



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 65th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TOMMO MONTHÉ (Cameroon)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

First reading of individual sections of the budget (continued)

Section 2A: Department of Political and Security Council Affairs  
(continued)

Conditions of service and compensation for officials, other than  
Secretariat officials, serving the General Assembly (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.92  
concerning agenda item 84 (c)

Programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125  
concerning agenda item 86

Emoluments, pension scheme and conditions of service for the members  
of the International Court of Justice (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.87  
concerning agenda item 73 (continued)

Revised estimates under section 31 (Staff assessment) and income  
section 1 (Income from staff assessment) (continued)

/...

\*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.

CONTENTS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 115: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Standards of accommodation for air travel (continued)

Use of experts, consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups

Consolidated statement of programme budget implications in respect of conference-servicing costs

AGENDA ITEM 119: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (continued)

(b) IMPACT OF INFLATION AND MONETARY INSTABILITY ON THE REGULAR BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 8.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 116: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1986-1987 (continued)

First reading of individual sections of the budget (continued)

Section 2A: Department of Political and Security Council Affairs (continued)  
(A/C.5/40/CRP.3)

1. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) emphasized the need for the News Service of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs to broaden the sources of its information, particularly by drawing on more sources in the developing world. There was also a need for at least a minimum level of editorial integrity and objectivity, for guidelines concerning the work of the Service, and for as full as possible a reflection of geographical balance in its staff. His delegation hoped that the final evaluation report on the service would reflect the views not only of the information's end-users, but also of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) and members of the Fifth Committee.
2. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that those views of the Committee would be taken into account in the final version of the evaluation by the Administrative Management Service, which had been begun on the initiative of the Secretariat.
3. Responding to comments made at the Committee's 62nd meeting, he said that where the mandate of the Service was concerned, there was no General Assembly resolution on the subject, but the Secretary-General, as Chief Administrative Officer, enjoyed a certain flexibility in determining how best to fulfil the functions assigned to him. To expand the staff of the Service, one D-1 post had been redeployed from the Office of the Under-Secretary-General, one P-4 post and one General Service post from the Security Council Division and two P-2 posts and one General Service post from the Centre against Apartheid. The geographical distribution of professional staff was a D-1 from Pakistan, P-4s from Hungary and Czechoslovakia and P-2s from the Federal Republic of Germany, Trinidad and Tobago and the United States of America. Where readership was concerned, copies of the daily bulletins and daily press reviews were sent to 75 people, and of the weekly summaries to about 175; total readership was from 175 to 200. The only additional cost to those shown in the preliminary report was \$11,000 a year for paper supplies.
4. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) welcomed the fact that the readership was larger than paragraph 10 of the preliminary report might suggest. While the cost per copy was thus somewhat less than he had expected, the overall cost of the operation remained high, at some \$1,600 or \$1,700 a day.
5. More important than cost was the question of the Service's mandate. Although the Secretary-General must of course enjoy flexibility in fulfilling the duties assigned to him, in the present instance Member States had already expressed their views on the matter. The understanding reached by CPC at its twenty-fourth session

(Mr. Murray, United Kingdom)

had been that a proposal to amend the plans for the Service would be withdrawn and that the staff of the Service would not increase. However, an increase from 7 to 13 staff had now taken place. His delegation remained unconvinced for the need for that increase, particularly in advance of the completion of the evaluation study, and accordingly proposed that the Committee should adopt a decision reading "The Fifth Committee decides that staffing resources allocated to the News Service in the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs should revert to the original level of seven, namely three Professional and four General Service staff, pending consideration by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the General Assembly at its forty-first session of the evaluation study now under way."

6. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago) said that for the Secretary-General to discharge effectively his role in the maintenance of international peace and security, he must have access to balanced information. The News Service was the vehicle for providing him with such information, and had the potential to become a substantial instrument of peace. The Committee should not, in haste, decide on negative steps before the evaluation report had been considered. Accordingly, his delegation proposed that the Committee should approve a decision reading "The General Assembly decides to maintain the personal resources of the News Service in the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs pending consideration by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the General Assembly of the report by the Secretary-General on the evaluation of the News Service."

7. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that his delegation, while welcoming the clarifications by the Secretariat, still had doubts regarding the advisability of the proposed course of action. The Secretary-General, while he must enjoy flexibility, was also responsible for optimum resource allocation and for applying the priorities determined by Member States; in that context, it was particularly disturbing that half the staff redeployed were from the Centre against Apartheid. Accordingly, his delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal.

8. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America), noting that paragraph 28D.52 of the budget referred inter alia to funds for the maintenance of eight teleprinters for the News Service, asked the cost of those teleprinters.

9. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that in his delegation's view, no further discussion was required, and the Committee should move to a decision.

10. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) endorsed that view, and proposed that the Committee should adopt a decision reading "Noting the interim report on the review of the News Service in the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs, and taking into account the views expressed during the debate on this subject by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Fifth Committee, the General Assembly requests the Secretary-General to ensure the editorial integrity, objectivity and a balanced reflection of developments relevant to the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as the operational efficiency of the News Service, by widening the information services to include more news sources, especially from developing countries, to the extent possible, and to provide guidelines for the operation of the Service".

11. Mr. RALLIS (Greece) asked how the flow of information to the Secretary-General would be affected by the maintenance or elimination of the additional posts in the Service.
12. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that the eight teleprinters had been purchased in 1984 at a cost of \$14,080, with installation costs of \$176. That was a one-time investment, and the only recurrent item apart from maintenance was the \$11,000 for paper supply which he had referred to. With regard to the question by the representative of Greece, he was not in a position to say more than that any rapid reduction in the level of staffing deemed necessary by the responsible programme manager might affect the quality of the services provided.
13. The views expressed by delegations regarding the staffing of the Service, priorities, the effective use of scarce resources, editorial objectivity and the need for diversity of information sources would all be taken into account in finalizing the study already begun by the Secretariat. The results of that study would be available within three or four months, and he did not feel it would be desirable to prejudge its outcome by deciding at the present stage to reduce the level of resources.
14. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) agreed that no further discussion was required. The News Service was an important "early warning system" which greatly facilitated the work of the Secretary-General and his staff in relation to the maintenance of international peace and security, and the Committee should accept the Secretary-General's proposals on the understanding that the Secretariat would take due account of the views expressed by delegations.
15. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) proposed that the words "for calendar year 1986" should be added to the proposal by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.
16. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that the efficiency of the News Service could not be enhanced by reducing its staff. Pending the consideration of the evaluation report, the Committee should take a decision based on the Secretary-General's proposals.
17. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee now had four proposals before it; unless consensus could be reached on one of those proposals, he would apply the provisions of rule 131 of the rules of procedure.
18. In the course of a procedural discussion in which Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan), Mrs. DEREGIBUS (Argentina), Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), and Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) took part, the CHAIRMAN recalled that at its twenty-eighth meeting, the Committee had approved the total amount under section 2A of the programme budget on the understanding, *inter alia*, that it would review the question of the News Service upon receipt of additional information requested. That decision had been taken on the assumption that the evaluation report would be available before the end of the session. Since only a preliminary report had been submitted, and many delegations felt that it did not provide sufficient information, the Committee was now required to decide on the proposals he had just referred to, rather than on the proposals initially submitted by the Secretary-General.

19. Mr. MONIRUZZAMAN (Bangladesh) said his delegation opposed the United Kingdom proposal, which would prejudice and might even distort the evaluation process.
20. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) supported the United Kingdom proposal. The best way of encouraging a critical evaluation was to maintain resources at the level previously authorized, increasing them subsequently if the service was shown to be effective.
21. Mr. WESTPHAL (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mr. LANGMAN (Australia) also supported the United Kingdom proposal.
22. Mr. KASTOFT (Denmark) said that, while his delegation could also support the United Kingdom proposal, it was prepared to support the Swedish proposal if that would facilitate consensus.
23. Mr. SINGH (Fiji) proposed that the Committee should proceed to a decision.
24. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) requested a vote on the United Kingdom proposal.
25. At the request of the representative of Pakistan, a recorded vote was taken on the United Kingdom proposal.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burma, Bvelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Turkey, United Arab Emirates.

26. The United Kingdom proposal was rejected by 38 votes to 19, with 27 abstentions.

27. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had supported the United Kingdom proposal because of its serious concern regarding the operations of the News Service as a whole.

28. Mr. KYELEM (Burkina Faso) said that his delegation had intended to vote against the proposal.

29. Ms. BYRNE (Ireland) said that her delegation had abstained in the belief that the staffing levels should be altered at a time when the evaluation report was almost at hand. However, it considered that the final evaluation report must take full account of the views expressed in the Committee.
30. Following a procedural discussion in which Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan, Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco), Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), the CHAIRMAN and Mr. MAKTARI (Yemen) took part, the proposal of Trinidad and Tobago, as amended by the representative of Sweden, was adopted.
31. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution in the hope that the evaluation report would take full account of all the views expressed in CPC and the Fifth Committee and would constitute a constructive example of the Organization's capacity for self-criticism.
32. Mr. ORSATELLI (France), Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) and Ms. HILLYER (New Zealand) welcomed the consensus on the draft resolution.
33. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said his delegation had joined the consensus involuntarily. Had it reacted more quickly, it would have called for a vote.
34. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division) said that as a result of the decision just taken, there would be reductions in the budget of \$498,400 under section 2A, \$124,800 under section 3 and \$136,200 under section 31 for 1987 only.
35. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee did not wish to take a decision on the remaining proposals before it on the subject.
36. It was so decided.
37. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that had his delegation been present during the voting at the Committee's 62nd meeting, it would have voted in favour of the appropriation of \$80,000 under section 2A of the budget.

Conditions of service and compensation for officials, other than Secretariat officials, serving the General Assembly (continued) (A/C.5/40/L.8)

38. Mr. ODUYEMI (Nigeria) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.8 on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Bangladesh, India and Zambia.
39. Mr. ANNAN (Director, Budget Division), in reply to a question by Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America), said that no programme budget implications were foreseen for the draft resolution.
40. Draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.8 was adopted.
41. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said his delegation supported the work of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), and took the explanation by the Secretariat to mean that the draft resolution had no financial implications.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.92 concerning agenda item 84 (c) (A/C.5/40/93)

42. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the conference-servicing requirements of reconvening the United Nations Conference to Review All Aspects of the Set of Multilaterally Agreed Equitable Principles and Rules for the Control of Restrictive Business Practices had been estimated at \$283,600.

43. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, if it adopted draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.92, the conference-servicing requirements, calculated on a full-cost basis, had been estimated at \$283,600 and that additional appropriations would be considered in the context of the programme budget performance report for the biennium 1986-1987 to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

44. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125 concerning agenda item 86 (A/C.5/40/94)

45. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said the Committee concurred in the request that the \$600,000 surrendered in the context of the first performance report should be reappropriated for UNITAR for the 1986-1987 biennium.

46. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that in making its pledge to UNITAR in 1985, his Government had informed the Executive Director that its voluntary contribution would be reduced by an amount equal to the United States share of the regular budget subvention, approved by the General Assembly at its previous session, so that the United States contribution for 1985 would not exceed \$422,000.

47. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.



Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Spain.

48. The programme budget implications of draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125, as contained in document A/C.5/40/94, were approved by 63 votes to 15, with 11 abstentions.

49. Mr. KHALEVINSKIY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation had cast a negative vote because of its position of principle with regard to the charging to the regular budget of activities that should be financed from voluntary contributions.

Emoluments, pension scheme and conditions of service for the members of the International Court of Justice (continued) (A/C.5/40/L.9)

50. Mr. MURRAY (Trinidad and Tobago), introducing the draft resolution, said that in informal consultations on the subject, diametrically opposed views had been expressed. The sponsors of the draft resolution, believing that an independent international judicial system was fundamental to international relations as a whole, considered that it was time for an increase in the emoluments of members of the Court, which had remained unchanged since 1 January 1981. Essentially, the draft resolution endorsed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and the sponsors hoped it would receive general support.

51. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/40/32 that the adoption of the proposals would entail additional appropriations of \$375,000 under section 25 of the regular budget.

52. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the information before the Committee did not justify the proposed increase.

53. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said his delegation fully supported the draft resolution, and was surprised that the level of remuneration proposed for the Judges should be questioned.

54. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) noted that, at a time when the salaries of Secretariat officials, of the Chairman of ACABQ and of the President of the ICSC were frozen, it was proposed that the Judges should receive an increase. True, in dollar terms their salary had remained unchanged since January 1981, but in Netherlands guilders it had risen by 41 per cent over the same period, while the cost of living at The Hague had risen by over 15.2 per cent. Their current salary was the equivalent of that of an Assistant Secretary-General at The Hague, and was commensurate with that of, for example, Canadian and United Kingdom high court judges. The proposed increase was therefore totally unjustified.

55. Mr. LANGMAN (Australia) said that his Government's support for the International Court of Justice was a matter of record. However, particularly in the current climate of restraint, it was unable to support the draft resolution.
56. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that his Government supported the important role of the Court. However, a salary of \$7,000 a month was sufficient, and any further increase was unjustified.
57. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), noting the comparisons that had been made with the salaries of high court judges in some countries, said that in comparison with the salaries of members of the United States Supreme Court, those of the Judges were very low. That was a violation of the Noblemaire principle. In making comparisons with the salaries of Secretariat officials, moreover, it should be recalled that the original intention had been to remunerate the judges at the same level as the Secretary-General. Furthermore, drawing analogies with the freezing of other salaries was unjustified; on that basis, it might equally well be argued that the scale of contributions should be frozen. The increase proposed in the draft resolution was the minimum necessary, and his delegation would vote in favour of it.
58. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his Government supported the Court and its important work, but also recognized the importance of careful management of the limited resources of the United Nations, and noted in that connection that the operating costs of the Court had also risen. His delegation was not convinced that the proposed increases were justified, or in line with the 1976 guidelines on the Judges' salaries. It was regrettable that consultations had begun late, and that the sponsors had been unable to accept the amendments proposed.
59. Mr. ORSATELLI (France) said that, while the Court was essential, careful use of money was also vital. For consistency, his delegation would support an increase in the operating costs of the Court, but not an increase in the emoluments of the Judges.
60. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.9.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Portugal, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Barbados, Bulgaria, Bvelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Philippines, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

61. Draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.9 was adopted by 60 votes to 14, with 19 abstentions.

62. Mr. WESTPHAL (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution. His Government appreciated the work of the International Court of Justice, but considered that the emoluments of the Judges were adequate, particularly in the light of the need for budgetary restraints both within and outside the United Nations.

63. Ms. HILLYER (New Zealand) said that her delegation had abstained because, while it supported the work of the Court, it had reservations regarding the level of emoluments proposed in the draft resolution.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.87 concerning agenda item 73 (continued)

Revised estimates under section 31 (Staff assessment) and income section 1 (Income from staff assessment) (continued)

64. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting it would have voted at the Committee's 63rd meeting in favour of the programme budget implications of the draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.87 and at the 63rd meeting in favour of the revised estimates under section 31 and income section 1 of the proposed programme budget.

AGENDA ITEM 115: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Standards of accommodation for air travel (continued) (A/C.5/40/L.10)

65. Draft decision A/C.5/40/L.10 was adopted.

66. Mr. RUEDAS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the decision would be implemented forthwith, and information would be provided with effect from 1 January 1986, since problems might arise in reconstructing the data for first-class travel for the period 1 July to 31 December 1985.

67. Mr. DEVREUX (Belgium) said he hoped that at the forty-first session the Committee would be in a position to revise the air travel rules, perhaps to the effect that business class should replace first class in cases except for travel by the Secretary-General. The Secretariat should report on the feasibility of such a measure and the savings to which it would lead.

Use of experts, consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups (A/C.5/40/40)

68. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said the Advisory Committee recommended that consideration of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/C.5/40/40 be postponed until the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

69. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in line with the Advisory Committee's recommendation, the Fifth Committee should decide to defer until the forty-first session consideration of the Secretary-General's report on the use of experts, consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups (A/C.5/40/40).

70. It was so decided.

Consolidated statement of programme budget implications in respect of conference-servicing costs (A/C.5/40/92)

71. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the total estimates for conference-servicing requirements for 1986, on a full-cost basis, were given in paragraph 3 of document A/C.5/40/92. The net additional appropriations requested by the Secretary-General were indicated in the table in paragraph 24.

72. The Advisory Committee was not convinced of the necessity for the appropriation of \$250,800 for General Services at Headquarters, and recommended that it should be absorbed. The Advisory Committee also considered that additional economies could be achieved in respect of the Department of Conference Services at Headquarters, and accordingly recommended an appropriation of \$3 million.

73. The Advisory Committee noted that no overprogramming had been applied with respect to the estimates for Geneva since, as indicated in paragraph 19 of the consolidated statement, the entire amount was for the travel and subsistence of Geneva conference-servicing staff. Since experience had shown that not all staff actually travelled as planned, the Advisory Committee recommended that the additional appropriation requested be reduced from \$711,900 to \$400,000.

74. The additional appropriation requested for Vienna was provisional, pending experience in operating the interim conference-servicing arrangements agreed upon between the United Nations and UNIDO. In the view of the Advisory Committee, there was no need for an additional appropriation at the current stage: any additional requirements could be reviewed in the light of experience and considered in the context of the consolidated statement or the performance report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

(Mr. Mselle)

75. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended an additional appropriation for conference servicing of \$3,400,000; an additional appropriation of \$728,100 would be required under section 31, to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1.

76. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya), commenting on the Secretariat's statement, in response to his question, that conferences at Nairobi were serviced from Geneva, with the exception of the services provided by the Nairobi-based core translation staff, requested the Secretary-General to provide in 1986 figures comparing the cost of servicing Nairobi meetings from Geneva with the cost that would be incurred if all the staff concerned were based at Nairobi.

77. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman, Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), in reply to a question by Mr. DITZ (Austria), said that conference resources for Vienna would be examined in the context of the consolidated statement and first performance report for the 1986-1987 biennium, to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-first session.

78. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said that he foresaw no financial difficulties arising with respect to conference servicing in Vienna if the recommendation of the Advisory Committee was followed.

79. The CHAIRMAN proposed that on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should approve an additional appropriation of \$3,400,000 for conference-servicing costs in 1986, \$3,000,000 for Headquarters and \$400,000 for Geneva, together with an additional appropriation of \$728,100 under section 31, to be offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1.

80. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the proposal.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Israel, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain.

81. The proposal was adopted by 71 votes to 12, with 12 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 119: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY  
(continued)

(b) IMPACT OF INFLATION AND MONETARY INSTABILITY ON THE REGULAR BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.5/40/L.11)

82. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/40/L.11, said that the impact of inflation and monetary instability on the regular budget was an important issue. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that important negotiations were currently going on concerning the establishment of an expert group to consider the Organization's administrative and budgetary functioning, his delegation had felt it more appropriate to submit a purely procedural resolution. On the understanding that the impact of inflation and monetary instability would be one of the topics to be considered by that group, his delegation would not press for a decision on the draft resolution pending the outcome of the negotiations regarding the groups's establishment.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of that statement, no action was required on the draft resolution at the present stage.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.