



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution I submitted by the Fourth Committee in document A/7736/Add.1 on agenda item 64 . . . . .	275
Agenda item 75: Planning estimate for the financial year 1971 . . . . .	276
Agenda item 77: Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly ( <i>continued</i> ): (a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions ( <i>concluded</i> ) . . . . .	278
(d) United Nations Administrative Tribunal ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	279
Agenda item 83: Personnel questions ( <i>continued</i> ): (a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	279

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS  
 OF DRAFT RESOLUTION I SUBMITTED BY THE  
 FOURTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/7736/ADD.1  
 ON AGENDA ITEM 64\* (A/7794, A/C.5/1269)**

1. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1269) in which he indicated that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Fourth Committee in its report on the question of Namibia (A/7736/Add.1, para. 9, draft resolution I) an amount of \$68,400 would have to be appropriated under section 17, chapter V, of the budget for 1970 over and above the \$287,000 already included under that chapter in the budget estimates (A/7606).

2. In connexion with funds to cover a possible visit to Africa by the United Nations Council for Namibia for meetings with the representatives of the Namibian people, the Advisory Committee—as indicated in its report (A/7794)—would assume that, if the Council were to decide not to proceed to Africa in 1970, the credit would be surrendered. The Committee was of the view that the

\* Question of Namibia:

(a) Report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples;

(b) Report of the United Nations Council for Namibia;

(c) Appointment of the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia.

estimated expenditure in relation to the visit should be as close as possible to that of the visit in 1968 and should therefore be set at \$44,000.

3. With regard to the fees and travel costs of consultants to carry out studies relating to the establishment of an emergency assistance programme, the Advisory Committee understood that no consultations had yet been held with ECA to determine whether it could carry out all or part of the task with its own staff resources. Moreover, in view of the provisional nature of the proposal, the Committee considered that an estimate of \$10,000 rather than \$12,000 would suffice for the services and travel of 2 or possibly 3 consultants.

4. In considering the additional requirements of the travel documents office in East Africa, the Advisory Committee had borne in mind that that office was not expected to be established before 1 March 1970, and it had felt that certain items of expenditure were somewhat over-estimated. It therefore recommended that the additional provision for the office should be reduced by \$3,100 to \$6,000.

5. In the light of those recommendations, the Advisory Committee suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution of the Fourth Committee, an additional appropriation for 1970 of \$60,000 would be required under section 17, chapter V, of the budget estimates for the financial year 1970.

6. Mr. TOTHILL (South Africa) wished to record his delegation's position on the expenditure entailed by the adoption of the draft resolution of the Fourth Committee.

7. The resolutions from which the so-called Council for Namibia purported to derive authority for its existence were invalid. It followed, therefore, that the appropriation of funds to finance the activities and operations of the Council and its supporting staff was also invalid.

8. In the event of a vote on the sum recommended by the Advisory Committee in its report (A/7794) his delegation would cast a negative vote.

9. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), recalling his delegation's support for full and unconditional independence for Namibia, said that as far as the financial implications of the Fourth Committee draft resolution were concerned, it considered that expenses associated both with the work of the Council for Namibia and with the various programmes envisaged in the draft resolution should be borne by the Government of South Africa and its allies. Accordingly, his delegation could not

support the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee and would abstain in the vote.

10. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the Committee could take its decision without a vote, as there did not appear to be a quorum for voting.

11. Mr. DE CURTON (France) requested that the position of his delegation should be recorded as an abstention.

12. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it approve the draft resolution of the Fourth Committee, an additional appropriation of \$60,000 would be required under section 17, chapter V, of the budget for 1970.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 75

#### Planning estimate for the financial year 1971 (A/C.5/L.1008)

13. Mr. SERUP (Denmark) observed that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2370 (XXII), the Fifth Committee was to consider a planning estimate for 1971 together with recommendations by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. While fully supporting the planning estimate procedure as a constructive step towards long-term administrative and budgetary planning which should eventually become a permanent feature of the United Nations budgetary system, his delegation wished to draw attention to the exceptional nature of the difficulties involved in preparing the planning estimate for 1971. There was considerable uncertainty with respect to the requirements under sections 3 and 4 of the budget, and it was likely to persist because the manpower utilization and deployment survey decided upon after the adoption of resolution 2370 (XXII) would not begin to produce recommendations for some time to come. His delegation had accordingly reached the considered conclusion that the wisest course would be to postpone the first forecast year from 1971 to 1972, and to prepare the first planning estimate for consideration by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session. His delegation was submitting a draft resolution to that effect (A/C.5/L.1008).

14. Mr. GINDEEL (Sudan) said that the annual planning estimate should always be considered against the background of the discussion which had led to the adoption of resolution 2370 (XXII) by the General Assembly. As originally conceived in draft resolution A/C.5/L.917,<sup>1</sup> the estimate was to be a planning figure which would serve as a framework within which the Secretary-General would prepare his budget estimate for the forecast period. Many delegations, particularly from the developing countries, had felt that the planning figure was a device for imposing an arbitrary ceiling on the budget. Despite assurances to the contrary from the sponsors, the draft resolution had been rejected. The main objection to it had come from the developing countries, particularly the African and Asian

States, whose proposals had eventually been embodied in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the revised text that had been adopted as resolution 2370 (XXII).

15. It was clear from that resolution that there were two essential features in the planning estimate procedure: that, on the one hand, the programme-formulating bodies should develop a system of long-term planning and programme-formulation which would act as a safeguard to prevent the planning estimate from becoming merely an arbitrary figure and that, on the other hand, the planning estimate should serve only as guidance to the Secretary-General in the preparation of the budget, not as a rigid framework. His delegation had therefore looked forward to consideration of the first planning estimate and found it difficult to accept the proposal that it should be postponed pending the completion of the manpower utilization survey. Furthermore, he understood that certain delegations had access to the Secretary-General's proposals with regard to the first planning estimate and that consultations had been held between those delegations and the Secretary-General. He could only express concern and apprehension that some delegations should have used a *de facto* privilege in order to withhold vital information from less privileged delegations.

16. He failed to see why consideration of the first planning estimate should be postponed pending the results of the manpower utilization survey. The two issues were quite separate. The General Assembly could take a decision regarding the planning estimate and if any results of the survey became available subsequently and prior to the preparation of the budget proposals for the forecast year, the Secretary-General would naturally take them into consideration, if necessary, even after the Assembly had approved the budget for 1971. It appeared, however, that the real purpose of the planning estimate was to provide a rigid framework for the budget, as the proponents of the new procedure had originally intended. Thus, the apprehension and reservations expressed by the developing countries during the twenty-second session had proved to be justified. In the circumstances, his delegation would support the Danish proposal on the clear understanding that the first planning estimate would now be submitted for the year 1972, that the Secretary-General would have full freedom in preparing the budget estimates for 1971 in the usual manner and that, before preparing the planning estimate for 1972, the Secretary-General would ensure that the programme-formulating bodies had developed processes to carry out a system of long-term planning and programme formulation in accordance with paragraph 1 of resolution 2370 (XXII). As the development of such processes was a basic requirement in the planning estimate procedure, his delegation would expect the Secretary-General to certify in the first planning estimate that that requirement had been met fully and that the planning estimate reflected the actions of the planning-formulation bodies concerned.

17. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) said that his delegation would have no difficulty in supporting the Danish proposal, on the understanding that the Secretary-General would be free to submit his proposals for the budget estimates for 1971 in the usual manner, taking into account the results of the manpower utilization survey. His delegation's views on the whole question of the planning estimate had been made quite clear in the debate on draft resolution A/C.5/L.917 at

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 74, document A/7014, para. 99.

the twenty-second session (1231st meeting). It would be unable to support any arbitrary measure directed solely at establishing a budgetary ceiling, to the detriment of United Nations economic and social programmes. Any future planning estimate must take due account of the opinions of the programme-formulating bodies—that factor had been the main reason for the decision that the first planning estimate should be for 1971 rather than for 1970. The postponement suggested by Denmark would enable the Secretary-General to take full account of all the factors essential to the preparation of a realistic planning estimate.

18. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation's views on the question of a planning estimate had been fully explained during the twenty-second session (1220th meeting). He concurred with the proposal of Denmark, on the understanding that the budget estimates for 1971 would be drawn up in accordance with the existing rules and procedures and that the Secretary-General would prepare those estimates in the usual manner, without impediment. If the planning estimates were not to operate as a hidden ceiling on the budget, it was essential that all the actions of the programme-formulating bodies should be taken fully into account.

19. Mr. FASCELL (United States of America) said that his delegation had been a leading advocate of long-range planning in United Nations programming and budgeting and had strongly supported the approach that had led to the adoption of resolution 2370 (XXII) which called for annual submission of a planning estimate for the second succeeding year. While an annual planning estimate would become a very useful instrument for ensuring the soundest possible budgetary management, it would be very difficult to introduce it in 1969. When resolution 2370 (XXII) had been adopted, in 1967, no one had known that a Secretariat staff survey would be under way in 1969, and when the survey had been called for in 1968 no one had related it to the submission of a planning estimate. A planning estimate at the current session would not benefit from any results of the staff survey, while significant results thereof would be available early in 1970. In that singular situation, and with the understanding that a vast majority of Committee members agreed, his delegation supported the proposal of Denmark to defer the implementation of the resolution concerning the planning estimate for one year, but one year only.

20. Mr. GONSALVES (India) said that the representatives of Sudan and Nigeria had largely anticipated his own delegation's views. The Committee had originally been assured that the aim of an annual planning estimate was the introduction of long-term planning, taking full account of the actions of the programme-formulating bodies. It was therefore difficult to accept the logic of postponing the first planning estimate solely because of the manpower utilization survey. Had the results of that survey been available, the Secretary-General could certainly have taken them into account. In a spirit of compromise, however, his delegation would support the Danish draft resolution.

21. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) said that his delegation could support the Danish draft resolution in principle. However, the words "and approved" in the operative paragraph tended to prejudice the outcome of consideration of the first planning estimate and he proposed their deletion.

22. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said the representative of Denmark had argued persuasively that no meaningful planning estimate could be produced until a sizable part of the manpower utilization survey had been completed. His delegation regretted that consideration of the first planning estimate would be postponed but recognized that the Danish proposal was sound. The operative part of the Danish draft resolution simply reflected the wording of paragraph 2 of resolution 2370 (XXII). He would therefore have some difficulty in accepting the Pakistan representative's amendment.

23. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that it was most important that the action by the programme-formulating bodies called for in resolution 2370 (XXII) should be completed and taken fully into account in the preparation of the planning estimate. It must also be made clear that consideration of the first planning estimate was not to be postponed merely because of the manpower utilization survey. The Danish draft resolution was therefore incomplete and he proposed the insertion, immediately before the operative paragraph, of two preambular paragraphs along the following lines:

*"Noting that the action called for in operative paragraph 1 of that resolution has not yet been completed by the programme-formulating bodies,*

*"Noting further that the manpower utilization survey called for in the first report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session<sup>2</sup> has not yet been completed,"*

24. Mr. RODIONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the Danish draft resolution as it stood. The preparation of the budget estimates was an extremely important matter and his delegation felt that it would be difficult, indeed, inappropriate, to discuss the question of the proposed planning estimate when so many questions remained unresolved and, in particular, the staff utilization survey had not been completed. There was no doubt, however, that resolution 2370 (XXII) should be fully implemented in due course.

25. Mr. VIEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation did not object to the Danish proposal, on the understanding that the postponement of the implementation of the planning estimate procedure would not in any way affect the normal establishment of the budget estimates for 1971. His delegation expected that the budget estimates would continue to reflect the level of resources needed to implement effectively all the programmes approved by the competent programme-formulating bodies, and that they would be prepared by the Secretary-General without any direct interference from individual delegations.

26. The difficulties which had arisen seemed to show that his delegation had been right in expressing doubts at the twenty-second session (1231st meeting) as to the advisability of introducing the planning estimate procedure. His delegation had considered that it would be very difficult, perhaps not even feasible, to make any meaningful forecast

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 7, para. 50.

of expenditure two years in advance without jeopardizing the normal expansion of United Nations activities. It had accepted the idea only after being assured that it would not lead to the imposition of a ceiling on the budget but would merely serve as a guide to programme-formulating bodies and an incentive to them to develop their own long-term planning processes. His delegation's views on the matter had since been confirmed by events. If the Organization was to respond promptly and efficiently to the new problems which were constantly arising in a rapidly changing world, the tools with which it worked, including its administrative and financial procedures, must be flexible. The planning estimate was no exception. Furthermore, his delegation believed that the planning estimate procedure should be kept under constant review in the light of experience; it should not be regarded as immutable, but should be judged by its effectiveness as a means to certain ends. Consequently, although his delegation had voted in favour of resolution 2370 (XXII), it reserved the right to discuss the usefulness and appropriateness of the new procedure again, if necessary, in future years.

27. Mr. DE CURTON (France) said that although his delegation had been one of the sponsors of resolution 2370 (XXII) and attached great importance to its implementation, it supported the Danish proposal and agreed that the introduction of the planning estimate should be postponed. Since the estimate must be as accurate as possible, particularly in respect of personnel matters, his delegation felt that the resolution could not be implemented until the results of the manpower survey were available.

28. Mr. M. EL-ATTRASH (Syria) said that his delegation supported the Pakistan delegation's suggestion that the words "and approved" in the Danish draft resolution were unnecessary and should be deleted.

29. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) recalled that his delegation at the 1326th meeting had asked the Committee to postpone consideration of the question of unforeseen and extraordinary expenses, because it had wanted to see how the question of the planning estimate was related to it. Consequently, it did not object to the postponement of the introduction of the planning estimate. It wished to associate itself with the statements made by the Nigerian and Sudanese representatives to the effect that the planning estimate should not be used as a means of imposing a ceiling on the budget or of restricting the scope of the economic, social and human rights programmes of the United Nations.

30. Mr. MEYER PICÓN (Mexico) said that his delegation had been involved in the negotiations leading to the adoption of resolution 2370 (XXII) and remembered that the developing countries had anticipated considerable difficulty in preparing an accurate planning estimate by 1969. It would be wise to postpone the matter, not only because the staff utilization survey had not been completed but also because many programme-formulating organs had not yet been able to finish their work.

31. Accordingly, he supported an amendment to the Danish draft resolution along the lines suggested by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. His

delegation also agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the words "and approved" should be deleted.

32. He noted that several delegations had already seen the Secretary-General's report on the planning estimate, and asked whether it might be made available to other delegations, either formally or informally.

33. Mr. MATHESON (Canada) said that his delegation supported the Danish proposal because it believed that there were sound reasons for postponing consideration of the planning estimate for one year. It hoped that considerable progress would be made in the manpower survey in 1970, so that the question of the planning estimate could be given thorough consideration by the Fifth Committee at the twenty-fifth session.

34. Mr. LAVERDE (Colombia) said that his delegation supported the Danish draft resolution and simply wished to suggest an amendment which might help to ensure its unanimous adoption. Since it was important that consideration of the question should not be left until the end of the twenty-fifth session, his delegation suggested that the wording of the operative paragraph should be amended to indicate that the debate should take place early in the session.

35. Mr. RIAD (United Arab Republic) said he wished to announce that, following consultations, the representatives of Pakistan and the United Republic of Tanzania had agreed to withdraw their amendments to the Danish draft resolution. His delegation also understood that the Danish representative did not wish to press for a vote on his text, and therefore suggested that it would be sufficient for the time being if the substance of the debate on the item was reflected in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, as he understood it, the consensus in the Fifth Committee was that the implementation of paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 2370 (XXII) should be postponed for a year, which should be reflected in its report to the General Assembly, so that the Assembly could take appropriate action.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 77

### Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly (*continued*)\*

#### (a) Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*concluded*)\*\* (A/7571, A/C.5/1235, A/C.5/1261 and Corr.1)

37. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the note (A/7571) by the Secretary-General in which members were informed that it would be necessary for the General Assembly to appoint four persons to fill vacancies in the membership of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions resulting from the expiration on 31 December

\* Resumed from the 1328th meeting.

\*\* Resumed from the 1309th meeting.

1969 of the terms of office of Mr. Bannier, Mr. Olarte, Mr. Ulanchev and Mr. Ziehl. Four persons had been proposed for appointment (see A/C.5/1261 and Corr.1). Subject to the provisions of rule 157 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, members were free to vote for anyone else, if they so wished. Since members were appointed to the Advisory Committee in their individual capacity, not as representatives of States, ballots should be cast for four individuals by name.

38. Mr. JACKMAN (Barbados), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman to postpone the election for a few minutes to allow time for consultations.

*The meeting was suspended at 12.5 p.m. and resumed at 12.15 p.m.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, U Tin Pe (Burma) and Mr. Makonnen (Ethiopia) acted as tellers.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers:	88
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	88
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	87
Required majority:	44

*Number of votes obtained:*

Mr. Jan P. Bannier	82
Mr. Albert F. Bender	77
Mr. V. K. Palamarchuk	75
Mr. José Piñera	58
Four other persons	14

*Mr. Bannier (Netherlands), Mr. Bender (United States of America), Mr. Palamarchuk (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. Piñera (Chile) having obtained the required majority, the Committee recommended their appointment as members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a three-year term beginning 1 January 1970.*

39. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) welcomed the new members of the Advisory Committee and paid a tribute to the retiring members. He expressed his gratitude to the Fifth Committee in connexion with his own re-election. After considerable hesitation, he had decided to stand for re-election, although members of the Fifth Committee were no doubt aware that he would serve for one year only. He would then be obliged to leave the Advisory Committee, for reasons of a purely personal nature. He expressed the hope that the Advisory Committee, with its new composition, would serve the General Assembly well.

40. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. ZEGERS (Chile), on behalf of Mr. Piñera, and Mr. FASCELL (United States of America), on behalf of Mr. Bender, thanked the members of the Fifth Committee.

**(d) United Nations Administrative Tribunal (continued)\*\*  
(A/7574, A/C.5/1237, A/C.5/1259)**

41. Mr. KITI (Kenya) speaking on behalf of the African group of countries, requested that the election to the United Nations Administrative Tribunal should be postponed until a subsequent meeting.

*It was so agreed.*

**AGENDA ITEM 83**

**Personnel questions (continued):**

**(a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/7745, A/C.5/L.992 and Add.1, A/C.5/L.1007/Rev.1)**

42. Mr. BYKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that his delegation had already incorporated the suggestions of several delegations in a revised version of the text it proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report. A further revision (A/C.5/L.1007/Rev.2) was to be issued incorporating the suggestion which the Belgian and French representatives had made at the previous meeting on the question of improving the linguistic balance in the Secretariat. The Ukrainian delegation had gone some way towards accommodating the views of others while seeking to keep clear the main point made in the text—the need for the earliest possible implementation of the pertinent decisions adopted by the General Assembly. The implementation of those decisions was important for the success of United Nations work in international co-operation and was therefore in the common interest of Member States. The draft text, which would be circulated, would represent the views of the Belgian and French delegations as well as his own.

43. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that he hoped that members would have an opportunity to study the newly revised text and said that his delegation might want to suggest certain amendments.

44. Mr. WEI (China) said that if the recommendations in paragraph 28 of the Secretary-General's report (A/7745) were put to the vote separately, his delegation would express reservations concerning sub-paragraph (c) in view of the fact that no adequate explanation had been given of the statement contained in that sub-paragraph.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*