

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1345th
MEETING**

Tuesday, 9 December 1969
at 8.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 76:	
Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences (<i>continued</i>)	
Administrative and financial implications of the decision taken by the First Committee at its 1715th meeting on agenda item 32 and contained in paragraph 12 of document A/7834	333
Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee in document A/7825 on agenda item 55	334
Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution C submitted by the First Committee in document A/7834 on agenda item 32	335
Administrative and financial implications of draft resolution III submitted by the Second Committee in document A/7854 on agenda item 12	335
Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee in document A/7853 on agenda item 88	336
Agenda item 74:	
Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (<i>continued</i>)	
Accommodation at Headquarters: proposed new construction and major alterations to existing premises	
Current requirements of space for office use and related purposes, and projected needs during the next twenty years	336
Draft resolution on the study of the nature of the increases in the level of expenditure in the United Nations regular budget (<i>continued</i>)	339

Chairman: Mr. David SILVEIRA DA MOTA
(Brazil).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Gindeel (Sudan),
Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 76

Pattern of conferences: report of the Committee on Conferences (*continued*) (A/7626 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1283, A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1023, A/C.5/L.1027, A/C.5/L.1030)

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE AT ITS 1715TH MEETING ON AGENDA ITEM

32* AND CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 12 OF DOCUMENT A/7834 (A/C.5/1288)

1. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) proposed that in view of the provisions of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution adopted on 3 December 1969 by the Sixth Committee at its 1169th meeting,¹ operative paragraph 5 (a) of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1 should be amended to read:

“The Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression shall resume its work, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2330 (XXII) of 18 December 1967, in Geneva in the second half of 1970”.

2. Mr. DE CURTON (France) withdrew his amendments (A/C.5/L.1023) to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020. He thanked those delegations, especially the Canadian delegation, which had worked with the French delegation to produce draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1, which incorporated the main provisions of the French amendments. Since the other provisions of the French amendments were taken into account in the amendments submitted by Ceylon and seven other countries (A/C.5/L.1030) and by Cyprus, he was willing to support them.

3. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) said he was opposed to the Cypriot amendment; he could see no reason why the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression—a short-term body which might well complete its work at its next session—should meet at Geneva. There was more justification for the Ceylonese proposal that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction should meet at Geneva in 1970, since that body would probably remain in existence for many years and the place of its sessions could be expected to change from time to time. He was nevertheless opposed to the Ceylonese proposal because of the expense involved (see A/C.5/1288).

4. Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee and would therefore vote for the Cypriot amendment to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1. However, it would vote against the Ceylonese amendment.

5. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the

* Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 88, document A/7853, para. 25.

Advisory Committee had considered the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/1288) on the administrative and financial implications of the proposal that the Sea-Bed Committee should hold its summer session in Geneva in 1970 and had concluded that the financial implications, especially those relating to the travel and subsistence of twelve substantive servicing staff, were somewhat overestimated. The Advisory Committee therefore considered that if the Ceylonese proposal was adopted, its financial implications should be \$100,000 rather than \$110,000.

6. With regard to the Cypriot amendment, the Advisory Committee's views on the proposal that the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression should meet in Geneva would be explained in detail later in the meeting; the financial implications of the proposal amounted to \$103,200 and although the Advisory Committee had made certain observations concerning that figure in its report (A/7838), it did not object to it.

7. Mr. GUPTA (India) proposed that the word "*Convinced*" in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1, should be replaced by the word "*Believing*".

8. Mr. TAITT (Barbados) proposed that in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution the word "not" should be replaced by the words "other than those".

9. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) accepted the Indian and Barbadian amendments but said that he could not accept the Cypriot amendment. He observed that the words "an emergency meeting" in operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution should be replaced by the words "emergency meetings".

10. Mr. HAMENOO (Ghana) said that his delegation, which had co-sponsored the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee, would support the Cypriot amendment.

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment by Ceylon and seven other countries (A/C.5/L.1030) to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1.

The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1 which had been submitted orally by the delegation of Cyprus (see para. 1 above).

The amendment was adopted by 45 votes to 11, with 15 abstentions.

13. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1, as amended and orally modified.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 69 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

14. Mr. BENDER (United States of America), explaining his vote, observed that the Fifth Committee was acting inconsistently; it had devoted considerable time and effort to the preparation of a draft resolution establishing the pattern of conferences, but was nevertheless endorsing

decisions by other Committees which were incompatible with that pattern. His delegation had voted against the two amendments to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1, but had supported the draft resolution itself, because it hoped that in future the Fifth Committee would adhere to the pattern of conferences it had established.

15. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) recalled that at the 1343rd meeting he had drawn attention to the need to review the arrangements for the allocation of staff between New York and Geneva; he was glad that that point had been taken into account in operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1020/Rev.1. He had been unable to vote for the two amendments to the draft resolution because the reasons given for holding the sessions of the two bodies concerned in Geneva did not seem to justify the very substantial expenditure involved. His delegation was becoming increasingly worried about the Fifth Committee's apparent lack of concern about the financial implications of its decisions.

16. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he had voted for the draft resolution. He had also voted for the Cypriot amendment, since his delegation had voted for the draft resolution of the Sixth Committee. He had voted against the amendment submitted by Ceylon, however, since his delegation was opposed to its financial implications and the First Committee had not yet taken a final decision as to whether the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction should meet in Geneva in 1970.

17. Mr. BRECKENRIDGE (Ceylon) observed that the First Committee had agreed in principle that the Sea-Bed Committee should hold its summer session in Geneva in 1970, and had further agreed that a final recommendation on that proposal should be made by the Fifth Committee, having regard to all the relevant implications.

18. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) said he had voted for the draft resolution, in the hope that it would establish a real pattern for conferences and meetings. It was paradoxical that staff might be transferred from New York to Geneva to service a meeting there, while at the same time Geneva staff might be on their way to New York to service a meeting at Headquarters. He hoped that the Secretariat would take that fact into account.

19. Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta) said he had voted against the two amendments, since the arguments adduced in their favour were not sufficiently convincing.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE THIRD COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/7825 ON AGENDA ITEM 55* (A/C.5/1271)

20. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) observed that

* Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:

(a) Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;

(b) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;

(c) Programme for the celebration in 1971 of the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General.

according to the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee (A/7825, para. 23), the General Assembly would designate 1971 as the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and would approve the programme of activity prepared by the Secretary-General for observing the International Year. In his note (A/C.5/1271, para. 10) on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution, the Secretary-General stated that the total financial implications would amount to \$229,900, of which \$76,000 would be required for the financial year 1970, \$143,500 for 1971 and \$10,400 for 1972. All but \$40,000 of the total would be required for staff to carry out the proposed programme. In so far as 1970 was concerned, the Advisory Committee had noted that the budget estimates already provided for a sum of \$71,500 for staff to begin preparatory work for the International Year. The additional financial implications foreseen by the Secretary-General for 1970 thus amounted to only \$4,500, which was required for office furniture and equipment and travel and subsistence of staff for co-ordination and consultation with Governments, the agencies and non-governmental bodies. However, the Secretary-General had indicated that he could meet that additional expense from within the existing estimates for 1970. The Fifth Committee might therefore wish to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the Third Committee's draft resolution, no additional appropriations would be required under the budget estimates for 1970.

21. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request its Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the Third Committee's draft resolution, no additional appropriations would be required under the budget estimates for 1970, but that the financial requirements for 1971 and 1972 would amount to \$143,500 and \$10,400 respectively.

It was so decided.

22. Mr. TOTHILL (South Africa) said that if the figures contained in document A/C.5/1271 had been put to the vote, his delegation would have voted against them.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION C SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/7834 ON AGENDA ITEM 32* (A/7837, A/C.5/1276)

23. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) observed that in his note (A/C.5/1276) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution C submitted by the First Committee in its report (A/7834, para. 13), the Secretary-General had estimated that adoption of the draft resolution would require an additional appropriation of \$6,000 under section 3 of the 1970 budget for consultant help in the preparation of the proposed study on international machinery having jurisdiction over the peaceful uses

* Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interest of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. In its report (A/7837), the Advisory Committee expressed the view that that amount could be absorbed in the budget estimates under the provision for consultant services, and it therefore recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that should the draft resolution of the First Committee be adopted, no additional appropriation would be required for 1970.

24. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request its Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution of the First Committee no additional provision would be necessary for 1970.

It was so decided.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION III SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/7854 ON AGENDA ITEM 12 (A/7836, A/C.5/1277)**

25. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to the Advisory Committee's report (A/7836) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution III recommended by the Second Committee in its report (A/7854, para. 58), under the terms of which the Secretary-General would be requested to study taxation systems in developing countries. As could be seen from paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report, the Secretary-General had not yet been able to determine the full financial implications of the resolution, but had indicated that an additional appropriation of \$25,000 under section 3 of the budget estimates for 1970 would be required for the initial phase of the study. The Advisory Committee agreed with the opinion expressed by the Secretary-General in his note on the question (A/C.5/1277) that, pending any future action that might be taken by the Economic and Social Council on the basis of the first phase, the resources devoted to the preparation of the study should be limited. It did not recommend that the Secretary-General's estimates for 1970 should be reduced, but it hoped that if paragraph 6 of its report was taken into account, the actual requirements would be less. The Fifth Committee might therefore wish to inform the General Assembly that if it should adopt the Second Committee's draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$25,000 would be needed under section 3 of the budget estimates for 1970.

26. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) observed that in his delegation's view the adoption of the Second Committee's draft resolution ought to have no financial implications at all. He therefore wished the report on the Fifth Committee to indicate that his delegation was opposed to the financial implications under consideration.

27. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) said his delegation considered that the study proposed by the Second Committee would be time-consuming and expensive and would serve no useful purpose. He therefore wished the Fifth Committee's report to indicate that his delegation was opposed to the relevant financial implications.

**Reports of the Economic and Social Council.

28. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Cuba) said he had reservations about paragraph 4 of the note by the Secretary-General since in his view IMF and IBRD were not the appropriate organizations to deal with questions relating to the developing countries.

29. Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta) said that in the Second Committee his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution in question, which contained a number of very equivocal provisions. He therefore wished the Fifth Committee's report to record the fact that his delegation had reservations about the financial implications of the provisions of that draft resolution.

30. The CHAIRMAN proposed that on the understanding that the reservations expressed would be recorded in the Fifth Committee's report, the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the Second Committee's draft resolution, an additional amount of \$25,000 would be required under section 3 of the budget estimates for 1970.

It was so decided.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/7853 ON AGENDA ITEM 88* (A/7838, A/C.5/1278)

31. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) called attention to the report of the Advisory Committee (A/7838) on the administrative and financial implications of a draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee (A/7853, para. 25), pursuant to which the Special Committee on the Questions of Defining Aggression would resume its work at Geneva in the second half of 1970. The Secretary-General, in his note on the subject (A/C.5/1278), had estimated the costs of a five-week session from 13 July to 14 August 1970 at \$103,200. While the Advisory Committee did not disagree with that estimate, it did wish to point out that the provisional dates would overlap to a considerable degree the period of the forty-ninth session of the Economic and Social Council, which could have a significant impact on the number of temporary staff that would need to be recruited for the session of the Special Committee. On the other hand, the proposed dates would result in economies in travel costs.

32. The Advisory Committee therefore suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee, an additional appropriation of \$103,200 would be required under section 2 of the budget estimates for 1970.

33. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that his delegation would have wished to register a negative vote on the item so as to make it clear that the decision to hold the meeting in Geneva was a violation of the decision taken at the twenty-third session concerning the calendar of conferences.

34. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee, an additional appropriation of \$103,200 would be required under section 2 of the budget estimates for 1970.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 74

Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (continued)
(A/7606, A/7608 and Corr.1, A/7710, A/7726, A/7749, A/7767, A/7769, A/7770, A/7776, A/7779, A/7796, A/7806, A/7817, A/7835, A/C.5/1230, A/C.5/1231 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1233, A/C.5/1234, A/C.5/1245, A/C.5/1246 and Add.1, A/C.5/1248, A/C.5/1249, A/C.5/1253, A/C.5/1254/Rev.1, A/C.5/1260, A/C.5/1263-1265, A/C.5/1268, A/C.5/1275, A/C.5/L.990, A/C.5/L.993, A/C.5/L.1002, A/C.5/L.1024)

Accommodation at Headquarters: proposed new construction and major alterations to existing premises (A/7835, A/C.5/1246 and Add.1)

Current requirements of space for office use and related purposes, and projected needs during the next twenty years (A/7835, A/C.5/1263)

35. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the Secretary-General's revised proposals (A/C.5/1246 and Add.1) for new construction and major alterations to existing premises, in New York, had been submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 2487 (XXIII). The Advisory Committee's observations on those proposals were contained in its report (A/7835).

36. Bearing in mind that the enlargement of United Nations facilities in any one city had to be viewed in the context of over-all development prospects during the coming decades, so as to ensure that potential accommodation reserves in various locations did not remain under-utilized, the Advisory Committee had taken into account the Secretary-General's reports on the situation in Geneva, Addis Ababa, Bangkok and Santiago, Chile, and the report on the current requirements of space for office use and related purposes and projected needs during the next twenty years.

37. One question with which the Advisory Committee had been concerned was whether the various United Nations offices provided an alternative to additional facilities at Headquarters, in New York. The conclusion reached by the Secretary-General in paragraph 27 of his report on the twenty-year projection (A/C.5/1263) had provided a negative answer to that question. The only location where some space would remain unused when the current construction programme was completed would be the United Nations Office at Geneva; but, while the possibility of moving some personnel from Headquarters to Geneva after 1972 should not be ruled out, the numbers of staff involved would necessarily be comparatively small.

* Report of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression.

38. The Advisory Committee had also addressed itself to the question of whether the Secretary-General's revised proposals provided an adequate answer to present and future accommodation requirements in New York. Those proposals, summarized in the table in paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report, were described in greater detail in paragraphs 16 to 22. The Advisory Committee's conclusion was that, on balance, the plans submitted by the Secretary-General were reasonable and acceptable.

39. Concerning the financial aspects, the Secretary-General had indicated that, although the estimated cost of the project was just under \$73.4 million, it would be prudent to base financial planning on the assumption of an outlay of up to \$80 million. The Secretary-General had recommended that the share to be borne by the United Nations regular budget should not exceed a maximum of \$25 million, to be spread over not less than 5 and not more than 10 years, commencing in 1971. The balance of \$55 million—which excluded the value of the land, estimated at \$12 million, generously pledged by the City of New York free of cost—was to be contributed from outside sources, including UNDP and UNICEF.

40. The Advisory Committee had attempted to assess the impact of the proposed construction programme in New York on the United Nations regular budget over the coming decade, in conjunction with other annual budgetary provisions for accommodation. The costs in New York were estimated in paragraph 25 of the Advisory Committee's report; the broader context was indicated in paragraph 27. The projection showed that the largest expenditure was likely to occur in 1973; thereafter a considerable reduction in the relevant appropriation would become possible.

41. The Advisory Committee had concluded that the revised construction programmes proposed by the Secretary-General would be to the advantage of the United Nations. It agreed with the Secretary-General that if the proposed plans met with the approval of the General Assembly, it would be undesirable to postpone action, not only because financial involvement of other interested parties was necessarily dependent upon assurance that the United Nations itself endorsed and supported the project, but also because delay might result in higher construction costs; moreover, the sooner rented premises were given up, the sooner the United Nations would be relieved of the need to pay rental costs in New York.

42. If the General Assembly, at its current session, authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the execution of the project on the conditions indicated in paragraph 26 of his report (A/C.5/1246), the Advisory Committee would be required to review and approve the total financing plan in 1970. It would, as indicated in paragraph 32 of its report, be required to ensure compliance with the arrangements which would have been approved in principle by the General Assembly.

43. In the light of its analysis of the situation, the Advisory Committee had concluded that the Secretary-General's proposals deserved favourable consideration by the General Assembly at its current session.

44. Mr. ULANCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the need for new construction allegedly stemmed

from the rapid increase in the size of the United Nations staff at Headquarters. His delegation considered that while the architectural and engineering plans were unobjectionable, they were also very expensive, especially in view of the fact that the new construction would provide only about 36,700 sq. m. of additional space—less than the existing Secretariat office space of 42,110 sq. m.—at a total cost of \$73.4 million and possibly \$80 million, or more than the original building, which had cost \$65 million and which had been financed, moreover, by an interest-free loan from the United States Government, only a little over half of which had yet been repaid from the United Nations budget.

45. Because of the very high cost of building, the Secretary-General had suggested that the share of the expenditure to be borne by the United Nations budget should not exceed \$25 million, but it was not at all clear what other resources would be made available from the United States; there had been only vague promises.

46. Moreover, his delegation was not convinced that the cost of construction to the United Nations would in fact be limited to \$25 million which was itself no small sum, especially if it were to be spent over the short period of four years. The construction work at Geneva was also costing some \$25 million, but there the burden on the United Nations was eased by a loan from the Swiss Government, repayable over fourteen years. Since no provision seemed to have been made for loans for the construction in New York, he wondered what justification there was for the Secretary-General's assumption that United Nations budget appropriations would be spread over a period of not less than five and not more than ten years. Moreover, contrary to the provisions of the Charter, it appeared that the actual construction work was to be started after the financial arrangements had been reviewed only by the Advisory Committee, and not by the General Assembly. Before the General Assembly was asked to take a decision on the new construction plan, it should receive clear and definite assurances regarding the financing procedures.

47. The Fifth Committee should also give serious consideration to the question whether it was really necessary for the United Nations Secretariat to expand so rapidly and uninterruptedly, and why it should be accommodated in New York alone.

48. In 1954, after a study had been undertaken by a special committee of experts presided over by the then Secretary-General, the Secretariat staff had been reduced by 300. A similar survey was once more being undertaken, and might well result in similar reductions.

49. There were currently three main centres of United Nations activities—New York, Geneva and Vienna. In Vienna, the Austrian Government was generously constructing a centre for international organizations, including UNIDO, at no cost to the United Nations. Since there was a limit to possible expansion in New York, the Secretariat should be distributed equally between the three centres. The United Nations centres in Europe presented a number of advantages. For example, they were closer to the capitals of many Member States; the sites were free; and construc-

tion, operating and living costs were lower than in New York. The cost of living in New York was rising rapidly, and in that connexion he recalled that at the current session it had been necessary to submit revised budget estimates for 1970, partly because of salary increases necessitated by inflation in New York, even though the estimates for 1970 had already taken account of one cost-of-living increase. Although costs were also rising in Geneva, the increases were modest compared with those of New York. Moreover, Geneva was now a centre of United Nations economic and social activity; UNCTAD had its headquarters there, and the Economic and Social Council held its summer session there every year. There seemed little reason for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs to be in New York at all. The United Nations auditors had suggested that the Statistical Office and the International Computing Centre should be transferred to Geneva; the same could be said of the department which serviced the International Law Commission, and also of the UNCTAD office in New York. Serious consideration should be given to those suggestions.

50. He had raised the question of more balanced distribution of staff between Geneva and New York because the Main Committees of the General Assembly often decided that a given body should hold certain meetings in Geneva, at considerable additional cost. In such cases, it was argued that the meetings, if held in New York, would not involve any additional expenditure. However, that argument was not altogether convincing: either there was a deliberate policy to concentrate all United Nations activities in New York, or it must be concluded that the New York staff was not working at full capacity and, in that case, it should not be increased. The distribution of United Nations staff between the various centres was unbalanced, since there were some 4,000 staff members in New York and only about 2,000 in Geneva. The Under-Secretary-General for Conference Services had said that when the facilities at Geneva were expanded, it would be possible to hold more meetings there. However, the best way to tackle the problem of financial implications was to move some United Nations bodies out of New York altogether. Arguments about financial implications were nearly always designed to serve some specific political purpose.

51. The question of accommodating the United Nations Secretariat in Geneva and Vienna had hardly been dealt with in the Secretary-General's reports, which had presented the question in a very one-sided manner. The report (A/C.5/1263) on current requirements of space for office use and related purposes contained a reservation to the effect that the conclusions were based on one assumption—uninterrupted growth of the United Nations Secretariat. Paragraph 27 of the same report stated that the possibility of transferring part of the activities of any branch of the Secretariat to another locality depended upon a number of factors "the majority and most important of which are outside the scope of the present document".

52. The reports had of course been prepared on behalf of the Secretary-General by members of the Secretariat who had every reason for wishing to stay in New York. They had bought or rented houses in the New York area, received higher salaries than their colleagues in Geneva, and were guaranteed against the risks of inflation by automatic

increases in the post adjustment. His delegation considered that the question of Secretariat accommodation should be studied by a small intergovernmental committee.

53. The Advisory Committee had indicated that there would be reserves of office space in Geneva from 1972 and in Vienna from 1974, but it too was still subject to the influence of those who were in favour of concentrating all United Nations activities in New York. Its report was equally one-sided, and certain paragraphs—particularly that relating to the spreading of appropriations until 1981—were clearly designed to "sell" the New York construction plan. Great stress had been laid on the ten-year payment period, but no reference was made to any loans.

54. His delegation still maintained the position it had taken at the twenty-third session (1274th meeting); it did not believe that the Organization should embark on a complex, expensive construction plan until an intergovernmental committee appointed for the purpose had studied all the possibilities, including the possibility of transferring part of the Secretariat to Geneva. It felt that the United Nations should not enter into any commitments until the arrangements for financing were absolutely clear; and it would therefore vote against the proposals contained in the reports of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee.

55. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) expressed his delegation's support for the new building plans and its hope that they would be approved at the current session. His delegation saw no alternative to a new building programme at Headquarters, and did not think there was any valid reason for further delay. The United Nations had approached the question of further building with caution over a period of several years; the need was evident in view of the crowding in the delegates' lounge and dining facilities. Representatives were less familiar with the situation in the Secretariat Building, but he noted that UNDP and UNICEF had had to find accommodation elsewhere, at a cost of some \$900,000 per year, and that the United Nations had to pay well in excess of \$1 million per year for outside accommodation for sections of the Secretariat and for storage space. Fortunately, the City of New York was prepared to make available, without charge, an area at the 42nd Street end of the Building. It would not be desirable to miss that opportunity, possibly lose the site forever and then find it necessary to make other plans for a site some distance from Headquarters.

56. Some might be reluctant to support the new construction because they favoured a greater measure of decentralization in the Secretariat; however, his delegation doubted whether that was a real consideration. The Secretary-General had shown that the regional centres also faced accommodation problems. The new building programmes at Geneva allowed some flexibility, but over-rapid expansion there had given rise to certain problems, and the new building would provide only for the needs of the next few years. But above all, it had to be appreciated that even the new Headquarters building proposal would not provide a permanent solution. Therefore, there was little force in the argument that the new construction would merely provide space for units which might have to be transferred in the future to a different location. Whatever other decisions

were reached, it was clear that all the additional space would be utilized to meet Headquarters requirements in the near future.

57. He stressed that both the land and the plans were currently available. The General Assembly would not meet again until the following year, and if no decision was taken at the current session, costs might rise and decisions might become more difficult to implement. His delegation would have preferred to have the plans available for consideration earlier in the session, but he noted that there was considerable difficulty in drawing up plans of such magnitude and complexity.

58. His delegation was pleased that the plans for new construction would take account of the need for parkland and recreation. It would be unfortunate simply to seize the available open land and then envisage new construction only in terms of concrete and steel. The area in question had been available to the people of New York as parkland, and his delegation considered it a credit to the designers of the new construction that an area for public use would not only be retained, but actually improved upon. It welcomed the proposal to include a recreational area in the new development, for that was something which was lacking in existing United Nations facilities. The difficulty of access to tennis and other sporting facilities in New York was such that representatives were often forced to forgo the recreation they would normally obtain in their home States. The United Nations already provided for a variety of its own facilities, and his delegation had no objection to providing for a measure of recreation in a manner that would be readily accessible and convenient; in fact, it saw considerable advantage in such a proposal. It would serve not only to keep representatives and staff members in better physical condition for their work, but also to provide a pleasant way of becoming acquainted with others.

59. His delegation hoped that the Committee would take the decisions necessary to begin construction in 1970, with a view to completion in 1973. It accepted the conclusions of the Advisory Committee that on balance the proposals were reasonable and acceptable and deserved favourable consideration by the General Assembly at its current session.

60. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that, while his delegation had no objection to parks and recreational facilities, it did not consider that the plans for new construction, as presented, provided a sound basis for a decision by the Committee. If the work of the Committee was to be taken seriously, it was difficult to see how the latter could be expected to give appropriate consideration to a proposal of such magnitude which had not been submitted until the last week of the session. The construction plans should in all fairness have been submitted at an earlier date.

61. He recalled that, during the general discussion, a number of delegations, including his own, had praised the presentation of the budget estimates for providing a realistic picture of the financial situation for 1970. It now appeared, however, that the budget estimates had been considerably enlarged by the financial implications of proposals submitted late in the session. His delegation considered that an unsatisfactory piecemeal approach had

been adopted in regard to the submission of proposals concerning construction and staff requirements in particular. The proposal concerning the expansion of Headquarters facilities seemed to be one of those for which it was difficult to find convincing arguments.

62. In regard to the proposed new construction, he wondered whether any estimate had been made of the cost of constructing equivalent office space at Geneva or Vienna, where construction costs would undoubtedly be lower. According to document A/C.5/1263, annex II, over 646,000 sq. ft. of additional office space would be required at Headquarters by 1989, while the proposed new building, as described in document A/C.5/1246/Add.1, would provide for a net area of less than 500,000 sq. ft. It was clear that still more space would be required, even if the proposed new building was constructed. He wondered whether any plans had been prepared to take account of that situation. He suggested that it might be preferable to consider additional construction on the existing Headquarters site.

63. A similar problem existed at Geneva in regard to office space. By 1972 or 1973, construction of additional conference facilities at Geneva would be completed, but there would be no space available for the conference staff and the substantive staff which would be required to service conferences held there. Thus, it would be necessary to transport large numbers of staff members from Headquarters to Geneva when conferences were held in the new facilities. That was hardly an economical proposition.

64. His delegation also had certain doubts regarding the financing of the proposed new construction. The total cost of the new building was estimated at approximately \$80 million, of which only \$25 million was to be provided by the United Nations. The remainder, in excess of \$50 million, was to be provided from other sources. Yet those sources had not even been named. It was unreasonable to expect the United Nations to commit itself to an undertaking of such magnitude without firm assurances that costs would be met with funds from known sources.

65. In view of the foregoing considerations, he suggested that the Committee should be provided with a comprehensive evaluation of staff and construction requirements for all possible variations of construction plans, taking into account the possibility of redeploying staff among different localities. If such a study was submitted early in the twenty-fifth session, the General Assembly would have adequate information on which to base its decision.

66. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further consideration of the question should be deferred until the following meeting and that the Committee should resume its consideration of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1024.

It was so decided.

Draft resolution on the study of the nature of the increases in the level of expenditure in the United Nations regular budget (continued) (A/C.5/L.1024)*

67. Mr. MEYER PICÓN (Mexico) said he would vote for the twenty-four-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1024)

* Resumed from the 1343rd meeting.

since he was fully convinced of the need for “a clear and objective picture of the various factors which have contributed to the expansion of the United Nations budget in the past”, in the terms of the last preambular paragraph. He considered that the confusion which existed in that regard resulted from the lack of a clear distinction between the increase in real terms and the increase in money terms, particularly in regard to the factors enumerated in subparagraphs (a) and (d) of the operative paragraph. His delegation believed that other significant factors existed in addition to those enumerated, and would vote for the draft resolution on that understanding, in view of the qualifying phrase “*inter alia*” in the first part of the operative paragraph.

68. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia) recalled the expressions of alarm voiced by certain delegations during discussions of the budget estimates for the financial years 1967 to 1969, which had given rise to the use of such terms as “ceiling”, “planning”, and “fixation” in many subsequent reports by the Secretariat and statements by delegations. The degree of concern at the annual rate of growth of the United Nations budget was such that the Secretary-General, in introducing the budget estimates for 1970, had said he was compelled to request an increase of only 2 per cent over the previous year, keeping his request to an absolute minimum. However, during the general discussion, the developing countries, as well as a number of developed countries, had not hidden their dissatisfaction with a budget which they considered insufficient to finance new programmes and activities. They had also made reference to the First United Nations Development Decade, the disappointing results of which they attributed, *inter alia*, to the lack of sufficient resources.

69. Two schools of thought had emerged in that connexion, and many delegations found little basis for any conclusion regarding the justification for the annual rate of growth of the budget. If the argument was to be based on facts rather than opinion, the only logical course was to resolve the many unanswered questions surrounding the subject by conducting a study. In his delegation's view, the draft resolution under consideration was an important and useful document which represented a step in the right direction. Its main objective was to establish the facts necessary to arrive at a realistic conclusion, as the representative of India had so eloquently explained at the 1343rd meeting, when introducing the draft. His delegation had been eager to know the cost of the study envisaged, and had been pleased to learn from the Controller that additional funds would not be required. It attached great importance to the draft resolution and looked forward with interest to the results of the study.

70. In conclusion, he wished to express his delegation's gratitude to the sponsors, and to the Indian delegation in particular, and its hope that the draft resolution would receive the support of the Committee.

71. Mr. PETHERBRIDGE (Australia) said that his delegation appreciated the conciliatory manner in which the draft resolution had been introduced by the representative of India on behalf of the sponsors. It likewise appreciated the assurance that the draft resolution was not intended to point a finger at anyone, but merely to provide for the collection of factual information. His delegation had initially had some doubts regarding the financial implica-

tions of the draft and the possibility of embarrassment for the Secretary-General in making the “economic and financial analysis” in relation to particular countries. It had therefore been relieved to learn from the Controller that the burden imposed by the study would not be excessive, and it accepted the Controller's statement that the report would be indicative rather than specific.

72. Although those assurances had put the draft resolution in a more favourable light, his delegation still had difficulties with certain aspects of it. He had no objection to the first preambular paragraph as a statement of fact; however, that paragraph implied that the purpose of the study envisaged was to show that there was no justification for concern regarding the expansion in the level of the budget. His delegation did not believe that anything would be lost if the paragraph was deleted. The third preambular paragraph raised difficulties because it suggested that there should be no restrictions of a budgetary nature on programmes which had proven themselves suited for international action. Such a wording suggested endless growth and unlimited budgets; individual Member States certainly did not view their own budgets in that way. Funds were always limited at some level, and therefore had to be governed by a system of priorities. That fact should be recognized in the third preambular paragraph.

73. Turning to subparagraph (b) of the operative part, it was obviously discriminatory to select for study the 16 Member States which contributed more than 1 per cent of the regular budget. That element raised doubts as to whether the draft was truly as conciliatory as had been said. A study covering all 126 Member States would, of course, impose a heavy and unnecessary burden, and it would seem more reasonable to study the situation in a much smaller number of States. Nevertheless, the task would still be considerable, since the 16 Member States concerned contributed together no less than 83 per cent of the regular budget; thus, the information collected would cover the part of the world which had by far the greatest responsibility in contributing to the funds required when there was an expansion in the budget. His delegation considered it unfortunate to concentrate the study on those 16 countries. It was hardly necessary to point out that those countries, in addition to being the largest contributors to the United Nations budget, also made considerable contributions to bilateral and multilateral aid programmes. It was likely that they would feel obliged to remind the Committee of their expenditures under such programmes in order to balance the information provided by the study when it came before the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session. It would be unfortunate to have to consider introducing material into the debates of the Fifth Committee which would normally be more relevant to the work of the Second Committee and others. In short, his delegation thought that the reference to States contributing more than 1 per cent of the regular budget should be deleted from the draft. Such a change would improve the text by adding to its objectivity.

74. Mr. GUPTA (India) noted that the delegations of Cameroon and Kuwait wished to add their names to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution (see A/C.5/L.1024/Add.1).

The meeting rose at 10.40 p.m.