

in Namibia, South Africa or Southern Rhodesia. Since it had no precise information on that matter, it would oppose the confirmation of the appointments.

98. Mr. HART (Australia) said that his delegation would support the appointments made by the Secretary-General. It was rational, in terms of an effective decision-making process, to have a concentration of expertise in the countries concerned.

99. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) recalled that in 1974 the Office of Financial Services had given an assurance that appointees were not involved in corporations which had interests in Namibia, South Africa or Southern Rhodesia. His delegation would welcome a similar assurance with regard to the 2 appointees under consideration.

100. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller) said that to the best of his knowledge, the corporations with which Mr. R. Manning Brown and Mr. Jean Guyot were associated had no economic links with South Africa or Southern Rhodesia.

101. Mr. AL-NAKKASH (Iraq) said that his delegation was unable to approve the appointment of the United States representative.

102. Mr. STOTTLEMYER (United States of America) stated that Mr. R. Manning Brown had not been nominated by the United States and was not its representative. He had been chosen by the Secretary-General.

*The Committee confirmed the appointment of Mr. R. Manning Brown by 31 votes to 18, with 29 abstentions.*

*The Committee confirmed the appointment of Mr. Jean Guyot by 37 votes to 1, with 38 abstentions.*

103. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted for the confirmation of the appointments. It would like to request, however, that in the future the relevant documents should be circulated at the beginning of the session.

*The meeting rose at 7.05 p.m.*

## 1766th meeting

Wednesday, 10 December 1975, at 8.20 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1766

### AGENDA ITEM 96

**Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 and medium-term plan for the period 1976-1979 (continued) (for the previous documentation, see the 1759th meeting; A/10008/Add.14 and 16, A/C.5/1715/Rev.1, A/C.5/1730/Add.1)**

***Coverage by the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund for periods of service of certain staff members of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East between 1950 and 1960 (A/10008/Add.16, A/C.5/1709)***

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that staff members of UNRWA were currently entitled to participate in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund in pursuance of a decision of the General Assembly at its twenty-first session. General Assembly resolution 2191 (XXI) had cleared the way for the admission of UNRWA staff members retroactive to 1 January 1961 but the period prior to that date remained to be covered. The Secretary-General stated, in his report, that the reason for that omission was "lost in antiquity" (A/C.5/1709, para. 2). The Advisory Committee understood, however, as indicated in its report (A/10008/Add.16, para. 5), that UNRWA staff members had not received retroactive coverage for service prior to 1961 simply because UNRWA

had lacked the resources to make the necessary contributions to the Pension Fund.

2. The Secretary-General was proposing that service rendered between 1950 and 1960 by UNRWA staff members who would still be serving on 31 December 1975, with UNRWA or another organization or agency in the United Nations common system, should be validated and credited to the staff members concerned for the purpose of pension coverage. UNRWA staff members, the United Nations and UNRWA would all pay certain amounts for the actuarial cost of that coverage, which was estimated by the Secretary-General at about \$2 million. The Secretary-General estimated that the maximum requirement from the regular budget would be \$1,020,840. However, because it was uncertain how many of the 45 staff members affected would actually elect to validate their service prior to 1961, he was proposing that for the moment an amount of \$700,000 should be appropriated.

3. The Advisory Committee had carefully examined the Secretary-General's request. UNRWA had been established on a temporary basis and until it had been realized that the Agency would be in existence for some time UNRWA staff members had not been allowed to participate in the Pension Fund. For reasons of equity and fairness, staff members who had worked with UNRWA from 1950 onwards and who were still with the Agency or were working elsewhere in the United Nations system should not be deprived of

pension coverage for any period of their service, unless they decided of their own free choice not to participate.

4. After considering the contractual and financial obligation of UNRWA, the Advisory Committee had concluded that, while it would be legally reasonable to ask UNRWA and its staff to bear the total actuarial costs involved, such a course of action would not in fact be fully in line with the position taken by the Assembly at the twenty-ninth session, when it had decided that the salaries of the international staff of UNRWA should be financed from the regular budget. The Assembly had been mindful of the financial difficulties facing UNRWA, and it was because those difficulties persisted that the proposal was being made. For reasons of equity, therefore, the Advisory Committee had recommended that the Secretary-General's request for \$700,000 should be approved. It was conceivable that some of the 45 staff members referred to in the Secretary-General's report, especially those who were not participants in the savings account, might opt not to participate in the scheme because they were unable to pay their share, and that would mean fewer payments by the United Nations than was currently envisaged. Consequently, the Advisory Committee, while agreeing to the request for a maximum provision of \$700,000 in the 1976-1977 biennium, nevertheless stipulated (*ibid.*, para. 8) that the commitments to be entered into by the Secretary-General should be limited to the amount that would be required to provide coverage for the staff who elected to participate.

5. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) asked what had motivated the Pension Board's decision in 1966 providing that admission of UNRWA staff as full participants in the Pension Fund should be made retroactive to 1961 instead of to 1950.

6. Mr. ZIEHL (Deputy Controller) explained that UNRWA had felt that it had not sufficient financial resources to extend the period of retroactive coverage any further.

7. Sir John RENNIE (Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, endorsed the Deputy Controller's explanation. The Pension Board had agreed, however, that the way should be left open for further validation of service if that became possible.

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in its report (*ibid.*) that the Secretary-General's proposal in document A/C.5/1709 should be approved and that the Secretary-General should be authorized to enter into commitments up to \$700,000 on the basis suggested by him in paragraph 10 of that document, subject to the observations of the Advisory Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

*The recommendation was approved by 68 votes to 10, with 2 abstentions.*

9. The CHAIRMAN said that the appropriate adjustment would be made in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 when it came before the Committee in second reading.

10. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the recommendation, not because it was opposed to having UNRWA staff members join the Pension Fund on the same conditions as other staff members, but because it questioned the propriety of a retroactive decision relating to so remote a period. Moreover, it felt that the financial burden should be borne by the agency to which the staff member belonged rather than by Member States.

11. Mr. SETHI (India) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the recommendation because it had always taken the position that any person who worked full-time for the United Nations was entitled to a pension and that that principle should be applied without any reservations.

12. Mr. MATHESON (Canada) said that his delegation had supported the recommendation, but noted that it applied only to staff members of organizations in the United Nations common system who would still be in service on 31 December 1975. He suggested that the Secretariat should examine the implications of its proposals in document A/C.5/1709 with regard to staff members who had formerly served with UNRWA and who had retired prior to 31 December 1975 and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session on the implications of extending such coverage to those former staff members. The Assembly would then be able to decide whether there was a case based on equity to include such former staff members in the pension arrangement.

13. Mr. ZIEHL (Deputy Controller) said that some former UNRWA staff members might be interested in such an arrangement. In his consultations with the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, the Secretary-General had felt that it was necessary to set a cut-off date for the proposal in order to be able to submit specific financial implications. The Secretariat would be willing to study the matter if the Committee so wished, although it might be rather difficult to locate all former staff members in order to ascertain their wishes.

14. Mr. WOLDE-AREGAY (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it had not fully grasped all the issues involved in the proposal.

15. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation had supported the retroactive provision of pensions, but sympathized with some of the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union. His delegation regretted that the Canadian representative had not raised the issue of former staff members before the Committee had taken a decision on the proposal, and it did not feel that it would be useful to reopen the cases of former staff members of UNRWA.

16. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Canadian delegation had simply asked for the Secretariat's opinion and had not made a formal request. The Deputy Controller had answered him and, in the view of his delegation, the matter should rest there.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that a decision by the Committee was not required, provided the Secretariat agreed to

proceed along the lines of the suggestion of the representative of Canada.

*Revised estimates under section 13. Architectural and engineering study relating to the construction of a permanent headquarters for the United Nations Environment Programme in Nairobi (A/10008/Add.14, A/C.5/1718)*

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the revised estimates under section 13, relating to UNEP. The estimates had been revised to take account of the architectural and engineering study on the construction of a permanent headquarters for UNEP in Nairobi.

19. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in his report (A/C.5/1718), the Secretary-General requested \$451,000 for the architectural and engineering study and related aspects of the planning process for the permanent headquarters of UNEP. Of that sum, \$307,000 was for the proposed study—of which \$260,000 was earmarked for fees for specialized services, and \$47,000 for related requirements, including one meeting in Nairobi of a panel of six experts to advise on the selection of a joint international and local architectural team—and \$144,000 for establishing a small temporary planning unit.

20. The Advisory Committee had accepted the request to establish the planning unit and, in its report (A/10008/Add.14), had recommended approval of the related \$119,000 for salaries and common staff costs, to be included in the regular budget under section 13. However, the Advisory Committee urged the Secretary-General to ensure that maximum co-ordination was maintained between the planning unit and the Office of General Services at Headquarters.

21. In paragraphs 11 to 13 of its report, the Advisory Committee recommended that the balance of \$332,000 should be shared between the United Nations regular budget and the Fund of UNEP; it would be recalled that it had recommended a similar cost-sharing arrangement<sup>1</sup> in connexion with the Secretary-General's request for an additional appropriation in 1974. In its report, the Advisory Committee had indicated a number of existing ratios of sharing for various items. It was recommending that the sum of \$332,000 should be shared in the proportion of 2:1, with the result that the United Nations would pay \$111,000. In paragraph 14 of its report it recommended that the estimate under section 13 should be increased by \$230,000. The remaining costs, totalling \$221,000, would accordingly be borne by UNEP. Members of the Committee would note that the Governing Council of UNEP had authorized the Executive Director to construct temporary premises pending a decision to construct permanent premises.

22. Mr. STOTTEMYER (United States of America) said that, while his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations, it was concerned about the rela-

tionship between the proposed planning unit and the Office of General Services. It regretted that the Advisory Committee, while urging maximum co-ordination between the unit and the Office of General Services, had not stated more explicitly what that co-ordination might mean.

23. The United Nations had encountered difficulties before with regard to construction projects, such as the extension of the Palais des Nations, which had been largely the responsibility of the United Nations Office at Geneva, with only minimal input from the Office of General Services. His delegation hoped that ultimate policy responsibility for any construction would be vested in the Secretary-General, operating through the Office of General Services, and that the Office would have a more important role in the construction of a permanent headquarters for UNEP.

24. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation had been struck by the last sentence of paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report, in which representatives of the Secretary-General were reported to have stated that "such elaborate planning for the study became necessary in view of the world-wide interest anticipated in the project". He assumed that the project was proposed because it was necessary, not because it would arouse world-wide interest. He was not very impressed by the arguments adduced in the Secretary-General's report, and felt that there might be a tendency to spend too much, particularly in that kind of study.

25. Mr. STEDMAN (United Nations Environment Programme), speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General and of UNEP, said, in reply to the representative of the United States of America, that the Secretariat had intended to make it clear in paragraph 19 of document A/C.5/1718 that the Secretary-General and the Executive Director of UNEP were seeking to ensure close and effective co-operation. UNEP had no expertise in that matter, and the small planning unit could not function without the closest co-operation and full support of the Office of General Services; policy control would remain with that Office.

26. With reference to the comment of the representative of Belgium concerning paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report, he said that the Secretary-General and UNEP were interested in ensuring careful and adequate planning for the new UNEP headquarters. They wanted to take full advantage of United Nations experience in construction activities in order to ensure that the first headquarters of a United Nations organization to be sited in a developing country would be first-class, would be appropriate for the small UNEP secretariat and would satisfy the General Assembly and all Member Governments.

27. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII), section II, paragraph 3, in which the General Assembly had decided that the costs of servicing the Governing Council and providing a small secretariat would be borne by the regular budget of the United Nations and that operational programme costs, programme support and administrative costs of the Fund of UNEP would be borne by the Fund.

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 8, document A/9608/Add.16, para. 24.

28. The United Nations was involved in a number of construction projects at various duty stations. In the case of the UNIDO building under construction at Vienna and the new United Nations Development Corporation building in New York there were a number of unresolved questions. It was therefore surprising that the Secretariat should be planning to undertake new construction activities without sufficient serious thought. The Advisory Committee was to be criticized for not having adequately considered the question of the new permanent headquarters of UNEP before recommending that the architectural and engineering study should be continued. Neither the Secretariat nor the Advisory Committee had seriously thought out the provisions of the General Assembly resolution to which he had referred, which laid down very clearly the division of responsibility between the United Nations and the Fund of UNEP. That resolution had been invoked in the Second Committee in connexion with the UNEP budget, and the United Nations had agreed to bear the cost of the proposed planning unit. Clearly, administrative costs had to be borne by the Fund and, in his view, they included construction costs.

29. His delegation was therefore unable to support the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning the architectural and engineering study.

30. Mr. RHODIUS (Netherlands) said that his delegation interpreted General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII) differently from the Soviet delegation. In his report the Secretary-General recommended that the total amount should be paid out of the regular budget; the Advisory Committee, on the other hand, recommended that only one third of the amount should come from the regular budget, the rest being borne by the Fund of UNEP.

31. The Committee had discussed the matter earlier in connexion with section 13; at that time, the Advisory Committee had drawn the attention of the Governing Council of UNEP to the need to ensure that the growth of the UNEP secretariat did not overtax the voluntary resources of the Fund (1705th meeting). In his view, the administrative and programme support costs of UNEP had grown too fast.

32. His delegation had the impression that if the Advisory Committee's advice were to be followed, the Fund would be overtaxed, and it therefore supported the Secretary-General's recommendation. He suggested that the Advisory Committee might be contradicting itself, in view of its earlier recommendation.

33. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that he had indicated that \$230,000 should be appropriated in the regular budget, \$221,000 should come from the Fund, and that \$332,000 should be shared between the Fund and the United Nations regular budget in the proportion of 2:1. The Advisory Committee had also recommended that the cost of the planning unit should be borne by the regular budget. He therefore saw no contradiction in the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

*An additional appropriation in the amount of \$230,000 under section 13 for the biennium 1976-1977 was approved by 62 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.*

*Working paper submitted by the Controller (continued)\**

34. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, since the Committee had exhausted the list of speakers on the working paper, the Controller might wish to make a concluding statement.

35. Mr. FELLAH (Algeria) asked the Chairman at whose request the Controller was making his statement.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding that it was normal procedure for representatives of the Secretary-General to make a statement after all delegations wishing to speak on an item had done so in order to reply to their comments and give any necessary explanations.

37. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation was among those which had made a number of requests for information from the Controller. It was, therefore, interested in hearing his observations.

38. Mr. STOFORPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation was also anxious to hear the comments of the Controller on statements made by delegations, including his own.

39. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia), speaking on a point of order, said that she associated herself with the question asked by the representative of Algeria. Her delegation hoped that the Controller would indeed answer all the questions which had been asked during the discussion of the working paper, but did not accept that the Controller's statement should conclude the Committee's consideration of the item. If he intended to provide answers to questions raised by delegations, the discussion of the item was really just beginning.

40. The CHAIRMAN observed that when he had said that the Controller would make a concluding statement, it was, of course, understood that the Committee could, if it so desired, pursue its consideration of the item.

41. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation regretted that the working paper had been submitted so late as to preclude adequate consideration at the current session. It agreed with a suggestion made at the 1764th meeting to the effect that the Secretary-General should rely on whichever working hypothesis for calculating the rate of inflation seemed best at the time when the budget was being prepared. His delegation had already stated its position of principle regarding inflation and currency instability. Subject to that position, it believed that the estimates of the inflation factor in the budget should be adjusted by reference to the most accurate data currently available. It was imperative that the budget should reflect as accurately as possible the situation prevailing at the time it was adopted. His delegation did not understand, therefore, why the Secretariat had made no effort to correct its forecast of inflation when it became aware of changes in the rate of inflation. The Member States relied on the ability of the Secretariat to prepare the programme budget. The Secretariat was being given a chance to demonstrate its concern for prudent financial management by making the adjustments in the budget necessitated by changes in the

\* Resumed from the 1764th meeting.

rate of inflation. A recalculation of the inflation factor in the budget would not adversely affect the programmes and activities of the Organization, but rather promote the spirit of fiscal restraint and sound management which were so sorely needed.

42. Mr. DEBATIN (Assistant Secretary-General, Controller) said that the twin problems of currency fluctuation and inflation were the most sensitive and difficult issues that had arisen during the Committee's deliberations on the budget.

43. As to currency fluctuation, he associated himself fully with the statements made by several delegations on the subject of full budgeting. A budget should, above all, be truthful and reflect accurately the activities of the Organization. For that reason, to ignore the impact of exchange rate fluctuations on the budget would be misleading and a denial of the basic purpose of programme budgeting, which was to show the financial resources actually required for the implementation of each programme. To underestimate cost elements would be to disregard the principles of sound budgeting and to jeopardize the attainment of the Organization's fundamental goals.

44. He thanked those delegations which had acknowledged the need for the Secretary-General to formulate a precise and realistic estimate of the anticipated impact of variations in international exchange rates on the expenditures of the United Nations. While the budget submissions to date had been based on the assumption of an exchange rate of 3.10 Swiss francs to the United States dollar, an assumption adopted by agreement among all the agencies of the United Nations system, the prevailing exchange rate was only 2.63 Swiss francs to the United States dollar. The difference would produce a shortfall of about \$25 million, based on the total initial appropriations already approved, with a few exceptions, in first reading. Moreover, the shortfall would be greater when further appropriations of approximately \$19 million were taken into account. The shortfall was therefore substantial, and while he himself deplored it, it was imperative that the final appropriations should reflect current financial realities.

45. With regard to inflation, a number of delegations had requested additional information on the reasoning that had led to the adoption of the initial assumptions for the average annual rate of inflation in 1976 and 1977. It would be recalled in that connexion that the instructions for the preparation of the 1976-1977 estimates had had to be issued as early as August 1974. At that time the average annual rate of inflation was in excess of 10 per cent at all of the main cities where the headquarters of various United Nations bodies were situated. The Secretariat had nevertheless based the estimates for 1976 and 1977 on more conservative assumptions as to future economic trends and the same attitude had been taken with respect to the revised estimates for 1975 submitted to the General Assembly at the preceding session.<sup>2</sup> In so doing the Secretariat had been fully aware that its approach was optimistic in the light of circumstances prevailing at the time.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 6.

46. The reasons for its decisions were given in the foreword to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 (A/10006), in particular in paragraph 13, in which the Secretary-General stated that it was not appropriate to proceed on the assumption that the efforts of Governments to control inflation were unlikely to succeed, and also that further inflation was both difficult to assess with any degree of accuracy and entirely beyond his control.

47. It was, therefore, quite understandable that the Advisory Committee should have stated in paragraph 22 of its first report (A/10008 and Corr.2) on the initial estimates that it had been unable fully to satisfy itself of the accuracy of the Secretary-General's estimates of inflation in 1976-1977 and that it consequently viewed those assumptions as no more than working hypotheses. He did not disagree with that statement of fact, since in forecasting inflation there was no alternative to relying on a careful analysis of trends and expectations which might be invalidated to some extent by actual events.

48. Members of the Committee had asked whether the initial assumptions were still valid in the light of an examination of the most recent inflationary trends throughout the world. He and his staff had made a careful analysis of current forecasts. It was, of course, extremely difficult to find reliable sources offering conclusive data as a basis for such a forecast. The sources consulted in re-examining the assumptions were: the various national statistical services for consumer price indices and gross national product deflators; the forecast made by the LINK project, which was conducted by econometricians from national public and private institutions from 12 countries and from four international bodies; forecasts made by the economic departments of several prominent corporations engaged in international business; and forecasts made by banks. Some of those forecasts compared only portions of the year with the corresponding portions of the previous year and were consequently not sufficient for comparing full calendar years. That fact should be mentioned because the inflation figures mentioned by some sources for the third quarter of 1975 had been rather low. The figures for the last quarter, however, had again shown a marked upward trend.

49. On the basis of the information derived from those sources, the following forecasts of inflation could be made for 1976-1977: United States of America, 6 to 7 per cent for 1976 and 5.5 to 8 per cent for 1977; Switzerland, 6 to 7 per cent for 1976 and 8 to 9 per cent for 1977; Austria, 6.5 to 7 per cent for 1976 and 7 to 8 per cent for 1977. Without entering into any discussion of economic theories, he felt bound to observe that the current favourable exchange rate for the Swiss franc might result, in the context of international development, in higher inflation rates for 1976-1977 than those established on the purely economic data available at the moment.

50. Those new statistics probably had a bearing on the assumption of the budget submissions as to inflation rates for 1976. Those for 1977, on the other hand, should, in his view, be left unchanged because, contrary to earlier expectations, the latest evidence indicated that the forecasts on which the estimates for that year had been based might prove to be on the conservative side. If the new

statistics were to be taken into account, the rates of inflation on which the budget estimates for the first half of the following biennium had been based might be reduced by two percentage points, a step that would substantially reduce the additional appropriations which would be required to compensate for potential losses as a result of unfavourable rates of exchange. He had provided the Committee with the most reliable evidence available, and it was for the Committee to judge whether it considered that evidence acceptable and whether it would be advisable for the appropriate adjustments to be made in the budget estimates at the current session.

51. He assured the Committee that every effort would be made to keep the pattern of actual expenditure during the following biennium under strict control. As in the past, appropriations would be allotted by programme and object of expenditure on an annual basis rather than for the biennium as a whole, and the allotments would constitute expenditure levels which could not be exceeded without prior approval and further allotment action by the Office of Financial Services. In view of the uncertain situation which would continue to prevail with regard to inflationary trends and currency realignments, it was natural to proceed on a tentative basis in the interest of good management. Accordingly, an unallotted reserve would be maintained. Further allotments would be made only as and when additional needs arose—for example, as a result of the granting of additional classes of post adjustment to staff in the Professional category or above, of increases in the basic emoluments of staff in other categories or of significant changes in rates of exchange. In that way it would be possible to ensure that appropriations were spent only for the purposes for which they were intended and that strict standards of economy were applied. Should any resources remain unutilized in certain sectors, as was the case in the current biennium, they would be kept available for the purpose of compensating any unforeseen and extraordinary requirements which might arise in other sectors, notably those which might stem from decisions taken by policy-making organs. In that connexion, he drew the attention of the Committee to the final performance report of the Secretary-General on the programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975,<sup>3</sup> a document which illustrated the manner in which management procedures contributed to keeping to a minimum the net additional appropriations requested before a financial period ended.

52. In conclusion, he thanked those delegations which had recognized the need to include in the final appropriations additional funds to compensate for the difference between current rates of exchange and the rather unrealistic rates on which the estimates had been based so far. Whatever decision the Committee might take with regard to inflation, he would endeavour to continue to manage the total funds approved with the utmost care.

53. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, since delegations might wish to have further time to reflect on the statement just made by the Controller and to formulate proposals, the Committee should postpone a decision on the working paper until a future meeting.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 106

### United Nations pension system (continued):\*

- (a) Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (continued)\* (A/10009, A/10335, A/C.5/1684 and Corr.1);
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General (continued)\* (A/10335, A/10374, A/C.5/1684 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1697, A/C.5/1729, A/C.5/1752, A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2)

54. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the second revised text (A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2) of the draft resolution on the question of pension coverage for members of the Joint Inspection Unit; the Committee also had before it a statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1752) concerning the administrative and financial implications of the new text. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had nothing to add to the report that it had submitted (A/10374).

55. Mr. FELLAH (Algeria) said that the text of the draft resolution introduced by the Algerian delegation at the 1751st meeting, on behalf of the sponsors, on pension coverage for the members of the Joint Inspection Unit, had been based on the Regulations and Rules of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund but, for the reasons explained by the Secretary-General in his report on the subject (A/C.5/1697), had envisaged the establishment of a separate system. The proposed system had certain shortcomings, in the view of some delegations; in particular, they believed that it would be difficult to administer a separate pension scheme for the Inspectors without giving rise to financial implications, and that the participation of the Inspectors in the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund would be a more satisfactory arrangement. In addition, certain experts believed that, in the case of so small a group as the Inspectors, there was a much greater risk that unforeseen circumstances might invalidate the assumptions on which the forecasts of the actuarial costs had been based.

56. The sponsors had therefore concluded that the best course was for the Inspectors to participate in the Joint Staff Pension Fund and they were accordingly submitting another revised version (A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2) of the draft resolution. Two major improvements had been introduced: first, the proposal would enable the members of the Joint Inspection Unit to participate in an established scheme which already covered 50,000 staff members and, secondly, it did not give exaggerated importance to specific provisions of the Regulations and Rules of the Joint Staff Pension Fund.

57. The sponsors had ascertained that the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2 would be lower than those in the preceding version. Since every effort had been made to reflect all points of view, the sponsors hoped that the new text would be adopted by consensus.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that Portugal should not be listed as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2.

<sup>3</sup> Document A/10035 of 13 November 1975.

\* Resumed from the 1761st meeting.

59. Mr. MATHESON (Canada) said that his delegation had not been able to consider the full implications of the draft resolution and had some reservations about its timeliness. It therefore proposed that the matter should be deferred until the thirty-first session, when the question of extending the mandate of the Joint Inspection Unit was to be considered.

60. Pension arrangements were a vital element in the total relationship between an employer and an employee. The importance of a pension could not be over-emphasized; it provided a stronger link with the employer than a salary, an honorarium or any other form of contractual payment.

61. The task of determining the impact of pensions on the functions and performance of the Inspectors could not be studied satisfactorily at the current session. There was no time for such a study, and it would be inappropriate to raise the issues involved without the necessary background information. Moreover, the role, mandate and functions of the Unit were due to be reviewed at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. In particular, delegations would no doubt wish to assure themselves that the high degree of independence that the Unit currently enjoyed was maintained. The provision of pensions for the Inspectors might affect their institutional independence—a point which required very careful consideration and constituted the principal reason for his delegation's proposal for deferment.

62. The Joint Inspection Unit had been established on an experimental basis in 1968 and had not yet been accorded permanent status. It would be an unfortunate precedent to confer pension rights on the members of the Unit before its status had been clarified. Moreover, the financial implications of the draft resolution were substantial, and there was insufficient time left to give the matter the careful consideration it deserved.

63. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said that, in view of the time factor and the extremely complex character of the subject, his delegation supported the proposal made by the Canadian representative. In any event, it was somewhat confusing to be faced at short notice with a proposal for a pension scheme that was entirely different from the one originally envisaged by the sponsors.

64. At the time of their appointment to the Unit, the Inspectors had not expected to participate in a United Nations-sponsored pension scheme. It was his delegation's understanding that many of the Inspectors were already fully covered by their national pension schemes. In any event, it seemed more prudent for the General Assembly to defer any action that might prejudice the outcome of the comprehensive review of the Unit's role that would be undertaken at the thirty-first session.

65. If the Inspectors were to carry out their tasks with the requisite objectivity and detachment, their conditions and length of service should be such as to ensure that they did not become yet another group of bureaucrats with a built-in personal interest in length of service. It could be argued that the provision of a pension for members of the Unit would tend to have precisely that effect, thus impairing the effectiveness and integrity of the Unit and discouraging the necessary rotation of membership. If compelled to vote on the revised draft resolution, his delegation would abstain.

66. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) expressed support for the proposal by the delegation of Canada. His delegation would prefer consideration of the matter to be deferred, although it had a completely open mind on the question of pension coverage for the Inspectors. It was supporting the proposal for postponement simply because the Committee should not act in haste. Pension coverage was only one part of the total remuneration package for any group of employees, the Inspectors included. The General Assembly should not therefore contemplate the extension of pension benefits without at the same time considering whether other items of the package should be altered to balance that benefit. Moreover, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution might create constitutional difficulties, inasmuch as it proposed the granting of pension benefits "equal to those to which they [the Inspectors] will become entitled when final action will have been taken by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session". The wording appeared to constitute a commitment by the General Assembly at its thirtieth session to action at the thirty-first session, and that was surely incompatible with the rules of procedure.

67. Mr. STOTTEMYER (United States of America) supported the motion for deferment for the reasons that had been ably explained by the Canadian delegation. The independence of the Inspectors might be jeopardized, however marginally, if they became participants of the Joint Staff Pension Fund. Furthermore, problems might arise if the age-limit of 60 years was dropped, as it would have to be if the Inspectors were to become participants. Similarly, article 21 of the Regulations of the Fund, which referred to "every full-time member of the staff of each member organization" would have to be amended, and such action might open a Pandora's box in the form of applications from other non-members of the United Nations staff to become participants. Finally, the cost to the United Nations, which was estimated by the Secretary-General at about \$306,000, should not be added to the budget without further reflection. If the Committee was unable to agree to the motion for deferment, his delegation would find it necessary to vote against the draft resolution.

68. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed gratitude to the Canadian delegation, which had considerably facilitated his task.

69. The Advisory Committee had reached the very sound conclusion that it would be premature to take a position on the matter at the current session. The sponsors of the draft resolution had not had sufficient time to take into consideration all the implications, and it would be wrong for the Fifth Committee to take any action until that had been done. Of particular importance was the basic principle set forth in the second report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies concerning the establishment of the Unit,<sup>4</sup> that the independence of the Inspectors should be preserved at all costs. The members of the Unit were not Secretariat staff; indeed, if they were, they would not be qualified to perform inspection duties. No matter as important as the one under consideration could be hastily disposed of. He therefore appealed to the sponsors to agree

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 80, document A/6343, para. 67, B.*



that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred until the thirty-first session, when the Committee would be in a position to debate it more thoroughly. For the foregoing reasons his delegation was unable to support the draft resolution.

70. Mr. HARDING (Sierra Leone) expressed support for the views of the Canadian delegation and the Advisory Committee. The issue was very complex and required careful consideration. His delegation was not opposed to the idea of granting pension coverage to the Inspectors; it simply felt that there was a need to assess the role of the Unit before taking a decision on the matter. That was why his delegation felt that the approach recommended by the Advisory Committee was the sensible one.

71. Mr. OH (Singapore) said that his delegation had a completely open mind on the question before the Committee. However, it supported the Canadian proposal because it agreed with the Advisory Committee that it would be premature to take a decision at the current session.

72. Miss VRECH (Argentina) said that her delegation had sponsored the draft resolution in the firm belief that pension coverage should be provided for a group of people who had contributed so significantly and efficiently to ensuring the better functioning of the Organization. The same reasoning had led her delegation to support the adoption of General Assembly resolution 3354 (XXIX), which had authorized the Secretary-General in collaboration with the other members of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, to explore alternative methods of providing coverage for the Inspectors, and to report to the Assembly at its thirtieth session. The reports prepared as a result of those studies—the report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (A/10009, chap. IV, sect. E) and the report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1697)—contained alternative proposals for pension coverage, a careful analysis of the merits and short-comings of each of the options, and details of their cost. Those proposals had greatly facilitated the sponsors' task.

73. There was no need to dwell on the Inspectors' entitlement to pension coverage, the rationale for which had been explained by the delegation of Algeria. It should be borne in mind, too, that there was complete agreement among the various bodies concerned regarding the validity of that entitlement and the moral obligation of the Organization to provide pension benefits.

74. Her delegation disagreed with the views expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 6 of its report (A/10374) for a number of reasons. First, the future of the Unit and entitlement to pension coverage were entirely separate matters. The right to pension benefits should be regarded as a just reward for services rendered and should not be made to depend on the General Assembly's decision on the Unit's future. To treat the one circumstance as a *sine qua non* of the other would mean that, should the Assembly decide to disband the Unit, its members would be deprived of a benefit that they had earned.

75. The General Assembly had decided in 1974 that the question of pension coverage for the Inspectors should be

taken up at the thirtieth session. Expenditure having been incurred for the preparation of reports, it would be irrational to postpone consideration of the matter until 1976, thereby incurring further expenditure, when all were in agreement that the Inspectors should receive pension benefits. Furthermore, the substantive question of the Unit's future would leave little or no time at the thirty-first session for a study of the pension issue. Her delegation therefore hoped that the Committee would take the logical action of making a decision at the current session.

76. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said his delegation welcomed the proposal by the Canadian delegation to defer the question of pension coverage for the members of the Unit until the thirty-first session. It was too late in the current session to embark on detailed consideration of a complicated issue, the financial implications of which were substantial. His delegation shared the reservations expressed by other delegations about giving pension coverage to a body such as the Unit, which had been established on a temporary basis, but that issue could be examined thoroughly in conjunction with the discussion of the role and future of the Unit. His delegation appealed to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2 to defer their proposal until the thirty-first session.

77. Mr. SETHI (India) said that the argument, adduced by a number of delegations, that since the mandate of the Joint Inspection Unit would be reviewed in 1976 the Fifth Committee should defer consideration of pension coverage of its members, was not consistent with the decision taken at the previous session. Other delegations had stated that the Inspectors had no expectation of pensions; that was not entirely accurate because ACC had examined the question as far back as 1967 and the Inspectors had been led to believe that they might receive pensions. The special and peculiar position of the Inspectors should be borne in mind, as should the fact that their functions had evolved and their conditions of employment had changed. A pension was a deferred remuneration for services rendered, and should in no way alter or compromise the honesty and independence of its recipient.

78. The Algerian representative had explained why the draft resolution had been revised. As for the arguments about lack of time, the Secretary-General had had a year in which to study possible alternatives to a fairly simple matter like a pension scheme, and his delegation felt that that was sufficient. The Inspectors, after all, had been waiting for 10 years; they should be made eligible for pensions and the gap in the system should be closed. It seemed discriminatory to award pensions to the staff members of UNRWA and not to members of the Unit. His delegation believed that if the Fifth Committee decided to defer the matter it would be abdicating its responsibilities. Consequently, his delegation was unable to support the Canadian proposal.

79. Mr. EKONG (Nigeria) expressed his delegation's support for the Canadian proposal and said that the Committee should not be stampeded into taking a decision on one aspect of a question which would be considered in its entirety at the following session. Moreover, it would be an unfortunate precedent to incorporate persons who were not staff members into the Joint Staff Pension Fund. If the



Canadian proposal was put to the vote, his delegation would vote in favour of it, and if the draft resolution was put to the vote it would vote against it.

80. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) said that the General Assembly had decided to deal separately with the question of pension coverage for members of the Joint Inspection Unit at the current session, although it had been fully aware that action on the future of the Unit would not be taken until the thirty-first session. The report of the Secretary-General had been before the Committee for some time and delegations had had sufficient time to study it. In his view, if other delegations disagreed with the draft resolution they should vote against it, but they should not confuse the issue by introducing extraneous arguments. Accordingly, his delegation would oppose the proposal by Canada.

81. Mr. PONCE (Peru) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution because it considered it to be fully justified and equitable.

82. Mr. AL-NAKKASH (Iraq) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution and opposed any kind of postponement.

83. Mr. ABRAHAMSON (Denmark) said that his delegation considered the Canadian proposal to be sound and would vote in favour of deferment.

84. Mr. BASSAM (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation could not support the Canadian proposal.

85. Mr. CHANDLER (Barbados) said that the Canadian proposal seemed to be designed to defer the issue indefinitely and his delegation could not support it.

86. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Canadian proposal to defer consideration of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1261/Rev.2 until the thirty-first session.

*The proposal was adopted by 44 votes to 28, with 13 abstentions.*

87. Mr. BAMBA (Upper Volta) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the Canadian proposal did not prejudice its position on the substance of the matter.

### AGENDA ITEM 103

**Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (continued):**  
**(d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointments made by the Secretary-General (concluded)**  
**(A/10154, A/C.5/L.1284)**

88. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) felt that the draft decision (A/C.5/L.1284) submitted by his delegation was a constructive and reasonable one, which he hoped could be adopted by consensus.

89. Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) pointed out that his delegation had suggested that it might be useful for a representative of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension

Board to express its views on the draft decision submitted by the Dominican Republic.

90. Mrs. TSIEN (Chairman of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board) said that the Board would study the question and report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session.

*The draft decision (A/C.5/L.1284) was adopted without objection.*

91. Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had accepted the consensus because of its confidence in the Pension Board to carry out the review in question fairly. He had had some doubts, however, because membership of the Investments Committee demanded special expertise which was not easy to find. He believed it should not be tied strictly to the principle of geographical distribution although equitable geographical distribution should, of course, be applied wherever possible.

92. Mr. AL-NAKKASH (Iraq) said that the draft resolution should have indicated the reasons for the need to apply equitable geographical distribution and to increase the membership of the Investments Committee; he hoped that those who would be reviewing article 20 of the Regulations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund would take those reasons into account.

### ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10430 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 31\* (A/C.5/1731)

93. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General, in the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1731) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report (A/10430, para. 7), had requested an amount of \$112,000 under section 2C of the programme budget for 1976-1977 for the travel, subsistence and fees of 14 experts (\$100,000) and for one consultant for a six-month period (\$12,000), all to be employed on updating the report entitled *Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures*, as requested in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

94. In response to inquiries, the representatives of the Secretary-General had informed the Advisory Committee that the request included provision for fees at the rate of \$60 per day. The Advisory Committee noted that no uniform policy existed for determining whether experts should be paid a fee and, if so, what the amount should be. The Advisory Committee questioned the need for the payment of fees to the experts as proposed in document A/C.5/1731. It accordingly recommended that the provision for fees, \$33,000, should be deleted and that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$79,000 would be required under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

\* Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security.

95. Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said that he did not agree with the deletion of the provision for fees for experts in view of the effect it would have on other requests by the Secretary-General for expert services.

96. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution of the First Committee, an additional appropriation of \$79,000 would be required under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

*It was so decided.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10447 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 122\* (A/C.5/1744)**

97. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1744) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report (A/10447, para. 8) the Secretary-General had indicated that the adoption of the draft resolution would not require an additional appropriation at the current session, but that potential additional requirements of up to \$109,100 might arise if he were unable to provide from within approved resources the conference servicing staff whom he would have to make available for the negotiations called for in the draft resolution. The Secretary-General stated that, because of other major conferences being held in May 1976, there could be no certainty that all the necessary staff could be recruited for a negotiating session to be held in that month.

98. The Advisory Committee trusted that every effort would be made to accommodate the conference servicing requirements for the negotiations in question within the approved resources. On that basis, it recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution would have no financial implications for the programme budget for 1976-1977.

99. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the First Committee would require no additional financial appropriation under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

*It was so decided.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10431 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 34\*\* (A/C.5/1745)**

100. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that

\* Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

\*\*Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General.

the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report (A/10431, para. 7) called for a study, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX), on military budgets.

101. In the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1745) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General had estimated that the preparation of the report called for would cost \$192,000, but that he was not for the moment requesting the component of conference servicing costs—estimated at \$110,000—actual requirements for which would be reported in the context of his 1976 progress report. The balance of \$82,000, which, in the Secretary-General's view, would have to be appropriated at the current session, comprised: \$66,000 for the travel, subsistence and fees of 10 experts, who would meet at Geneva for three series of meetings for a total of 4 weeks; \$8,000 for 4 months of consultant services; and \$8,000 for the travel and subsistence of staff. For the reasons explained in the discussion on document A/C.5/1731 (see para. 94 above), the Advisory Committee recommended that no fees should be paid to the experts, with a consequential reduction in requirements of \$24,000.

102. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$58,000 would be required under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977. The Advisory Committee expected that the conference servicing would be provided from within approved resources at no extra cost to the United Nations.

103. Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) drew attention to the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by the First Committee by a vote of 91 to 2. He deeply regretted that the Advisory Committee had recommended the deletion of the provision for fees for experts to assist the Secretary-General in preparing the report on the reduction of military budgets. The saving recommended seemed modest when compared with the amount spent annually on military expenditures which, according to the introduction<sup>5</sup> to the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, amounted to \$300 billion. What was being requested was an addendum to the 1974 report on the reduction of military budgets;<sup>6</sup> the Fifth Committee, when it had considered the question during the twenty-ninth session (1681st meeting), had not raised any objection to paying fees to experts for that report. He suggested that the Fifth Committee follow the same procedure as it had in the case of the earlier report.

104. He requested that a vote should be taken on the amount proposed by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/1745.

105. Mr. HOLMES (United Kingdom) said that he had no objection to the statement of financial implications circulated as document A/C.5/1745. As many of the financial

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 1A, sect. VIII.

<sup>6</sup> Document A/9770/Rev.1 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.75.I.10).

implications before the Committee seemed to involve the services of consultants, however, he drew attention to the decisions taken by the General Assembly concerning the amount of resources to be spent on experts and consultants, and to paragraph 66 of the Advisory Committee's first report (A/10008 and Corr.2) which indicated that the amount to be spent on experts and consultants in the biennium 1976-1977 was less in real terms than the amount spent in the previous biennium. In that connexion, he asked the Secretariat whether account was being kept of the amounts being approved for experts and consultants during the current session of the Assembly.

106. Mr. WANG Lien-sheng (China) said that if a vote was taken on the statement of financial implications (A/C.5/1745), his delegation would vote against it.

107. Mr. RUEDAS (Budget Division) said, in reply to the United Kingdom representative, that the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 contained a smaller total appropriation than the 1974-1975 budget for consultancy services. The Secretary-General was continuing to monitor the amounts approved for experts and consultants. If the Committee wished, a statement indicating the amounts approved for that purpose by the Fifth Committee through its decisions on financial implications would be provided during the second reading of the proposed programme budget.

108. Mr. BERG (Sweden) drew attention to the context of the draft resolution of the First Committee, of which his delegation had been a sponsor. Arms expenditures throughout the world were enormous, and his country was working with others to initiate real disarmament in order to bring about peace and security and to free human and material resources for more beneficial purposes. It had been proposed that States should reduce their military budgets, but before that proposal could be applied realistically, it was essential to have some kind of basis for comparing the military budgets of States having different economic systems. That was why his delegation had proposed that the experts who had worked in 1974 on a report on the subject should continue their work on analysing military budgets. The subject was an extremely complicated one and members of the group would have the very great responsibility of reporting as objectively as possible; accordingly, the Secretary-General should not be prevented from engaging the best experts available. He pointed out that in 1974 the Fifth Committee had approved the amounts requested for experts by the Secretary-General. He supported the Mexican proposal that a vote should be taken on the amount proposed in the statement of the Secretary-General.

109. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that it was customary for the Committee to vote first on the proposal of the Advisory Committee.

110. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee, at the request of the Mexican representative, to vote on the Secretary-General's estimate of \$82,000 in his statement of financial implications (A/C.5/1745).

*The Secretary-General's estimate was rejected by 20 votes to 19, with 34 abstentions.*

111. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the General Assembly should be informed that \$58,000 would be required under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 if the draft resolution of the First Committee were adopted.

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 38 votes to 2, with 33 abstentions.*

112. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the First Committee would require an additional appropriation of \$58,000 under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977, the resources required for conference servicing being provided from within approved resources at no extra cost to the United Nations.

*It was so decided.*

113. Mrs. DE ZEA (Colombia) said that, had she been present at the time of the vote, she would have voted in favour of the Secretary-General's estimate of \$82,000.

114. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) invited the Secretariat in future to indicate more clearly the subject of statements of financial implications submitted to the Committee.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10432 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 35\* (A/C.5/1746)**

115. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1746) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report (A/10432, para. 7), the Secretary-General had requested \$5,400 for travel and subsistence under section 2C of the programme budget for 1976-1977 to enable him to send observers to the Conference of Government Experts to be held at Lugano under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and to the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts. The representatives of the Secretary-General had subsequently informed the Advisory Committee that part of the request, namely, the \$3,100 relating to the Diplomatic Conference was being withdrawn since it duplicated a provision already included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 (see A/10006, para. 2.36).

116. The Advisory Committee believed that the balance of the request, relating to travel to the Lugano Conference, could be absorbed within approved resources for the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs or through the dispatch of a qualified observer from the United Nations Office at Geneva. Accordingly, the Advi-

\* Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: reports of the Secretary-General.

sory Committee recommended that the Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the First Committee would have no financial implications under the programme budget for 1976-1977.

117. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the First Committee would have no financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

*It was so decided.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION A SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10441 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 44\* (A/C.5/1747)**

118. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1747) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A submitted by the First Committee in its report (A/10441, para. 9), the Secretary-General had requested \$21,000 under section 2C of the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 to cover the cost of printing in six

\* Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

languages the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects, as requested in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution. The Advisory Committee believed that a reduction could be made in that amount through the use of more economical printing methods and by making certain that the number of copies printed did not exceed requirements.

119. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the First Committee would require an additional appropriation of \$15,000 under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

120. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that the adoption of draft resolution A of the First Committee would require an additional appropriation of \$15,000 under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

*It was so decided.*

121. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that he had gone along with the consensus, but that he believed that the printing costs were unduly high. He was sure that the comprehensive study could have been published without additional appropriations.

*The meeting rose on Thursday, 11 December at 12.20 a.m.*

## 1767th meeting

Thursday, 11 December 1975, at 8.25 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Christopher R. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago).

A/C.5/SR.1767

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Akashi (Japan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10459 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEMS 113\* AND 29\*\* (A/C.5/1733 AND CORR.1)**

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in the statement he had submitted (A/C.5/1733 and Corr.1) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in its report (A/10459, para. 7), the Secretary-General had indicated that the provisions of the draft resolution could be implemented within the approved resources for the Depart-

\* Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Charter of the United Nations.

\*\* Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States: reports of the Secretary-General.

ment of Conference Services and the Office of General Services. The Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would not require any additional appropriations under the programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

2. Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said that his delegation had no objection to the convening of the Committee established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3349 (XXIX) from 17 February to 12 March 1976. In connexion with paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/1733 and Corr.1 he said that, although the Secretary-General understood that that Special Committee would meet at Headquarters, a Member State might invite it to meet elsewhere and offer to defray the expenses; if the session was included in the calendar of conferences, that information concerning the venue of the meeting should be indicated.

3. Mr. RUEDAS (Budget Division) said that paragraph 2 of document A/C.5/1733 and Corr.1 meant that the Secretary-General would use the cost of convening the meeting at Headquarters as a base for calculating the cost of