



Chairman: Mr. Max H. WERSHOF (Canada).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Tardos (Hungary), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLI-
CATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION
SUBMITTED BY THE THIRD COMMITTEE
IN DOCUMENT A/8252 AND CORR.1 ON
AGENDA ITEM 49* (A/C.5/1355)**

1. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that under operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee (A/8252 and Corr.1, para.16), the Secretary-General would be requested to prepare and publish a brochure on the measures taken and envisaged for combating the resurgence of nazism and racial intolerance in any form. In his note (A/C.5/1355), the Secretary-General indicated that the cost of translating and printing 23,000 copies of the brochure in four languages would amount to \$11,500 and that an additional appropriation in that amount would therefore be required under section 10 of the budget for 1971.

2. The Advisory Committee believed that the appropriation approved by the Fifth Committee in first reading under section 10 was sufficient to enable the Secretary-General to cover the cost of the brochure and that an additional appropriation would not be necessary. The Fifth Committee could therefore inform the General Assembly that should it adopt the draft resolution of the Third Committee, no additional appropriation for 1971 would be needed.

3. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that should it adopt the draft resolution of the Third Committee, no additional appropriation would be necessary.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 80

Implementation of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies (continued) (A/7968, A/7987 and Add.1, A/7999 and Add.1, A/8033, A/8128, A/8139, A/8217, A/8230, A/C.5/1299, A/C.5/1304

* Measures to be taken against nazism and racial intolerance: report of the Secretary-General.

and Corr.1, A/C.5/1335, A/C.5/1351, A/C.5/L.1045/Add.1, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.41, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.47, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.48):

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/7999 and Add.1);
- (b) Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (continued) (A/8139)

**Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses
(A/8230, A/C.5/1351)**

4. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the report by the Secretary-General on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (A/C.5/1351) had been submitted by him in response to a decision taken by the Fifth Committee at the previous session¹ calling for an inquiry to be made during 1970 with the assistance of the Controller to determine how the system recommended earlier by the Advisory Committee for dealing with unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure² would have worked, had it been in force.

5. On the basis of the data presented by the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee—as stated in its report (A/8230)—agreed with his conclusion that experience during 1970 did not provide a sufficient basis for testing adequately the effectiveness of the new procedures suggested by the Committee. Moreover, the question could not be considered in isolation from the studies being made on the form of presentation of the budget and the budget cycle. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that further consideration of the question of unforeseen and extraordinary expenses should be deferred until such time as it could be reviewed in that broader context and on the basis of fuller data than were available at present.

6. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Committee should decide that further consideration of the question of unforeseen and extraordinary expenses should be deferred until such time as it could be reviewed in the broader context of the question of the form of presentation of the budget and the budget cycle, and on the basis of fuller data than were available at present.

It was so decided.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 74, document A/7916, paras. 102-104.

² *Ibid.*, document A/7726.

Reactivation of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies (continued)
(A/C.5/XXV/CRP.41, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.47)

7. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had made a very careful study of the draft resolution (A/C.5/XXV/CRP.41) introduced by the United States delegation at the 1413th meeting on behalf of a number of sponsors in which it was proposed to reactivate the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.

8. His delegation noted that the terms of reference envisaged by the sponsors for the *Ad Hoc* Committee were entirely different from the terms of reference of the 1965 *Ad Hoc* Committee and that consequently what they had in mind was not merely the reactivation of the Committee, but the establishment of an entirely new body which had nothing in common with its predecessor but its name. The 1965 *Ad Hoc* Committee had owed its existence to very special circumstances, namely, the financial crisis which had paralysed the work of the nineteenth session, and it was chiefly in order to examine that situation and help the Organization to break the impasse in which it found itself that the General Assembly had established the *Ad Hoc* Committee with terms of reference authorizing it to make a comprehensive and thorough study of the budgetary and financial procedures of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The terms of reference proposed for the reactivated *Ad Hoc* Committee went much farther: it was to be entrusted with such powers as the determination of priorities, the evaluation of the activities of United Nations bodies and the review of programmes. It was also to consider the question of the harmonization of programming policies as well as the terms of reference of the machinery for administrative and budgetary control, audit, inspection and co-ordination, that is, the terms of reference of subsidiary bodies of the principal organs of the General Assembly, which had been drawn up and established by intergovernmental bodies and approved by the General Assembly. In other words, the draft resolution before the Fifth Committee proposed the establishment of a new committee with powers which would give it authority over the fields of activity and competence of the Fifth Committee.

9. It was not accurate to talk about reactivating the *Ad Hoc* Committee unless its terms of reference were similar to those of the 1965 *Ad Hoc* Committee, as defined in General Assembly resolution 2049 (XX). Its powers would be restricted to consideration of United Nations budgetary and financial questions, in particular, the question of programme budgeting. Consequently, the sponsors would have to make basic changes in their draft resolution, specifically in the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3. In the last preambular paragraph, the words "programme formulation, determination of priorities, programme review" and "evaluation" should be deleted.

In operative paragraph 3, he suggested the addition in the introductory paragraph, after the words "in liaison with the Secretary-General", of the words "the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination, the Joint Inspection Unit", bodies which also dealt with the question which the new *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts would have to consider. Operative paragraph 3 (a) should end after the words "programming and budgetary policies", thus deleting the last clause which referred to the determination of priorities, a task within the competence of the principal organs of the United Nations with which a committee of experts should therefore not be entrusted. Operative paragraph 3 (b) should be deleted, since its effect was to make the *Ad Hoc* Committee—an expert body of limited membership—responsible for changing the terms of reference of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly and other intergovernmental organs. Operative paragraph 3 (c), too, should be deleted, since it gave the *Ad Hoc* Committee the task of evaluating the activities of the United Nations system, a task which was essentially political in nature and was proper to the Economic and Social Council.

10. Moreover, even if the draft resolution were to be amended in the way he had suggested, his delegation would be unable to support it unless the sponsors were prepared to expand substantially the membership of the reactivated *Ad Hoc* Committee. It was regrettable, in any event, that a proposal on a matter of such importance should have been submitted so late, when the Fifth Committee had no time to consider it as thoroughly as it deserved. In the circumstances, it might be advisable to postpone further discussion of the matter until the twenty-sixth session; he appealed to the sponsors to agree to that and requested them to consider withdrawing their proposal.

11. Mr. GUPTA (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of Seventy-seven, which had met to discuss the draft resolution before the Fifth Committee, said that the Group was of the opinion that the proposal, which was an important one, had been submitted too late for the Committee to consider it in detail, and that it would be preferable to defer consideration of its substance. The Group of Seventy-seven intended to give further consideration to the matter at a forthcoming meeting.

12. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) suggested that, while the draft resolution before the Fifth Committee was not as innocent as its sponsors wanted it to appear, neither was it as frightening as its detractors contended. First, it was not really the case that the 1965 *Ad Hoc* Committee had been established for the sole purpose of helping the Organization to resolve the financial crisis which it had then been experiencing. In fact, its terms of reference had been somewhat broader, since it had also been instructed to examine the administrative, financial and budgetary procedures of the United Nations. Secondly, it should be noted that, under the terms of reference outlined by the sponsors of the draft resolution, the new *Ad Hoc* Committee was merely asked to direct its attention to a number of matters; there were no grounds in that provision

for fears that the *Ad Hoc* Committee would replace the Economic and Social Council, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, or any other body. Lastly, he did not see in what way the proposed terms of reference for the new *Ad Hoc* Committee were wider than those of the Fifth Committee, as the representative of Yugoslavia seemed to think; that, in his opinion, was not so. In any event, the fact that the General Assembly had subsidiary organs was not an adequate reason in itself for preventing it from reactivating a particular organ for a specific purpose.

13. On the subject of the representation of States in the new *Ad Hoc* Committee, he said that the 1965 *Ad Hoc* Committee, with whose work he had been associated, had invariably made its decisions by consensus and he saw no reason why the reactivated *Ad Hoc* Committee should not continue the same practice: if matters turned out otherwise and the new *Ad Hoc* Committee was required to make its decisions by voting, its membership might legitimately give grounds for concern. In any case, the fears that had been expressed on that subject were groundless, since, as he had already stated, the new *Ad Hoc* Committee would be restricted, under its terms of reference, to directing its attention to the matters listed in the draft resolution. By so doing, it could be of great service to all the bodies concerned and to Member States.

14. Accordingly, there seemed to be no valid reason for deferring a decision on the reactivation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts; the fact that the question had not come up for discussion until the end of the session was not a valid reason. The Fifth Committee had no need of Secretariat studies and reports on the question to enable it to make its decision.

15. His delegation believed that the draft resolution was useful and that it provided a means of helping to improve existing machinery and so increasing the efficacy of the work of the United Nations.

16. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) asked why it was a question of "reactivating" the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which implied no change in its membership. It would have been better to speak of "re-establishing" the *Ad Hoc* Committee, thus making it possible to alter the membership. Secondly, he asked why the proposed terms of reference for the new *Ad Hoc* Committee differed from that of its predecessor. Moreover, it was essential to know whether the Governments of Member States would have to bear the travel and subsistence costs of expert members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, as had been the case in the previous instance. Lastly, there was the fact that, under operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee would be requested to appoint "such experts as they deem best qualified to consider the questions listed" in paragraph 3; those questions were extremely wide-ranging and complicated, and there was no indication of the number of experts the *Ad Hoc* Committee might wish to appoint. In any event, there were grounds for thinking that the financial implications (see A/C.5/XXV/CRP.47) of the draft resolution had been underestimated.

17. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that his delegation would have preferred no decision to be taken on the matter at the current session. The matter was a highly important one, which deserved to be considered more thoroughly and at greater length than was possible at so late a stage in the session. His delegation, for one, needed more time to study the draft resolution carefully and possibly to submit amendments; as matters stood, he would comment briefly on it.

18. He suggested, first, that before proposing reactivation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which was to be commended for its invaluable recommendations, it might be best to give some thought to the manner in which those recommendations might be implemented. Moreover, the draft resolution did not confine itself to proposing the reactivation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee: its main effect was to strengthen that Committee's terms of reference. The functions which it was proposed to confer on the *Ad Hoc* Committee, however, such as programming or the determination of priorities, seemed to go far beyond the competence of a body consisting entirely of experts, particularly when there were other intergovernmental organs—such as the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Economic and Social Council itself—to deal with those questions. Lastly, the membership of the *Ad Hoc* Committee could with advantage be somewhat larger, so as to secure a proper balance among experts from developed and developing countries.

19. He reaffirmed his delegation's doubts about the advisability of dealing so rapidly with such a question and expressed the hope that, if the sponsors of the draft resolution insisted on having the discussion of the question continue, they would take account of the comments made by delegations, especially those on the terms of reference and membership of the new *Ad Hoc* Committee.

20. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said, in reply to the representative of the Sudan, that when the *Ad Hoc* Committee had been established in 1965 the Member States composing it had appointed their own experts and the United Nations had not had to bear any costs. It was on that basis that the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee interpreted paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.5/XXV/CRP.41. He added that if some Member States appointed more than one expert more documentation would be needed, but in any event the financial implications would be less.

21. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, in his view, the wording of operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was ambiguous on that point and should be changed.

22. Mr. GUPTA (India) pointed out that in 1965 the Fifth Committee had been unanimous in deciding that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be established, whereas now there was by no means a consensus. He therefore felt that, if the *Ad Hoc* Committee were to be reconstituted, the United Nations should pay travel expenses and *per diem* for the representatives and experts of

the member Governments of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. He requested that the Secretariat should revise the estimate of financial implications of the draft resolution accordingly.

Form of presentation of the United Nations budget and the duration of the budget cycle (A/8217, A/C.5/1335, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.48)

23. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1335) on the form of presentation of the United Nations budget and the duration of the budget cycle and the Advisory Committee's report (A/8217) did not deal with the substance of the question, but rather with certain proposals which were designed to bring about improvements in planning, programming and budgeting procedures in the United Nations.

24. The Secretary-General's proposals were to establish within the Secretariat a planning and programming unit and a high-level programme and budget review committee. In the Advisory Committee's opinion, the Secretary-General could proceed with those steps without requiring specific authority for so doing; as they involved redeployment and utilization of staff resources available to him. The Advisory Committee saw merit in those proposals, which, if implemented, would enable the Secretariat to acquire experience in internal planning and programming. With reference to the high-level programme and budget review committee—which was in many respects similar to the internal Programme Committee of the ILO—the Advisory Committee expressed the view that, if it was to succeed, each programme it discussed would have to be evaluated on its merits, the competing claims of departments and divisions would have to be reconciled within a budget level acceptable to the Member States and, where disagreements could not be resolved by compromise, executive decisions would have to be taken.

25. The Secretary-General's other suggestions related to the setting up of a consolidated medium-term programme of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and to changing the form of presentation of the budget.

26. The Advisory Committee discussed the former in paragraphs 14 to 16 of its report. The Advisory Committee believed that the Secretary-General should be encouraged to proceed with whatever preparatory work was necessary for the establishment in due course of a consolidated medium-term programme. The Advisory Committee realized that the preparation of even an outline plan might be a time-consuming undertaking, given the lack of experience in the United Nations in medium-term programming. For that reason, the Advisory Committee warned against expecting too much too soon.

27. With regard to the form of presentation of the budget, the Secretary-General proposed preparing a "mock-up" of the 1972 estimates on an organizational unit basis, while submitting the estimates themselves

in their present form. The Advisory Committee was in agreement with that proposal. At the same time, in paragraphs 17 to 26 of its report, it indicated that the breakdown proposed by the Secretary-General would not present a consolidated picture of United Nations expenditures by programme, and submitted its observations on some technical aspects of the proposal.

28. On the subject of a biennial budget cycle, which, in the Secretary-General's opinion, would logically follow from the programme and budget formulation procedure he had outlined, the Advisory Committee reserved judgement for the reasons given in paragraph 28 of its report.

29. Paragraphs 29 to 31 of the Advisory Committee's report were devoted to a discussion of the role of inter-governmental bodies, since the success of the internal endeavours would hinge on what was done at the inter-governmental level about rationalizing the present United Nations central decision-making machinery. In view of the late submission of the report by the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee doubted whether the Fifth Committee would have time at its current session to discuss the question in all its details. It hoped, however, that the various organs involved would give thought to it in the course of 1971 so that the General Assembly, at its twenty-sixth session, could deal with the substance of the question with all the attention it deserved.

30. The Advisory Committee recommended approval of the Secretary-General's suggestions. Should they be approved by the General Assembly, supplementary credits in the amount of \$36,000 would be required under section 3 (Salaries and wages), chapter III (Other temporary assistance) of the budget estimates for 1971, although the Advisory Committee trusted that the Secretary-General would find it possible to defray some of those costs from within the total resources available to him under that chapter.

31. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was unfortunate that the two extremely important reports now before the Fifth Committee had been submitted so late in the session, with the result that it was impossible for delegations to study them in consultation with their experts. Yet such consultation was essential, since a decision could not be taken in haste on so important a proposal as that relating to a change in the form of presentation of the budget. The presentation of the budget on a medium-term or long-term programme basis would, of course, have very great advantages for the United Nations. First of all, however, certain recommendations would have to be implemented, in particular those relating to the changes in required present United Nations programme and budget practices. As the Secretary-General pointed out in paragraph 15 of his report, the determination of programmes was generally made without regard to the budgetary consequences or the level of total resources likely to be made available by Member States. The Secretary-General added that, as long as that state of affairs existed, no useful purpose would

be served in embarking on the preparation of longer-term plans, developing improved procedures for programme formulation and evaluation or producing a budget on a programme basis.

32. Moreover, the Advisory Committee stated in paragraph 31 of its report that, in view of the late submission of the report by the Secretary-General, it doubted whether the Fifth Committee would have time at its current session to discuss the question in all its details. That being so, the Fifth Committee would certainly not be able to take a decision on the preparation of a "mock-up" of the budget estimates, as the Secretary-General had proposed in his report. He for one would prefer the Committee to discuss the question as a whole at the twenty-sixth session, when it would have more time and fuller documentation.

33. He agreed with the Secretary-General's proposal, in paragraph 16 of his report, that Member States should concentrate the authority to approve projects and to determine the organizational programme and budgetary policy in as few governmental bodies as possible, ideally in a single body. He also agreed with the suggestions in paragraph 18, namely, that before programme-formulating bodies gave final passage to resolutions having financial implications the Secretariat should provide full details on possible alternative means of achieving the proposed objectives, the time required for their completion, the human and financial resources required and the possibility of cutting projects short if resources were insufficient. Lastly, he agreed with the principle of a biennial budget cycle.

34. He did not agree with the idea of establishing within the Secretariat a high-level programme and budget review committee. The work programme of the United Nations should not be drawn up by the Secretariat, but by the Member States. It should be prepared strictly on the basis of the resources that could be expected to be available during the period covered by the programme. The role of the Secretariat should be simply to assist in estimating those resources.

35. Presentation of the budget on a departmental basis had been the practice up to 1958. It was not until then that the system of presenting the budget by head of expenditure had been adopted, in the belief that it would be more flexible, would facilitate the establishment of priorities and would permit improved administrative and financial control. That method of presentation had originally been adopted for an experimental period of two years, and had subsequently been extended for two-year periods until now, without its ever having been said whether or not the experiment had produced the desired results.

36. He had noted with interest, from paragraph 33 of the Secretary-General's report, that the proposed budget would intensify the degree of control to be exercised by the General Assembly.

37. He could not, however, agree to the request for a supplementary appropriation of \$36,000 for consultant services. His delegation believed that such costs

should be defrayed from within the available resources, and regretted that the Advisory Committee had confirmed the request for a supplementary appropriation.

38. Referring to the draft paragraph (A/C.5/XXV/CRP.48)³ submitted by the Austrian delegation for inclusion in the report of the Fifth Committee, he proposed some amendments⁴ to that text. In the first sentence, which read: "The Fifth Committee decided to approve the Secretary-General's report . . .", he suggested that the words "decided to approve" be replaced by the words "took note of". He also suggested the deletion of the second sentence—which read: "The Committee approves in principle the various suggestions contained in the Secretary-General's report as endorsed by the Advisory Committee in its report (A/8217) and requests the Secretary-General to base his report to the twenty-sixth session on them."—, as well as the last sentence, which read: "The Fifth Committee is conscious of the need to benefit from the best possible advice on the technical questions involved, and requests the Secretary-General to secure, as necessary, the services of qualified outside consultants."

39. Mr. VAN VLOTEN (Netherlands) said that he believed the day would come when there would be a consolidated programme and budget for the United Nations system as a whole and that it would prove to be an essential tool for handling the expanding affairs of the system. That, of course, meant not a mere compilation of unrelated decisions by a great number of subsidiary and higher-level legislative bodies, such as could be found in the present work programme in the economic, social and human rights fields, but a well-structured and well-balanced programme which clearly expressed priorities and the interrelation of the work in various fields.

40. Progress towards that goal would require some new or improved arrangements. Among them were the promotion of more coherent programming and clearer financial presentations, as mentioned by Mr. Bertrand in his report.⁵ Harmonization of programmes and budgets was required, and programme budgeting should be introduced in all organizations. Comparability of programme and budget presentation should be pursued, and longer-term planning should be undertaken or intensified. In addition, the excellent document on programme expenditures of the United Nations system which was submitted to the Economic and Social Council every year by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination could be further developed.

41. With regard to the United Nations itself, consideration, might be given to the introduction of a single draft programme and budget, prepared by the Secretary-General, which would be the basic document for discussion and decision by the appropriate legislative bodies. Of course, that would mean much more than merely programme budgeting or budget classification on the basis of broad organizational units.

³ See A/8266, paras. 27-28.

⁴ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.49.

⁵ See document A/7822 (mimeographed), of 3 December 1969.

42. In the light of that objective, his delegation found the report submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1335) most encouraging. It supported the establishment within the Secretariat of a planning and programming unit and of a high-level programme and budget review committee. It agreed that the presentation of the budget and the budget cycle could be more thoroughly explored along the lines suggested by the Secretary-General. His delegation was glad to note the Advisory Committee's endorsement of the Secretary-General's suggestions.

43. To the measures described by the Secretary-General another might have been added as a logical consequence of the new integrated programme and budget approach. It would be a broadening of the functions of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management to include responsibilities for the programme aspects, so that he would in fact become an Under-Secretary-General for Programme and Management.

44. The Advisory Committee rightly noted, in paragraph 29 of its report (A/8217), that the success of internal endeavours would hinge on what was done at the intergovernmental level about rationalizing the present central decision-making machinery. Final responsibility for the programme and budget rested with the General Assembly, but one should not disregard the role of the Economic and Social Council and of two essential advisory bodies, namely, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The functions of CPC and the Advisory Committee should be brought closer together, and both should serve at various stages of the decision-making process. Eventually, CPC might be transformed into an expert advisory committee on programme matters, similar in size to the Advisory Committee. The new committee and the Advisory Committee would have to undertake joint action and make joint recommendations. One could envisage a further stage when the two committees would be merged to form a programme and budget committee with two sub-committees, one for programme and co-ordination matters and the other for administrative and budgetary questions.

45. Those, of course, were ideas for further thought; they did not constitute proposals or even suggestions. The General Assembly would have to adapt itself to the exigencies of a new decision-making process in that field, and all the bodies involved and the Secretary-General would have to give thought to those problems and study the various possibilities that presented themselves. His delegation was willing to discuss the problem in any body where an opportunity arose; they were problems of real importance, and all the instruments available should be used in dealing with them, in a spirit of cohesion and solidarity and without any compartmentalization or competition among the various bodies concerned. The question was not whether changes would occur; there was no doubt about that. The question was whether they would occur sooner or later, and whatever could be done to assist that progress a little should be done.

46. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he wished to express his delegation's satisfaction with the excellent reports on programming and budgeting matters submitted by Mr. Bertrand,⁶ by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8217) and, in particular, by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1335).

47. Owing to lack of time, it was hardly possible to consider those matters in detail at the current session, but the Austrian delegation was to be thanked for its proposal that the paragraph contained in document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.48 should be inserted in the report of the Fifth Committee. He would like to suggest to the Austrian representative some changes, which were not, of course, formal amendments. They were as follows: first, in the first sentence, replace the words "decided to approve" by "noted with interest"; secondly, in the same sentence, replace the words "to take a final" by the words "to be in a position to take a"; thirdly, in the second sentence, replace the words "approves in principle" by the word "notes"; fourthly, in the same sentence, replace the word "base" by the word "prepare"; fifthly, at the end of the second sentence, replace the words "on them" by the words "also on the basis of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee and in the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination at its seventh session".

48. The ideas put forward by the representative of the Netherlands were most valuable, and he would certainly inform his Government of them.

49. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) thanked the representative of India for his suggestions regarding the text of the paragraph proposed by the Austrian delegation. While he would gladly accept the first two suggested changes, he could not change the words "approves in principle", because they exactly reflected the tenor of the discussion. The fourth change was quite minor, but the last one was not, and he could not agree to include in the paragraph a reference to CPC. In order not to delay the Committee's work, he would discuss the matter with the representative of India.

50. He also regretted that he could not agree to the deletion of the last sentence, as proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union; in that connexion, he would draw attention to paragraphs 32 and 33 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/8217). The Secretariat could not dispense with the assistance of consultants, in view of the highly specialized nature of the questions involved, and sometimes in such cases some expenditure was necessary in order to effect savings at a later stage.

51. In reply to a question put by Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the CHAIRMAN announced that a revised version of document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.48 would be circulated at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 11.20 p.m.

⁶ *Idem.*