

Committee's report, should be selective in establishing its programme of work in the early years of its existence.

31. The success of the Commission would depend very much on the attitude of Member States, the staff and the secretariats in the United Nations system. It would certainly be unfortunate if the members of the Commission were politically influenced; the independence of the Commission and the commissioners must be respected by all, subject to the recognition that the Commission would be responsible as a body to the General Assembly. As Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, the Secretary-General should at all times ensure that the staff provided to the Commission were as competent and highly motivated as possible, while Member States and the Secretary-General must ensure that the commissioners met the standards required to produce results which would command the confidence not only of the Member States themselves but of the staff and the secretariats.

32. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, although not necessarily intentionally, statistics frequently lied, because they were based on averages which distorted the picture. Moreover, statisticians were almost always government officials who were required to show the picture that their Government wanted. It was regrettable that there was still too great a respect for statistics in international circles. The comparisons in the documentation before the Committee between United Nations and United States civil service remuneration in New York and Washington were hardly reliable in view of the discrepancies between categories of remuneration and the cost of living in the two cities. Conditions were very changeable and no valid conclusion could be drawn. He did not see why there should be any relationship between United States civil service salaries and United Nations salaries, since many United Nations staff were not United States citizens and were therefore not entitled to the benefits available to United States citizens. The United Nations should be a model for Member States and not vice versa.

33. The current economic situation was very confused and the expanding rate of inflation and currency fluctuations had had very adverse effects upon the living conditions of United Nations staff members. Dependency and education allowances had also been seriously eroded. The difference between the numerical value of money and its purchasing power was widening with increasing rapidity and there was galloping inflation almost everywhere. The United Nations must have a Secretariat staff that was dedicated to its principles and purposes. He therefore proposed that there should be a 12 to 15 per cent increase in all United Nations staff salaries and indexation of salaries to keep pace with inflation. He asked the Secretary of the Committee what such an increase would mean in terms of dollars.

34. The Soviet Union appeared to be in cahoots with the United States of America on the question of an increase in the remuneration of United Nations staff. Although the Soviet Union preached a 10 per cent decrease in military budgets to benefit the developing countries and although there was much talk by both countries of détente, they still spent billions of dollars on the ever-increasing arms race, while quibbling over a 6 per cent increase in the remuneration of United Nations staff.

35. He appealed to all States Members of the United Nations to support his proposal; the cost would be shared and would be included in the assessment of each State's contribution to the United Nations budget. The United Nations must be innovative in devising ways to deal with the current situation. Recently, the Organization had lost much of its credibility and now its Member States must either make every effort to fulfil the principles and purposes of the Charter or allow malaise to grow in the Secretariat and among the diplomats, in which case the Organization would become a mere shadow of what it was intended to be and accomplish next to nothing. The choice was for all Member States, great and small, to make.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1691st meeting

Thursday, 12 December 1974, at 3.05 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

A/C.5/SR.1691

AGENDA ITEM 82

United Nations salary system (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/9738 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/9891, A/C.5/L.1213);
- (b) Report of the International Civil Service Advisory Board (*continued*) (A/9630, A/9709, A/9919, A/C.5/1652)

1. Mr. TALIEH (Iran) said that his delegation favoured the changes to the draft statute of the International Civil Service Commission proposed by the Advisory Committee on

Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its report (A/9891). It also supported an increase of 6 per cent in United Nations salaries, as recommended by IS CAB.

2. Mr. AUGDAHL (Norway) said that his delegation supported the 6 per cent increase; if the United Nations was to attract and keep highly qualified personnel, it must offer satisfactory remuneration. At the same time, he stressed the urgency of a comprehensive review of the salary system so that any doubts regarding its fairness might be removed; he trusted that the new Commission would be able to perform that task in the very near future.

3. The CHAIRMAN declared the general debate on agenda item 82 closed.

4. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) introduced amendments (A/C.5/L.1213) to the draft statute of the International Civil Service Commission, which had been prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in its report (A/9891) and of comments made by delegations.

5. The Advisory Committee had noted, in paragraph 28 of its report, that the chapter on the functions and powers of the Commission followed that on composition and appointment and observed that a more logical sequence would be obtained if the order of chapters II and III were reversed; alternatively, the desired result might be achieved by amending article 1 (a). The Secretariat had deemed it more convenient to adopt the latter course of action and to expand article 1 so that it stated the Commission's purpose and general functions.

6. Article 2 had been redrafted and now made provision for the appointment of 2 full-time members, instead of 3. That amendment was consistent with the conclusions of the Secretary-General, as endorsed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 19 of its report.

7. The amendment to article 4 was of a technical nature; it seemed apparent that the Secretary-General, in compiling a list of candidates, should designate the Vice-Chairman as well as the Chairman and members of the Commission.

8. Notwithstanding the Advisory Committee's belief that the power of terminating the appointment of a member of the Commission should rest with the General Assembly, article 7 remained the same except for the addition of paragraph (b). The Secretary-General shared the reservations which had been expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom (1688th meeting): the existing provision which was similar to one in the Statute of the International Court of Justice, was designed to ensure that no member would be able to continue in his functions for any substantial length of time once it had been established by the other members that he was failing to discharge his duties satisfactorily.

9. The amendments to article 8 were simply consequential changes.

10. The amendment to article 10 (a) was designed to reflect the belief of the Advisory Committee and of some delegations that the General Assembly should not relinquish its responsibility for determining major allowances and benefits of the staff. In addition, the Secretariat was proposing the inclusion of a new subparagraph (c) in article 10, which would read:

"(c) Allowances and benefits of staff hitherto determined by the General Assembly";

the existing subparagraph (c) would become subparagraph (d).

11. As a consequence of those amendments, article 11 (b) should be redrafted to read:

"(b) Rates of allowances and benefits, other than pensions and those referred to in article 10 (c), the conditions of entitlement thereto and standards of travel".

Thus, the General Assembly would continue to determine such major benefits as dependency allowances and language incentives for the staff in the Professional and higher categories, the education grant, home leave, the repatriation grant and the termination indemnity. While the Commission might recommend changes in those benefits, the actual decision concerning their levels would be taken by the Assembly. The determination of certain other benefits, particularly subsistence allowances for staff in official travel status, which had to be changed frequently owing to currency fluctuations, would be left to the executive heads of the organizations in the United Nations system.

12. In paragraph 10 of its report, the Advisory Committee had made two important points concerning article 12. First, it had recommended that the Commission should have the right to determine the pace at which it was able to assume the responsibility of recommending changes in the salary scales of staff in the General Service and other locally recruited categories; hence the addition of the new paragraph (d). Secondly, it had observed that, when the Commission made such recommendations and they were accepted, the new salary scales should apply to all staff in the same category at the duty station concerned. The wording of paragraph (b) had been amended accordingly.

13. After reflection, the Secretariat had decided to withdraw its amendment to article 18 contained in document A/C.5/L.1213 and to support the Advisory Committee's reformulation, which was to be found in paragraph 26 of its report. If that wording was acceptable, the original article 19 should be deleted.

14. The wording proposed by the Secretariat for what would now be article 19 (a) reflected a consequential change.

15. The purpose of the amendment to the new article 20—formerly article 21—was to ensure that the standards laid down in the Charter would apply to the recruitment of staff for the Commission.

16. The changes proposed in articles 21 and 23 were minor, but article 23 should become paragraph (a) of that article and the amendment providing for meetings to be held in private—which was stated in document A/C.5/L.1213 to apply to article 29—would instead constitute paragraph (b).

17. The Secretariat was indebted to the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago for its observations concerning article 28 of the original draft. He accordingly suggested that the article should be amended to read:

"The Commission may, with the approval of the General Assembly, establish subsidiary bodies . . .".

18. The proposed amendments to article 31 were designed to reflect the suggestions in paragraph 34 of the Advisory Committee's report.

19. One point that had not been taken up in the proposed amendments was the Advisory Committee's suggestion, in paragraph 35 of its report, that there should be a provision defining the term "staff representatives". That was because the Secretariat considered that the inclusion of such a definition might lead to serious complications, owing to the fact that staff rules and regulations varied considerably from organization to organization within the United Nations system. Accordingly, it would be preferable to leave it to the Commission to define the term "staff representatives" for the purposes of the statute. Such a definition might be embodied in the rules of procedure of the Commission.

20. Once the Secretariat had heard the comments of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and those of delegations, it would issue a further document reproducing the text of the draft statute with the amendments.

21. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) explained that he had been unable to consult the other members of the Advisory Committee; consequently he could do no more than offer his personal views regarding the extent to which the Secretary-General's amendments reflected the views of the Advisory Committee.

22. The Secretary-General had accepted most of the Advisory Committee's recommendations; the decision to include the Advisory Committee's formulation of article 18 was particularly gratifying. Perhaps the only major divergence that remained was in connexion with article 7. The Under-Secretary-General had cited the Statute of the International Court of Justice in support of his point of view. It remained for the Fifth Committee to decide whether it preferred the position of the Secretariat or that of the Advisory Committee. The proposed amendments to articles 10, 11 and 12 appeared to reflect the Advisory Committee's intentions.

23. There were, however, two points to which the Under-Secretary-General had made no allusion when introducing the amendments. The first was the Advisory Committee's suggestion, in paragraph 33 of its report, that the statute should specify that the Commission was not entitled to summary records of its meetings. Alternatively, a provision to that effect might be included in the enabling resolution. The important point was that it should be clearly understood from the outset that records would not be provided. Secondly, it was nowhere stated in the revised text that the General Assembly would have the authority to give general direction to the Commission. He did not know whether that was an oversight or a deliberate omission.

24. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the comments made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee facilitated the task of the Secretariat, which would be ready to submit a revised draft statute—incorporating almost all the changes suggested by the Advisory Committee—for consideration by the Fifth Committee on the following day. The Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General had different views on article 7, and there was a possible slight divergence of views on whether there should be specific reference to staff representatives in the text of the statute

or whether that matter should be left for the Commission itself to decide.

25. Referring to paragraph 4 of the report of the Advisory Committee, he said that draft article 9 had not specifically authorized the General Assembly to give general direction to the Commission, not because there was any objection on the part of the Secretary-General but because it was axiomatic that any subsidiary organ established by the General Assembly was subject to its guidance. However, such a provision would be included in the revised draft.

26. In connexion with paragraph 33 of the report of the Advisory Committee, he said that the Secretary-General did not feel that it was necessary or appropriate to include in the statute a provision stating that the Commission should not be entitled to summary records. The Fifth Committee might wish to accept the alternative suggestion made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and include that provision in the resolution to which the statute would be annexed. If a detail of that kind was to be spelt out in the statute, there were many others that could also be included in it.

27. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) recalled that the General Assembly, when establishing the Commission in principle in its resolution 3042 (XXVII), had decided that the Commission would be collectively responsible to the General Assembly. In his view, the independence of the Commission should be subject only to the overriding responsibility of the General Assembly. Accordingly, article 6 (a) of the draft statute, stating that the Commission would be responsible as a body to the General Assembly, should be read in conjunction with paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report.

28. On the question of summary records for the Commission, he agreed with the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management that there was no need to include such a provision in the statute itself, but that it should be included in the resolution approving the statute of the Commission.

29. He drew attention to the fact that article 31 (b) as drafted in document A/C.5/L.1213 was considerably more restrictive than the recommendation by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 34 of its report, which suggested that the Secretary-General should draw any notice of withdrawal to the attention of the General Assembly and, through the executive heads concerned, to the attention of the legislative organs of the other participating organizations.

30. Commenting on article 7 of the draft statute in connexion with paragraph 29 of the Advisory Committee's report, he said that he had some difficulty with the idea that the General Assembly should appoint members to the Commission but should not have the power to terminate an appointment. He wondered whether there would ever be unanimity in the Commission on terminating the appointment of any member; the question might well be theoretical, but it should be taken into account.

31. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that the Fifth Committee, having

heard the statements of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, should postpone further consideration of the draft statute until the following day, when a revised text would be available.

32. Mr. MURG (Romania) said that he had some difficulty with the provisions of article 28 of the draft statute (A/9147 and Corr.1, annex I), and suggested that the Commission should establish subsidiary bodies only with the approval of the General Assembly.

33. Mr. SETHI (India) suggested that it might be better to enumerate the allowances covered under article 10 (c), rather than refer to allowances "hitherto determined by the General Assembly" as proposed orally by the Under-Secretary-General.

34. The draft statute should reflect the point made in paragraph 4 of the report of the Advisory Committee, as General Assembly resolution 3042 (XXVII) establishing the Commission in principle had done.

35. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) suggested that the words "broad geographical distribution" in article 3 (b) of the draft statute should be replaced by the words "equitable geographical distribution".

36. Referring to article 11 (b), he asked whether the Commission would be able to change the decision taken by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session concerning the standards of travel of senior staff. He also asked why Geneva had been selected as the headquarters of the Commission.

37. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) noted that there was no clause in the draft statute concerning its entry into effect, and asked whether there would be any objection to adding a final article reading:

"The present statute shall take effect on 1 January 1975."

38. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management), said that, as a clause indicating the date of entry into effect of the statute would be a transitional provision, it might be better to include it in the resolution establishing the Committee, rather than in the statute itself. The statute would enter into effect for the United Nations on 1 January 1975, but it would take effect for the specialized agencies only when their governing bodies had formally approved it.

39. Replying to the representative of Algeria, he said that, if it was the wish of the Fifth Committee, the words "broad geographical distribution" in article 3 (b) could be amended to read "equitable geographical distribution". In response to the second question, he said that the Commission would not be empowered to alter the General Assembly's decision that all staff members, with the exception of Under-Secretaries-General and Assistant Secretaries-General, would travel economy class. He added that Geneva had been selected as the headquarters because most of the agencies involved were in Geneva.

40. Replying to the representative of India, he said that the Secretariat did intend to list in a foot-note to article 10 (c)—i.e., not in the article itself, but nevertheless as an integral part of the statute—what allowances were involved.

41. The representative of Romania had expressed concern over article 28; he (Mr. Davidson) had dealt with that point earlier in the meeting, in his reply to the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, by suggesting that the article should be amended to provide that the Commission might establish subsidiary bodies with the approval of the General Assembly.

42. The incongruity between article 31 (b) in document A/C.5/L.1213 and the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 34 of its report, which had been pointed out by the Tanzanian representative, would be corrected by amending article 31 (b) to read "...and, through the executive heads concerned, to that of the legislative organs of the other participating organizations".

43. On the question of summary records, he recalled that the General Assembly in its resolution 2538 (XXIV), paragraph 10 (b), had decided that verbatim or summary records should not be provided for a newly established subsidiary body of the General Assembly unless they were specifically authorized in the enabling resolution.

44. A provision similar to that of article 7 was included in Article 18 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which stated *inter alia*: "No member of the Court can be dismissed unless, in the unanimous opinion of the other members, he has ceased to fulfil the required conditions".

45. The representatives of India and the United Republic of Tanzania had referred to the provision suggested in paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report. He was glad they had both felt that article 6 (a) met the requirement to a certain extent, as it was in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3042 (XXVII) establishing the Commission in principle and stating that its members would be answerable as a body to the General Assembly. Article 6 (a) did not go as far as the Advisory Committee had suggested, but he wondered whether going any further would be consistent with the rest of article 6 (a), concerning the full independence and impartiality of the members of the Commission. The intention of the General Assembly might be questioned if it expressed the wish that the members of the Commission should be fully independent but at the same time reserved for itself the right to give instructions while denying others, who were equally concerned with the Commission, the same right. There should be no derogation from the principle that the members were not subject to anyone's direction in performing their functions. It was an important point, and he suggested that the Fifth Committee might reflect seriously on it.

46. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) said that he preferred the wording "equitable geographical distribution" in article 3 (b). He was satisfied by the response of the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management concerning article 11 (b). However, he felt that the Under-Secretary-General's comments on the reasons for choosing Geneva as the Commission's headquarters were irrelevant in

view of the provisions of article 6 (b), which stated that no member of the Commission might participate in the deliberations of any organ of the organizations on any matter within the competence of the Commission.

47. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Advisory and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was aware of General Assembly resolution 2538 (XXIV) concerning summary records and of resolution 3042 (XXVII) providing that the Commission was responsible as a body to the General Assembly. He himself saw no inconsistency between paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report and article 6 (a) of the draft statute. He would, however, consult the Advisory Committee on those points.

48. He did not think it was essential to specify in the statute the date on which it would become effective. He was, however, concerned at the fact that some time would apparently elapse before it could be known whether the agencies would participate in the Commission. Their governing bodies would, of course, have to approve the statute, but he considered it extremely important that a situation similar to that which had occurred in connexion with the International Computing Centre should not arise; the General Assembly had established the Centre, but few of the other organizations had decided to participate and the United Nations had had to cover all the costs involved.

49. Mr. SETHI (India) said that he was satisfied with the response to his comments on article 6 (a). Commenting on the relationship between the General Assembly and the Commission, he suggested that the status of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board might be a useful model, as it protected the autonomy of the Board but left some scope for action by the General Assembly. He agreed that the allowances referred to in article 10 (c) could be listed in a foot-note, but he suggested that the word "hitherto" was not necessary in the body of the text.

50. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he shared the apprehensions expressed by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee concerning the participation of agencies in the Commission and the date on which the statute would take effect. In connexion with article 32 of the draft statute, he asked whether the withdrawal by an organization of its acceptance of the statute would disqualify it from rejoining later; if so, he suggested that an additional paragraph should be included indicating that withdrawal would not prejudice the right of an organization to accept the statute again later.

51. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that, in commenting on an effectivity clause, he had simply been referring to the provisions of the statute itself and in no way discussing the attitude that might be taken by the specialized agencies. The provisions of article 1 (b) and (c) meant that, until the statute was accepted by an organization and the Secretary-General was notified of that acceptance, the statute did not apply to that organization. Any organization that had withdrawn its acceptance of the statute could accept it again in accordance with article 1 (c) by notifying the Secretary-General accordingly.

52. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) introduced, on behalf of his delegation and the delegations of Guyana, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yugoslavia, a draft resolution concerning the United Nations salary system.¹

53. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. NAUDY (France), proposed that the draft resolution should be circulated in writing before the Committee considered it.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 73

Programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 (*continued*)* (for the previous documentation, see the 1670th meeting; A/9606, A/9608/Add.11-15, A/9854)

*United Nations accommodation in Addis Ababa, Bangkok and Santiago, Chile (concluded)** (A/9608/Add.14, A/C.5/1596/Add.1)*

54. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that, although the question under discussion made specific reference to Addis Ababa and Bangkok, in point of fact the question at issue was the construction of a new building for ECLA in Santiago, Chile.

55. The Secretary-General in his report (A/C.5/1596/Add.1) recommended the construction of a new building to house the documents research centre and also to provide additional office space for ECLA. The Government of the Netherlands had made a generous donation for the construction and equipping of a documents research centre on the ECLA site, and the General Assembly had already appropriated in 1972 approximately \$500,000 for the construction of a satellite building for ECLA, final decision on which had subsequently been deferred. The Secretary-General was of the opinion that a new office building could be constructed using the \$500,000 already appropriated for the latter project and the donation from the Netherlands. The Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should approve the Secretary-General's proposal but had considered it necessary to point out, in paragraphs 8 to 14 of its report (A/9608/Add.14), a number of uncertainties which might be involved in the project.

56. First, there was some uncertainty with regard to the future status of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning. That was a matter which had been under discussion for several years and was yet to be resolved. Secondly, there was uncertainty with regard to the continued accommodation of extra-budgetary staff in the ECLA building. That question, and the conditions of such accommodation, were to be considered at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly in the context of the report which the Joint Inspection Unit would submit; the Unit was currently gathering data and studying the issue. Thirdly, the Secretary-General's proposal would meet only the comparatively short-term requirements of ECLA, since

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/L.1216.

*Resumed from the 1689th meeting.

**Resumed from the 1643rd meeting.

if extra-budgetary staff continued to be accommodated in its headquarters building, the problem of office space would probably arise once again by 1980. Finally, in paragraph 13 of its report, the Advisory Committee had expressed its doubts as to whether the contractors' forecast that work could be completed in one year was fully realistic. However, the Advisory Committee did not believe that its doubts offset the advantages offered by the Secretary-General's proposal, which it therefore endorsed.

57. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was fully aware that ECLA was suffering from inadequate accommodations. However, it should be pointed out that a similar shortage existed both in Geneva and in New York. In Santiago more than 200 extra-budgetary staff occupied offices within ECLA's headquarters, with the result that the United Nations had to use the contributions of its Member States to construct new office space. That was not right. The Advisory Committee did make a number of well-taken points in paragraph 10 of its report, but unfortunately it had not drawn the correct conclusions. His delegation could not support the Secretary-General's proposal for the construction of a new building in Santiago. It would therefore request a vote on the proposal and would vote against it.

58. Replying to a question put by Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines), Mr. TIMBRELL (Office of the Assistant Secretary-General for General Services) said that since the architectural plans for the proposed new building had already been drawn up, actual construction could begin as soon as the General Assembly approved the proposal and therefore the building could hopefully be completed within one year.

59. With regard to the issues raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, he did not wish to go into the general question whether the United Nations should provide office space to extra-budgetary staff. The Joint Inspection Unit was investigating the matter and the Secretary-General wished to await the comments of the inspectors. The situation in Santiago with regard to extra-budgetary staff was influenced by the fact that the Chilean Government, in contributing \$1.2 million for the construction of the original ECLA building, had stipulated that accommodation should also be provided for the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning. Thus, there was a question as to the obligation of the United Nations to provide space for the Institute. He suggested that the donation from the Netherlands Government might be thought of as financing that portion of space which would be occupied by extra-budgetary staff. However, he was not making a policy statement, but was simply offering some general reflections on the situation.

60. He reiterated the gratitude of the Secretary-General to the Government of the Netherlands for its generous offer, which would enable the Organization to solve some of the accommodation problems in Santiago for a number of years. If another building was not constructed, it would be necessary to rent office space as from 1975. The Netherlands donation, together with the amount already appropriated in 1972, provided the United Nations with a fortuitous opportunity to construct a new building without incurring any additional expenditure.

61. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the representative of the Secretary-General for the clarifications he had given and asked two additional questions. First, what percentage of the total costs for the construction of the existing United Nations building in Santiago had been contributed by the Government of Chile? Secondly, did the Institute reimburse ECLA for the office space it occupied and, if so, what was the extent of that reimbursement?

62. Mr. TIMBRELL (Office of the Assistant Secretary-General for General Services) said that the Government of Chile had given the United Nations a freehold of the land on which the existing ECLA building had been constructed. While it was not possible to estimate the market value of that land, it represented a considerable gift. In addition to the land, the Government of Chile had contributed \$1.2 million, or approximately 30 per cent of total construction costs. With regard to the proposed new building, no offer had been made by the Government of Chile, nor had one been solicited. The site on which it would be built was land already donated by the Government of Chile.

63. In reply to the second question put by the representative of the Soviet Union, he said that to the best of his knowledge the Institute did reimburse ECLA for utilities, maintenance and other incidental costs.

64. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should: (a) take note of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1596/Add.1); and (b) concur with the observations and recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 7 to 15 of its report (A/9608/Add.14).

The proposal was adopted by 64 votes to 11, with 3 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 81

Personnel questions (*continued*)* (A/C.5/L.1172):
(b) Other personnel questions: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)* (A/8454, A/8826, A/9608/Add.5, A/9841 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1600, A/C.5/1601 and Add.1, A/C.5/1603, A/C.5/1639, A/C.5/L.1211, A/C.5/L.1212)

65. Mr. TALIEH (Iran), introducing a draft decision (A/C.5/L.1211), said it was clear from the Committee's consideration of personnel questions that a majority of delegations were in favour of implementing the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/1601, subject to the observations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

66. Although the draft decision did not single out any one of the Secretary-General's recommendations, his delegation would like to see particular emphasis placed on the restructuring of the Office of Personnel Services with a view to enhancing its authority and effectiveness.

67. While the General Assembly would be anxious to receive the progress report called for in subparagraph (b) of

*Resumed from the 1689th meeting.

the draft decision, it was important to allow sufficient time for the Secretary-General's recommendations to be implemented and to take effect. For that reason, and also in view of the fact that at its thirtieth session the General Assembly would be preoccupied with budgetary questions, subparagraph (b) requested the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly at its thirty-first session.

AGENDA ITEM 106

Translation of some official documents of the General Assembly and of resolutions of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council into the German language (A/9608/Add.13, A/9705, A/C.5/1617/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1189)

68. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, although the three sponsoring States had indicated their willingness to assume the costs involved in translating and issuing the specified documents in the German language, the Advisory Committee in its report (A/9608/Add.13) had approached the question of budgetary estimates in its usual manner so as to give the Committee an idea of what would be involved in such an undertaking, in terms of staff and expenditure. It was the understanding of the Advisory Committee that the sponsoring States intended to meet the full cost and that no budgetary charges would be involved unless at some future date the arrangements set out in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1189 were revised. The Advisory Committee therefore approved the estimates of the Secretary-General and endorsed his proposal that a trust fund should be established for the contributions from the sponsoring States.

69. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) said that, according to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the three Governments of the German-speaking countries were prepared to assume full payment for the translation of documents into the German language. He saw some divergence, however, between that understanding and the wording of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1189, which referred to additional contributions "towards meeting expenses," thus implying that the three Governments would contribute only a portion of the total cost. He requested a clarification on that point.

70. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) agreed with the representative of Algeria that the interpretation he himself had given went somewhat farther than what was explicitly stated in the second preambular paragraph, but said he hoped that it was not erroneous.

71. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he saw no contradiction between the text of the draft resolution and the interpretation of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

72. Mr. BOUAYAD-AGHA (Algeria) said that his delegation was satisfied in principle with the draft resolution, but would prefer the Committee to approve paragraph 10 of the Advisory Committee's report.

73. Mr. HENČIĆ (Yugoslavia), supported by Miss BASTOS (Portugal), proposed that, in order to bring the French text of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1189 into line with the understanding of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and of the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, the words "aider à" in the second preambular paragraph should be deleted.

74. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) requested the postponement of a decision on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1189. His delegation had wished to make a statement in that connexion, but was not prepared to do so at the current meeting.

75. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Japan that an opportunity would be given to his delegation to make a statement at a future meeting.

76. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) said that it was sufficiently clear from the English version of the second preambular paragraph that the sponsoring States intended to meet all expenses resulting from the draft resolution.

77. Mr. MACGREGOR (United Kingdom) said that in his opinion there was no equivalent of the phrase "aider à" in the English text.

78. Mr. SETHI (India), supported by Miss BASTOS (Portugal), said that, in view of the amendment proposed to the French text by the representative of Yugoslavia, the phrase "towards meeting expenses" in the English text should be changed to "to meet the expenses".

79. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) pointed out that the Yugoslav amendment could be incorporated into the Spanish text by adding the article "los" before "gastos".

80. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.1189. However, in view of the difficulties caused by the second preambular paragraph, he asked the sponsors whether they would be willing to substitute the wording "to contribute collectively to cover the costs" contained in paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report.

81. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the proposed amendments to the draft resolution, requested that a decision should be postponed in order to give the sponsors time to consult among themselves.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.