



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

**TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF GENERAL  
CHARLES DE GAULLE, FORMER  
PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC**

1. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of the members of the Fifth Committee, expressed his sorrow on the occasion of the death of General de Gaulle, and extended his sympathy to the Government and people of France.

*On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.*

2. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation deeply appreciated the Committee's expression of sympathy with his country in its bereavement.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLI-  
CATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION  
SUBMITTED BY THE SIXTH COMMIT-  
TEE IN DOCUMENT A/8147 ON AGENDA  
ITEM 84\* (concluded)\*\***

*Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the  
General Assembly (A/C.5/L.1044)*

3. Mr. EL BARADEI (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur, introduced the draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/L.1044) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee (A/8147, para. 126). He stated that paragraphs 1-4 of the draft report summarized the views of the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and paragraphs 5-8 the views expressed in the Fifth Committee, while paragraph 9 reproduced the verbatim text of the decision adopted by the Fifth Committee at its 1376th meeting.

4. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that his delegation believed that the Committee had an obligation to bring to the attention of the General Assembly all the information at its disposal concerning the financial implications of proposals adopted by other bodies, and to advise the Assembly on such proposals. Since the Committee had concluded its discussion of the proposal now under consideration, his delegation had received further information on its cost which would be useful to the Assembly and should therefore be included in the report.

\* Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its twenty-second session.

\*\* Resumed from the 1376th meeting.

5. In the first place, the reason why the cost of the proposed four-week extension of the session of the International Law Commission in Geneva would be \$22,500 per week instead of \$6,000 a week was that the extended session would overlap with meetings of other bodies. That was information which the General Assembly should have.

6. Secondly, his delegation understood from the Secretariat that if the four-week extended session was held in New York in July or August 1971 rather than at Geneva, the estimated cost would be substantially reduced. The General Assembly should also be informed of that possible alternative.

7. Thirdly, the first sentence of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 9 did not seem to take full account of the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on which the Committee's decision was based. Accordingly he proposed that that sentence should be revised to read:

“(b) Should the General Assembly consider the publication of a new up-to-date edition of the publication entitled *The Work of the International Law Commission* to be a priority item and accordingly adopt the proposal of the Sixth Committee for the publication of this edition in 1971, it would cost the United Nations \$17,200 . . .”

8. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the conclusion of the Committee's lengthy debate on the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee—much of which had been concerned with the merits of the proposal rather than with its effect on the budget estimates—he had, at the 1367th meeting (document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.1) in an effort to expedite the Committee's work, suggested the text of the decision which the Committee might wish to adopt on the item. His text had omitted any reference to the question of priority for the reasons he had given at the time. At the same meeting, the Committee had adopted his text. Since paragraph 9 of the draft report contained the verbatim text of the formal decision adopted by the Committee, it could not be changed unless the United States representative wished to move that the debate should be reopened.

9. Mr. EL BARADEI (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur, said that if the United States representative so desired, he could include the breakdown of the extra cost of holding the four-week extension of the session of the International Law Commission at Geneva given in document A/C.5/1314/Add.1 in an annex to his draft report.

10. Since the question of the cost of holding the meeting in New York rather than at Geneva had not been raised in the debate, he could not include that information in his draft report.

11. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that, although it had been his impression that the decision taken at the 1376th meeting was a tentative one, subject to confirmation when the draft report was adopted, his delegation would withdraw its request for the revision of the first sentence of sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 9.

12. His delegation accepted the Rapporteur's suggestion that the additional information concerning the extra cost of holding the four-week extension at Geneva should be included in an annex to the report. It believed, however, that the annex should also include information concerning the cost of holding the four-week extension in New York rather than in Geneva.

13. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) thought that it was the duty of the Fifth Committee to inform the General Assembly of the minimum amount that could be spent on any particular proposal. If there were alternatives which would reduce the cost of holding the extended session, he could not see why the Committee should take a hasty decision on the matter before exploring those alternatives thoroughly. Surely precedents could be cited when even the substance of a Rapporteur's draft report had been modified before it was adopted.

14. Mr. TURNER (Controller) pointed out that the decision taken by the International Law Commission, which the Sixth Committee had approved in operative paragraph 3 of its draft resolution, was that the Commission should hold its session from 26 April to 30 July 1971 at Geneva. Under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, it was the responsibility of the Fifth Committee to inform the Assembly of the financial implications of that specific decision only. The possibility of holding the session in New York had not been mentioned during the discussion and therefore did not appear in the Rapporteur's draft report, which, in his opinion, fully and accurately reflected the substance of the discussion. It would be inconsistent with precedent and with United Nations practice and policy for the Rapporteur to include in his draft report any points not raised during the substantive discussion. Thus, although the information which the United States representative had given was correct, it should not appear in the draft report. It would, however, be reflected in the summary record of the meeting.

15. He drew attention to the fact that the Fifth Committee had never before failed to submit its reports on financial implications to the General Assembly on time and, therefore, urged the Committee to adopt the draft report under discussion, with the annex he had suggested, and to submit it to the Assembly without delay.

16. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that his delegation felt strongly that the General Assem-

bly should be in possession of all relevant data likely to assist it in making a reasoned decision on a proposal before it, and the Fifth Committee's procedures should be made more flexible so that it could achieve that objective. He asked the Controller, for the record, whether it was true that the resources and facilities available in New York in July and August 1971 would make it possible to hold the four-week extended session of the International Law Commission in New York at a total extra cost of approximately \$50,000, representing a saving of \$57,000 below the cost of holding the additional session at Geneva.

17. Mr. TURNER (Controller) confirmed the accuracy of the facts cited by the United States representative. If the four-week extended session were held in New York in July 1971, the cost would be on the order of \$50,000, as compared with the estimated cost of \$107,000 if it was held at Geneva.

18. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) expressed his satisfaction that the point he had raised would be reflected in the Committee's summary record.

19. Mr. BYKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the words "one representative" in the first sentence of paragraph 6 of the draft report should be changed to "some representatives" because other representatives had supported the view expressed.

20. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the Ukrainian proposal, and added that paragraph 6 should also reflect the fact that the statement of one delegation that the inclusion of the sum of \$107,000 in the budget estimates before a decision had been taken in the Sixth Committee or by the International Law Commission itself was contrary to rule 103.1 of the Financial Rules of the United Nations, had been recognized by the Controller as valid.

21. Mr. EL BARADEI (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur, said that, as far as he could remember, only one representative had made the point to which the Ukrainian representative had referred. He would therefore be unable to change the words "one representative" to "some representatives" without the express authorization of the Fifth Committee.

22. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt its draft report (A/C.5/L.1044), on the understanding that the Rapporteur would supplement it by an annex giving a breakdown of the sum of \$107,000 mentioned in paragraph 6, on the basis of the information contained in document A/C.5/1314/Add.1 and on the understanding that some delegations maintained their reservations to the Sixth Committee's proposal in its draft resolution.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 80

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

**Agencies (continued) \* (A/7968, A/7987 and Add.1, A/7999 and Add.1, A/8033, A/8128, A/8139, A/C.5/1299, A/C.5/1304 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.1043/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3/Rev.2):**

- (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 (concluded) \* (A/8128, A/C.5/1299, A/C.5/1304 and Corr.1, A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3/Rev.2)**

23. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the new revised version (A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3/Rev.2) of the text proposed for inclusion in the report of the Committee. He said that two corrections should be made in the text: in the introductory sentence the words "terms of reference and" should be inserted before the words "independent status", and the words "the following procedures be implemented" should be deleted.

24. Mr. LAWRENCE (United States of America) said that his delegation would be unable to support a text which seemed designed to amend the Joint Inspection Unit's terms of reference by restricting its ability to act as an independent mechanism. It could be said that by requiring the Unit, in sub-paragraph (b), to give priority attention to requests from legislative bodies, a restriction was placed on the Unit. His delegation recognized, however, that the Joint Inspection Unit must be responsible to legislative bodies and would therefore be able to accept the sub-paragraph if the word "priority" were replaced by the word "due". It also entertained some doubts about the appropriateness of the word "fully" in the second sentence of that sub-paragraph.

25. In order to meet the concerns expressed by the Joint Inspection Unit in paragraph 33 of its report (A/C.5/1304 and Corr.1, annex), it might be advisable to add to the text under consideration a sub-paragraph indicating that the executive heads of the specialized agencies should take such measures as were necessary to provide legislative bodies with information concerning action taken to implement the inspectors' recommendations.

26. In conclusion, he suggested that in its report, the Fifth Committee might wish to refer to Economic and Social Council resolution 1554 (XLIX) on Reports of the Joint Inspection Unit.

27. Mr. STOBY (Guyana) said that, in view of the time already spent on the draft text, the sponsors felt unable to consider further changes at that stage. If the Committee could not agree on the text, it should be put to the vote. Similarly, if the United States representative wished to propose formal amendments, they too should be put to the vote.

\* Resumed from the 1379th meeting.

28. Mr. LAWRENCE (United States of America) said that since its amendments were unacceptable to the sponsors, his delegation would be unable to accept sub-paragraph (b) of the text. He requested that that fact be reflected in the Committee's report, which should also include the additional sub-paragraph suggested by his delegation.

29. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, on the understanding that members' criticisms of, and comments on, the text would be reflected in the summary records and in the Committee's report, the Committee should adopt the text contained in document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.3/Rev.2 as a paragraph for inclusion in its report.

*It was so decided.*

## 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 to 3, 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.5/1322, A/C.5/L.1041)**

### *General discussion (continued) \**

30. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that at the 1379th meeting the representative of Israel, speaking in exercise of her right of reply on the question of the United Nations Economic and Social Office in Beirut, had said that the Beirut Office served only a limited number of States and excluded others, including Israel. His Government was prepared to co-operate in the promotion of regional development and in the establishment of a regional economic commission in which all States of the area would be represented.

31. Commenting on the willingness of Israel to co-operate economically with the States of the region, he said that there were three settler States—two in Africa and one in west Asia—of which two unfortunately were Members of the Organization. But Israel alone had forcibly dispossessed and subjugated the indigenous people of Palestine. Though the settler States were physically and geographically part of Asia and Africa, their societies were alien to the indigenous people of the two continents and did not share their culture, moral values, hopes or aspirations. On the contrary, the structure of the settler States was based principally on racial supremacy and religious prejudice. Similarly, in keeping with Zionist exclusiveness, Israel practised racial discrimination and religious prejudice. Its basic aim of establishing a State as Jewish as England was English nullified its declared intention of co-operating with other States in the area and rendered its acceptance by the States of the region unthinkable.

Although Israel was geographically a part of the Middle East, it was a completely alien enclave in the heart of the Arab world which drew its main support from international Zionism. Mr. David Ben-Gurion, the architect of the State of Israel, fully endorsed those views in his book, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*. In the circumstances, Israel was never regarded as an Asian State and was barred from any meetings, formal or informal of Asian countries. Its position was identical with that of South Africa: because of its policy of racial supremacy, it would never be permitted to participate in any regional economic co-operation.

32. Mrs. HERLITZ (Israel) said that her country was a fully recognized Member of the United Nations. The Jewish and Arab citizens of her country had strong ties with the region to which they belonged and took pride in its civilization. That must surely be reflected in contributions to the economic and social development of the region.

***Electronic data processing in the United Nations family of organizations (A/8008 and Add.2, A/8072, A/C.5/1305)***

33. The CHAIRMAN read out the text of a decision taken by the Economic and Social Council at its 1725th meeting, on 6 November 1970, on electronic data processing in the United Nations family of organizations.<sup>1</sup>

34. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had for a number of years concerned itself with the question of how to rationalize the disparate electronic data processing activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the interest of both efficiency and economy. It had therefore followed with interest the developments arising from the recommendation of the Auditor-General of Canada (see A/8072) concerning the establishment of a central inter-organization computer facility in Europe.

35. The Secretary-General's proposals, as set forth in his report on the subject (A/C.5/1305), were that the United Nations participate with UNDP and WHO in such a central facility, to be located in Geneva, and that, jointly with other agencies, it participate in an Inter-Organization Board for information systems and related activities, which would be concerned with such matters as uniformity of terminology, definitions and classifications. While the United Nations would continue to operate a computer in New York, the bulk of the work would be done in Geneva, and part of the data-processing and statistical staff of the United Nations would be outposted to that city.

36. The Advisory Committee recognized that the proposals were not ideal; it considered, however, that they had merit and commended them to the General Assembly. Should the proposals be implemented, the net additional charge to the United Nations budget for 1971 would amount to \$103,400—as the Advisory

Committee had stated in its third report (A/8008/Add.2, para. 35) after taking into account \$213,400 in non-recurring expenses. Thus, the actual operating costs in 1971 would be less than the amounts already provided for in the initial estimates for data-processing and related activities in that year. The Advisory Committee had indicated (*ibid.*, para. 41) the adjustments required in the budget estimates for 1971 should the General Assembly authorize the Secretary-General to go ahead with his proposals.

37. In conclusion, he drew attention to the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraphs 38 and 42 of its third report on the implications of the proposals for the other organizations, particularly those based in Geneva.

38. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee (*ibid.*, para. 28) that there were still a number of uncertainties inherent in the proposals.

39. Referring to the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1305), he asked how the percentages mentioned in paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 had been calculated. It would be interesting to know, too, which other agencies would bear the 10 per cent of operational costs referred to in paragraph 9. It would have been useful if the Secretary-General had supplied more precise information concerning the nature of the permanent equipment to be installed and had justified the travel for which appropriations had been made.

40. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the calculations in paragraph 9 were largely empirical and represented the share of operational costs which would seem to be appropriate for each organization. It was difficult to say precisely which other agencies would bear the 10 per cent of operational costs. A number of agencies had indicated that they would expect to use the Centre and, on the basis of that information, the Secretariat had estimated that their share of total costs would amount to 10 per cent. For instance, WMO was already using the equipment available in WHO. The percentages mentioned in paragraph 10 related to installation costs. The intention was that the Centre should be located on the premises of WHO. Since the expenses involved in establishing the Centre would result in some improvement to its building, WHO had agreed to bear the higher share of expenses relating to the installation. The percentage mentioned in paragraph 11 had been worked out in accordance with the usual Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions (CCAQ) costs-sharing formula. Whereas not all members of the United Nations family would participate, initially, in the Centre it was hoped that they would all be represented on the Inter-Organization Board, which would be concerned with uniformity of terminology, definitions and classifications, and under the auspices of which research work would be carried out. The travel costs to which the Tanzanian representative had referred would be incurred by officials of the Board who would have to visit actual computer installations in agencies outside Geneva in order to co-ordinate work in the Board.

<sup>1</sup> Text subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.4.

41. Mr. VAN VLOTEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation attached importance to the establishment of the International Computing Centre and therefore endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendations. The General Assembly should pay particular attention to the suggestion in paragraph 38 of the Advisory Committee's third report that all agencies in the United Nations system should be invited to consider seriously the possibility of becoming partners in the Centre. That suggestion had been reflected in the Economic and Social Council decision which the Chairman had read out and which should be circulated as a Committee document.

42. Mr. TAITT (Barbados), referring to paragraph 28 of the Advisory Committee's third report, asked what were the objections of other organizations to the Centre.

43. Normally, travel costs involved in establishing computer facilities were borne by the firm providing the equipment. Would that be so in the case of the International Computing Centre?

44. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, like the representative of Barbados, he would welcome some explanation of why more specialized agencies had not agreed to participate in the establishment of the Centre. Ideally, the project should command wide support, not merely the backing of three organizations.

45. He asked whether the CCAQ formula referred to in paragraph 11 of the Secretary-General's report took into account the fact that UNDP functioned not in Geneva but in New York; that should entitle it to favourable consideration in the sharing of costs. The administrative costs of UNDP were mounting sharply, and he recalled that at the last session of the Governing Council, in June 1970, members had expressed concern at the increasing use for administrative purposes of funds which might more appropriately be applied to field projects.

46. Referring to paragraph 27 of the Advisory Committee's third report, he asked what was understood by the expression "reasonable bounds". It was possible that further agencies would subscribe to the computer project and that its establishment would grow, and he wondered whether the Advisory Committee had some firm idea as to how the costs of the proposed facility might be controlled.

47. Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) asked whether the siting of the computer facilities in Geneva would affect the work of various United Nations bodies which normally met in New York. The Committee on Contributions, for instance, might have to change the venue of its meetings to Geneva.

48. Mr. ASHWIN (Australia) requested clarification on the relationship between the Inter-Organization Board and the Centre. In paragraph 6 (i) of the ACC's special report on computers,<sup>2</sup> it was said that the Board

would have direct responsibility for establishing the Centre's programme of work. He wondered whether that meant programme of work in a general sense, rather than a specialized computer programme. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee in paragraph 28 of its report said that there were a number of questions regarding the management and control of the proposed Board and its relationship with the Centre which had yet to be clarified.

49. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines), referring to the contingency item in paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's report, which, it was said, would enable the Centre to undertake additional special work for all agencies and institutions, including Member Governments, upon request, asked what kind of assistance could be given and how much Member Governments would be expected to pay for using the services of the Centre.

50. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no difficulty in supporting the Advisory Committee's third report. However, he wished to emphasize that, in deciding on the staffing of the Computing Centre, due consideration should be given to the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

51. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), referring to the question put by the representative of Barbados concerning the delay on the part of many specialized agencies in participating in the Centre, said that it would be improper for him to anticipate the statements of intentions which they would shortly be making to the General Assembly. However, he believed that the hesitation of the specialized agencies was principally due to natural caution: they were waiting to see whether the proposed new computer facilities would prove cheaper than the methods they were using at present. There were signs of interest on the part of specialized agencies which had not yet decided on participation, notably the ILO, which expected to participate substantially in the project towards the end of 1971. With regard to the travel costs incurred by the personnel of firms installing the facilities, he confirmed that the firms would be responsible for meeting such expenses.

52. With regard to the points raised by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania concerning UNDP, he said that UNDP would pay an appropriate share of costs under the CCAQ formula, and that, since a large number of UNDP executing agencies were situated in Geneva, it would be of advantage to UNDP to do some of its work there.

53. With regard to the possibility raised by the representative of Mexico that various United Nations bodies which now met in New York might have to transfer their meetings to Geneva, he said that the IBM 360/40 computer in New York should be adequate to cope with the statistical work on contributions and similar matters.

54. Replying to the questions raised by the representative of Australia, he said that the Advisory Commit-

<sup>2</sup> Document E/4893 (mimeographed).



tee in paragraph 28 of its report made clear that there was still much thinking to be done on the relationship between the Inter-Organization Board and the Centre. The Secretary-General envisaged a close link between the two, with the Centre doing the practical computer work and the Board planning for the compatibility of informational systems and working towards ultimate standardization. The Secretary-General hoped that an administrator of proven ability might be found to act both as Director of the work programme resulting from the Board's decisions and as Director of the Centre. The programme of work mentioned in the relevant report of the ACC<sup>3</sup> was a programme aimed at introducing compatibility and standardization; it bore no relation to programmes connected to the actual operation of the computer, for which the Board would be responsible.

55. With regard to the question asked by the representative of the Philippines concerning the services which the Centre might provide for Member States, he said that such services were already being provided—for instance, in the field of international trade data—and that they would be expected to increase with the establishment of the Centre. It was difficult to say at the present stage what costs might be involved for Governments, as it was still uncertain how far the Centre could expand services of that kind.

56. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to the possible costs involved in the creation of a data-processing facility, said that technology was advancing at such a rate that it was difficult to say what might be the most economical computer arrangement in years to come. It was for that reason that the Advisory Committee had stressed the need to consider future developments in the light of technological progress. However, he was convinced that the proposals before the Committee were reasonable.

57. With regard to the reluctance of many specialized agencies to agree to immediate participation in the computer project, he expressed confidence that their hesitations were largely due to a natural conservatism. The current facilities were working to their satisfaction, whereas there was still some uncertainty about the proposed new system. Moreover, some agencies were afraid that, in a unified system where priorities would be decided by the Inter-Organization Board, their own immediate priorities might be regarded as less important. Finally, there were some misgivings that confidential information on being sent to a Centre beyond their immediate control, might become more widely known. All those factors should be borne in mind.

58. Mr. MORGAN (United Kingdom) recalled that the question of national access to computer facilities had recently aroused lively interest in the Statistical Commission. He wondered what arrangements the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had in mind for bringing the views expressed in that Committee to the attention of the Board.

59. Mr. KEENLEYSIDE (Canada) noted that the Advisory Committee's report envisaged that the United Nations share of start-up costs would amount to over \$200,000. He asked whether agencies which joined the Centre at a later stage would make a contribution towards those start-up costs, as was the normal practice in private industry.

60. Mr. STARK (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), replying to the United Kingdom question concerning national access to the computer facility, said that it was too early to say exactly what arrangements would be made. However, one of the reasons for setting up a combined facility in one place was to be able to make a vast amount of information freely available to Member States. With regard to the question of the apportionment of start-up costs, the intention was to amortize those costs over a period of approximately five years. Those who joined the Centre at a later stage would be charged a reasonable sum for use of the facilities, but in order not to discourage participation, no specific entry charge was expected to be required to cover the start-up period.

61. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan), supported by Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines), suggested that the Committee should postpone a decision on the question until its following meeting, when the summary records of the meetings of the Economic and Social Council, in which the matter had been discussed, and the text of the decision on electronic data processing taken at its 1725th meeting would be available.

*It was so agreed.*

## AGENDA ITEM 79

**Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*continued*) \* (A/7938, A/8031, A/8131)**

***Report of the Secretary-General on bodies and organs established for purposes of administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination (continued) \* (A/7938, A/8131)***

62. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that his delegation, as one of the co-sponsors of the proposal that, on the initiative of the delegation of Pakistan, had led to the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2537 B (XXIV), wished to express its appreciation for the report submitted by the Secretary-General (A/7938) in accordance with that resolution, as well as for the relevant comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8131).

63. The Secretary-General's report dealt objectively with the matter raised by the resolution, and the understanding of the Advisory Committee was that no action

<sup>3</sup> *Idem.*

\* Resumed from the 1377th meeting.

was required on its part as a consequence of the Secretary-General's report. However, it would be contrary to the intentions of that resolution if the Fifth Committee, as had been suggested, merely took note of the report. The sponsors of the resolution had been motivated by the desire to investigate duplication of activities and overlapping terms of reference in the United Nations organs responsible for administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination. Such duplication and overlapping was contrary to the purposes for which such organs had been established, namely the improvement of management practices and procedures and the more effective co-ordination of activities.

64. He suggested that an evaluation of the bodies concerned might well show that some streamlining should be made, that the terms of reference of some of those organs should be changed or made more precise, or even that some of them might be abolished or merged with others covering the same ground. The problem of who might undertake such a study was rendered more difficult by the fact that some of the organs that comprised the existing machinery were internal bodies of the Secretariat, while others were expert bodies assisting legislative organs and still others were intergovernmental organs. Such a study might be entrusted to the Advisory Committee or to an expert body similar to the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, if, as had been suggested by the United States delegation (1367th meeting), it was reactivated.

65. Rather than merely take note of the report, the Committee should commend it to the Secretariat, the Economic and Social Council, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Advisory Committee and the specialized agencies for use in their consideration of the question of administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination. The report might also be used in the review of the activities and terms of reference of the Joint Inspection Unit to be undertaken at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

66. If his ideas proved acceptable to other delegations, he suggested that they might be embodied in a paragraph in the Committee's report to the General Assembly, to be worded as follows:

"The Fifth Committee took note of the Secretary-General's report on bodies and organs established for purposes of administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination (A/7938), and of the comments of the Advisory Committee thereon (A/8131). The Fifth Committee was of the opinion that these reports could be used by the competent organs of the United Nations system in their consideration of matters related to administrative and budgetary control, investigation and co-ordination, particularly with a view to the avoidance of duplication and to the efficient and economical use of resources. The Fifth Committee therefore requests the Secretary-General, the Economic and Social

Council, the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Joint Inspection Unit to take into account the aforementioned reports when appropriate. It also requests the Secretary-General to transmit the reports to the specialized agencies and the IAEA for the same purpose."<sup>4</sup>

67. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) expressed his delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report; the main purpose of requesting that report had been to assemble in a single document all available data on organs concerned with control and investigation so that the Committee could decide whether the terms of reference of the various investigatory and co-ordinating bodies were sufficiently clear to avoid any overlapping or duplication, and whether the benefits were commensurate with the expenditure incurred by maintaining such bodies. It was difficult to assess whether that expenditure, which amounted to some \$7 million each year, was worthwhile and whether, in the absence of those co-ordinating and investigatory bodies, a corresponding amount would have been available for other uses. Nevertheless, answers to those questions must be found, and the information contained in the Secretary-General's report represented the first step towards a solution; on the basis of that information, the Committee could perhaps give more thought to the matter and revert to it in due course, not necessarily at the current session.

68. The review of the activities of the Joint Inspection Unit to be undertaken at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly might be an appropriate occasion for a similar review of the activities of all investigatory bodies. In that connexion, he referred to the decision taken by the Fifth Committee at its twenty-fourth session<sup>5</sup> that co-ordination between investigatory and administrative organs such as the Advisory Committee, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Board of Auditors and others should be strengthened with a view to avoiding duplication, and that that co-ordination should be brought about through mutual consultations in which the Advisory Committee could play a central role. Since a central role was envisaged for the Advisory Committee in that regard, the Fifth Committee could perhaps request it to undertake a study of the terms of reference of all investigatory and co-ordinating units so that duplication of activities could be identified and remedial measures taken as appropriate. That would not imply any recognition that the Advisory Committee occupied a higher position than other co-ordinating bodies.

69. His delegation agreed that the Committee should take note of the Secretary-General's report. He suggested that it might be circulated to all the bodies mentioned by the representative of Brazil in the text he had just suggested.

<sup>4</sup> See footnote 6 below.

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 81, document A/7849, para. 21.

70. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Brazil for a study of the various United Nations co-ordinating and investigatory bodies. He also supported the insertion of the text suggested by the Brazilian representative in the Committee's report; the Secretary-General's report contained important information which should not be condemned to oblivion.

71. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation's position was similar to that of Brazil and that he would be prepared to co-sponsor a paragraph in the Fifth Committee's report on that item. The Secretary-General's report should be consulted by intergovernmental bodies which might be contemplating the establishment of new investigatory organs to ensure that the proposed functions of such organs might not be entrusted to one of the bodies mentioned in the Secretary-General's report.

72. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) said that although the Secretary-General's report complied strictly with the terms of General Assembly resolution 2537 B (XXIV), he, as one of the co-sponsors of that resolution, was

surprised that it had been interpreted so literally. No attempt had been made to point out areas in which duplication might occur.

73. He was in basic agreement with the suggestions made by the representative of Brazil regarding the action which the Committee might take on the Secretary-General's report. He felt some misgivings about the Pakistani suggestion that the Advisory Committee might be requested to undertake a study of the terms of reference of the various investigatory and co-ordinating units, since the Advisory Committee itself was too closely involved. He would prefer to have that task carried out by the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts, provided it could be reactivated.

74. The CHAIRMAN announced that the text suggested by the representative of Brazil would be circulated as a Conference Room Paper.<sup>6</sup>

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*

<sup>6</sup> Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.5.