



Monday, 11 December 1972,  
at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Motoo OGISO (Japan).

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FOURTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8960 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 69\* (A/C.5/1493)**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, in his statement (A/C.5/1493) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the Fourth Committee (A/8960, para. 9), the Secretary-General had advised the Committee that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, an additional appropriation in the amount of \$100,000 would be required under section 20 of the budget estimates for 1973.

2. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee agreed with the advice tendered to the Committee by the Secretary-General.

3. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution of the Fourth Committee, an additional appropriation in the amount of \$100,000 would be required under section 20 of the budget estimates for 1973.

*It was so decided.*

4. Mr. DRUMMOND (South Africa) said that his delegation reserved its position on the appropriation just approved. It had stated its views clearly in the Fourth Committee debate on the item and would not take up the Committee's time by restating them.

**AGENDA ITEM 73**

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1973 (continued)  
(for the documentation, see 1541st meeting)**

**Report of the Special Committee on the Financial Situation  
of the United Nations (continued) (A/8729)**

5. Mrs. DERRÉ (France) said that in view of the hopes placed in the Special Committee on the Financial Situation of the United Nations it was disappointing to learn that, according to its report (A/8729), the Special Committee had been unable to reach a consensus

\* United Nations Educational and Training Programme for Southern Africa: report of the Secretary-General.

on the matter. Nevertheless, its report had the merit of once more drawing attention to the seriousness of the Organization's financial situation and of classifying the problems involved. Her delegation did not wish to make detailed comments on the report but would indicate its position with respect to the financial crisis.

6. In the first place, responsibility for settling the crisis lay with all Member States without exception. Old political squabbles should not be revived; Member States should consider only whether they wished the Organization to continue to perform the tasks entrusted to it under the Charter. She recalled, in that connexion, that the French Government, which had opposed the operations that had caused the deficit and whose position in respect to those operations remained unchanged, had nevertheless provided proof of its loyalty to the United Nations family. Three times in the course of one year it had taken steps to improve the financing of the Organization: firstly, it had made a voluntary contribution; secondly, it had decided that from 1972 on it would pay the whole of its assessed contribution and not withhold any sum in respect of the amortization of United Nations bonds; and thirdly, it had agreed to the suspension for the current financial year of the provisions of the financial regulations calling for the surrender to Member States of unused appropriations. It should be noted, with reference to annex II of the report of the Special Committee, that by virtue of application of the well-known principle of accountability whereby settlements should serve in the first instance to discharge debts of longest standing, the bulk of the figure shown for France was made up of amounts her Government had refused to pay for reasons of principle. Almost the whole of the French contribution for 1972 had been paid earlier than usual.

7. The second point her delegation wished to emphasize was that it could only support proposals designed to bring about general budgetary rehabilitation. In its opinion, there was no partial solution to the financial crisis.

8. In conclusion, she said that her delegation fully endorsed the total package solution worked out by the majority of the Special Committee, which was described in paragraph 14 of the report. It went without saying, of course, that the transfer of technical programmes from the regular budget to UNDP should not be prejudicial to developing countries and that the developed countries should provide the developing countries with a formal assurance that in establishing the amount of their voluntary contributions to UNDP they would bear the transfer in mind.

9. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation fully agreed with the French delegation that the question was one which concerned all Member States and that every effort must be made to avoid reviving old political squabbles. In that connexion, gratitude was due to the French Government, which, although maintaining its position of principle, had nevertheless not withheld contributions from items of expenditure with which it did not agree.

10. The report of the Special Committee was important not only because it clarified the issues and mentioned specific figures but also because it contained a list of the 25 Member States which had paid or pledged voluntary contributions to the United Nations Special Account. All Member States should make voluntary contributions. In its report or in any recommendations it might adopt on the matter, the Fifth Committee should therefore direct a strong appeal to all Member States to contribute to the Special Account. Such contributions were necessary not only to demonstrate the collective responsibility of all Member States in the matter but also because, unless its financial solvency was restored, the Organization would be unable to implement properly the important decisions on such matters as the environment and the law of the sea recently taken by the General Assembly.

11. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden) said that the item under discussion was one of the most important and complex before the General Assembly. Unless there was a radical change in the financial situation, the Organization would be unable to expand or to maintain its effectiveness. The General Assembly must, at its current session, find ways and means to relieve the Organization of the financial problems confronting it.

12. The Special Committee was to be commended on its work even though its members had failed to come to a common understanding. The total package solution described in paragraph 14 of the Committee's report represented a very reasonable compromise between the positions taken by Member States on certain sections of the regular budget; it deserved unanimous support. It was therefore a matter for concern that the Special Committee had not been able to reach a consensus on the proposal. The reluctance of some developing countries to accept the transfer of technical programmes from the regular budget to UNDP except as part of a package deal was understandable. Sweden had already expressed its willingness to make, as part of the package deal, additional contributions to UNDP to offset the amount it currently paid to the regular budget for technical programmes. Nevertheless, it agreed with the developing countries that technical assistance programmes constituted very important sections of the regular budget. Such programmes had an identity of their own, concentrated as they were in the very important fields of assistance and on the least developed of the developing countries.

13. The regular budget of the United Nations must, by most standards, still be regarded as very modest. The question was not so much one of money as of principles. The Chairman of the Special Committee,

in introducing the Committee's report at the 1534th meeting, had mentioned the sum of \$86 million. For a poor country that was certainly a great amount of money, but there were 132 Member States—many of them rich—to pay the bill. In the case of Sweden, the sum corresponded to two thirds of what it paid to the United Nations system in a single year. His delegation fully agreed with the Chairman of the Special Committee that all Member States were collectively responsible in the matter and should be prepared to accept certain sacrifices in order to secure the future of the Organization. The fact was that seven years after the 1965 consensus—which had been reached on the understanding that all countries, especially those which played a central role in the financial crisis, would make the necessary voluntary contributions—the expected amount of money was not forthcoming. It was sad to note, in the schedule to annex I of the report of the Special Committee, that only 25 of the 132 Member States had provided positive proof of willingness to support the Organization. Again, the problem was not merely financial; it was much more a question of goodwill, for even poor States could afford to make token payments. His delegation had indeed noted, in that connexion, that some small and far from wealthy Member States had made voluntary contributions. It hoped that the gesture of support announced by the United Arab Emirates would be emulated by others. As permanent members of the Security Council and as the largest and wealthiest countries, the two major contributors to the regular budget had a special responsibility for the Organization. It was high time for all other States to urge those great Powers to discharge their responsibility in the financial crisis. There were, however, many other Member States which should also share in the collective responsibility. In a sense, the willingness of the total membership to contribute to a solution could be taken as a test of the support the United Nations concept actually enjoyed.

14. In conclusion, he said that the United Nations must be enabled to make a fresh start on a sound financial basis. The time to act had come.

15. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) said that the view of the Special Committee seemed to be that all problems germane to the critical financial situation of the Organization were interrelated and must be dealt with simultaneously as a total package. His delegation had difficulty in subscribing to such a rigid view, although it did not deny that the problems were interrelated and should if possible be dealt with simultaneously. According to paragraph 13 of the Special Committee's report, the proposals forming part of the total package were to be subject to consultation with regional groups. He noted, in that connexion, that his delegation was not aware that any consultations had taken place in the regional group to which it belonged.

16. The findings of the Special Committee were confusing. In paragraph 5 of its report, the Special Committee emphasized that the Organization's financial difficulties must be overcome by means of a total package; yet, in paragraph 23 it stressed the fact that it had

been unable to formulate a common position on the matter of resolving the financial situation of the United Nations. It was puzzling that the Fifth Committee should be requested to agree on a package deal on which the Special Committee itself had been divided. It was not surprising that the members of the Special Committee had been unable to reach agreement in the matter, for the subjects they had dealt with had been bones of contention for many years. For example, it was not only the developing countries which were opposed to the transfer of technical assistance programmes from the regular budget to UNDP; the Italian delegation was also opposed to the transfer. In the absence of specific assurances that voluntary contributions to UNDP would be increased, it would be very difficult to agree to the proposed transfer. It would also be interesting to know whether, in relation to the transfer, provision had been made under the package deal to ensure that the skills of technical experts would be put to effective use in other fields. The United Nations could ill afford to lose or waste expertise. Since the proposed transfer was envisaged as part of the package deal and since, according to paragraph 15 of its report, the Special Committee had not yet carried out a study of all the details that would be required to implement the package deal, his delegation would reserve its position in the matter until the detailed study had been made.

17. Indonesia had invested in United Nations bonds in good faith, believing that it had an obligation to help strengthen the financial position of the Organization, and his delegation would therefore find it difficult to agree that the bond issue should be removed from the regular budget and redeemed through voluntary contributions. He welcomed the fact that the impropriety of not repaying the sums invested in United Nations bonds was clearly recognized, but to repay them through voluntary contributions would be to convert the basis for repayment from a matter of principle to something of a questionable nature, particularly in view of the uncertainty surrounding the whole problem of voluntary contributions. In any event, his delegation would require instructions from its Government before it could take a position on the subject.

18. The report of the Special Committee dealt with matters of principle, and the implementation of its recommendations would have far-reaching consequences. At the present stage, in the absence of instructions from its Government, his delegation could only express its appreciation to the Special Committee and welcome its readiness to extend its services should the General Assembly so desire.

19. States Members of the United Nations enjoyed certain privileges, but membership also entailed obligations; certain burdens must be assumed, not necessarily on grounds of fairness but because it was essential to do so if the United Nations was to continue to exist. It would not be appropriate to allocate blame for the financial situation of the United Nations; delegations must deal with the situation as it existed, and not as it might have been had all Member States lived

up to their responsibilities. Although the members of the Special Committee had not been working from a common position, they had unanimously agreed that the responsibility of seeking a final solution rested with all Members, and not with any single category of Member States. The representatives of France and Italy had stressed that point, and his delegation agreed that, if the package deal was to prove fruitful, delegations must be fully conscious of their collective responsibility for sharing burdens.

20. Mr. OUFÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the representatives of India (1546th meeting) and Brazil (1544th meeting). While it was true that any solution to the problem must be in the nature of a package deal, it must, precisely for that reason, be acceptable to all Member States, including of course the developing countries. As a developing country, the Upper Volta was unable to agree that the technical programmes at present financed from the regular budget should be removed from it and financed from voluntary contributions to UNDP. Technical assistance was an activity deriving directly from the provisions of the Charter, whereas the two other parts of the total package related to specific activities which were unacceptable to certain Member States. Small though the amounts allocated under part V of the budget might be, they nevertheless constituted a guaranteed source of assistance to the developing countries. To have the technical programmes financed from UNDP would be particularly unacceptable in view of the fact that UNDP was, at the present level of contributions, unlikely to reach its own objectives; unless there were unforeseen developments, the targets for assistance to the least developed countries, in particular—which totalled some \$30 million in accordance with current indicative planning figures—were unlikely to be met. It would also be unacceptable to transfer the financing of UNIDO to UNDP, particularly at a time when most of the developed countries professed support for its activities but nevertheless felt unable to make specific voluntary contributions to it. Both the capitalist and the socialist countries, for different reasons, believed that UNIDO should be financed through UNDP. The result was, roughly speaking, a division of views between the northern and southern hemispheres. His delegation would find it particularly unacceptable to have UNIDO financed through UNDP in view of the fact that at least one major contributor to UNDP had recently, in the Second Committee, voted against a draft resolution<sup>1</sup> which called for an increase in voluntary contributions by 15 per cent annually in order to bring about a doubling of the Programme's resources by 1976. In the circumstances, it seemed illusory to believe that the financing of technical programmes by UNDP could be guaranteed if they were removed from the regular budget. To effect such a transfer would in fact not be in the interests of the majority of Member States and, notwithstanding his Government's desire to find a solution to the financial problems of the United Nations, his delegation was unable to accept that approach.

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently adopted by the General Assembly as resolution 2973 (XXVII).

## AGENDA ITEM 81

**Personnel questions (continued) (for the earlier documentation, see 1541st meeting; A/8829/Add.1, A/8935, A/C.5/L.1098/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.1, 21 and 22):**

- (a) **Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/8826, A/8831 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/8836, A/8897, A/C.5/1472, A/C.5/L.1079, A/C.5/L.1098/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.1 and 22)**
- (b) **Other personnel questions: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1, A/8935, A/C.5/1435, A/C.5/1439, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21)**

21. Mr. YEREMENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) reminded the Committee that during the discussion on the composition of the Secretariat, his delegation had expressed the opinion that the Secretary-General should be asked to submit information to the Fifth Committee on the status of the implementation of the long-term personnel recruitment plan. He proposed the inclusion of a paragraph (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.22) in the Committee's report to read:

“The Fifth Committee requests the Secretary-General to include in his annual reports on the composition of the Secretariat information on progress in the implementation of the long-term recruitment plan (see A/8836).”

22. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the revised text (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.1) of the Costa Rican proposal, which read as follows:

“Greater attention should be given at the time of recruitment of new staff, and especially of senior administrative officials who participate directly in the implementation of the management policy of the United Nations, to candidates from developing countries and other under-represented countries, recruitment being based, *ceteris paribus*, on equitable geographical distribution in the composition of the Secretariat.”

23. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) proposed that the words “to candidates from developing countries and other under-represented countries” in the text of the paragraph should be replaced by “to candidates from under-represented developing and other under-represented countries”; in addition, the words “*ceteris paribus*” should be deleted; and the words “without sacrificing the Charter requirements of efficiency, competence and integrity” should be added at the end of the paragraph.

24. Mr. VARGAS (Costa Rica) said that the main purpose of his delegation's proposal was to ensure that greater attention was given in the recruitment of new staff, and especially of senior administrative officials participating directly in the implementation of manage-

ment policy, to candidates from developing countries. Document A/C.5/L.1079 made it clear that the number of such senior posts allocated to nationals of developing countries, and particularly of Latin American countries, was extremely low; in the Executive Office of the Secretary-General, the Office of Financial Services and the Office of Personnel Services, there were no Latin Americans occupying such posts. Accordingly, his delegation felt that the paragraph it had proposed was important in the interest of ensuring better balance within the Secretariat, subject of course to the requirements of equitable geographical distribution. The meaning of words “*ceteris paribus*”, to which the representative of Ghana had referred, was that existing recruitment practices should remain unchanged; it was therefore an implicit reference to Article 101 of the Charter, and his delegation did not believe that the amendment proposed by the representative of Ghana was necessary. It was also unable to accept his first amendment since the main object of the paragraph was to ensure that greater attention was given to candidates from developing countries; that group naturally included a number of under-represented countries, but it was the interests of all developing countries that the paragraph sought to defend. While it was true that some developing countries were over-represented, that did not alter the paragraph's main purpose of ensuring a better balance within the Secretariat. Moreover, it referred only to the recruitment of new staff, and would not apply to existing posts.

25. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) supported the amendments of Ghana. In the first place, his delegation would be reluctant to support a text containing words not in one of the working languages of the United Nations. Moreover, his delegation believed that recruitment should be undertaken on the basis of certain general principles and it was those principles to which the third amendment of the representative of Ghana referred. For the United Nations to give greater attention to the recruitment of highly trained staff from developing countries might in fact be detrimental to the interests of those countries, since such staff were urgently needed in their home countries. If the amendments of Ghana were incorporated, his delegation would be able to support the paragraph.

26. The Ukrainian proposal (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.22) created some difficulty for his delegation, which had not spoken in the debate on the long-term recruitment plan because it believed the plan to be unsatisfactory and incomplete. Paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report (A/8836) stated that a revised plan covering the period from 1 July 1973 to 30 June 1978 would be prepared during the first months of 1973, based on updated and improved statistical information, and incorporating revised assumptions and targets with regard to all factors dealt with in the plan. Since the Committee would presumably have the revised plan before it at the twenty-eighth session, it might be best merely to take note of the Secretary-General's report and request him to submit a new plan as outlined in paragraph 4 of his report, rather than to report on pro-

gress in the implementation of the plan. His delegation would therefore be unable to support the Ukrainian proposal.

27. His delegation felt that the report of the Joint Inspection Unit dealing with personnel problems in the United Nations (A/8454) had not been discussed in sufficient depth. Paragraph 13 of the Secretary-General's note on the subject (see A/8897) noted that some of the inspector's recommendations, which would have far-reaching implications for policy decisions, would be examined at a later stage in the light of whatever action the General Assembly might take on the report of the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System. If, as a result of that report, it was decided to establish an international civil service commission, his delegation was not clear as to whether the Secretary-General would in fact report on the recommendations, or whether the matter would be taken up by the new commission.

28. The revised text (A/C.5/L.1098/Rev.1) of the draft resolution on the composition of the Secretariat was a great improvement over the earlier version, and his delegation would be able to support it without difficulty. It hoped, however, that the question of discrimination on grounds of sex would not occupy too prominent a place in the Committee's debates in future years.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his intention to request the Committee to take note of the reports of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat (A/8831 and Corr.1 and Add.1) and on long-term recruitment planning (A/8836); the Ukrainian proposal had obviously been submitted on the assumption that the Committee would also take note of the latter report.

30. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said his delegation's point was that, if the plan was to be revised in the early part of 1973, the revised plan would be submitted to the Committee at the twenty-eighth session. Accordingly, to request a report on its implementation would be inappropriate.

31. Mr. GHERAB (Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services) confirmed that, as paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report stated, a revised plan was to be prepared and would be submitted to the Committee at the twenty-eighth session.

32. Mr. YEREMENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that the paragraph referred to by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania and the Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services, also stated that the 1972 edition of the plan had from 1 July 1972 been serving as a quantitative guide for the recruitment operation. It was therefore already being implemented and the Committee was entitled to receive information on the results of that implementation. When the revised plan was put into effect, the Secretary-General would of course report on its implementation.

33. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) asked for an explanation of two expressions in the Costa Rican text—"administrative officials" and "management policy"—which could be given either a broad or a narrow interpretation.

34. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) felt that there was no very great difference between his views and those of the representative of Costa Rica. He had asked for the insertion of the word "under-represented" before "developing" to avoid giving the impression that over-represented developing countries wanted even greater representation in the Secretariat. It was only when the Secretariat found it unavoidable that it should resort to recruitment from over-represented countries. As to the Latin expression "*ceteris paribus*", he simply felt that it should be spelt out in plain language. If the Costa Rican representative would not accept the amendments, he would have to ask that they should be put to the vote.

35. Mr. VARGAS (Costa Rica) said that in the specific context of the draft paragraph he felt that the words "candidates from developing countries" were quite appropriate. He agreed, however, to delete the words "*ceteris paribus*", altering the latter part of the paragraph to read "recruitment, subject to the paramount considerations set forth in Article 101 of the Charter, being based on equitable. . .".

36. Mr. McENTYRE (Canada) said that he favoured the proposed amendments of the representative of Ghana and approved of the change just made by the representative of Costa Rica, as it made it clear that the criterion of competence laid down in Article 101, paragraph 3, took priority over the criterion of geographical distribution.

37. Mr. JAIN (India) said he did not fully understand the stress laid on administrative officials responsible for implementing management policy. While greater representation in such posts might be desired by the Latin American countries, the text should be made to respond to the needs and desires of all countries and to apply to senior-level posts in a wider variety of functions.

38. The Fifth Committee's report of the previous year had contained a forcefully worded paragraph about the lack of progress in achieving equitable geographical distribution. It was his feeling that the report for the current session should draw attention to that earlier statement<sup>2</sup> and request the Secretary-General to take it fully into account when drawing up the long-term recruitment plan.

39. Mr. BUTLER (Australia) said that the report of the Committee should present a balanced picture of the views expressed during the debate, and another point of view besides that reflected in the Costa Rican proposal had been quite clearly expressed. He could not have supported the Costa Rican text in its original

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes, agenda item 84, document A/8604, para. 34.

form as it watered down the terms of Article 101 of the Charter. The change just made by the representative of Costa Rica was a positive one, but it raised the question whether any paragraph at all was really necessary. If any text was to be inserted, he would prefer one reiterating the Committee's full support for the terms of Article 101 and indicating its desire that in implementing the principles stated in that Article due regard should be paid to the need for countries to be fully represented in line with the principle of geographical distribution. That was as far as one could go without risking a reinterpretation or weakening of Article 101. It might also be useful to see the final text of the Costa Rican proposal in writing.

40. Mr. VARGAS (Costa Rica) explained that the proposed paragraph was the result of consultations held between Latin American countries, developing countries in general and under-represented countries in particular. It was the outcome of an effort to meet the various concerns expressed. The aim was to secure greater attention, within the framework of the existing principles, for under-represented countries in filling senior administrative posts. He could agree to a further change which might make the text more acceptable: the words "candidates from developing countries and other under-represented countries" could be changed to "candidates from under-represented countries, especially developing countries".

41. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that, while developing countries would certainly like to see their people fill senior posts in administration and management, their interest was hardly limited to that sphere. In fact, the area of economic and social policy was probably much more important to them. In that respect he fully agreed with the representative of India and hoped that the Costa Rican delegation could accommodate their point of view. Otherwise, he would find it difficult to support the proposed paragraph.

42. Mr. DAMASCENO VIEIRA (Brazil) suggested that interested delegations should get together and attempt to work out a joint text.

43. The CHAIRMAN accordingly proposed that the Committee should defer action on the Costa Rican proposal (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.19/Rev.1) until the following day.

*It was so decided.*

44. Mr. WANG Wei-tsai (China) said that, while his delegation was very concerned about the item "Personnel questions", it was not fully familiar with its historical background and, in view also of the voluminous documentation, had not expressed any opinion on it. For the same reasons it would not take part in the voting on the item.

45. He wished to clarify his delegation's position on the proposals before the Committee. His delegation fully supported the draft resolution of the Third Committee on the employment of women in senior and other professional positions by the secretariats of organiza-

tions in the United Nations system (see A/C.5/1472). It supported the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1098/Rev.1) submitted by the Upper Volta and two other countries on ensuring equality to both men and women and avoiding all discrimination based on sex. It supported in principle the view of the representative of Costa Rica that greater attention should be given, in recruiting new staff, to candidates from developing countries, based on the principle of equitable geographical distribution in the composition of the Secretariat.

46. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) said that his delegation, which believed that women had proved that they were the equal of men in discharging responsibilities at every level in national and international public service, could readily support the idea expressed in the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1098/Rev.1) concerning non-discrimination in the Secretariat. For the sake of clarity, however, he wished to suggest three changes: the second preambular paragraph might begin "*Desirous* of ensuring that"; the third preambular paragraph might begin "*Desirous further* of avoiding"; and the end of the operative paragraph might be altered to read: "... whose application might, in certain cases, be interpreted as giving rise to discriminatory acts between staff members on grounds of sex".

47. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that the suggested changes to the preambular part appeared to affect the English version only; the French version was quite clear. As for the operative paragraph, he could not agree with the suggested change. It was application and not interpretation that was at issue. In particular, rule 107.5 (a) of the Staff Rules, as applied, had been found by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal to involve discrimination on grounds of sex and accordingly to be in violation of Article 8 of the Charter. So far as remedial action was concerned, only the General Assembly could amend the provisions of the Staff Regulations of the United Nations.

48. Mr. BUTLER (Australia) said that his delegation could accept the preambular paragraphs either in their original form or with the changes suggested by the representative of Indonesia. So far as the operative paragraph was concerned, he suggested to the representative of Indonesia that the word "might" in the original paragraph gave the text the same essential meaning as the suggested amendment.

49. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) said that he would maintain only his first amendment, namely that the second preambular paragraph should begin "*Desirous* of ensuring that".

50. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) accepted that amendment.

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1098/Rev.1), as amended.

*The revised resolution was adopted.*



52. Mr. JAIN (India) referring to the draft paragraph proposed by the Ukrainian delegation (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.2), suggested that the words "in the implementation" should be deleted, since the General Assembly would be receiving a revised plan and not a programme which was to be implemented.

53. Mr. YEREMENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said it appeared that the Committee would be taking note of the Secretary-General's report on long-term recruitment planning (A/8836). Paragraph 4 of that report said that the 1972 edition of the long-term recruitment plan was serving as a quantitative guide for the recruitment operation and that a revised plan for the future would be prepared during the first months of 1973. That suggested to him that there would be implementation results which could be reported to the Committee at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

54. Mr. JAIN (India) asked for an explanation from the Secretariat as to whether a plan not yet adopted or approved by the General Assembly was being or was to be implemented. His delegation for one had sought but not yet received certain clarifications about the criteria for some of the calculations involved in the plan. It understood that a revised plan would be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. His delegation assumed that no action would be taken under the plan before that time.

55. Mr. GHERAB (Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services) said that the Secretariat had not asked the Committee to adopt the plan submitted at the current session because it recognized that it contained imperfections. The Committee would simply be asked to take note of the report (A/8836). In view of the fact that a revised plan was to be prepared in early 1973, it might be more appropriate for the proposed text (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.22) to refer to "development" rather than "implementation" of the plan.

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the text of the paragraph (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.22) which the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics proposed should be included in the Committee's report.

*The text was adopted.*

57. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the Secretary-General's reports on the composition of the Secretariat (A/8831 and Corr.1 and Add.1) and on long-term recruitment planning (A/8836).

*It was so decided.*

58. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee entitled "Employment of women in senior and other professional positions by the secretariats of the organizations in the United Nations system" (see A/C.5/1472). Two amendments to that draft resolution had been suggested

by the Assistant Secretary-General, Personnel Services, and had been accepted with minor changes by the Committee. A further amendment had been proposed by the representative of Austria and had also been accepted by the Committee. He suggested that the Committee should deal with the proposed changes by including them in its report on the present agenda item. That would enable the General Assembly, when dealing in plenary meeting with the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 12, to have before it also the amendments recommended by the Fifth Committee. The three proposed amendments were as follows: firstly, in the fifth preambular paragraph, the word "total" should be deleted and, at the end of the paragraph, the following text should be added: "in posts subject to geographical distribution, and from 7.3 per cent at the P-5 level to 39.8 per cent at the P-1 level for the Secretariat as a whole"; secondly, in the sixth preambular paragraph the word "common" should be inserted between the words "United Nations" and the word "system"; thirdly, in operative paragraph 2, the words "nature of posts and" should be deleted.

59. Mrs. AUGUSTE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that she had not been aware that the Committee had agreed to the latter amendment, submitted by the representative of Austria and she herself felt that it detracted from the text.

60. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) said that he had not intended to press the amendment if there were any objections to it, and he accordingly withdrew it.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee agreed to recommend the two remaining amendments for adoption by the General Assembly in its report on that item.

*It was so decided.*

62. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would also, in the interest of orderly procedure, inform the President of the General Assembly, in response to his letter of 15 November 1972 (see A/C.5/1472), of the decision which the Committee had just taken.

*It was so decided.*

*Revised proposal for the establishment of a United Nations staff college (continued) (A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1, A/8935, A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21)*

63. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that his delegation had come to the conclusion, after due consultation, that it would not be desirable at present to approve the suggestion contained in paragraph 21 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8935), since further clarification of the matter was necessary before proposals could be prepared. He suggested the inclusion in the Committee's report of a paragraph (A/C.5/XXVII/CRP.21) to read:

“While recalling that the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session had approved in principle the idea of the establishment of a United Nations staff college,<sup>3</sup> the Fifth Committee, taking into account the relevant report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8935), decided to defer consideration of the revised proposal submitted by the Executive Director of UNITAR (see A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1) and to review the subject at its twenty-eighth session. To that end, the Fifth Committee requested the Secretary-General, in his capacity as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and in collaboration with the Executive Director of UNITAR, to submit a further report on the staff college project, including its financial, administrative and budgetary implications, in the light of the comments and observations of the Advisory Committee (A/8935) and of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee at its twenty-seventh session.”

64. Mr. McENTYRE (Canada) said he endorsed the Brazilian proposal. The proposal to establish a staff college was as yet insufficiently developed; the financial plans for it were not in final form. He felt that the paragraph submitted by Brazil would correctly express the Committee's feelings on the matter.
65. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation's position on the matter of the staff college had not changed since the previous year. In view of the fact that staff costs represented a very high proportion of the total budget of the United Nations and the agencies, no investment could be more productive than that intended to improve the professional training of staff members. In a world marked by rapid technological progress, it was essential that staff members should be in a position to keep up with modern methods and to undergo regular refresher courses. In the modern world, training was a continuous process, particularly in the case of organizations in the United Nations family where tasks were steadily becoming more numerous and diversified. Expenditure on a staff college would be money put to good use.
66. The idea of establishing a United Nations staff college had been approved in principle at the twenty-sixth session but its further consideration had been postponed to the twenty-seventh session. The intervening period had been put to good use. Paragraph 3 of the report of the Advisory Committee provided a clearer and more complete picture than the previous year's report on the question. His delegation was generally satisfied with that picture, particularly the general agreement noted in the report on the need for training in the fields of administrative management and interdisciplinary operational activities related to development.
67. His delegation had no reservations about siting the college at Geneva, since it supported the idea that it should be near the other specialized agencies. However, it should of course be decentralized to a considerable extent.
68. His delegation felt that there should be no delay in implementing the proposal; it therefore supported the recommendation contained in paragraph 21 of the report of the Advisory Committee to set aside \$130,000 in a special account pending a decision on the extent and manner of UNDP participation. It opposed any postponement of the project and could not, therefore, support the Brazilian proposal.
69. Mr. SAULS (United States of America) said the views of his delegation were largely in agreement with those expressed by the representative of Brazil. He suggested, however, that the latter part of the proposed paragraph should be amended to read: “in the light of the comments and observations of the Advisory Committee (A/8935), of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee at its twenty-seventh session and the views of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme”.
70. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that he accepted the United States amendment to the draft paragraph proposed by his delegation because it improved the text.
71. Mr. NICOL (Executive Director, United Nations Institute for Training and Research), said that, as had been pointed out in the introductory paragraphs of the UNITAR memorandum (see A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2), it was generally accepted that professional training in the field of public administration was a necessity. Many countries which had introduced training schemes with an emphasis on an up-to-date approach to present-day problems had achieved impressive improvements in efficiency. There was little doubt that the need for adequate training in modern public administration techniques was even greater in the United Nations system where the officials came from diverse backgrounds and had acquired different administrative habits during their formative years.
72. It was true that sending an official on a training course meant a loss of working time. That had to be balanced, however, against the gain from increased efficiency on return to work. Experience around the world had shown that the long-term benefits of carefully planned training far outweighed the short-term loss.
73. The argument that such training could be carried out adequately within individual organizations and agencies was open to serious objections. Experience had shown that for the more senior officials training was much more effective if it could be provided in a way which brought together men and women from different organizations so that they could examine together the effectiveness of new methods and approaches in the light of their differing experiences. There were many activities common to all the organizations and agencies within the United Nations family. Investigations undertaken by the UNITAR consultant during the previous year had shown there was wide agreement throughout the United Nations family that there could be very real advantages in providing common training programmes for officials at different levels

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, document A/8604/Add.1, para. 34 (c).



of seniority from various organizations working in the same fields. Such programmes would avoid the expense and time involved when a number of organizations each ran similar programmes. The intention of establishing the college was to eliminate duplication of efforts by concentrating training in one institution whenever it seemed that was the most efficient and effective thing to do.

74. The Secretary-General himself had fully endorsed the staff college project in his report (A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2). The previous Executive Director of UNITAR had clearly intended that the project should be a joint venture in which all the agencies and organizations participated; he had reported regularly on it to ACC from 1969 to 1972. ACC's annual report for 1971-1972 made it clear<sup>4</sup> that the college had the support of the four major specialized agencies; it also referred specifically to the support of UNICEF and IMCO.

75. The Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had already commented on the suggestion that the United Nations should not commit itself to any definite measure of financial support for the college until the agencies had made a definite commitment on their own account. Any such commitment could only be made by the governing bodies of the agencies. It seemed only reasonable that the General Assembly, which was the governing body of the United Nations itself, should give a lead in the matter.

76. He had been unable to follow up with the Administrator of UNDP the latter's submission to the Advisory Committee regarding the size of UNDP's contribution to the college. The Administrator had, however, reaffirmed his support for the project; it was only the extent of UNDP's financial support that was at issue. As was clear from the blueprint of the programme for the college (see A/8829/Add.1), the whole emphasis of the work of the college during the first two years of operation would be on development. The whole subject would be discussed in detail with the Administrator before the Governing Council of UNDP met in January 1973; he had every hope that it would be possible to reach full agreement with the Administrator. It would be very unfortunate if a substantive decision on such an important matter were to be deferred because the Administrator's absence from New York made it impossible to obtain complete clarification from him at the present time.

77. He assured members of the Committee that, although the greater part of the staff of the college would be based in Geneva, the college would be prepared to organize training courses wherever there was demand for them.

78. He assured the representative of Italy that continuing and inexorable financial demands were by no means inevitable. UNITAR had some experience in organizing training programmes within a very tight budget; although it was not easy to avoid increases due to inflation, he was able to give an assurance that

nothing would be done to commit the United Nations in any way to any substantial increase in budgetary support for the college until the General Assembly had been fully consulted.

79. He was certainly prepared to give careful consideration to the possibility, referred to by the representative of the Upper Volta, of having courses at the college for citizens of developing countries employed in national public services. He pointed out, however, that in the original proposal for the establishment of the college, such training had been envisaged as a second stage in its development. At that time, however, the general feeling in the Committee had appeared to be against any definite commitment to such a second stage. Consequently, all reference to any such commitment had been deleted from the revised proposal before the Committee. It would, of course, be quite possible to revert to the idea of such a second stage when the future of the college was reviewed after two years of operation as proposed in article IX of its terms of reference (A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2, annex I).

80. Despite suggestions to the contrary, there was widespread agreement at the administrative level throughout the United Nations system that a United Nations staff college was needed. If its establishment was postponed, the system would be condemned to a further period of efficiency below the level which could be achieved and which was required by Member States.

81. UNITAR had proposed the establishment of the college because it was charged under its statute with responsibility, *inter alia*, for providing "training at various levels to persons, particularly from developing countries, for assignments with the United Nations or the specialized agencies". According to the statute, those programmes might include training for staff members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and training for special United Nations field assignments. Since a staff training college was considered necessary for the United Nations family, UNITAR was, in accordance with its statute, the appropriate organ to take the initiative towards its establishment. It had accordingly done so, although it had always seen the college in terms of service which would be provided for all the other organizations and agencies and which would therefore be carefully designed and tailored to meet their needs.

82. He commended the memorandum circulated as part of document A/8829 and Corr.1 and 2 and especially the covering report by the Secretary-General, to the very serious attention of the Committee.

83. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, as was clear from the report of the Advisory Committee (A/8935), the Secretary-General and the Executive Director of UNITAR had provided new material on the subject of the United Nations staff college. Before any action was taken, however, the Committee must be quite clear as to what the General Assembly had been asked to approve at the twenty-sixth session. It had approved in principle the establishment of a

<sup>4</sup> Document E/5133 (of 3 May 1972), para. 198.

staff college and had asked for details of the way in which it was to be financed, its proposed location and so forth. The answers provided to a number of the questions asked had not been entirely satisfactory, particularly with regard to the extent of UNDP's financial participation.

84. The Brazilian proposal to defer consideration of the item to the twenty-eighth session should be seen in the light of a difficult situation reflected in paragraph 21 of the report of the Advisory Committee. The course of action proposed in the report was midway between deferring the item to the twenty-eighth session and unreservedly supporting the financial package deal proposed. He asked whether the representative of Brazil could provide a further explanation of what the Committee should ask the Secretary-General and the Executive Director of UNITAR to include in their report. The question of UNDP participation was obviously one important point, but other questions would also require further clarification. He was inclined to follow the course proposed by the Advisory Committee since, although the project had been approved in principle, his delegation was not completely satisfied with the replies given. The approach of the Advisory Committee required that certain conditions should be met. If UNDP did not make any allocation, the project would not go forward and the General Assembly would consider alternative financial plans in 1973. Although the course outlined in the paragraph proposed by the Brazilian delegation was attractive, the proposal of the Advisory Committee was pragmatic and practical. If the Brazilian proposal was approved, he feared that the Committee would receive the same material as before except for information on the UNDP contributions. Moreover, the two-year experimental period would be deferred by one year.

85. The other questions that remained unanswered arose mainly from weaknesses in handling the whole problem of training, as was clear from the surveys of personnel questions made by the Joint Inspection Unit. Member States had failed to take a long-term view of the matter; their approach had been unimaginative and limited in content. As a result, a situation had arisen in which the subject of training had to be approached without any knowledge of the implications of training projects, or, indeed, of the nature of training itself. Whether one agreed or not with the ideas set out in the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/8454), they certainly could not be ignored.

86. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) said that any further delay in the establishment of the staff college would be inexplicable. Unless the Advisory Committee's recommendations in paragraph 21 of its report were approved, the project would never get off the ground.

87. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil), referring to the comments of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, said that what his delegation proposed was that the Secretary-General and the Executive Director of UNITAR should be allowed to refine the project and remove the inconsistencies surrounding it. It was true that, in paragraph 21 of its report, the Advisory Committee had made approval of the appropriation contingent on UNDP participation

in the project, but the case the Advisory Committee had made in previous paragraphs of its report against immediate approval of the project was not reflected in paragraph 21. In paragraph 3, for instance, the Advisory Committee had stated that some aspects of the proposal required further clarification and in paragraphs 4 to 20 it had dealt with those aspects in detail. There were still many problems relating to the financial, administrative and budgetary implications of the proposal, including the effect the attendance of staff members at the college would have on the work of the various secretariats, that remained to be solved. It had therefore seemed a good idea to request the Secretary-General to prepare a further report elaborating on such questions as whether the finances would be provided in the manner now contemplated, how the staff college would operate and how many staff members would attend the college and thus be unable to discharge their official duties. In the absence of the clarifications requested by the Advisory Committee, it would be difficult for the Fifth Committee to approve the project. In the absence of such clarifications it would also be difficult to judge how UNDP might behave with respect to the financing of the college. If his delegation's proposal was approved, the Committee would be able at the twenty-eighth session to take a precise and informed decision on the establishment of the college.

88. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation would support the Brazilian proposal but considered that some of the points made by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania were well taken. The Committee's desire for precision should not be so great as to cause it to refuse to approve an acceptable project. As the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had pointed out, it was by no means certain that UNDP would take a decision on the matter at its next session; if it did not, the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session would be in exactly the same position as it was at the present time. The Advisory Committee's recommendation did therefore seem an acceptable compromise, although certain points still remained to be cleared up. One of the organizations of the United Nations family must take the lead in the matter.

89. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) explained that the project had been started as the result of a proposal by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and had been presented in such a way as to imply that it had the support of all the administrations. It now appeared, however, that in so far as UNDP was concerned, it was the Administrator, not the Governing Council, who was entertaining doubts about expenditure of the magnitude proposed. That was clear from paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report. It would therefore seem prudent to defer any decision in the matter until the administrations had reached agreement among themselves.

90. Following a request by Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait), the CHAIRMAN said that the decision on the Brazilian proposal would be deferred until a later meeting.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*