially with regard to operational activities. The Advisory Committee should therefore determine which of its responsibilities could best be undertaken by the Joint Inspection Unit on its behalf. At all events, any fundamental changes would be premature, since the functioning of the Joint Inspection Unit was soon to be re-examined.

60. Mr. ZIEHL (United States of America) asked for a ruling from the Chair on the question whether the Committee in its current discussion of agenda item 81 was properly to confine itself to an examination of the reports dealing with the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit and the supplementary arrangements for the handling of its reports, or whether, under rulings from the Chair, delegations were in order—during discussion of that item—to consider any problem relating to the functioning of the co-ordination and control bodies.

61. The CHAIRMAN replied that certain delegations might consider it necessary to view the work of the Joint Inspection Unit within the more general context of the activities of the control bodies. However, the Committee would be required to give its opinion only on the reports which were before it at the current meeting.

62. Mr. ZIEHL (United States of America) noted with satisfaction the contents of the four reports before the Committee and stated that, pending review of the terms of reference of the Joint Inspection Unit at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, the procedures for handling the reports of the Unit, twice approved unanimously by the Assembly, should continue to be carried out.

63. Fully satisfactory modalities for distributing the reports had been worked out by CPC, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee. Although fully aware that some changes needed to be made in the Advisory Committee and its methods of work, if it was to be able to discharge the ever-increasing responsibility with which it was being entrusted, his delegation wished to dissociate itself from some of the negative comments which had been made concerning that body. He wondered, for example, of what use recommendations of the Advisory Committee would be to the Fifth Committee, if the Advisory Committee, instead of trying to establish a position more or less acceptable to all its members, confined itself to stating the various opinions which had been expressed. As a member of the Advisory Committee, he wished to point out that although he had not always fully approved of the conclusions of that Committee on specific subjects, he had felt that its findings arrived at by consensus should warrant his support.

64. His delegation wished to recall its position of principle concerning external investigative bodies, a position which it

had stated during the general discussion at the 1309th meeting. It recognized that the activities of bodies which had been established with a view to achieving greater efficiency and economy were perhaps not always being properly co-ordinated. In order to accomplish that objective, the Advisory Committee should study the problem in depth, in consultation with the other bodies concerned, and make specific recommendations to the Fifth Committee at the twenty-fifth session on how to deal with the matter.

65. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) expressed the hope that the Fifth Committee would be able to devote a more detailed discussion to the question of co-ordination and control bodies and, in particular, that a preliminary debate on the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit would be held before the twenty-fifth session. The work of that body was outstanding, and reports such as the one which the Joint Inspection Unit had devoted to the activities of the United Nations in Turkey³ were of particular interest. The question was whether the recommendations set forth in those reports were being duly implemented: unfortunately, it appeared that was not the case, and that the handling of the reports was unsatisfactory. In that respect, he considered it regrettable that, at the discretion of the Advisory Committee, certain reports issued in all the official languages were only available in summary form.

66. Moreover, his delegation had reservations concerning the comments made during the debate with regard to paragraphs 77 to 80 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/7608). It felt that the Advisory Committee was overburdened with work, with the result that it could not properly exercise its function of co-ordination. Certain changes should be made, either at the initiative of the Advisory Committee itself or by decision of another body.

67. Unlike certain other representatives, he considered it quite appropriate to discuss the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit in detail during the current debate. He thought that the work of the Committee at the twenty-fifth session would be greatly facilitated if a preliminary debate was held at the current session. It should still be possible to organize such a debate if the Advisory Committee raised no objections. His delegation would, he hoped, have the opportunity to state its views on those questions at greater length when other items were being considered.

68. The CHAIRMAN stated in reply to the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago that it was his understanding that it would be proper to discuss at that time the role and the *modus operandi* of the Advisory Committee within the terms of General Assembly resolution 2150 (XXI) and Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII). He did not think that any further elaboration as to the advisory Committee's working arrangements in general and such matters as representation and character of composition would be in order without providing a new agenda item for that purpose.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

³ See document E/4698, sect. I.