



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

**AGENDA ITEM 73**

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1971**  
(continued) (A/7822, A/7937, A/7968, A/7987  
and Add.1, A/8006, A/8008 and Add.1 and 2,  
A/8032, A/8033, A/8072, A/8122, A/8133,  
A/C.5/1296, A/C.5/1298, A/C.5/1302 and  
Corr.1, A/C.5/1303, A/C.5/1305, A/C.5/1307,  
A/C.5/1309, A/C.5/1310, A/C.5/1315, A/C.5/  
1317, A/C.5/1319, A/C.5/L.1041)

*General discussion (continued)*

1. Mr. BERGER (Chile) congratulated the Secretary-General on the well-balanced budget he had submitted to the Fifth Committee for 1971 and thanked the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for the great service it was rendering the United Nations. The growth of the Organization necessitated the recruitment of additional personnel, which in turn increased the budget. His delegation was pleased that the Secretary-General had taken account of some of the recommendations made by the Administrative Management Service on the basis of its manpower utilization and deployment surveys, since those surveys should result in increased staff productivity and in greater efficiency in the Organization's work. At the same time, staff salaries should be adequate and should reflect the increased cost of living; the staff position in that respect therefore seemed quite justified.

2. His delegation supported the measures which the Secretary-General had proposed with a view to reducing by \$7 million the budget estimates for 1971, which would consequently amount to \$193 million, or an increase of approximately 14 per cent over the amount approved for 1970. That increase was largely due to uncontrollable costs resulting from inflationary pressures in most countries with their inevitable effects. The United Nations budget must be viewed dynamically if it was to be possible to achieve the purposes of the Charter and to rationalize the budget's various component parts. Ways and means must be found of reconciling the expenditure required under General Assembly decisions with the use of the resources needed to provide greater scientific and technical assistance to the developing countries. The Fifth Committee bore a special responsibility for ensuring that the United Nations would have the necessary resources in hand to achieve the objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade. As the Minister for

External Relations of Chile had said at the General Assembly on 21 October 1970 (1876th plenary meeting), United Nations officials must seek boldly and imaginatively to reinvigorate the United Nations in the new phase which had begun so that it would be able to carry out its future responsibilities.

3. His delegation welcomed the progress made by the Joint Inspection Unit with respect to the quality of its reports and hoped that its studies and recommendations would not be ignored. In particular, it felt that the Bertrand report on programming and budgets in the United Nations family (see A/7822) was a very useful one and it supported the proposal to continue the Joint Inspection Unit on an experimental basis.

**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/C.5/1299, A/C.5/1304 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3):

- (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)

*Report on the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit during the period 1 July 1969-30 June 1970 (continued)* (A/8128, A/C.5/1299, A/C.5/1304 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3)

4. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider first the revised text A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1 of the six-Power draft resolution, and then the text (see A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3) submitted by six delegations for inclusion in the report of the Committee.

5. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that he thought the revised draft resolution now before the Committee took account of most of the observations made during the debate, and he hoped that the Committee would adopt the new text.

6. Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) observed that the changes made by the sponsors in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution did not appear in the Spanish version of the revised text. He would not press for a separate vote on the words "with appreciation" in the second preambular paragraph.

7. The CHAIRMAN assured the Mexican representative that the Secretariat would take account of his observation and that the Spanish text of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1 would be brought into line with the French and English texts.

8. Mr. ASHWIN (Australia) said that he had some reservations with regard to operative paragraph 1, under which the General Assembly would decide to continue the Joint Inspection Unit on the existing experimental basis for a further period of two years beyond 31 December 1971 because, if the Assembly decided at its twenty-sixth session to revise the terms of reference of the Joint Inspection Unit, that decision would be in conflict with its earlier decision.

9. Mr. GUPTA (India) pointed out that if the General Assembly adopted the revised draft resolution it would decide to extend provisionally the Joint Inspection Unit's terms of reference on the existing experimental basis until it took a final decision. If, at its twenty-sixth or twenty-seventh session, it decided to continue the Unit permanently, it would necessarily have to amend its terms of reference, and the decision it would take at that time would automatically annul the decision taken at the current session.

10. Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) expressed the view that, on the contrary, a future final decision by the Assembly on the Joint Inspection Unit would not necessarily annul the decision it now had to take. If the Assembly decided in 1971 to amend the Unit's terms of reference, the implementation of that decision could be delayed for one year to enable the specialized agencies and the other interested bodies to take the necessary action. The new terms of reference would not come into effect until 1 January 1973, on the expiry of the two-year prolongation of the existing terms of reference decided at the current session.

11. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) said that the members of the Committee had been unanimous in recognizing the need for closer co-operation between the Joint Inspection Unit and United Nations bodies in order to improve the efficiency of the Unit's work and ensure that its recommendations were implemented. However, operative paragraph 2 did not make that clear, for it recommended to the other participating organizations in the United Nations system to take appropriate measures for the continuation of the Unit "on the same basis".

12. Mr. GUPTA (India) pointed out that the words "on the same basis" in operative paragraph 2 referred to the words "on the existing experimental basis" in paragraph 1, and he hoped that the United Nations bodies and specialized agencies would so interpret them.

13. Mr. VAN VLOTEN (Netherlands) asked the Secretariat to reply to the question of principle raised at the previous meeting by the New Zealand representative, who found it difficult to reconcile the decision which the General Assembly was to take on operative paragraph 1 of the revised draft resolution with the

note by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1299), which indicated that the Assembly should merely make a recommendation on the question to the organizations in the United Nations system.

14. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, according to the second report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies<sup>1</sup> the Assembly could limit itself to making a recommendation at the current session. However, it also had to take a decision before the original mandate of the Joint Inspection Unit expired. The sponsors of the draft resolution had presumably felt, therefore, that the Assembly could take a decision now and make a recommendation at the same time.

15. Mr. TAITT (Barbados) said he wished to re-submit the Mexican representative's proposal that a separate vote should be taken on the words "with appreciation" in the second preambular paragraph.

16. Mr. GUPTA (India) requested a roll-call vote on the same words.

17. Mr. SADRY (Iran) proposed that, to take into account the views of the New Zealand representative and the recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts, the words "Decides to continue the Unit" in operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by "Recommends that the Unit should be continued", and, in operative paragraph 2, the words "Recommends to the" should be replaced by "Requests the".

18. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) said that he unreservedly supported the Iranian representative's proposal.

19. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he could not accept the Iranian amendments: the General Assembly should forthwith take a decision with regard to continuing the Joint Inspection Unit and a recommendation in that context would not be sufficient. The United Nations had to take a decision so as to facilitate a decision by the other members in the common system who also participate in the functioning of the Joint Inspection Unit.

20. Mr. DE FACQ (Belgium) said that there was a difference between the term "*avec satisfaction*" in the French text and the term "*with appreciation*" in the English text. It was possible to appreciate efforts without being satisfied with the results obtained.

21. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the English and French versions of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1 were both original texts and therefore equally valid. It was for the sponsors to amend one or the other; the vote would be on both texts simultaneously.

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 80, document A/6343, para. 67 B (f).

22. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that the expressions “*avec satisfaction*” and “*with appreciation*” were quite synonymous and it was customary, in United Nations documents, to translate the one by the other.

23. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for incorporating his proposals in their revised text. He would vote in favour of the draft as a whole but against the maintenance of the words “*with appreciation*” in the second preambular paragraph because he considered that the Committee was in no position to judge the work of the Joint Inspection Unit since it had not examined its reports.

24. Mr. LAWRENCE (United States of America) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that the General Assembly would be able to take up the question of the Joint Inspection Unit as its twenty-sixth session if it received a recommendation to that effect, bearing in mind the possible reconstitution of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts.

25. Mr. TAITT (Barbados) said that he would vote against the retention of the words “*with appreciation*” in the second preambular paragraph because, like the Brazilian representative, he considered that the General Assembly was in no position to judge the work of the Joint Inspection Unit inasmuch as it had not examined its reports.

26. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the General Assembly was obliged to give a reason for its decision to continue the Joint Inspection Unit. If it was not satisfied with the work of that body such a decision would not be justified and hence the words “*with appreciation*” should appear in the draft resolution.

27. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) pointed out that, if the General Assembly decided to extend the mandate of the Joint Inspection Unit, it would not be because it was satisfied with its work but because it had to continue the Unit provisionally while waiting to take a final decision on it.

28. Mr. VAN VLOTEN (Netherlands) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution but, like the New Zealand representative, would have preferred the General Assembly at its current session to confine itself to making a recommendation and to wait until the twenty-sixth session before taking a final decision on the matter.

29. Mr. SADRY (Iran) said that his delegation would vote against the retention of the words “*with appreciation*” in the second preambular paragraph. They were out of place in the present context, as the representative of Brazil had convincingly explained in his comments on the interpretation of that paragraph.

30. His delegation would be able to accept operative paragraph 3 in view of the sponsors’ amendments thereto, although, in its opinion, the bodies mentioned would probably not all be able to submit their views in time. He was thinking, in particular, of the Adminis-

trative Committee on Co-ordination. With those reservations, his delegation would vote for the revised draft resolution as a whole (A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1).

31. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) endorsed the Netherlands representative’s comments. His delegation would vote for the revised draft resolution as a whole but it continued to have reservations with regard to the procedure adopted.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1).

33. In accordance with the request of the representative of Barbados, the Chairman put to the vote separately the words “*with appreciation*”, which appeared in the second preambular paragraph, and at the request of the Indian representative, the vote on those words would be by roll-call.

*Australia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Austria, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Argentina.

*Against:* Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa, Syria, Tunisia.

*Abstaining:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Hungary, Kuwait, Mali, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, People’s Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Afghanistan, Algeria.

*The Committee decided to retain the words “with appreciation” in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution by 46 votes to 14, with 28 abstentions.*

*The revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1) as a whole was adopted by 89 votes to none.*

34. Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia) said that his delegation had abstained during the vote on the words “*with appreciation*” for the sole reason that it had been somewhat dissatisfied to note that, with regard to staff questions, the Joint Inspection Unit had not tried to ascertain the views of staff representatives and that it did not propose to do so as part of the study of staff questions which it had undertaken, even though it recog-

nized in its own report (A/C.5/1304 and Corr.1, annex, para. 26) that staff problems were “urgent and crucial”. His delegation would not be satisfied with the work of the Joint Inspection Unit until it read in a Unit report that the Unit had listened to the staff’s views on questions which affected them. The fact that the Secretary-General, who was the spokesman of the staff in the General Assembly, consulted the staff representatives on all questions affecting the staff should not excuse the Joint Inspection Unit from undertaking on its own account the consultations necessary for the purposes of its inquiries and studies.

35. Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) said that he had voted against retaining the words “with appreciation” for the reasons given by the representative of Brazil in particular. The Committee did not have enough information to be able to express an opinion on the quality of the Joint Inspection Unit’s work and could not, therefore, take note of that work “with appreciation”.

36. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) said that he had voted to retain those words on the understanding that they implied a judgement of the efforts made by the Joint Inspection Unit, not of the results achieved. It would be preferable if the words did not appear in the text, but if his delegation had voted against their retention it would have misrepresented its position.

37. Mr. ASHWIN (Australia) agreed with the Brazilian representative’s comments concerning the words voted on separately, and with those of the Brazilian and United States representatives concerning the revised draft resolution as a whole.

38. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that if his delegation had been present when the vote was taken it would have voted for the revised draft resolution as a whole.

39. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted for the revised draft resolution as a whole. It had, however, abstained in the separate vote on the retention of the words “with appreciation” because they seemed to imply that the Joint Inspection Unit had been continued because its work had been considered satisfactory. If that was so, what was the explanation for the fact that the Unit had been continued on an experimental rather than a permanent basis? Moreover, the Committee was far from unanimous about the quality of the Joint Inspection Unit’s work and that was another reason why his delegation did not want the words retained in the text.

40. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft text (see A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3) submitted by the delegations of Barbados, Ghana, Guyana, India, Mexico and the United Republic of Tanzania for inclusion in the Fifth Committee’s report on the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit.

41. Mr. STOBY (Guyana), introducing the draft text, expressed the hope that implementation of the procedures the Committee was being invited to recommend would lead to an improvement in the operations of the Joint Inspection Unit.

42. Under sub-paragraph (a), the Committee would recommend the Unit to publish details of its work programme at the beginning of each year in order that overlap and duplication of work carried out by the various competent bodies might be lessened. Thus, any body requesting the Unit to report on a question already on the work programme of another body would do so with the knowledge that its request might result in duplication of work. Lastly, the Joint Inspection Unit was being requested to publish details of its work programme “at the beginning of each year” so that it could retain complete freedom of action.

43. Sub-paragraph (b) stated that the Joint Inspection Unit should give priority attention to requests for reports from legislative bodies. By that, the sponsors did not mean that the Unit should devote itself exclusively to reports requested by legislative bodies but that it should consider such requests before those of other bodies. The last sentence of sub-paragraph (b) reflected the concern of the Tanzanian and Nigerian representatives that field visits should not be given undue importance and, as the sponsors requested, should be undertaken primarily in response to requests from participating organizations, particularly the specialized agencies and the United Nations Development Programme.

44. Sub-paragraph (c) merely consisted of an appeal to legislative bodies to continue to arrange their work programmes in such a way that sufficient time was allocated for full consideration of the Unit’s reports.

45. The sponsors intended to delete sub-paragraph (d) since the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had informed them that the procedure it recommended was inconsistent with the mandate of the Unit, which was not authorized to transmit its reports to Member States. The sponsors therefore proposed to replace that sub-paragraph by the following text:

“(d) It is the view of the Fifth Committee that existing procedures for the handling of the Joint Inspection Unit reports should in future allow for the reports to be made available to Member States as soon as practicable after issue.”

46. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) suggested that the representative of Guyana should slightly alter the new wording of sub-paragraph (d) and delete the word “existing” before the word “procedures”. A slight modification of those procedures might actually be necessary to take account of the Fifth Committee’s view as expressed in that sub-paragraph. Referring to sub-paragraph (a), he explained that the Joint Inspection Unit already consulted some of the competent bodies in question—the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the Board of Auditors and the Administrative Management Service—but that consultations should be extended to other bodies. Referring to sub-paragraph (b), he suggested that it would be desirable to specify, in the first sentence, that the inspectors’ reports should relate to fields within the Unit’s terms of reference.

47. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that his delegation had no difficulty in accepting sub-paragraphs (a) and (c) and the revised version of sub-paragraph (d), but entertained some doubts about sub-paragraph (b). The very nature of the Joint Inspection Unit might be modified if the first part of that sub-paragraph was adopted. If the Unit paid too much attention to requests from legislative bodies, it might become merely another investigating team, like the many already in existence. His delegation feared, too, that the last sentence of sub-paragraph (b) limited the Unit's activities, since the Unit was requested to undertake field trips in response to requests from participating organizations. The Joint Inspection Unit's original terms of reference provided that the inspectors would "make on-the-spot inquiries and investigations", if necessary "without prior notification", "as and when they themselves may decide".<sup>2</sup>

48. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) said that his delegation would have preferred the Committee to consider document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3 before voting on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1. It might have been possible simply to add a sentence to the draft resolution requesting the Joint Inspection Unit to take account of the Fifth Committee's comments on its programme of work and procedures.

49. With regard to sub-paragraph (a) of the text proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report, he agreed with the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management; moreover, he considered that it might be better not to stress the question of publication of details of its work programme by the Joint Inspection Unit, but rather to indicate that the Unit should be able to exchange views with all the bodies concerned before finalizing its work programme. Such consultations would be very useful in that when those bodies submitted their work programmes to the Unit, they would be sure that they did not conflict or overlap with those of the Unit or duplicate the latter's work. Sub-paragraph (a) might be redrafted accordingly.

50. His delegation generally approved of the wording of sub-paragraph (b). Its intention had never been to prevent the Joint Inspection Unit from visiting countries for the purpose of carrying out field visits; it merely wanted the Unit to rationalize those activities. It particularly welcomed the sentence which indicated that field visits should be undertaken "primarily" in response to requests from participating organizations. His delegation would have preferred some indication in sub-paragraph (b) that the Joint Inspection Unit should take into account the comments made in the Committee concerning rationalization of its field activities.

51. He had no objections to the sentiments expressed in the new sub-paragraph (d) submitted by the representative of Guyana.

52. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) recalled that the Indonesian representative had stressed the need for co-operation between the Joint Inspection Unit and

the participating organizations, and pointed out that the proposed text did not take account of that idea. The sponsors might consider amending the last sentence of sub-paragraph (c) by adding the words "and recommendations" after the words "full consideration of the Unit's reports". Turning to the new sub-paragraph (d), he proposed that the words "and to participating organizations" should be added after the words "member States".

53. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Philippines if he was merely making suggestions to the sponsors or submitting formal amendments to the text contained in document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3.

54. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he was proposing amendments.

55. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could accept the text proposed for inclusion in the report of the Fifth Committee. He thought that the sponsors of the text might bear in mind the remark made by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management concerning the deletion of the word "existing" before the word "procedures" in the new sub-paragraph (d). With respect to the Under-Secretary-General's comments on sub-paragraph (a), his own opinion was that the publication by the Joint Inspection Unit of details of its work programme could be valuable not only for the various bodies concerned and Secretariat departments, but also for member States. The Joint Inspection Unit was a body established by the member States and they should be kept informed of its activities. Accordingly, he hoped that the text of sub-paragraph (a) would be left as it has been drafted initially.

56. Mr. STOBY (Guyana) said that he could agree to the deletion of the word "existing" in the new sub-paragraph (d) and to the inclusion of the words "in fields within its terms of reference" in the first sentence of sub-paragraph (b). He thought that in that same sentence it might be desirable to add "inspection" after the words "requests for", and in the second sentence of sub-paragraph (b) to replace the words "the preparation of suitable studies and reports" by the words "the preparation of such reports".

57. Replying to the comments made by the representative of Japan, he explained that the sponsors of the text had no intention of placing any restrictions upon the Joint Inspection Unit's freedom of action and independence when they said, in sub-paragraph (b) that field visits should be undertaken primarily "in response to requests from participating organizations".

58. He would like the first sentence of sub-paragraph (a) to be retained because he felt such bodies as the Economic and Social Council, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and other bodies concerned with the work of the inspectors should be kept informed of the Unit's work, as well as the various bodies mentioned in the second sentence of the sub-paragraph.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, para. 67 B (c).

59. He had taken note of the comments by the Nigerian representative and agreed that it would have been better if the Committee had considered the text now under discussion before it had voted on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1. He pointed out that in the last sentence of sub-paragraph (b) the stress was on the word "primarily".

60. Turning to the amendments proposed by the representative of the Philippines, he said that when the sponsors of the text indicated in sub-paragraph (c) that legislative bodies should continue to arrange their work programmes "in such a way that sufficient time is allocated for full consideration of the Unit's reports", they also had in mind the possibility of implementing the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit, but could not stress that aspect of the question. He had no objection to the amendment to the new sub-paragraph (d) proposed by the representative of the Philippines, but was not sure that it was absolutely necessary. As things stood, the participating organizations were the first recipients of the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit.

61. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he shared the misgivings of the representative of Guyana concerning the advisability of the second amendment proposed by the representative of the Philippines. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of

Experts stated that the reports of the inspectors were submitted "to the service being reported on and to the executive head of the organization concerned simultaneously";<sup>3</sup> the organization was therefore the first to receive the reports prepared by the inspectors, and they were subsequently transmitted "by the head of the organization concerned to the members of the organization's executive board or governing body".<sup>4</sup>

62. With regard to sub-paragraph (a), he explained that the Joint Inspection Unit was not, strictly speaking, authorized to "publish" anything; he assumed that what the sponsors of the text had meant was that the Unit should enter into consultations with all the bodies working in the same field earlier than was the case at present.

63. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that most of his misgivings about the text submitted to the Committee had been dispelled during the debate. However, he felt that, regardless of how much or how little stress was placed on the word "primarily", the last sentence of sub-paragraph (b) contradicted the notion of unscheduled inspections and the independent status of the Joint Inspection Unit.

*The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 67 B (d) (i).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 67 B (d) (iii).