

Division concerned would be maintained for a number of years. It was therefore hard to argue that more people were needed to carry out the same work. For those reasons, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General.

60. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation supported the Mexican proposal.

61. Mr. FELLAH (Algeria) felt that the views put forth in paragraph 8 of the report of the Advisory Committee were somewhat tendentious; the budgetary principles of the United Nations had to be brought into line with its political and economic objectives, not the reverse. Paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/1750 stated that there had been a sharp increase in the workload of the Disarmament Affairs Division from 1971 to 1975 and the sponsors of draft resolution D had merely wished to ensure that the Secretary-General had the means to carry out his task. His delegation would therefore support the proposals made by the Secretary-General rather than those made by the Advisory Committee.

62. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that should it adopt draft resolution B of the First Committee, no additional appropriation would be

required under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

It was so decided.

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the proposal by Mexico and Sweden that the original estimates of the Secretary-General concerning the provisions of draft resolution D should be maintained. Those estimates were contained in paragraph 11 of document A/C.5/1750.

The proposal was adopted by 56 votes to 9, with 25 abstentions.

64. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that should it adopt draft resolution D of the First Committee, additional appropriations of \$149,200 would be required under section 2C of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977, with consequential requirements of \$31,600 for staff assessment under section 25, offset by the same amount under income section 1.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.

1768th meeting

Friday, 12 December 1975, at 10.55 a.m.

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

A/C.5/SR.1768

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION II SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10469 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 65* (A/C.5/1756)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1756) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution II submitted by the Second Committee in its report (A/10469, para. 17); paragraph 4 of that statement provided a breakdown of the total estimated cost of \$18,900. It was to be noted that the summary in paragraph 6 did not correspond to the breakdown in paragraph 4: the subtotals should be \$15,000 and \$3,900 respectively.

2. The Advisory Committee recommended that the translation and editing component estimated at \$3,900 should be absorbed within the resources already recommended for

approval under section 23. The Committee had no objection to the balance of the request, namely, \$12,000 for contractual services and \$3,000 for travel.

3. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution, an amount of \$15,000 would be required under section 5A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

4. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should the draft resolution of the Second Committee be adopted, an additional appropriation in the amount of \$15,000 would be required under section 5A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

It was so decided.

5. Mr. BACHE (United States of America) said that, had there been a vote, his delegation would have abstained for the reasons explained at the 1706th meeting of the Second Committee, on 27 November 1975.

* Mid-term review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS II AND IV SUBMITTED
BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT
A/10344/ADD.1 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 123*
(A/C.5/1757 AND CORR.1, A/C.5/1758)**

Draft resolution II (A/C.5/1757 and Corr.1)

6. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1757 and Corr.1) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution II submitted by the Second Committee in its report (A/10344/Add.1, para. 26). Included in the total estimate of \$27,600 was a sum of \$19,750 for consultant's services and temporary assistance in connexion with the preparation of a preliminary report on the extent to which women participated in fields such as agriculture, industry, trade, and science and technology.

7. The information provided orally to the Committee by the representatives of the Secretary-General showed that the reference to "consultant's services" was inaccurate, since the Secretary-General would not be seeking any expertise not already available in the Secretariat. His request was, in fact, motivated by his conclusion that the staff resources in the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs already recommended for approval for 1976-1977 might prove inadequate for the performance of the additional tasks requested of them. The Advisory Committee was not convinced that the established staff would be unable to furnish at least some assistance in the performance of those tasks. Recognizing, however, that some temporary addition to staff resources would be called for, the Committee recommended that an amount of \$10,000 should be approved to provide temporary assistance in the Professional and General Service categories.

8. The Advisory Committee recommended that the component for language services, estimated at a total of \$7,850, should be absorbed within the resources already recommended for approval under section 23.

9. The Advisory Committee therefore recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution II of the Second Committee, an amount of \$10,000 would be required under section 5A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

10. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution II of the Second Committee, an additional appropriation of \$10,000 would be required under section 5A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977. A further amount of \$1,000 would be required for staff assessment under section 25, offset by an increase in the same amount under income section 1.

It was so decided.

* Development and international economic co-operation: implementation of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its seventh special session.

Draft resolution IV (A/C.5/1758)

11. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referred to the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1758) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution IV submitted by the Second Committee in its report (A/10344/Add.1, para. 26), said that the Advisory Committee recommended that the \$30,000 for travel requested by the Secretary-General in connexion with the implementation of the provisions of the draft resolution should be approved.

12. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should draft resolution IV of the Second Committee be adopted, an additional appropriation in the amount of \$30,000 would be required under section 5A of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977.

It was so decided.

13. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, had there been a vote, his delegation would have voted against the proposal, for the reasons already given in the Second Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 100

Pattern of conferences (continued)* (for the previous documentation, see the 1763rd meeting; A/C.5/L.1289):
(b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/10348 and Corr.1, A/10454, A/C.5/L.1289)

*Inclusion of Vienna in the pattern of conferences
(A/10348 and Corr.1, A/10454, A/C.5/L.1289)*

14. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that although the report of the Advisory Committee (A/10454) was entitled "Inclusion of Vienna in the pattern of conferences", it dealt with the narrower question whether the United Nations should accept the offer of Tower A-2, which was deemed not to be needed for the medium-term requirements of IAEA, for which it had initially been intended.

15. In paragraphs 4 to 12 of its report, the Advisory Committee discussed how much of the space being built would be needed for UNIDO and IAEA not only in 1979, when they moved in, but also over the following 8 or 10 years. It concluded that some 330 staff members belonging to other units could be accommodated in the Donaupark centre in 1979 and that there would still be enough vacant space left for expansion of the new units over a number of years.

16. Paragraphs 13 to 15 were less detailed because the Advisory Committee lacked the necessary comparable data to determine the relative cost-effectiveness of the Donaupark centre as against New York or Geneva. In paragraph 14 the Advisory Committee recommended that such details

* Resumed from the 1763rd meeting.

should be furnished to the General Assembly at the thirty-first session.

17. In paragraphs 16 and 17, the Advisory Committee linked the acceptance of Tower A-2 with the need for the General Assembly to determine how the space was to be used.

18. The Advisory Committee had concluded that in order to avoid costly under-utilization of space at Vienna, acceptance by the General Assembly of Tower A-2 should be linked with a commitment to utilize space in the tower before additional space was acquired in New York, Geneva or elsewhere. Further, it had concluded that there would be advantages in considering the question of the location or relocation of additional units at Vienna in the broader context of accommodation questions as a whole, and that the financial implications of the assumption by the United Nations of responsibility for Tower A-2 should be considered in detail at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

19. Mr. KLESTIL (Austria) said that with the report of the Secretary-General on the inclusion of Vienna in the pattern of conferences (A/10348 and Corr.1), the Secretariat had discharged in a fair manner the task entrusted to it under General Assembly resolution 3350 (XXIX). Since 1955 it had been Austria's declared aim, in accordance with its policy as a neutral State, to do everything possible to serve the international community. His Government's endeavour to develop Vienna into an international meeting-place and the headquarters of international organizations was its contribution to understanding, coexistence and peace in the world, and the expression of its policy of security and neutrality.

20. The construction of the international headquarters and conference centre at Vienna was the fulfilment of an Austrian commitment to the United Nations. In 1966 UNIDO decided to establish its headquarters at Vienna on condition that Austria would make a headquarters and conference building available to that part of the United Nations Secretariat. Similarly, IAEA, which had come to Vienna 10 years earlier, had likewise expected to have its own headquarters building. It was clear therefore, that Austria had not decided on its own and without reaching agreement with the United Nations to construct the international centre at Vienna with its existing capacity.

21. It had, of course, been Austria's intention to build the Donaupark centre, but not on such a large scale. The project had been planned in close co-operation with IAEA and the United Nations and, after protracted negotiations, Austria had obtained a reduction of the demands for office space. Construction was going ahead for the capacity on which agreement had been reached in 1972 in an exchange of letters between the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Secretary-General. His Government was accordingly complying with the United Nations requirement, and the size of the project had not been determined by any concept of its own—hence the responsibility of the United Nations for the practical and rational use of the project.

22. It could, of course, be argued that that did not hold good for the IAEA office tower, since IAEA was an

organization in the United Nations system. It was clear, however, from documents A/10348 and Corr.1 and A/10454 that the United Nations would eventually need the space and that the one-time cost of the transfer of personnel would be offset by the fact that Austria was making the whole centre available rent-free, whereas in New York and Geneva extra space would have to be rented or constructed at United Nations expense. The Donaupark buildings would practically be owned by the United Nations since they were being offered for 99 years for a nominal rent of about 5 cents a year. In that context, it should be noted that the total cost of the Donaupark centre amounted to some \$700 million, which would be borne entirely by Austria. Thus, every Austrian citizen would be making a special contribution to the United Nations of about \$100.

23. Since the member States of IAEA were also Members of the United Nations, they would not escape the burden of an under-used IAEA headquarters in the Donaupark centre. The United Nations had much greater scope than IAEA, and it seemed desirable that the United Nations should take over Tower A-2. His Government had advised the United Nations of the availability of the tower, which was not required by IAEA.

24. Paragraph 22 of document A/10348 and Corr.1 indicated that by 1979, based on the estimates of the Joint Inspection Unit in 1974, the requirements for rental space in New York would be on the order of 26,022 square metres. At Geneva, recent and anticipated acquisitions of the former ILO space and that to be vacated by GATT would provide sufficient facilities for normal growth up to the end of 1980 only. The space offered at Vienna would therefore be needed by the United Nations.

25. The report of the Secretary-General also made it clear that, in addition to the savings in rental costs, general personnel costs, as matters stood, were lower at Vienna than in either of the two other major United Nations headquarters cities. Staff transfer costs would therefore be compensated in a relatively short period by the savings in rental costs and in continuing personnel costs which would result from a transfer of units to Vienna.

26. With regard to the Secretary-General's specific suggestions concerning the principles to be applied in considering the establishment of new units of the Secretariat or the transfer of existing units to Vienna, he stated that Austria had never intended to enter into competition with anyone or to entice anyone to Vienna. Its friendly relations with the other States where United Nations headquarters were situated should certainly not be affected in any way by the Donaupark project. Moreover, Austria fully understood that the transfer of old-established organizations would be difficult for their host countries to accept. It also understood the interest of the developing countries in decentralizing United Nations activities. However, it asked for understanding of its own position. What Austria was building at the request of the United Nations and at its own expense should be most economically used in the interest of all Member States. It was from that point of view that his Government was considering the many interesting suggestions in paragraphs 31 to 35 of document A/10348 and Corr.1. A number of Secretariat units mentioned as

examples for a possible transfer would fit well into the organizational pattern.

27. The Advisory Committee had agreed that the Secretary-General needed guidance before he could proceed any further in selecting units for possible location in or transfer to Vienna. His Government therefore hoped that the Advisory Committee's report would be approved and that the Secretariat would be requested to proceed in the way suggested in it, so that more detailed proposals could be considered at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, together with a full statement of all administrative, financial and social implications, taking into consideration the comments and suggestions made by the delegations during the current session. A considerable time-lag could be expected between the decision to transfer a given unit and the transfer itself. For that reason also, an early decision on the potential use of the space available was desirable. On the subject of the administrative and technical problems of accommodating a large number of international civil servants at Vienna, he was authorized to assure the Fifth Committee that a solution to such problems was absolutely guaranteed.

28. By building and making the Donaupark centre available, Austria was investing in the future of the Organization. Because of the potential savings and because of the geopolitical location, neutral Austria seemed to be an ideal site for organizations of the United Nations system.

29. Introducing draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289, he said that the text was the result of numerous consultations and serious efforts to reach a compromise, and already enjoyed broad support in the Committee. The operative paragraphs stated the purposes of the draft resolution. More detailed information on the costs involved would be presented subsequently. The sponsors were anxious to ensure the rational and economic use by the United Nations of its available premises and he hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

30. Mr. FELLAH (Algeria) said that his delegation recognized Austria's tradition of hospitality. It appreciated the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289 to reach a compromise and wished to become a sponsor of it.

31. The CHAIRMAN announced that Zambia, Canada, Indonesia and Senegal had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289.

Mr. Matseiko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

32. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that the report of the Secretary-General did not contain the expected information, proposals and recommendations or the data on administrative and financial implications requested in General Assembly resolution 3350 (XXIX); his delegation found it interesting, however, because it raised the very important question of Vienna's becoming a third major centre of United Nations activities. The Committee was therefore considering a broader question than the transfer of Secretariat units to Vienna: the question of decentralizing United Nations activities and services, to which Member States, especially the developing countries, attached great importance. For that reason, the report should

be given careful consideration by the General Assembly. Questions that had to be considered included the savings which the United Nations might make by transferring some of its services and bodies to Vienna and the Secretary-General's difficulties in finding accommodation, particularly in New York, where the shortage of office space placed an increasing financial burden on the Organization.

33. It was regrettable that the report of the Advisory Committee had not been issued early enough to permit Member States to consider it carefully before being required to make a decision at the current session. Paragraphs 32, 33 and 34 of the Secretary-General's report did not provide a sufficient basis for a decision. It was not enough merely to mention the possibility of transferring to Vienna only departments and units located at Geneva, where the situation, in any event, was satisfactory at the moment; that suggestion did not take into account the problem as a whole or the possibility or necessity of transferring some departments and units from New York. In his delegation's view, the question of decentralization could not be satisfactorily resolved by the availability of office space in the Donaupark centre in 1978; it should be resolved on the basis of the real needs which necessitated the transfer of various departments and units from their current locations. To that end, the Committee needed a report describing in detail the existing situation with regard to the utilization of office space so that Member States could assess the extent to which any proposed transfer would improve the performance and efficiency of the United Nations. Account should also be taken of the fact that Member States would be called upon very shortly to decide on two very important questions: the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency and the restructuring of the United Nations. The decisions taken on those questions would have a direct bearing on the commitments the United Nations should make with regard to the utilization of office space in the Vienna international conference centre. Accordingly, his delegation believed that all decisions concerning the transfer of United Nations bodies should be deferred until the thirty-first session of the General Assembly and taken up then in conjunction with the JIU reports on utilization of office accommodation.

Mr. Thomas (Trinidad and Tobago) resumed the Chair.

34. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation was firmly opposed to any transfer of Secretariat units. Such transfers were costly in themselves, and also entailed invisible costs such as reduced efficiency and morale. It was difficult to see what useful purpose they could serve or what need there was to move units from locations in which they had become well integrated. Moreover, if no units were to be located at the United Nations Office at Geneva, a use would have to be found for any premises vacated there, and, as the Advisory Committee stated in paragraph 18 of its report, at a time when the structure of the United Nations was under scrutiny, it would be difficult to decide which additional units could be located at Vienna. In addition, the General Assembly was to consider the whole question of the utilization of office accommodation at the thirty-first session, and, as the representative of Yugoslavia had pointed out, the possible conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency would have repercussions on the question.

35. The report of the Secretary-General did not satisfy the requirements of General Assembly resolution 3350 (XXIX), paragraph 4, and consequently the Advisory Committee's comments were less clear than usual. The administrative and financial implications had not been studied carefully enough for the Fifth Committee to be able to take a decision. It would be both illogical and dangerous to take a hasty decision, because the expenditures involved were substantial. Furthermore, the Advisory Committee acknowledged, in paragraph 14 of its report, with regard to the operating and maintenance costs of the Donaupark centre, that it had been unable to obtain comparable data for the office space currently occupied in New York and Geneva, and it recommended that such data should be furnished to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. The Advisory Committee likewise considered that it was impossible to predict relative staff costs in New York, Geneva and Vienna over a long-term period. His delegation was somewhat confused by the estimates and projections made in the reports of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee concerning the size of the space which might be reserved for the United Nations in Tower A-2 and in the UNIDO towers without prejudicing the normal expansion of IAEA and UNIDO. It needed to know how many staff members could be accommodated in the UNIDO towers so that it could take an informed decision with regard to Tower A-2.

36. His delegation was not, of course, questioning the generosity of the Austrian offer, but it felt that the Committee had not sufficient information to be able to take a decision. It paid a tribute to the Austrian delegation for including in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution a request for the submission of detailed information to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. His delegation would make its decision when all the information was available.

37. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that at the twenty-ninth session his delegation had expressed its gratitude to the Austrian Government for its offer of rent-free premises at the international conference centre. Vienna was the capital of a country which had a constructive policy of neutrality and maintained friendly relations with the majority of Member States; Vienna was therefore a good site for international organizations. His delegation was prepared to support a decision to approve the Austrian offer in principle, but it agreed that it would be advisable to discuss practical questions relating to the more effective utilization of office space at the thirty-first session, together with the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit. It would also be useful to consider the possibility of the use of office space at Vienna by organizations financed from extra-budgetary funds. His delegation proposed that the words "including extra-budgetary funds" should be added after the words "services of the United Nations" in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289.

38. Mr. AL-NAKKASH (Iraq) stressed that the effect on the morale of staff members, which had been referred to by the representative of France, applied to staff members from the developing countries as well as to those from the United States of America and Western Europe. On the other hand, given the efficiency of modern communications, the proposed transfers would not disrupt the work of the units

involved to any great extent. Of course any process of decentralization involved costs, but the proposals would certainly relieve the pressure on office space at Headquarters. The Secretary-General was right to support the Austrian offer and the Committee should do likewise.

39. Mr. MURG (Romania) said that Romania supported the idea that United Nations meetings should be held in different member countries and that there should be a broader geographical distribution of regional organizations, and his delegation accordingly endorsed the inclusion of Vienna in the pattern of conferences. Such a step would increase the participation of Member States in the Organization's activities and enhance its prestige. There should be a headquarters office in each of the geographical regions; as well as establishing political and diplomatic centres throughout the world, that would contribute to the democratization of the United Nations and make its activities better known. His delegation supported the policy of decentralization and hoped that it would include the socialist as well as the developing countries. However, caution had to be exercised with regard to the move to Vienna so as to ensure that the effectiveness of the bodies concerned was maintained and costs were kept to a minimum. Consultations should be held among the bodies concerned. His delegation appreciated the efforts of the Austrian Government with regard to working and living conditions, but it agreed with the Advisory Committee that it was difficult to decide which additional units could be located at Vienna at a time when the structure of the United Nations was under scrutiny.

40. Mr. McCARTHY (Australia) said that in considering the use of the Donaupark facilities by the United Nations his delegation had taken into account the following factors: first, office space could be made available in 1979 to accommodate some 330 staff members; secondly, relative staff costs at Vienna would probably continue to be considerably lower than in New York and Geneva; thirdly, it would cost less to use Tower A-2 than to use a comparable amount of space in New York or Geneva; and fourthly, existing facilities in New York and Geneva would be inadequate by the 1980s if current trends continued. There was therefore a good case for deciding that some 300 to 330 staff members should be accommodated in Tower A-2 in 1979 and that, on the completion of the Donaupark centre, the United Nations should not seek additional space in New York or Geneva until consideration had been given to use of space in Tower A-2. His delegation did, however, endorse the request for detailed information made in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289. It could not make specific proposals as to which units might be moved to Vienna, but it believed that an effort should be made to maintain or improve the geographical proximity of functionally related units and that the Secretary-General should take into account the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System. As matters stood, there seemed to be no reason why the Joint Inspection Unit and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal should not be located at Vienna, and there was a good case for transferring the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament because IAEA headquarters were at Vienna. Likewise, there was merit in the idea of transferring units concerned with energy or industrial development

because of the presence of IAEA and UNIDO at Vienna. A good practical reason for retaining the International Law Commission at Geneva was that it was essential for the Commission to have access to the United Nations Library. When discussing functional groups the Secretariat should also bear in mind the relationship between various international organizations and non-governmental organizations; it might find arguments both for and against the transfer of certain units to Vienna.

41. His delegation would support the draft resolution.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Marcuard (Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations) took a place at the Committee table.

42. Mr. MARCUARD (Permanent Observer of Switzerland to the United Nations) said that the report of the Secretary-General (A/10348 and Corr.1) had a number of implications for the United Nations Office at Geneva and for the organizations which worked in conjunction with it. Switzerland considered itself honoured by the long-standing presence of the United Nations at Geneva, since it viewed international co-operation as a lasting and certain basis for peace. His Government had always tried to fulfil scrupulously its duties as host country by fully respecting the independence of the organizations established in Switzerland and by providing them with the necessary physical facilities. The Federal and local authorities were constantly attentive to the problems of the international organizations and were in constant touch with their executive heads and with the missions accredited to them. His Government did a great deal more than was legally required of it by the headquarters agreement to create at Geneva the best possible conditions for the United Nations Office and the other international organizations. It had provided assistance for the construction of at least 10 headquarters buildings, and the Federal and municipal authorities had also created at their own expense the infrastructure required by the international community.

43. His country had never sought to secure a monopoly of international organizations. As the community of nations grew, it was natural that other States should wish to serve as host countries to international organizations. For that reason, his Government was not seeking to attract new organizations to Geneva. It was difficult, however, to understand why transfers should be made which were not justified by considerations of efficiency and economy and which did not take into account human and social factors that had an influence on the smooth functioning of any organization. Switzerland and the United Nations had concluded headquarters agreements. Consequently, to the extent that the decisions of the General Assembly or the proposals of the Secretary-General would bring about, either directly or indirectly, a change in the *status quo*, his Government believed that it should be consulted about and associated with those proposals and decisions.

44. All the necessary conditions for the effective functioning of international organizations were present at Geneva. Geneva, indeed, was a unique example of what might be termed the organic growth of an international centre, a growth which had come about gradually, as requirements emerged, over more than half a century. The network of

professional and human relations between the organizations which had been built up was an invisible but important component of international co-operation. It would be regrettable, therefore, if that co-operation machinery was disrupted for no good reason.

45. His Government and the Geneva authorities were prepared to do everything in their power to facilitate the smooth running of the organizations at Geneva. Such difficulties as had arisen in the past had always been of a temporary nature. Switzerland would do its utmost to enable Geneva to continue to fulfil its international mission.

46. With regard to the office space and facilities available at Geneva, which were the subject of paragraph 22 of the Secretary-General's report, he had additional information which might be of interest to the Committee. In the view of his Government, sufficient land and rental space for normal growth did exist at Geneva. Approximately 1,000 to 1,200 additional offices would be available in the buildings in question during the following five years. While it was true that the situation regarding office space in the United Nations Office at Geneva would be temporarily difficult—until the renovation of the former ILO building was completed—the Swiss authorities had already taken measures to expedite the work and to advance the date of completion to April 1977, or even the end of 1976, from the original date, i.e., 1978. Moreover, the rate of staff growth in most international organizations, including UNIDO and IAEA, had recently slowed down and the earlier growth forecasts for those organizations in the 1970s had not been borne out. Consequently, a margin of safety for five years of normal growth would in fact probably cover the needs of six or seven years.

47. In paragraph 15 of its report (A/10454), the Advisory Committee had referred to the impossibility of predicting the relative staff costs in New York, Geneva and Vienna over a long-term period, since they depended on several factors such as currency exchange rates, relative rates of inflation and relative local rates of pay. In that connexion, he pointed out that the Swiss authorities had taken measures to bring inflation under control and that, thanks to the Government's strict price control policy, the annual rate of inflation in Switzerland would probably be slightly under 7 per cent for 1975 and approximately 5 per cent in 1976.

48. Similar difficulties arose in making comparisons of overhead and maintenance costs; the figures given in paragraph 29 of the Secretary-General's report for the Donaupark centre and for other United Nations office space did not seem, therefore, to be directly comparable. The Advisory Committee had taken a similar view.

49. His delegation fully endorsed those sections of the Secretary-General's report which emphasized the significant costs for a host country of establishing itself as a major centre for international organizations. The cost of establishing an administrative and conference servicing unit at Vienna, referred to in paragraph 48 of the Secretary-General's report, would no doubt be even greater than the cost of acquiring additional office space. Because those two questions were closely linked, the Committee should obtain

the most accurate and detailed estimates of costs possible before taking any decision.

50. His delegation concurred in the Advisory Committee's view that any decision regarding the transfer of Secretariat units should be taken only after careful consideration of the possible implications, taking fully into account the structural reforms of the United Nations which were under consideration. It also shared the view that the location or relocation of additional units in Vienna should be considered in the broader context of accommodation questions as a whole.

51. Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289 took account, to a large extent, of the views of his Government.

52. Mr. SIBAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that since a large number of United Nations organizations and bodies already had their headquarters in New York, any new organizations established in the future should, ideally, have their headquarters elsewhere, in countries in which a climate conducive to international co-operation prevailed. The rate of inflation was higher in New York than in many other countries and delegations accredited to the United Nations in New York experienced many problems and much annoyance, particularly with regard to housing and security. Vienna was a suitable choice for a headquarters city because IAEA and UNIDO were already established there. For those reasons, his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289 and the oral amendment submitted by the Soviet delegation.

53. His delegation did not share the views of some delegations which had stressed the costs of implementing the draft resolution and the problem of morale which might be occasioned by transfers of staff to Vienna.

54. Mr. EKONG (Nigeria) said that his delegation appreciated the generous offer made by the Government of

Austria and would have no difficulty in voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289, should it not be adopted by consensus. His delegation supported in principle any steps taken to decentralize the United Nations and enhance its effectiveness. Because of Austria's neutrality, Vienna offered the non-partisan atmosphere which was vital to the proper functioning of the United Nations.

55. When deciding upon the location of new bodies, the United Nations should not limit itself to the existing choices, namely, New York, Geneva and Vienna, but should take decentralization to its logical conclusion by establishing their headquarters in other places, especially in the developing countries. Accordingly, while his delegation supported the inclusion of Vienna in the pattern of conferences, it believed that certain aspects of that decision required closer examination. Many of the developing countries had no permanent missions at Geneva, and the situation would be further complicated by the establishment of a third major conference centre. Moreover, the fact that Vienna was in a German-speaking country created problems for some delegations, since German was not an official language of the United Nations. The Secretary-General should take into account the views expressed in the Committee when preparing his report to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session on the possibility of relocating certain services and the optimum utilization of the office space offered by the Austrian Government.

56. Mr. LASCARRO (Colombia) said that he had recently been to Vienna and could assure members of the Committee that he had experienced no moral or psychological problems. On the contrary, he had found the city's hospitality and facilities to be completely satisfactory. His delegation wished, therefore, to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1289.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

1769th meeting

Friday, 12 December 1975, at 5.25 p.m.

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

A/C.5/SR.1769

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT DECISION I SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/10344/ADD.1 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 123* (A/10008/ADD.24, A/C.5/1742)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the report of the Advisory Committee (A/10008/Add.24) on the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/1742) of the administrative and financial implications of draft decision I

submitted by the Second Committee in its report (A/10344/Add.1, para. 27), the subject of which was the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System,¹ said that the Secretary-General had requested an additional appropriation of \$85,800 under section 4 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1976-1977 for a series of meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

2. Paragraph 2 of the Advisory Committee's report contained a breakdown of the request. In paragraph 3 of its

* Development and international economic co-operation: implementation of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its seventh special session.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Supplement No. 5.*