

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**FORTIETH SESSION**

**Official Records\***



FIFTH COMMITTEE  
38th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 18 November 1985  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative  
and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

**CONTENTS**

AGENDA ITEM 124: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 125: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD (continued)

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

First reading (continued)

Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

Section 25. International Court of Justice

Section 26. Legal activities

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC 2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/40/SR.38  
27 November 1985  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH  
/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 124: UNITED NATIONS COMMON SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued) (A/40/30, A/40/653 and Add.1; A/C.5/40/26, 41, 44, A/C.5/40/45 and Corr.1)

1. Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said that, based on a comparison of the net remuneration of United Nations officials and employees of the United States Federal civil service and on the evolution of the margin over the years, the International Civil Service Commission had recommended that the range for the margin should be between 110 and 120, with the mid-point, 115, as the desirable level. An issue that might need to be addressed in that connection was whether a comparison of total remuneration was not more appropriate than net remuneration alone. However, as matters stood, realism demanded that the Fifth Committee should approve the recommendation provisionally, subject to further review of the matter by ICSC. It would then be possible to settle other directly linked matters, such as post adjustment, and a scale would be provided for measuring the application of the Noblemaire principle. It should be noted, moreover, that the desirable range suggested by the ICSC was not excessive since it was well below the upper limit reached by the margin. If the Fifth Committee did not approve the recommendation, it should refer it back to the ICSC with its observations.

2. Progress on the issue of the recruitment of women was still limited, despite the many resolutions adopted by the General Assembly. His delegation therefore welcomed the set of measures proposed by ICSC in paragraphs 245 to 247 of its report, aimed at enhancing the number of women in the various organizations, particularly at senior levels.

3. It was regrettable that the Commission's work and its conclusions should have been called into question in some quarters. Under its Statute, ICSC was charged with developing a single unified international civil service through the application of common standards, methodology and arrangements. Formulating a second opinion or separate opinion in that connection was tantamount to challenging the Commission's authority and trespassing on its prerogatives. In that connection, his delegation found it very disturbing that the Joint Inspection Unit should have submitted a report (A/40/653) on the Commission's decisions directly to the General Assembly without first referring it to ICSC. In so doing, it had clearly exceeded its mandate since, as ACC recalled in paragraph 4 of document A/39/522/Add.1, its role was to consider the implementation of policies established on the basis of ICSC recommendations rather than the substance of those policies. The plurality of views sought by the Joint Inspection Unit existed within ICSC, which was composed of experts acting in their individual capacity. It was imperative, therefore, that the two bodies should remain within their respective spheres of competence, as one of the General Assembly's objectives was to avoid duplication of effort.

4. Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, despite the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its previous session, which had been a warning to it, ICSC, as its most recent report illustrated, had continued to

(Mr. Shustov, USSR)

ignore the opinion and the interests of Member States. His delegation could therefore not agree to any of the major recommendations contained in the report.

5. The range proposed for the margin (between 10 and 20 per cent) was too high: until 1984 the margin had never been more than 18 per cent. Furthermore, the methodology recommended by ICSC for calculating the margin, based on average remuneration in each class of post, would not prevent a further widening and would tilt the comparison still more in favour of the international civil service, although, according to the figures provided by United States experts, the salaries of United Nations personnel were more than 30 per cent higher than those of United States civil servants.

6. Nor could his delegation agree with the recommendations concerning post adjustment. It believed that the General Assembly itself should regulate the salary level in the base city, New York, on the basis of the Noblemaire principle, and that the post adjustment mechanism should be applied only to duty stations other than New York to make up for differences in purchasing power. Moreover, contrary to the specific request of the General Assembly, ICSC had not taken the duration of annual leave into account in comparing total remuneration and had refused to revise downward the scale of pensionable remuneration, the effect of which was to keep international civil servants pensions at an unjustifiable level.

7. It was clear that in its 10 years of existence, ICSC had progressively turned away from its role as a neutral body to become an instrument for continuous increases in the remuneration of United Nations personnel. Therefore, while taking note of the Secretary-General's appeal for a period of calm in the question of international civil service remuneration, his delegation believed that the time had come to consider the future role of ICSC. It believed that, as matters stood, the only solution would be to appoint a special committee of governmental experts to help the General Assembly throw complete light on the question of the remuneration of international civil servants and to formulate guidelines which could bring the activities of ICSC back into line.

AGENDA ITEM 125: UNITED NATIONS PENSION SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS JOINT STAFF PENSION BOARD (continued) (A/40/9 and 848; A/C.5/40/24 and 41)

8. Mr. GREGG (Australia) wished to express his delegation's concern over the unacceptably high level of the pensions paid to United Nations officials, which were more than 50 per cent higher than United States civil service pensions for employees of similar rank. Furthermore, it could not agree with the views expressed in paragraphs 25 and 26 of the ICSC report regarding the inclusion of an expatriation factor in pensionable remuneration.

9. It was imperative for the Fifth Committee to agree at the current session on a clear set of instructions to the Joint Staff Pension Board and ICSC based on the following principles: the benefit margin between the United Nations and the United States Federal civil service should be gradually reduced to zero; the two-track system should be abolished; and a ceiling should be imposed at a level similar to

(Mr. Gregg, Australia)

that prevailing in the United States civil service. His delegation's position on the increase in rates of contribution would be determined by the decisions taken on the pension question.

AGENDA ITEMS 116 AND 117: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 AND PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/40/3, 6, 7, A/40/38 and Add.1, A/40/262; A/C.5/40/3 and Add.1 and A/40/7/Add.3; A/C.5/40/11 and A/40/7/Add.4)

First reading (continued)

#### Section 24. Regular programme of technical co-operation

10. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to comment on the recommendation contained in paragraph 679 of the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (A/40/38) and on section 24 as a whole.

11. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the importance which his country attached to co-operation with developing countries. Its economic aid to those countries had risen to 9 billion roubles in 1983, which was equivalent to 1.2 per cent of the national income; in 1984, it had been equivalent to 1.4 per cent of the national income. The co-operation was intended to encourage the economic independence of young States, particularly by strengthening the public and co-operative sector. Another important aspect was the training of national staff: 1.6 million specialists and skilled workers had been trained with the assistance of the USSR and within the framework of the specialized agencies, and 11,000 students had been given grants to study in the USSR in the past 20 years. The Soviet Union was thus contributing actively, in the context of technical co-operation, to the establishment of the new international economic order.

12. Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation considered that the programme should be financed completely from voluntary contributions, and could not accept the inclusion of appropriations under the regular budget. He asked for section 24 of the budget to be put to the vote and stated that his delegation would vote against the requested appropriations.

13. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation contained in paragraph 679 of the report of CPC.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast,

Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Mongolia.

14. The recommendation contained in paragraph 679 of the report of CPC was adopted by 94 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

15. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia) stated that, owing to an error, his delegation had in fact abstained when it had intended to vote in favour of the recommendation.

16. Mr. LADJOUI (Algeria) asked why one delegation had requested a vote on a recommendation of CPC. He would like to know whether there was an established procedure for that case and whether a recommendation which had already been adopted by consensus could be challenged in the Fifth Committee.

17. Mr. CABRIC (Chairman of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination) said that he shared the previous speaker's surprise. The lines of authority between the Fifth Committee and CPC raised an interesting legal problem, but it could also be tackled from a logical point of view: what was the value of the consensus reached in CPC if it was to be challenged afterwards in the Committee?

18. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he did not wish to enter into the political reasons which might have prompted the request for a vote. The Advisory Committee, for example never voted on its recommendations; all its recommendations were adopted by the Fifth Committee by voting or without a vote. The Committee on Conferences provided a recent example. That Committee took its decisions to the fortieth session by consensus, but the Fifth Committee had recently taken separate votes on specific parts of the draft resolution recommended by the Committee on Conferences. The reason for that might be that between sessions of intergovernmental bodies delegations received new instructions from their Governments.

19. In any event, the Fifth Committee was master of its own procedure. It could decide to adopt the recommendations of CPC as they stood without a vote. But it should not be forgotten that any Member State was entitled to request a vote at any time.



20. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) expressed concern that Member States might confuse their duties as legislators in some organs of the General Assembly with their executive responsibilities in others. That was a good theoretical issue for debate and might at some point be entrusted to the competent legal services of the Secretariat for study.

21. ACABQ was a consultative body, whose recommendations could be adopted or rejected, but CPC was a governmental body. When all its members were in agreement, none of them should question their common decision; however, there was some doubt, as the representative of Algeria had said, about the value of the adherence of the Member State in question to the consensus, especially since it had subsequently voted against the decision.

22. Mr. TAKASU (Japan) noted that section 24, subsection C, concerning industrial development, referred exclusively to UNIDO. Since UNIDO was to become a specialized agency, he would like to know what would happen to the appropriations requested under that component.

23. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the appropriations, amounting to \$6,473,700, estimated for industrial development would be transferred to UNIDO in their entirety and would be deducted from the final 1986-1987 programme budget. Naturally, they would appear in the budget of UNIDO. The Fifth Committee would be informed of developments in a summarized statement soon to be submitted.

24. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on section 24 as a whole.

25. At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Netherlands, Portugal, Ukrainian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United  
States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Spain.

26. The recommendation of ACABQ for the inclusion of an appropriation of \$36,637,000 under section 24 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 82 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.

27. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) and Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) said that their delegations had voted against the estimates because, in their opinion, operational activities and technical assistance should be financed from voluntary contributions and should not come under the regular budget of the Organization.

28. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, which did not, however, mean that it approved of the steady growth in the Organization's budget.

#### Section 25. International Court of Justice

29. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the estimates for the International Court of Justice had been submitted in two parts. First, a request for an amount of \$8,503,500 had been included by the Secretary-General in his initial proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987; and secondly, the Secretary-General had submitted revised estimates in the amount of \$793,200 in document A/C.5/40/3/Add.1. The Advisory Committee regretted such a practice and hoped that it would be discontinued in the future. It saw no reason why all the requests could not have been made at the same time.

30. The Advisory Committee had considered at length the revised estimates submitted by the Secretary-General and had decided to recommend a number of reductions which would reduce the revised estimate to \$435,900. The Committee's reasons for recommending the reductions were set out in the relevant report (A/40/7/Add.3).

31. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) asked for an explanation of the estimated ICJ travelling expenses. \$20,100 had been requested for travel by members of the Court and \$42,600 for its staff. No detailed information had been given about the missions or activities which would make that travel necessary.

32. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) noted that consultations between the Secretary-General and the International Court of Justice had delayed the submission of the draft budget of the Court. It would be useful to take steps to ensure that ICJ estimates were submitted at the same time as other estimates in the future.

33. The growth rate of the resources requested for the section under consideration amounted to more than 17 per cent, which was at least four times higher than that

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

of any other section. Even with a subsequent reduction, the percentage was excessive. The Court would also have to display some financial realism. It was true that its activities had escalated, particularly at the level of translation, interpretation and documentation, but it was proposed, for the second successive biennium, to increase its resources by a figure far higher than the budget average. It was to be hoped that the increased resources would enable the Court to function properly and that it would perhaps consider reductions in its expenditure, for instance in activities which used the language services.

34. Mrs. SHEAROUSE (United States of America) strongly opposed the procedure used for the submission of estimates for the International Court of Justice. The procedure had, in her opinion, made it impossible to give the issue due consideration.

35. The Court did not seem to be displaying any restraint: it requested the establishment of 10 posts, an increase in its temporary staff and a level of growth rate for the programme of almost 18 per cent. Her country found the estimates completely unacceptable and would vote against them.

36. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), said that he took note of the observations made by the delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States.

37. Concerning the question of the representative of Morocco, he explained that the required appropriation for travel expenses comprised \$20,100 for journeys to be made by the President of the Court to meet the Secretary-General and to visit New York to consult the legal services as the need arose, and \$42,600 for the travel of staff members. That represented a total of \$62,700 requested under that heading.

38. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) felt that the International Court of Justice should not be reproached for the delays in the submission of its proposed budget, since it appeared that the United Nations Secretariat was not entirely blameless in that regard. The Court carried out an essential role and, if its full authority was to be preserved, the Secretariat would have to adapt to its requirements.

39. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on section 25 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee (\$8,939,400 for the biennium 1986-1987). It also had to approve, under the revised estimates, an appropriation of \$98,400 under section 31 (Staff assessment) to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

40. At the request of the United States, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican



Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

41. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$8,939,400 under section 25 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading by 107 votes to 1.

42. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that, although he had voted in favour of the requested appropriation, he was nevertheless concerned about the excessive rate of increase in the budget of the International Court of Justice as compared with other budget sections. The Court clearly must have the resources needed to carry out its task, but it should give thought sooner or later to controlling the growth of its expenditures and to improving its productivity, even if that meant modifying its working methods.

43. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) fully endorsed the comments of the French delegation.

44. Mr. LADJOUZI (Algeria) said that he had been in favour of the appropriations requested to support the International Court of Justice in its work. He certainly did not share the negative opinions expressed with regard to the budgetary procedures followed by the Court. In his view, it was not to blame for the shortcomings attributed to it.

45. Mr. HOLBORN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he was not entirely satisfied with the procedure used for submitting the revised estimates and the delay in preparing the Court's proposed budget. He hoped that, in future, appropriations requested in that regard would be submitted at the same time as the others.

46. Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) and Ms. HILLYER (New Zealand) said that, if their delegations had been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

Section 26. Legal activities

47. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was recommending approval of an appropriation of \$16,358,000 under section 26, or \$269,300 less than the amount of \$16,627,300 requested by the Secretary-General (A/40/7, para. 26.14). The reduction reflected the Committee's recommendation in paragraph 26.5 of its report that a 20 per cent discount factor should be applied to the estimate relating to the sessions of the International Law Commission to take account of the non-attendance or the partial attendance by representatives at sessions of the Commission and the recommendation in paragraph 26.6 that the estimate for external printing and binding for the International Law Commission for 1986-1987 should be reduced by \$62,600.

48. The CHAIRMAN explained that the recommendations of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination relating to section 16 could be found in paragraphs 680 to 682 of its report (A/40/38, chap. IX).

49. Mr. YAKOVENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that CPC had shown very little initiative in attempting to eliminate overlapping and terminate obsolete or ineffective activities under section 26. Examples of duplication could be noted in that section, however, particularly in the case of subprogramme 2.2 entitled "Yearbook of the International Law Commission" (A/40/6, para. 26.5).

50. The summary records of the Commission's meetings were issued first in the form of mimeographed documents reserved for members of the Commission. Later, they were reprinted as the first volume of the Yearbook, which was issued, inter alia, to Member States. Since those summary records were consulted only by specialists, his delegation wondered whether it would not be sufficient as a general rule, to issue them in mimeographed form. The same applied to the Commission's report, which appeared first in mimeographed form and then, a year and a half later, in the second volume of the Yearbook. In view of the high cost of that procedure and the limited use made of the documents of the International Law Commission, his delegation, mindful of the need to contain excessive growth in expenditures, would vote against the appropriations requested under section 26, if they were put to a vote.

51. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that, apart from the United Nations programme of technical co-operation, the section under discussion was of the greatest importance for the developing countries given their interest in the establishment of a just legal order. Considering the low rate of real growth estimated under section 26 and the valuable work of the organs whose expenditures were covered in that section, his delegation would vote in favour of the appropriations requested for legal activities. It hoped that the Committee would approve them by consensus.

52. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) pointed out that, at the thirty-ninth session, the consideration of a document relating to the improvement of the methods of operation and work of the Administrative Tribunal had been deferred because it had not been possible to determine whether it should be studied by the Fifth Committee or the

(Mr. Orsatelli, France)

Sixth Committee. In that regard, his delegation wished to know whether that document appeared during the current session on the agenda of one of those two committees and, if so, whether it would have implications in respect of the estimated appropriation for the Administrative Tribunal. It seemed to him that the rationalization of the Tribunal's methods of work would make it possible to reallocate resources to other legal activities.

53. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom), referring to paragraph 26.13 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/40/7), felt that the progress report on the publication of the Treaty Series should have been submitted before the Fifth Committee discussed the appropriation requested under section 26. Nevertheless, his delegation was satisfied with the comments of the Secretariat on that matter.

54. Regarding paragraph 26.10 of that report, his delegation, like ACABQ, deplored the fact that, contrary to rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Fifth Committee had not been consulted at the time when the Assembly had approved, by its resolution 39/86, the holding of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations, or between International Organizations, at a cost that would amount to nearly \$3 million. Accordingly, it fully endorsed the comments made on that subject by the Advisory Committee.

55. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), responding to the representative of France, said that the report on the methods of work of the Administrative Tribunal would not be issued until January. He did not yet know whether the conclusions of the report would have any implications for the allocation of appropriations. However, if they offered any opportunity to rationalize methods of work and, consequently, expenditure, the Secretariat would not fail to implement them to the benefit of the Organization.

56. He noted the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning the non-application, at the thirty-ninth session, of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Recalling that the Secretariat was bound to submit biennial reports on progress made in the publication of the Treaty Series, he agreed that the report would have been of more use to the Committee had it been available during the consideration of section 26. However, he assured the Committee that the conclusions of the report would entail no financial implications.

57. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) noted that in paragraph 26.6 of the draft programme budget, the Secretary-General had provided for negative growth of \$39,300 in resources for the travel of representatives. The Advisory Committee had explained the reduction (A/40/7, para. 26.5) by lower air fares and the strength of the dollar. Further, table 26.10 of the programme budget indicated a revaluation of \$20,900 in the 1984-1985 resource base. His delegation thus wondered how the changes in appropriations since the previous biennium were distributed between negative growth and recosting of the resource base. Further, since the difference of \$39,300 related to a programme of activity which was identical to that in the

(Mr. Miller, United States)

previous biennium, it seemed to his delegation that it must have been included in the recosting of the resource base rather than having been considered as a reduction in resources. The same was true of the reduction in resources of \$12,200 referred to in paragraph 26.7 of the budget, and for that of \$178,100 referred to in paragraph 26.39.

58. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the recosting of the resource base had involved recalculating the 1984 portion of the revised appropriations and part of the appropriations for 1985 at the prices and rates obtaining in the base year (1985), all other fluctuations in the resources requested by comparison with 1984-1985 being considered as either growth or negative growth.

59. Mr. SCHLAFF (Director, Programme Planning and Evaluation Branch, Office for Programme Planning and Co-ordination) said that the introduction at the United Nation of word-processing equipment had made it possible to develop a more economical system of composition, and thus to reduce printing costs. That was why the saving of \$178,100 was referred to as negative growth and not as a recosting of the resource base at current prices and rates.

60. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the explanations given by the Director of the Budget Division of the recosting of the resource base seemed to confirm his impression that there was a contradiction between the categorization of the fluctuation of \$39,300 as negative resource growth and the fact that the saving had been due to events in 1984-1985, such as lower air fares and the strength of the dollar. He did not understand why the 1984-1985 resource base had been recosted, since costs had decreased, nor why there had been a provision for a reduction in resources in 1986-1987, since, in view of the forecast decline in the dollar, costs would increase.

61. In view of the foregoing, his delegation had little confidence in the method of calculating real rates of growth and thought that the calculations should be reworked before a final decision was taken. If, in several sections of the budget, the Secretariat had wrongly taken a decrease in the resource base to be an increase, and an increase to be a reduction in resources, a very different rate of growth would doubtless have been obtained on the converse hypothesis.

62. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that monetary fluctuations were only one factor in increased costs. Other elements came into play, on which the United States delegation would receive all the explanations it wished.

63. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to comments made by the representative of the United States, said that any change in expenditure resulting from currency fluctuations should, as a general rule, be reflected in the column headed "revaluation of resource base" and not in the column headed "resource growth". The saving in respect of travel referred to in paragraph 26.5 of the Advisory Committee's report was in fact the result of the strength of the dollar and not a result of a decrease in the number of journeys. Had the latter been the case, it would have been necessary to show the decrease under the "resource growth" column.

(Mr. Mselle)

64. Although the Advisory Committee had noted similar discrepancies in other parts of the budget, it did not believe that the problem was sufficiently serious to call into question the overall growth rate calculated by the Secretariat. It was sometimes hard to determine, when calculating the various components of expenditure, whether a given amount should be placed in the "resource growth" column (whether as an increase or decrease) or in the "revaluation" column. Consequently, programme managers could hardly be blamed for opting, in cases of doubt, for the solution which put their expenditures in the best possible light.

65. In any event, the Advisory Committee would review the method of classifying changes in requirements when it considered the future format of the programme budget. In that connection, it would indicate how the existing method could be improved in order to take into account difficulties such as the one referred to by the representative of the United States.

66. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the recommendation contained in paragraph 682 of the report of CPC.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

67. The recommendation contained in paragraph 682 of the report of CPC was adopted by 105 votes to 1.



68. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the recommendations contained in paragraph 682 of the CPC report since it was opposed to the assumption by the United Nations of travel costs and subsistence allowances for representatives of national liberation movements.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt without a vote the recommendations contained in paragraphs 680 and 681 of the CPC report without a vote.

70. It was so decided.

71. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 26.20 of the draft programme budget.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Germany, Federal Republic of, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Netherlands.

72. Paragraph 26.20 of the draft programme budget was adopted by 100 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

73. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on section 26 as a whole.

74. The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$16,358,000 under section 26 for the biennium 1986-1987 was approved in first reading without a vote.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.