



CONTENTS

	Page
Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution B submitted by the Special Political Committee in document A/7773 on agenda item 34	243
Agenda item 74: Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (<i>continued</i>) Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (<i>concluded</i>)	247
Agenda item 81: Implementation of the recommendations of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (<i>continued</i>)	247

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
 OF DRAFT RESOLUTION B SUBMITTED BY THE
 SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT
 A/7773 ON AGENDA ITEM 34* (A/7775, A/C.5/1262)**

1. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that—as the Secretary-General had indicated in his note (A/C.5/1262) on the administrative and financial implications—if the General Assembly were to adopt draft resolution B submitted by the Special Political Committee (A/7773, para. 18), it would be necessary to make an additional appropriation of \$54,750 for 1970 in order to give effect to operative paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b) and paragraph 13, of the draft resolution.

2. In paragraphs 5 and 6 of its report on the question (A/7775), the Advisory Committee had set out the considerations which had led it to concur in the estimate of \$5,000 for the travel and subsistence expenses which would result from the implementation of the sub-paragraph in question. In concurring with that estimate, the Advisory Committee wished to emphasize the need for establishing a clear distinction between individuals specifically invited to appear before United Nations bodies in truly exceptional cases and those who asked on their own to appear and be heard. The Committee recommended that any future invitations should be carefully considered on their merits by the competent organs, and that the provisions envisaged by the Secretary-General in the case under consideration should not be construed as setting a precedent.

* The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa: report of the Special Committee on the Policies of *Apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

3. As for the amount which would be necessary to give effect to the request contained in operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, namely \$49,750, that amount related principally to the production of information material on *apartheid*. The Advisory Committee recommended that that amount should be reduced by \$4,000 since it considered that some of the costs could be covered by the estimates for public information activities already approved on first reading.

4. Consequently, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee, it would be necessary to include in the budget estimates for the financial year 1970 an additional amount of \$50,750, or \$4,000 less than the Secretary-General's estimate.

5. Mr. ZIEHL (United States of America) said that his delegation could not vote for the financial implications of the draft resolution, just as it had had to vote against that text in the Special Political Committee. In taking that position, which was in no way related to the substance of the question of *apartheid*, it was concerned about two of the categories of expenses which would result from the adoption of the draft resolution.

6. First, his delegation could not approve an allocation for the production of a French addition of four issues of the periodical *Objective: Justice*. It understood that that publication dealt with several subjects other than *apartheid* and considered that it should be possible to disseminate information on activities against *apartheid* in a less costly way, without dealing with other subjects at the same time.

7. Secondly, his delegation could not approve of an allocation to give effect to operative paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution, because it could not accept the interpretation which had been given to that provision. For the consultations mentioned in that sub-paragraph, it was proposed that the representatives of the movement in question should be brought to New York at the expense of the United Nations, which would pay for their round-trip travel expenses and their subsistence allowances for two weeks. An allocation for that purpose would constitute a violation of the procedures and rules established by the General Assembly for expenses to be borne by the United Nations budget. Moreover, it would set a definite precedent regardless of what might be said about it and regardless of the validity of the arguments and explanations which might be adduced to justify the expense envisaged.

8. If the Committee were required to vote only on the estimate of the costs which would have to be met if the

General Assembly approved a text which his delegation, for its part, did not support, he would be willing to acknowledge that the Secretary-General's estimate was correct and realistic. But voting for the financial implications would be tantamount to accepting the inclusion in the budget estimates of items which his delegation did not approve. For that reason, he must oppose the financial implications.

9. Mr. TOTHILL (South Africa), referring to operative paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution of the Special Political Committee, one of the two provisions of that draft resolution that had financial implications for the budget for 1970, said that the procedure envisaged therein was derived directly from paragraph 149, sub-paragraph (d) of the report of the Special Committee¹ which left no doubt as to the interpretation which should be given to the invitation to the Special Committee "to hold consultations" with representatives of the so-called "national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa". In that sub-paragraph the Special Committee suggested that the Secretary-General should be requested "to provide the appropriate liberation movements with travel costs and other necessary facilities to send representatives to participate in meetings of the Special Committee and other appropriate organs."

10. The United Nations was in effect being requested to subsidize some of the petitioners who perennially appeared before certain United Nations bodies. His delegation felt constrained to emphasize that such a measure was completely unprecedented, and urged the Fifth Committee to reflect on the possible consequences. If the door was opened to one set of petitioners to have their travel and subsistence costs borne by the United Nations, such a hand-out could hardly be denied to others. He considered that there was no need to dwell on the number of potential petitioners from various parts of the world who would probably be delighted to avail themselves of such a facility.

11. At the twenty-second and twenty-third sessions of the General Assembly, his delegation had had occasion to question the legality of the procedure of paying fees to governmental representatives serving on an *ad hoc* working group established by the Commission on Human Rights. Such a practice amounted to subsidizing the individuals concerned, if not their Governments. His delegation's reservations had been shared by other delegations which, like his, had been gratified to see that illegal practice discontinued. The Fifth Committee now seemed to be confronted with a similar situation. Although the Secretary-General had speculated that three individuals might travel to New York and remain there for a period of up to two weeks, who was to say that that would actually be the case? It was conceivable that the individuals brought to New York for "consultations" could find a pretext to remain there indefinitely and to become semi-permanent charges on the resources of the Organization. That would certainly not be a legitimate debit to the United Nations budget.

12. He also wished to comment on paragraphs 2 to 5 of the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/1262), which incorporated a number of suggestions made by the Office of Public

Information to implement operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution. Those suggestions included, first, the production of a French edition of the periodical *Objective: Justice* and, secondly, the appointment of an information assistant at Lusaka, whose duties would be, *inter alia*, to liaise "with anti-apartheid groups, universities and other educational institutions and the Press".

13. In regard to the periodical *Objective: Justice*, the purely political nature of which had been acknowledged by the Assistant Secretary-General for Public Information at the 1315th meeting of the Fifth Committee, he wished to point out that, in publishing the periodical in question, the Office of Public Information had become a protagonist in a political dispute. In so doing, it was acting contrary to the Charter and in violation of its mandate, which prohibited it from engaging in propaganda. Such action was also contrary to the position of the staff of that Office as international civil servants. The Office of Public Information could not fulfil its function as the publicity arm of the United Nations if it was to be permitted to operate in the political arena. The publication of the periodical *Objective: Justice* should, therefore, be a matter of regret to all delegations.

14. The type of activity envisaged for the information assistant at Lusaka should also be cause for regret to all delegations, for it represented a further breach of the Secretariat's constitutional position of neutrality. Such activity could hardly be reconciled with regulation 1.4 of the Staff Regulations, which required members of the Secretariat "to avoid any action . . . which may adversely reflect on their status, or on the integrity, independence and impartiality which are required by that status."

15. For those reasons, the South African Government was not prepared to assume any financial obligation for the expenditure which the adoption of the draft resolution in question would entail. That decision was in keeping with the position it had taken for several years and applied not only to the activities of the Special Committee but to any activity, whether initiated by the Secretariat or ordered by a United Nations body, which had the effect of contravening the Charter. If the amount recommended by the Advisory Committee was put to the vote, his delegation would vote against it.

16. Mr. MORGAN (United Kingdom) emphasized that the Fifth Committee was considering solely the budgetary aspects of the problem. In connexion with the financial implications of paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution, his delegation welcomed the distinction which the Advisory Committee had made between persons specifically invited to appear before United Nations bodies in truly exceptional cases and those who might themselves request to appear and be heard. However, that did not go far enough. The question had wider implications which had not been sufficiently thought through, and for that reason his delegation would vote against the appropriation.

17. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said he was surprised that delegations who were always heard to condemn *apartheid* sought to oppose the adoption of measures aimed precisely at combating that policy, by challenging, on the basis of considerations of a technical nature, the admissibility of some of the measures contemplated. He wondered in fact

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 25.

whether that opposition was not more a reflection of traditional positions than an objection to the admissibility of such-and-such a measure.

18. His delegation had always supported the measures the United Nations had decided to adopt in order to combat *apartheid* and was still convinced that any steps designed to eliminate that policy must be endorsed, particularly when, as in the case under discussion, the cost was not exorbitant. One of the measures provided for in the draft resolution was the dissemination of information on *apartheid*—obviously a highly effective course of action—and an appropriation for that purpose must be made.

19. He considered that operative paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution should not give rise to too many fears regarding the future. The Secretary-General would always be able to draw a distinction between those persons who should be invited to appear before United Nations bodies and those who should not. Under the circumstances, it was undeniable that the persons the Special Committee was invited to consult were persons who belonged to a movement which genuinely represented an oppressed people.

20. It would be regrettable if the Fifth Committee was able to challenge the merits of a decision taken by another Main Committee of the Assembly by questioning the admissibility of some of the measures it advocated, which had financial implications. Those who had never suffered from *apartheid* found it difficult to grasp the importance of combating that scourge and, as soon as they had to vote on appropriations which would permit effective action, minimized the seriousness of the problem. The time had come for the Organization to review its attitude and its methods with regard to the struggle against *apartheid*.

21. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) said that he had listened with interest to the arguments of the representative of the United States of America but that he had difficulty in understanding the subtlety of a position which consisted in supporting the struggle against *apartheid* yet opposing the adoption of measures to wage that struggle.

22. The question of extending an invitation to representatives of the national movement of the oppressed people of South Africa had been fully considered by the Special Political Committee. The Advisory Committee had noted that the Special Political Committee had discussed the question and had adopted the resolution in full knowledge of its financial implications; therefore, it had been a conscious political decision on the part of that body. It was difficult for his delegation to accept that a body responsible solely for budgetary questions could oppose a decision taken by a political body which was at the same time one of the Main Committees of the Assembly. Certainly, the representatives of political movements could not all be regarded as petitioners and a distinction should be drawn between individuals specifically invited to appear before United Nations bodies and those who might themselves request to appear and be heard. However, although he appreciated the fears of the Advisory Committee, which considered that the Organization should not have to appropriate funds for the travel of petitioners, he felt that the Committee should be relied upon as being capable of

evaluating the requests it might receive in the future and of deciding how they were to be treated. Moreover, the Advisory Committee recommended that any future invitations should be carefully considered on their merits by the competent organs. He believed that all the Main Committees of the General Assembly had the required competence and that all the organs of the United Nations were as desirous as the Fifth Committee of ensuring that the rules and regulations in force in the United Nations were observed.

23. His delegation considered that the draft resolution should be placed in proper perspective and regarded as a conscious political decision by one of the Main Committees of the Assembly, whose efforts must not be thwarted.

24. Mr. ZODDA (Italy) said that, in keeping with the position it had always adopted on the question of *apartheid*, his delegation would vote in favour of the additional expenses under sections 3, 4, 10 and 17 of the budget estimates for the financial year 1970. Nevertheless, he felt compelled to stress that, by approving an appropriation of \$5,000 for the travel expenses and subsistence allowances of three representatives of the Organization of African Unity, the Fifth Committee would establish a very dangerous precedent which it might find would be invoked in future in other circumstances.

25. Mr. LICHILANA (Zambia) said that he had some difficulty in understanding the fear apparently caused by the idea that the invitation in question would set a precedent: that measure would create neither more nor less of a precedent than any of the new decisions taken over the years for which a new appropriation had been required in the budget of the Organization.

26. Mr. S. TRAORÉ (Mali) said he wondered whether the measure which would give effect to operative paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution would create a precedent because it was the first time that the Special Political Committee was submitting a proposal of that type to the Fifth Committee or because, for the first time, it would involve a proposal relating to *apartheid*. Was it the procedure or the programme which was being questioned? It might be said, as the representative of Zambia had just done, to those who opposed the measure because it had no precedent and might create one, that the budget of the Organization was merely a long history of measures which had had no precedent. Today, the United Nations budget was not what it had been twenty-four years earlier and it had been necessary to take measures for the first time. The decisions concerning the Congo and Korea, the recruitment of experts and many other questions were equally measures which had had no precedent.

27. The Special Political Committee had taken a decision entailing the adoption of measures which it was the Fifth Committee's duty to assist the Organization in applying. The representatives the United Nations would invite to visit New York were not tourists who wished to get to know New York; arguments of that type questioned not only the good faith of persons who might be able to help the United Nations to combat the policy of *apartheid* but also the good faith of the Secretary-General and that of the Special Political Committee, which was better placed than any

other body to determine what should be done in that field. The fear that the payment of travel expenses and subsistence allowances would set a precedent was groundless, particularly since the Advisory Committee had taken care to specify that the measure should not be regarded as establishing a precedent.

28. All those considerations merely distracted the Fifth Committee from its real task; it was called upon to decide on a programme for the United Nations, and that was the most important point to remember.

29. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) said that the Committee was not called upon to hold a political debate or to go back on the decision of the Special Political Committee. The political aspect of the matter had been considered already and all the Fifth Committee had to do was to study the financial implications of a duly adopted decision. It should be remembered that in many cases some delegations stressed that the Committee should not discuss political issues which were within the competence of other organs of the General Assembly. It seemed, however, that some delegations did not always apply that principle.

30. Keeping strictly to the problem before it, the Committee could not fail to recognize that under Article 17 of the Charter financial obligations arising out of decisions adopted by other organs had to be accepted by all Member States. That rule should be strictly obeyed, for if some Member States were to be allowed to escape the financial obligations arising out of a duly adopted decision which was not to their liking, that right would have to be given to all Member States, which could not fail to lead to chaos. His delegation would therefore approve the financial implications of the draft resolution in question and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

31. Mr. NGUIAMBA (Cameroon) said that it was becoming urgently necessary for the United Nations to intensify the dissemination of information on the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government so as to acquaint world opinion with the harmful effects of those policies.

32. The Secretary-General, in the introduction² to his annual report on the work of the Organization, had drawn attention to the problem and to the need to implement the resolutions which had been adopted on the subject. Thus the decision of the Special Political Committee did not really constitute a precedent; it was more correct to describe it as the logical outcome of the action which the General Assembly had always recommended. His delegation would therefore approve the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee.

33. Mr. GUPTA (India) pointed out that, if the United Nations Charter represented mankind's conscience, the policies of *apartheid* practised by the South African Government flagrantly contradicted it. No effort should be spared to combat those policies, and his delegation would therefore approve the financial implications of the Special Political Committee's draft resolution and the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 6 of its report (A/7775).

34. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia) said that once again the South African Government, through its representative, was trying to silence the voice of the oppressed peoples who were victims of colonialism. It was obvious that despite appearances the objections raised by the South African representative were basically political.

35. He appealed to the entire Committee to join forces in fighting the policy of *apartheid* in all its forms, in South Africa and elsewhere, and to do so by every possible means. His delegation would approve the financial implications of the Special Political Committee's draft resolution.

36. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would approve the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee. As far as the implementation of paragraph 12, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution was concerned, his delegation shared the view expressed in paragraph 6 of the Advisory Committee's report.

37. Mr. NZISABIRA (Burundi) observed that the arguments advanced by the representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and South Africa in favour of refusing the appropriation requested were not new and had already been defeated in the Special Political Committee.

38. Burundi strenuously opposed the policies of *apartheid* of the South African Government and considered that the freedom movements which were fighting those policies should receive every possible assistance. He would therefore approve the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

39. Mr. MULONGO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that the policies of *apartheid* were an evil which should be fought at any price and by every possible means; it was impossible to compromise with the supporters of those policies. His delegation would therefore approve the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee.

40. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) reaffirmed his Government's opposition to all forms of *apartheid* and said that his delegation would approve the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Special Political Committee on the basis recommended by the Advisory Committee.

41. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should ask the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly directly that if it adopted the draft resolution submitted by the Special Political Committee it would have to approve an additional appropriation of \$50,750 in the budget estimates for the financial year 1970, made up as follows: \$8,650 under section 3, \$500 under section 4, \$36,600 under section 10 and \$5,000 under section 17. The last-mentioned appropriation which was intended to cover the travel expenses of representatives of national movements against the policies of *apartheid*, would require the express authorization of the General Assembly. The attention of the General Assembly should also be drawn to the

² *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 1A, paras. 145-158.

observations of the Advisory Committee on that point in paragraph 6 of its report (A/7775).

The proposal was adopted by 61 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

42. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the proposal which had just been adopted if it had been present for the vote.

AGENDA ITEM 74

Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (continued)
(A/7606, A/7608, A/7710, A/7726, A/7749, A/7767, A/7769, A/7770, A/7776, A/7779, A/C.5/1230, A/C.5/1231 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1233, A/C.5/1234, A/C.5/1245, A/C.5/1248, A/C.5/1249, A/C.5/1253, A/C.5/1254/Rev.1, A/C.5/1260, A/C.5/L.990, A/C.5/L.993, A/C.5/L.1002)

*Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (concluded)**
(A/7726)

43. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) said that his delegation was prepared to accept the suggestion made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions at the 1325th meeting that an inquiry should be undertaken in the first ten months of 1970 on how the proposed new system could be applied. He merely wished to point out, first, that it was pointless for the proposed inquiry to extend to estimates of supplementary income and, secondly, that—although the Secretary-General was required to certify that the proposed expenditure was in the nature of an emergency and could not be deferred without serious detriment to the United Nations—that did not mean that he had to assess the urgency of a programme whose implementation had already been approved by a body responsible for drawing up programmes.

44. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that he favoured an inquiry of the kind proposed by the Advisory Committee and thought that it should provide valuable information on the basis of which the Fifth Committee could take a fully informed decision at the twenty-fifth session.

45. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general support for the proposal of the Advisory Committee that the existing procedures for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses should be retained in 1970 and that an inquiry should be undertaken as to how the new system proposed in its report (A/7726) could be applied.

The Advisory Committee's proposal was unanimously approved.

AGENDA ITEM 81

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

the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (continued)* (A/7728, A/7738, A/7765, A/C.5. 241, A/C.5/1242, A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.1003-1006)

46. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the two proposals before it: the second revision (A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2) of the ten-Power draft resolution and the draft paragraph (see A/C.5/L.1004) proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, to which amendments had been submitted by France (see A/C.5/L.1005) and the United States of America (see A/C.5/L.1006). Since the new text of the draft re-embodied the proposals made at the 1327th meeting by the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, he did not think that that delegation would press its amendments (see A/C.5/L.1003).

47. Mr. BYKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation withdrew its amendments.

48. Mr. TURNER (Controller), in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, informed the Committee of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2. As the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had said at the 1329th meeting, the preparation of the projected report would require an expenditure of time and effort which might possibly be detrimental to other activities. The implementation of the draft resolution, however, would not directly entail any additional expenditure and would therefore not require the allocation of any credits other than those which the Committee had approved on first reading.

49. Mr. GINDEEL (Sudan) introduced the revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2). The amendments made to the third and fourth preambular paragraphs were purely drafting amendments and did not change the scope of the draft resolution. A sixth preambular paragraph had been added to take into account one of the amendments proposed by the Ukrainian delegation; the sponsors had agreed to that amendment in a spirit of co-operation and because they were convinced that it would not greatly alter the purport of the draft resolution. The words "by year" in operative paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv) had been deleted, thus emphasizing the approximate nature of the information requested of the Secretary-General. The amendments to sub-paragraph 1 (b) were purely drafting changes and the sponsors had found it easy to accept them.

50. Lastly, after last minute consultations, the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided to introduce a slight change in operative paragraph 2 as it appeared in document A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2 and to replace the words "the occasion for a new perspective and reconsidered approach" by the words "the occasion for new efforts to resolve".

51. The aims of the draft resolution had been clearly defined at the 1329th meeting by the representatives of Pakistan and Nigeria, who had emphasized that it was essentially a matter of collecting data on the organs for control and investigation. The essential answer to the

* Resumed from the 1330th meeting.

* Resumed from the 1329th meeting.

question of what the General Assembly would do with the information was given in operative paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (c), and paragraph 2. The information would make it possible to study the problem in full knowledge of the facts and to adopt the requisite measures where necessary. It was certainly not the sponsors intention to try to abolish any of those organs or to restrict their competence. That was confirmed by the spirit of co-operation and conciliation shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution, which the Committee should find no difficulty in adopting, as modified.

52. His delegation fully supported the inclusion in the Committee's report of the paragraph proposed by the Tanzanian representative (see A/C.5/L.1004) and the amendments submitted by the French representative (see A/C.5/L.1005), which would make the text clearer and would emphasize the importance of Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII).

53. Mr. HAMENOO (Ghana) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the spirit of compromise which they had shown and for their efforts to make it possible to remedy the situation created by the overlapping of the functions of certain organs for control and investigation. Many delegations had shown their concern about that problem and, without in any way wishing to prejudge the conclusions of the proposed report, he thought that it must be admitted that if the General Assembly had at its disposal precise information and figures concerning those organs, it would be able at its twenty-fifth session to study the problem in full knowledge of the facts.

54. There was no question of interfering with the authority of the Advisory Committee, which was doing extremely useful and important work; he wished to reaffirm his complete confidence in the integrity of the Chairman of that Committee. His delegation would support the revised draft resolution.

55. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) supported the inclusion of the paragraph proposed by the Tanzanian representative, with the amendments proposed by France and the United States of America in the Committee's report.

56. With regard to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2, he was grateful to the sponsors for the amendments made to the original text, in particular to operative paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv). As far as operative sub-paragraph (b) was concerned, his delegation had hoped that the request for information from the executive heads of the specialized agencies would not be retained, because it would take up a great deal of their time; moreover, it was not for the United Nations to make decisions concerning the specialized agencies. Nevertheless, his delegation was not formally proposing the deletion of that paragraph and would be able to approve the draft resolution, as revised.

57. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that, as a result of the amendments submitted by France and United States of America consultations had taken place between the delegations that had participated in the drafting of the text submitted by the Tanzanian delegation for inclusion in the Committee's report. They had tried to produce a synthesis of the three points of view expressed and, with

the agreement of the Tanzanian delegation, had drawn up the following text:

“Having considered the reports of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee circulated as documents A/C.5/1242 and A/7738 respectively, the Fifth Committee endorses the acceptance by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the principle that the texts of all formal reports of the Joint Inspection Unit should be made available to all Member States. The Fifth Committee endorses the supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit adopted by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1457 (XLVII) and the further arrangements for ensuring this and which are set forth by the Advisory Committee in its report (A/7738). The Committee realizes, however, that some inspection reports may be of so highly technical and complex a character that they may be of only limited interest to Member States. Accordingly, and without in any way infringing the right of access of Member States to these reports, the Committee accepts that the Advisory Committee should, in the first instance, determine the extent of normal distribution in the case of reports which, in the Advisory Committee's opinion, are of such limited interest. The Fifth Committee agrees that co-ordination between the investigative and administrative organs like the Advisory Committee, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Board of Auditors, and others, should be strengthened with a view to avoiding duplication and that this co-ordination should be brought about through mutual consultations in which the Advisory Committee could play a central role. However, the Fifth Committee reaffirms the independence of operation conferred on the joint Inspection Unit by its mandate.”

58. the CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the submission by the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago—on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Republic of Tanzania—of a new text to be included in the report of the Committee, the text previously proposed by the Tanzanian delegation (see A/C.5/L.1004) and the amendments submitted by the delegations of France (A/C.5/L.1005) and the United States of America (see A/C.5/L.1006) were withdrawn. Although the text of the new proposal was not yet available in writing, he thought that, in view of the numerous consultations held before its submission, delegations should be able to express their opinion on it after hearing it read out.

59. Mr. S. TRAORÉ (Mali) thanked the sponsors of the ten-Power draft resolution for the efforts they had made to improve the presentation of that text and to make it clearer. With regard to operative paragraph 2, his delegation quite understood the reasons which had led the sponsors to express the hope that new efforts would be made to resolve the Organization's administrative, budgetary and financial problems, but thought that it would be more appropriate for such considerations to appear in the preamble, which would give the text a more balanced presentation without in any way changing its spirit.

60. He would also like to have some particulars about operative paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv). It would seem that the information requested in that sub-paragraph,

namely “the estimated outlay of manpower for preparation of data for the testimony before or consultation with each such body and organ,” should already have been supplied under sub-paragraph (iii).

61. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan), referring to operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, explained to the representative of Mali that the representatives of the ten Powers were fully aware that the inclusion of considerations of that kind in the operative part of a resolution was somewhat unusual. As he had pointed out, the sponsors of the draft resolution would have liked to make stronger and more specific recommendations, but since the present circumstances were not propitious for such an initiative, they had confined themselves to expressing a hope which they thought was shared by all delegations. It had been in order to emphasize the strength of their feelings on the matter that they had expressed that hope in the operative part of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, if the retention of that paragraph would raise serious difficulties, the delegations of the ten Powers would be prepared to discuss ways of remedying the matter.

62. The wording of paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv) did not duplicate that of sub-paragraph (a) (iii). Sub-paragraph (a) (iv) was concerned with the outlay of manpower, in terms of the number of man-hours spent by members of the Secretariat on the preparation of data, a figure which was not given in any budgetary document and which could only be estimated. It would, of course, be a somewhat imprecise notion and it was for that reason that, taking into account a comment by the representative of the Secretary-General, the sponsors had decided not to request that the figures should be given for each financial year.

63. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) said that his delegation would have preferred the information in question to be provided on an annual basis.

64. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) explained, for the information of the representative of Mali, that the distinction drawn in paragraph 1, sub-paragraphs (a) (iii) and (a) (iv) was justified, for it should be borne in mind that the work done by members of the Secretariat was never free of charge. It might reasonably be presumed that they devoted all their time to their regular tasks and that any new task assigned to them had to be carried out more or less at the expense of existing tasks. The time spent on the execution of the new tasks could be estimated approximately, but the corresponding cost for the Organization was very hard to estimate and the Secretariat appreciated the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution had given up the idea of having a break-down of those figures by year.

65. Mr. S. TRAORÉ (Mali) said that he was satisfied with the information that had been given and would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

66. Mr. GANEM (France), referring to the text read out by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for inclusion in the Committee's report, said that his delegation greatly appreciated the new text, but it was difficult to accept a text that it had not been possible to read and which had not been translated into all the working languages. Never-

theless, his delegation accepted the proposed text, provided that, when the Rapporteur submitted the report, delegations would be free to make any drafting changes they saw fit so long as they did not go back on any decision adopted by the Committee.

67. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) thanked the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for preparing the text he had read out. It would have been difficult for the Nigerian delegation to accept the inclusion in the Committee's report of the original text proposed by the Tanzanian delegation since it had failed to stress the importance of the reports of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1242) and of the Advisory Committee (A/7738). He would support the inclusion of the new text in the Committee's report.

68. Regarding the ten-Power draft resolution, he pointed out to the Israel delegation that it was in order to facilitate the task of the Secretariat and to take into account the comments of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management that the sponsors had decided not to ask for the figures referred to in paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv), to be provided for each financial year. In reply to the Canadian representative, he pointed out that it would be difficult to delete sub-paragraph (b) because in some cases it was necessary for the General Assembly to know about activities of organs of control and investigation which concerned the specialized agencies. He did not think that the transmission of the information requested would entail a large amount of work for the secretariats of the specialized agencies and he hoped that the Canadian delegation would not press the point.

69. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) said that his delegation's opinion on that question remained unchanged but that he would not press it and would vote in favour of the draft resolution as it stood.

70. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution and the inclusion in the Committee's report of the text submitted by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

71. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had before it two texts on which it had to take a decision: the revised ten-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2), as orally amended by the representative of the Sudan, and the text proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report which the representative of Trinidad and Tobago had just read out.

The revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1000/Rev.2), as orally amended, was unanimously adopted.

72. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the revised draft resolution because it stressed that the General Assembly should take into account the need to strengthen and improve the whole machinery of the United Nations system for control and investigation of administrative and financial activities in the interests of economy and greater efficiency, and on the understanding that the resolution would in no way affect the independence of the Joint Inspection Unit as laid down in its terms of reference.

73. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement regarding the inclusion in the Committee's report of

the text read out by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago at the meeting, on the understanding that drafting changes could be made to it, as requested by the representative of France.

The inclusion of the text in question (see para. 57 above) in the report of the Fifth Committee was approved.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.