*United Nations*
**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**
**THIRTY-NINTH SESSION**
*Official Records**



FIFTH COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Saturday, 15 December 1984
at 11 a.m.
New York

# SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados)

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

## CONTENTS



/...

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/39/SR.52
19 December 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

84-58414 7895S (E)

/...

CONTENTS (continued)

The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 109: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1984-1985 (continued)

Use of consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups in the United Nations in 1982-1983 (A/39/7/Add.9; A/C.5/39/19; A/C.5/39/L.29)

1. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that the English and French titles of document A/C.5/39/19 differed. In the French text, reference was made to the use of consultants and experts in the United Nations (emploi d'experts et de consultants à l'Organisation des Nations Unies), which was the title of section VIII of General Assembly resolution 37/237. However, in the English text, the words "use of consultants and participants in ad hoc expert groups" appeared. Since there were experts who were not necessarily in expert groups, that formulation was not all-inclusive.

2. In the operative part of draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.29, the reference to a benefit received under the regulations of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund differed from the text adopted two years previously. What had been called a "pension benefit" was now called a "periodic benefit". Belgium believed that all former staff members on an equal footing, and that the provisions of paragraph 2 should apply to all retired individuals of an institution or agency of the United Nations system. It was also necessary to agree on the scope of application of that paragraph.

3. His delegation requested time to consider the matter.

First performance report (A/39/7/Add.15 and A/C.5/39/88)

4. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/39/88), said that the main indications in the report dealt with the effect of changes in exchange and inflation rates. As had been indicated in that report and in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/39/7/Add.15), gross savings amounting to nearly $45.7 million arose from favourable rates of exchange; at the same time, gross savings arising from lower rates of inflation amounted to approximately $2.6 million. Decisions of policy-making organs would account for an increase of approximately $1.9 million and other changes would account for about $1.2 million. The largest increase was accounted for by adjustments to standard costs, which would give an increase of about $36 million. The net reduction in expenditure was, accordingly, $9,158,700. The net revised appropriations for 1984-1985 were estimated at $1,277,647,300, which was nearly 2 per cent less than the net appropriations approved by the General Assembly in 1983. The Advisory Committee had met with representatives of the Secretary-General, who had provided additional information, and it was therefore recommending approval of the revised appropriations and estimates of income as indicated in annexes I and II of the Secretary-General's report.

5. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that paragraph 6 of the first performance report (A/C.5/39/88) reflected a small change in the accounts for the International Trade Centre, which amounted to a reduction of $46,300. Earlier in the current session, when the Fifth Committee had reviewed the 1982-1983 audited

(Mr. Nygard, United States)

financial statement of the Centre, his delegation had been informed that the Centre had been erroneously charging certain extrabudgetary posts to the regular budget. The audited financial statement had suggested that the situation was under review. From the performance report, it did not appear that the corrections recommended by the Board of Auditors had been implemented. His delegation wished to know what the current situation was and what the decrease represented.

6. With reference to paragraph 13 of the performance report, he wished to know what were the actual percentages to be used for each component and what was the dollar-equivalent expenditure for each component. The Secretariat should explain how General Assembly resolution 39/27 of 30 November 1984 had been taken into account in calculating salary costs in New York and other duty stations. Did the performance report take into account savings arising from the freeze?

7. Since the performance report contained increases in expenditure which his delegation did not support, including those relating to the August post adjustment increase, he requested that the adoption of that report be the subject of a recorded vote.

8. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said, with reference to the International Trade Centre at Geneva, that the adjustments in terms of the erroneous charges of extrabudgetary staff costs to the regular budget had been made. He would provide information later on the actual percentages and what they covered in the common staff costs. General Assembly decision 39/27 of 30 November 1984 to halt the December increase in the New York post adjustment had been reflected in the tables in schedule 3. The post adjustment index of 171 had been reflected since August 1984 and had also been projected throughout 1985.

9. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that increases or decreases in the programme budget could usually be explained by decisions taken by various bodies after the adoption of the budget as well as by inflation and changes in the rate of exchange. When those three elements were compared, it became clear that the variations resulting from inflation and changes in the rate of exchange were greater than those resulting from decisions taken by policy-making organs.

10. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Fifth Committee should approve a net decrease of $9,158,700 in the appropriations approved for the biennium 1984-1985, to be apportioned as indicated in column (7) of table 1 in annex I of document A/C.5/39/88, and a net increase of $16,461,000 in the estimates of income for the biennium, to be applied as indicated in annex II of the same document.

11. _At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal._

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India,

/...

Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

12. The proposal was adopted by 70 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

13. Mr. MILLS-LUTTERODT (Ghana) and Mr. NUGALI (Saudi Arabia) said that, had their delegations been present, they would have voted in favour of the Chairman's proposal.

14. Mr. KHALEVINSKI (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the first performance report because the report reflected the continuing growth in additional appropriations for United Nations activities which were not of high priority and which should not be a function of the regular budget. The report also reflected activities leading to the establishment of new posts to be financed under the regular budget. There were also cases of unfounded reclassifications of posts and, on the whole, the question of savings had not been satisfactorily solved in the report.

Consolidated statement of programme budget implications in respect of conference-servicing costs (A/C.5/39/98)

15. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/39/98), said that conference-servicing requirements calculated on a full-cost basis were estimated at $19,352,100, of which $13,253,200 related to United Nations Headquarters, $2,906,200 to Geneva and $3,192,700 to Vienna. After taking into account the resources which had already been appropriated for the biennium 1984-1985, the Secretary-General was requesting a total additional appropriation of $9,238,200. The Advisory Committee believed that the method of estimating conference-servicing requirements for Vienna should be refined. At United Nations Headquarters, there was room for increased productivity and also for better preparation of documents. Whenever the Advisory Committee had looked at forecasts of documentation, it had noted, in certain cases, areas in which documentation could be decreased without jeopardizing the work of the intergovernmental body which was to consider those documents. The Advisory Committee was recommending that $4,250,000 should be appropriated as follows: $50,000 to section 28D; $2,200,000 to section 29A; $2,000,000 to section 29C. Staff assessment would be $900,000, which would be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

/...

16. Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) said that, earlier in the session, his delegation had objected to the current practice of approving draft resolutions with conference-servicing requirements calculated on a full-cost basis. The consolidated statement presented the total bill for all the individual statements of conference servicing, which was over $19 million, and the additional budget appropriation. The requested budget increase included expenditures to which his delegation objected, and for that reason his delegation requested a recorded vote.

17. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said conference servicing at Vienna had to rely on a very limited resource base. There were four established interpreter posts to service a work-load amounting to 500 meetings a year. Conference services at Vienna therefore had to rely heavily on free-lance interpreters and temporary assistance. That was a very costly and unsatisfactory way to proceed. His delegation hoped that the Secretary-General, when preparing the next programme budget, would request the necessary permanent interpreter posts for Vienna. Conference services at Vienna were required to carry a regular work-load and his delegation hoped that the Advisory Committee, following its usual policy regarding conversion from temporary assistance posts to permanent posts, would approve the Secretary-General's request.

18. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, on the basis of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee should approve an additional appropriation totalling $4,250,000, to be apportioned as follows: $50,000 to section 28D; $2,200,000 to section 29A; $2,000,000 to section 29C. An additional appropriation of $900,000 under section 31 (Staff assessment) would be offset by an increase of the same amount in the estimates of income under income section 1 (Income from staff assessment).

19. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the Chairman's proposal.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* None.

20. *The proposal was adopted by 70 votes to 21.*

/...

21. Ms. DRUNEN LITTEL (Netherlands) said that, had her delegation been present, it would have voted against the Chairman's proposal.

Emoluments of the Secretary-General, of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (A/39/7/Add.16)

22. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the procedure whereby the Advisory Committee had submitted its report (A/39/7/Add.16) without a corresponding report of the Secretary-General was not unique. It had been followed in the past whenever the emoluments of the Secretary-General were being considered. Although the report appeared somewhat involved, it was actually simple. General Assembly resolution 39/27 of 30 November 1984 had incorporated 20 points of post adjustment into the base salary of the Professional and higher categories. In the past, the Controller had submitted information to the Advisory Committee to review the emoluments of the Secretary-General whenever such incorportions had occurred, and he had done so again in 1984. The background of past procedures was outlined in paragraphs 1 to 3 of the report of ACABQ.

23. In paragraphs 6 to 9 of the report, the Advisory Committee explained the method it had used to determine the level of the new gross salary as well as the net salary of the Secretary-General. Paragraph 6 indicated that, excluding post adjustment, the net salary before consolidation, with dependants, amounted to $72,516, but after consolidation it came to $85,000, with dependants. The amounts for post adjustment must be revised after the consolidation. Paragraph 9 dealt with the question of determining the gross salary. The Advisory Committee was recommending that the gross should be increased by 17.2 per cent. Accordingly, the new gross would be, with dependants, $163,300. There was a relation between the gross salary of the Secretary-General and his pension, which was based on one half of the gross if he remained in office for the full term. There was also a relationship between the gross salary of the Secretary-General and pensions which were paid to former Secretaries-General or their survivors. There was currently one surviving former Secretary-General and a spouse of a former Secretary-General. The Advisory Committee had indicated in paragraph 9 the changes which would take place in their benefits. Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report dealt with the emoluments of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme.

24. In paragraph 12 of its report, the Advisory Committee indicated that the current levels of pensionable remuneration of the Administrator and the Director-General had been determined by applying the same adjustment procedures in effect for staff in the Professional and higher categories. In paragraph 13, it recommended that, should the General Assembly approve the scale of pensionable remuneration for the Professional and higher categories contained in annex VI of the report of ICSC, pensionable remuneration for the Administrator and the Director-General should be established, as from 1 January 1985, at $143,400. The changes in emoluments would result in only temporary minor increases in net remuneration due to consolidation. The Advisory Committee thus believed that the financial implications outlined in paragraphs 14 to 17 of its report need not give rise to any additional appropriation for 1984-1985.

(Mr. Mselle)

25. As was customary, a draft resolution embodying the recommendations of ACABQ was annexed to its report. He trusted that the Fifth Committee would have no difficulty with the proposals contained therein and could adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution recommended by the Advisory Committee in the annex to its report (A/39/7/Add.16) without a vote.

27. It was so decided.

Conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials (A/C.5/38/27 and A/39/7/Add.1)

28. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had first considered the question of conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials at its 15th meeting, at which time it had decided to consider the matter in the course of informal consultations, the conduct of which had been entrusted to Vice-Chairman Ditz of Austria.

29. Mr. DITZ (Austria) said that, after extensive discussion, it had been felt that the conditions of service and compensation for the Chairman of ACABQ and the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of ICSC must continue to be determined by the General Assembly outside the common system, since it was essential that those officials should be treated in every way as independent from the Secretariat. Concerning entitlements upon the completion of their appointments, there was support for the idea of a lump-sum payment rather than a separate scheme of benefits, as suggested in the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/38/27). Further, doubts were expressed as to whether the present adjustment procedure for emoluments was still appropriate. Finally, it was felt that, in view of the distinct nature of their functions, conditions of service and compensation for members of the International Court of Justice should in future be treated in a separate document from the repoort which dealt with the other three posts.

30. Bearing in mind the Fifth Committee's decisions on the New York post adjustment and on pensions, and taking into account that a comprehensive review of the emoluments of officials other than Secretariat officials would be carried out at the fortieth session, he suggested that it would be advisable to defer consideration of the item until that time.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Assembly that consideration of the conditions of service and compensation for officials other than Secretariat officials should be deferred until its fortieth session.

32. It was so decided.

/...

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34 concerning agenda item 80 (d) (A/C.5/39/91)

33. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/39/91) concerning the programme budget implications of the draft resolution indicated that, in order to implement the proposed activities, additional resources would be required to finance in 1985 the cost of nine Senior Industrial Development Field Adviser posts already approved for 1984 under the United Nations regular budget. The estimated costs of those posts in 1985, including their support costs, amounted to $1,135,000. The Advisory Committee had no objection to the request for an additional appropriation and agreed that an amount of $238,500 for staff assessment would also be required under section 31, Staff assessment, to be offset by a credit in the same amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment.

34. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium), supported by Mr. ORSATELLI (France), Mr. NYGARD (United States of America) and Ms. CONWAY (Ireland), suggested that more time should be allowed for delegations from the industrialized and developing countries to pursue their consultations with a view to reaching agreement on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34, as well as on draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.33 and L.35. While it was regrettable that no apparent progress had been made within the framework of those contacts over the past few hours, an immediate decision could only widen the gap between the groups. Good will had been shown on all sides and every chance should be taken in the search for a satisfactory solution, bearing in mind the need to facilitate discussion of the matter in the General Assembly.

35. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon), supported by Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said it was his understanding that the Committee had agreed, at its 50th meeting, to postpone consideration of the draft resolutions referred to by the representative of Belgium for 24 hours and no longer, and then to follow established practice. Accordingly, since ACABQ had already presented its report, the Committee should firstly proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34, and thereafter take up the other two draft resolutions.

36. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) observed that it was traditional for the Fifth Committee to make exceptions to established procedure when circumstances warranted greater flexibility. He could not see how a postponement for a few more hours could do any harm.

37. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt) wished to emphasize that the Committee had already agreed to a postponement of 24 hours, during which time he had seen no evidence of progress in the informal consultations. The Group of 77 had never suggested that it was unwilling to listen to different views, but he doubted whether delegations would benefit from a further postponement. The task of the Fifth Committee was to consider the financial implications of the draft resolutions, which had already been put to a vote in the Second Committee and only the General Assembly could decide finally on matters of substance.

38. Mr. OULD MALLOUM FALL (Mauritania) said that, in the light of the Egyptian representative's statement, his delegation believed that it would be advisable to proceed to take a decision. Time was short and the Fifth Committee still had a heavy work-load.

39. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that he was not seeking a confrontation with the representative of Belgium regarding the substance of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.34. After a lengthy procedure that had begun in the Second Committee, a consensus had proved impossible on the draft resolution. Delegations must simply agree to differ on the substance and, without delaying further, take a decision on the financial implications. The final decision on both the substance and the financial implications rested with the General Assembly.

40. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone its consideration of the item to its 53rd meeting, at which time it must be prepared to take a decision.

AGENDA ITEM 112: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (continued)

(a) REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued) (A/C.5/39/L.30)

(b) IMPACT OF INFLATION AND MONETARY INSTABILITY ON THE REGULAR BUDGET OF THE UNITED NATIONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.5/39/L.22)

(c) FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A SINGLE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.5/39/L.31)

Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.22

41. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), referring to the second and fourth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution L.22, observed that, according to the first performance report (A/C.5/39/88), the slow-down in inflation had in fact resulted in savings of over $2.6 million for the Organization, while monetary instability had yielded over $45 million in savings. According to World Bank figures, the average inflation rate over the past decade for the developed countries in which the United Nations incurred its main expenditures had been 8.5 per cent, while that for the countries which had sponsored the draft resolution had been 17.6 per cent and that for the developing countries in which the United Nations incurred substantial expenditures had been 47.2 per cent. That situation was confirmed by the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/39/44) and, since the draft resolution was based on false assertions, he called on the representative of Cuba to withdraw it.

42. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) recalled that, when his delegation had introduced the draft resolution, no delegation had raised any objections to it. At one stage, a representative of the Nordic countries had even said that, while those countries did not see the need for a new study, they would not oppose it. In the process leading to the adoption of General Assembly resolution 37/130, various interested delegations - although not the United States - had consulted with the sponsors with a view to having their ideas reflected in the draft resolution. No one had approached the sponsors at the current session, in connection with draft resolution L.22, however.

43. The arguments put forward by the United States delegation sounded convincing, but they were without substance. While he agreed that inflation had slowed down in recent years in some developed countries, that was a short-term trend which

(Mr. Fontaine Ortiz, Cuba)

economists predicted was unlikely to continue. In view of the global economic situation, there was no guarantee that inflation would not rise again in 1985. He wondered what source the United States representative had drawn on for his statistics on inflation in the countries which had sponsored the draft resolution: the inflation rate in Cuba was certainly not at the level suggested. Finally, the inflation in developing countries where the United Nations had duty stations had been imported from the developed countries. The comparisons drawn by the United States representative were therefore worthless. The sponsors could not withdraw their draft resolution. If any delegation wanted a vote to be taken, however, it should request one. The sponsors were confident that the draft resolution would, in that case, be adopted overwhelmingly.

44. Mr. AMNEUS (Sweden) recalled that, in the statement on behalf of the Nordic countries to which the representative of Cuba had just referred, the representative of Iceland had in fact said that the Nordic countries believed that the Secretary-General's report responded satisfactorily to the request made by the General Assembly in resolution 37/130, that there could be as many different interpretations of a given set of data on inflation and monetary instability as there were economic experts, that they respected the views of those delegations which wanted to study the matter further but disagreed with those views and their implications, and that it would be an obvious waste of resources to request the Secretary-General to make a further study.

45. Mr. FORBES (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the 10 member countries of the European Community, observed that, like General Assembly resolution 37/130 before it, draft resolution L.22 suggested that the developed countries alone were to blame for inflation and monetary instability and should compensate other countries accordingly. The international economic situation was far more complex, however. The Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/39/44) indicated that it was difficult to draw conclusions as to what caused inflation, and that inflation in United Nations duty stations might not have adverse consequences for all Member States as contributors to the United Nations budget. It was thus clear that draft resolution L.22 was politically, not financially, motivated. Inflation knew no boundaries and no single country was responsible. Resources should not be wasted on a pointless study, especially when inflation was slowing down world-wide. The Ten would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

46. Mr. DITZ (Austria) observed that, while the draft resolution contained some acceptable ideas, he could not see what was meant by paragraph 3. Three studies had already been made and the representative of Cuba was still not satisfied. He wondered whether the Office of Financial Services had the capacity to make the study which was now being requested, or whether outside consultants would be required. All Member States were concerned at the impact of inflation and monetary instability but, to be acceptable, the second preambular paragraph would have to be revised. For instance, did the sponsors really believe that there was monetary instability in Austria? His delegation would be prepared to consider the draft resolution if the sponsors were prepared to revise it. At present, it was unclear, based on false assumptions and analyses, and called for a study which was beyond the capacity of OFS.

47. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) expressed concern that delegations should have waited until the last moment to make specific proposals on the draft resolution. If they had done so earlier, a text could have been prepared for adoption by consensus. Of course, the sponsors did not presume to know more about the economic situation in Austria than that country's representative, but they did know how inflation and monetary instability were affecting their own economies. Cuba, which had limited resources and was facing a difficult economic situation, had recently had to pay out an additional $478,000 because of the impact of inflation on the United Nations budget.

48. He wished to point out that the second and fourth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 3 (a) were identical to paragraphs to be found in resolutions 36/230 and 37/130. Thus, the sponsors were not requesting something that the General Assembly as a whole had not requested earlier. The two studies prepared thus far had not met fully the guidelines set forth in those resolutions or taken full account of the views of Member States. The sponsors therefore believed that a decision should be taken on the draft resolution as soon as possible.

49. Mr. DITZ (Austria) reiterated that, while his delegation shared the sponsors' concern at the impact of inflation and monetary instability, it objected to the wording of the draft resolution and regretted that it had not been consulted during the drafting process. Just because a certain wording had been accepted in earlier resolutions did not mean that it was totally acceptable now, and consultations might have permitted the drafting of a consensus text.

50. Mr. FORAN (Controller), referring to the question raised by the representative of Austria, explained that all four of the Secretary-General's reports on the subject had been prepared by members of the Budget Division and, where necessary, economists from DIESA, without outside expertise. If a fifth report was to be prepared, the same procedure would be followed.

51. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that the Secretary-General's report and the first performance report were perfectly clear on the subject and that the draft resolution was therefore politically, not financially, motivated. It was worth noting that ICAO had benefited from monetary stability and the absence of inflation in Canada. His delegation could not therefore support the draft resolution.

52. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) pointed out that only two reports had been prepared by the Secretary-General on the subject, in response to General Assembly resolutions 36/230 and 37/130. He rejected the assertion that the draft resolution was politically motivated. The text dealt with a genuine budgetary problem and he had statistics to prove it, if delegations had only asked to see them.

53. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, recalled that, in introducing the draft resolution, the representative of Cuba had said that most members of the Fifth Committee had been disappointed at the Secretary-General's report. It was his belief, however, that the real reason for the draft resolution was that the sponsors' hopes for a cheap propaganda exercise against the developed countries had been thwarted by the Secretary-General. The proposed study would waste valuable resources and the time should instead be used to study the real economic problems that were impeding development and growth.

54. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.22.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Ghana, Jamaica, Maldives, Nigeria, Pakistan, Singapore, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania.

55. Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.22 was adopted by 43 votes to 23, with 11 abstentions.

56. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed that there was a need to compensate for inflation and monetary instability. If one analysed the budgets of the United Nations system, it was clear that their growth was attributable largely to inflation in the various host countries and that not all Member States were responsible for the increased costs resulting therefrom.

57. General Assembly resolution 37/130 had requested the Secretary-General to prepare a broader and more detailed study of the impact of inflation and monetary instability. The report in document A/C.5/39/44 did not meet those requirements. Its conclusions as to the causes of inflation and related factors were generally theoretical and it did not analyse, on the basis of specific data, the real consequences of those phenomena for the United Nations budget. His delegation hoped that the next report would finally enable the Fifth Committee to consider thoroughly the negative impact of inflation on the United Nations budget.

58. Mr. EL-SAFTY (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because of its serious drafting flaws. If indeed a more thorough study was required that was beyond the capacity of the Budget Division, the time had clearly come to enlist outside expertise. As a result, the draft resolution should have included a statement of its programme and financial implications. His delegation also had reservations about the draft resolution because inflation in the developed countries concerned had, for several years, been lower than at other United Nations duty stations. Finally, the sponsors had not taken into account Austria's legitimate difficulties with the second and fourth preambular paragraphs and paragraph 3.

/...

59. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon) said that his delegation had nothing against the draft resolution as such but found some of its preambular paragraphs problematic. For instance, it was not proven that the General Assembly was "convinced" that many Member States were not responsible for the losses experienced as a result of inflation and monetary instability, or that there was "a need for a continuing review of procedures that could help to meet the above-mentioned budget costs". Since it believed that the proposed study was necessary, however, it had abstained in the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.30

60. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) expressed support for draft resolution L.30, which reproduced the main thrust of the corresponding resolutions adopted by consensus at the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions and endorsed the recommendations made in the highly informative report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

61. Draft resolution A/C.5/39/L.30 was adopted.

Draft decision A/C.5/39/L.31

62. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the substance of the draft decision submitted by the Chairman in document A/C.5/39/L.31. However, he had doubts as to the timeliness of the request in paragraph (b) that Member States should submit their comments regarding the Secretary-General's report on the feasibility of establishing a single administrative tribunal (A/C.5/39/7 and Corr.1) by 30 June 1985. The report contained many far-reaching proposals of a complex legal nature which required detailed expert study and, since a number of those proposals were vaguely or inaccurately formulated, delegations would need more time to clarify their meaning in consultation with the Secretariat. Accordingly, he proposed that paragraph (b) of the draft decision should be deleted and that paragraph (c) should be reworded to read: "To consider, at its fortieth session, how to proceed with the examination of this matter at that session".

63. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) supported that proposal. The actual jurisdiction of the proposed single administrative tribunal needed careful examination, which could not be completed in only six months. The reformulation of the draft decision could be entrusted to the Secretariat.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision A/C.5/39/L.31 as orally amended.

65. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 2.20 p.m.