

not insist on it being put to the vote immediately, but whether it could be put to the vote at the following meeting depended on the type of report that the Committee decided later in the day to submit to the General Assembly. He had the impression that the Rapporteur was to submit to the Assembly, in the course of the same day, the report of the Committee on the item under consideration, with an indication that other parts of the report, which could be issued as addenda, would appear later, on the understanding that a decision taken on the Tanzanian proposal would be included in those addenda.

75. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) suggested that, since the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania had accepted the postponement of a vote on his proposal, the part of the first sentence reading "During the discussion of this item it was apparent that there was widespread interest in the Committee in the arrangement for the apportionment of the expenses . . ." should be replaced by a more concise

form of words. As it stood, the sentence seemed to go beyond the facts.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee, in a departure from the decision it had taken at the 1651st meeting on the item relating to publications and documentation of the United Nations, requested the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly on the decision taken at the current meeting, on the understanding that a future report, which would cover the decision to be taken by the Committee on the Tanzanian proposal (A/C.5/L.1193), would be submitted to the Assembly after a draft of that report had been considered by the Committee.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.*

## 1679th meeting

Monday, 2 December 1974, at 3.10 p.m.

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

A/C.5/SR.1679

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Garrido (Philippines), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 84

**Financing of the United Nations Emergency Force and of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/9822, A/9870; A/C.5/L.1193/Rev.1)**

1. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Group of 77 had held a meeting at which it had endorsed the draft decision submitted by Peru (A/C.5/L.1198), noted that the scale for apportionment of the costs of UNEF and UNDOF was subject to change and agreed to follow the *ad hoc* scale adopted during the twenty-eighth session, provided that a paragraph indicating that the question of apportionment would be reconsidered during the thirtieth session was included in the report of the Fifth Committee. The draft decision he had submitted (A/C.5/L.1193) was in accordance with the decision taken by the Group of 77. Members of the Committee should bear in mind, in making comments or requesting amendments, that he had no authority to change the text of the draft decision.

2. A revised text (A/C.5/L.1193/Rev.1) of the draft decision had been issued which included the amendment proposed by the representative of the Philippines at the previous meeting; also an additional phrase was inserted in the last sentence. He revised the draft decision to bring it more closely in line with the decision taken by the Group of 77 by adding in the last sentence, after the words "General Assembly", the following phrase: "in the light of

the relatively limited capacity of the economically less developed countries to contribute towards peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures". That phrase reflected the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution already adopted by the Committee (document A/9825/Add.1, para.9).

3. Mr. POSSO (Ecuador), recalling that at the previous meeting he had requested the Tanzanian representative to withdraw his proposal since he had felt that it was not necessary in view of the provision in section II, paragraph 4, of the draft resolution adopted by the Committee, said that, in view of the decision taken by the Group of 77, of which his country was a member, he had decided to support the draft decision (A/C.5/L.1193/Rev.1).

4. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) supported the draft decision without reservation, as it was in line with the decision taken by the Group of 77. The draft decision made clear that it referred only to the method of financing UNEF and UNDOF should the Security Council decide to extend the mandate of the Force beyond October 1975, and that it did not refer to the political question of extending the mandate. It simply stated that, if necessary, the present arrangement for financing UNEF and UNDOF should be reviewed in the light of the situation of the developing countries. He trusted that all representatives would support the draft decision.

5. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed appreciation to the Group of 77 for its co-operation, and regretted that he had some difficulty with the draft decision. The *ad hoc* nature of the existing arrangement for the apportionment of the expenses of UNEF and

UNDOF implied that it would be reviewed; reiterating the fact that it would be reviewed, as in document A/C.5/L.1193/Rev.1, seemed to imply something more than a review. The revision just introduced by the Tanzanian representative provided that the arrangement would be reviewed in the light of one particular set of circumstances. His delegation agreed that the existing arrangement should be reviewed but could not subscribe to the implications of a review such as that provided for in the draft decision.

6. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) said that a review of the existing arrangement for the apportionment of the expenses of UNEF and UNDOF was inevitable. He trusted that the review would be carried out in a dispassionate manner, and inquired what kind of documentation the Secretariat envisaged providing for the review.

7. Mr. DAVIDSON (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the draft decision did not instruct the Secretary-General to provide any documentation. Unless otherwise instructed, the Secretary-General did not intend to prepare any documentation.

8. Mr. BEATH (New Zealand) said that, in view of the emphasis placed by the draft decision on the capacity to pay of certain countries, the Fifth Committee would need appropriate documentation to assist it in reviewing the financing arrangements. He reserved the right to formulate a draft proposal to that effect.

9. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the representatives of Arab States which were involved in the conflict in the Middle East and were victims of Israeli aggression had stated very clearly in the Security Council and in the Fifth Committee that the mandate of UNEF and UNDOF was a temporary one. That was also the position of principle of his delegation. In the Security Council, on 29 November 1974, his delegation had stressed<sup>1</sup> that disengagement of troops was only the first step towards a full solution of the Middle East problem and that it should not be used as a pretext for maintaining the *status quo* and perpetuating Israeli occupation of Arab territories seized in 1967. The Tanzanian draft decision under discussion was based on the assumption that the mandate of UNEF and UNDOF would be extended for a third time, to 1976. That was contrary to the position taken by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the Arab countries in the Security Council. Accordingly, his delegation could not support the draft decision and would vote against it.

10. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, although the draft decision could be interpreted as presupposing a third extension of the mandate of UNEF and UNDOF, he did not accept that interpretation. If the mandate was not extended but supplementary appropriations were submitted, the Committee reserved the right to determine the scale of assessments for such supplementary appropriations.

11. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) said that he could have accepted the original text of the draft decision, which was supported by the Group of 77, because it took an

attitude of compromise and co-operation to the possibility of reopening discussion on the scale of assessments for financing the expenses of UNEF and UNDOF at some time in the future. That question was not purely financial but had political overtones. His delegation had approved the *ad hoc* arrangement adopted at the twenty-eighth session and would have preferred to retain it. He would have much more difficulty in supporting the draft decision with the revision that had just been introduced orally. He would decide what position he would take after listening to the debate.

12. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he had assumed from the text of the draft decision that the review of the existing arrangement for apportioning the expenses of UNEF and UNDOF referred to expenses incurred after October 1975. He strongly opposed the interpretation given by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that the review referred also to supplementary appropriations for 1975. The text of the draft decision, which was somewhat unclear, did not lend itself to that interpretation. He regretted that the arrangement for the apportionment of the expenses of UNEF and UNDOF for the period October 1974 to October 1975 which had been adopted was now being questioned again.

13. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland), recalling that his country contributed both money and troops to UNEF and UNDOF, said that his delegation's position on their financing was based on the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3101 (XXVIII), which exemplified the practical implementation of the principle of collective responsibility for peace-keeping. Accordingly, he would not repeat the reservations expressed by his delegation the previous year on the special scale of assessments, provided that it did not become an issue again.

14. UNEF and UNDOF had been established for emergency purposes and in emergency circumstances. They represented an *ad hoc* arrangement based on the hope that the situation would soon change and that the Force would successfully complete its mission. Only the Security Council, which had established the Force, could take a decision to extend its mandate or to terminate it. Any decision, direct or implied, which would perpetuate the existing political and military situation in the Middle East could not promote a speedy peace. He feared that a decision by the Committee to take action on financing the Force beyond October 1975 would be tantamount to anticipating far-reaching political developments. That fear had been confirmed by the statements of several delegations, including Arab delegations, in the Fifth Committee and the Security Council.

15. Accordingly, his delegation believed that any attempt to change or weaken the principle of collective responsibility for peace-keeping would not be consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and would complicate the mission of the Force. He therefore requested the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania not to press for a vote on the draft decision in document A/C.5/L.1193/Rev.1.

16. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that it was the position of principle of his delegation that the special scale of

<sup>1</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, 1809th meeting.

assessments for financing UNEF and UNDOF should depart as little as possible from the normal scale of assessments for the United Nations regular budget. The Tanzanian proposal in document A/C.5/L.1193/Rev.1, as orally revised and clarified, seemed to make the special scale depart even further from the regular scale of assessments, without any statistical justification. Accordingly, and also in view of the political implications that it might have for some delegations, he could not support the draft decision.

17. Mr. KARANGBA (Central African Republic) associated his delegation with the views expressed by the representative of France.

18. Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen), supported by Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco), proposed that a decision should be deferred to the following meeting.

*It was so decided.*

### AGENDA ITEM 73

Programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 (*continued*)\*, (for the previous documents, see the 1670th meeting; A/9606, A/9608/Add.11, A/9854, A/C.5/L.1199)

*Study of the role, organization and functioning of the United Nations Board of Auditors (concluded)\* (A/9608/Add.1, A/C.5/L.1188/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1199)*

19. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 1676th meeting the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had asked for an opinion from the Office of Legal Affairs on the status of the Brazilian proposal in document A/C.5/L.1199.

20. Mr. SUY (Legal Counsel) said that he had considered paragraph 15 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/9608/Add.1), the draft paragraph submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.5/L.1188/Rev.1), and the amendment thereto submitted by Brazil (A/C.5/L.1199).

21. In paragraph 15 of its report, the Advisory Committee referred to the need for representation of the five geographical areas on the Board of Auditors. The Soviet Union's proposal stated that geographical distribution must be applied to the Board of Auditors and therefore requested the General Assembly to implement the principle of rotation of the membership of the Board. The Brazilian proposal was also aimed at ensuring the principle of rotation, not among the members of the Board of Auditors but among the members of the General Assembly.

22. Technically speaking, and in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the text submitted by the Brazilian representative, as it tended to change part of the proposal of the Soviet Union, was therefore an amendment to the proposal within the scope of rule 130 of the rules of procedure.

23. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he agreed with the Legal Counsel's explanation but not with his conclusion. The Legal Counsel had clearly explained that the Brazilian so-called amendment changed the substance of the Soviet proposal. That proposal concerned rotation within the Board of Auditors on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, while the Brazilian proposal was based on the rotation of the members of the General Assembly within the Board. Thus, the Brazilian proposal would merely confirm what the Committee had in fact already confirmed by concurring, at its 1675th meeting, with the observations and recommendations in paragraph 15 of the Advisory Committee's report.

24. Nevertheless, the Legal Counsel had maintained that the Brazilian proposal was technically an amendment; what the Soviet delegation had asked was its status legally, not technically.

25. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) pointed out that the text of the paragraph proposed by the Soviet Union changed the effect of paragraph 15 of the report of the Advisory Committee, which the Committee had already endorsed. It was for that reason that he had proposed an amendment. A legal opinion had now been given and the Chairman should rule on the status of the amendment.

26. He pointed out an error in the text of his amendment as set forth in document A/C.5/L.1199: the words "General Assembly" had been included in error and he repeated the text which he had read out at the 1676th meeting.

27. Mr. KARANGBA (Central African Republic) said that the Brazilian amendment changed the first part of the draft paragraph of the Soviet Union but not the second part.

28. Mr. DIPP GOMEZ (Dominican Republic) said that the principle of geographical rotation was already embodied in paragraph 15 of the Advisory Committee's report, which the Fifth Committee had endorsed. However, having heard the opinion of the Legal Counsel, he thought that the Brazilian proposal was an amendment and he would vote for it.

29. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) pointed out that the Legal Counsel's opinion seemed to have been based on an incorrect text of the Brazilian proposal. His delegation was in favour of rotation among the five geographical regions and had intended to support the Brazilian amendment under the impression that it endorsed that principle, which was also embodied in paragraph 15 of the Advisory Committee's report. It had since been suggested that the text of the amendment contradicted paragraph 15 and before voting his delegation would need clarification of the status of the various proposals.

30. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) asked the Legal Counsel to state whether his opinion had been based on the text read out at the 1676th meeting or on the text as issued, with an error, in document A/C.5/L.1199.

31. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that even in its corrected form the proposal of the Brazilian representative was still not an amendment. The

\* Resumed from the 1676th meeting.

Soviet proposal requested the General Assembly to implement the principle of rotation of the membership of the Board of Auditors, whereas the Brazilian amendment simply said that more emphasis should be given to the principle of rotation. However, if the Legal Counsel ruled that the Brazilian proposal was an amendment, it should be put to the vote.

32. Mr. SUY (Legal Counsel) repeated his opinion that the Brazilian text was an amendment of the Soviet proposal.

33. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Chairman for a ruling on the basis of the Legal Counsel's opinion.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that he agreed with the Legal Counsel that the Brazilian amendment to the draft paragraph proposed by the Soviet Union was, in fact, an amendment within the meaning of rule 130 of the rules of procedure. He would therefore first put to the vote the Brazilian amendment (A/C.5/L.1199) as corrected.

*At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Iraq, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Iran.

*Against:* Libyan Arab Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Upper Volta, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Burma, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia.

*The amendment was adopted by 30 votes to 12, with 47 abstentions.*

35. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that he had abstained in the vote because his delegation did not favour either of the two proposals under consideration.

36. Mr. KARANGBA (Central African Republic) said that a large number of members had not voted; perhaps in the future the reasons for that would be understood.

37. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), responding to a suggestion by the Chairman that the

Soviet proposal be adopted by consensus, said that he must insist on his proposal being put to the vote. However, with the adoption of the so-called Brazilian amendment, his proposal had virtually lost its meaning. The effect of the Brazilian amendment was to repeat paragraph 15 of the report of the Advisory Committee; consequently, as before, the principle of geographical rotation would not be respected, and Africa and Eastern Europe would continue to be underrepresented. That was presumably what the Brazilian representative had wished to achieve. The rules of procedure precluded withdrawal of the Soviet proposal, but he himself would abstain in the vote.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft paragraph proposed by the Soviet Union (A/C.5/L.1188/Rev.1) as orally revised and as amended.

*The text was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 41 abstentions.*

39. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he had been unable to see much difference between the texts proposed by the representatives of the Soviet Union and Brazil. He had been prepared to support either of the proposals and had therefore voted in favour of the Brazilian amendment and, when that had been adopted, had had no difficulty in voting for the Soviet proposal. If the Brazilian amendment had not been adopted, he would nevertheless have voted for the Soviet proposal.

40. Mr. SETHI (India) said that his delegation had abstained on the Brazilian proposal and, that proposal having been adopted, he had likewise abstained on the Soviet proposal since, without prejudice to the ruling of the Legal Counsel, the voting procedure was not, in his view, in accordance with the rules of procedure.

*Mr. Dipp Gómez (Dominican Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 74

**Review of the intergovernmental and expert machinery dealing with the formulation, review and approval of programmes and budgets (A/9603 (chapter VI, sect. A.1, and VII, sect. 1-3), A/9646, A/9816)**

41. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) observed that the subject under consideration could be divided into two main areas: the programme budget itself, and programming and co-ordination procedures in general. Consideration of the second area was currently entrusted to various United Nations bodies, and it was clear that the Fifth Committee should concentrate on the first area.

42. The task of the Committee was to give its views on how the procedures for drawing up the programme budget could be improved. The word "programmes" should be understood in the sense of the programmes on which the budget was based, rather than in the broader sense in which it was employed in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade of the programmes of the United Nations system as a whole and of individual Governments. Similarly, the words "co-ordination" and "evaluation" should be used in their

narrower sense by the Committee and should be applied strictly to the context of the programme budget. In short, the Committee's first concern should be with improvements in the programming procedures leading to the budget, and in the budgetary procedures themselves.

43. Current programming procedures left a great deal to be desired. Admittedly, the programme-budgeting exercise was in its infancy. Furthermore, the Secretary-General had no mandate to set priorities, to select programmes or to draw up a proper programme budget. The need was therefore to consider how the legislative organs might draw up improved programmes on which the budget could be based. However, it was important to ensure that changes in programming procedures did not affect the budgetary procedures, which on the whole worked fairly well.

44. The programme budget machinery was so vast and complex that any ideas concerning its reform which might be advanced in the short time remaining at the current session would necessarily be incomplete. He therefore suggested that some way should be found of studying the subject between the current session and the thirtieth session of the Assembly.

45. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) recalled the Secretary-General's remarks in the introduction<sup>2</sup> to his report on the work of the Organization about the need for a political institution to respond to challenge and change and for the community of nations to co-operate and plan effectively for the future in the common interest of all. That observation was especially relevant to the item under consideration. In recent years, the Organization had been confronted by an increasing number of complex problems, the nature of which pointed to the increasing interdependence of Member States and called for a global and integrated approach by individual Governments and, above all, by international organizations. Yet the functioning of United Nations machinery was basically the same as 25 years earlier, except that new specialized branches and agencies had been added to the original structure. The creation over the years of a growing number of more or less independent action centres raised the question how the activities of such centres were to be controlled, and how the available funds were to be put to most effective use.

46. The Secretary-General's factual report (A/9816) listed an impressive number of governmental and expert bodies. An equally complex institutional system existed at the executive level, consisting of the various secretariats of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. An additional complication was the existence of a growing centrifugal tendency, exemplified by UNIDO and the World Food Council which was about to be established.

47. What appeared to be most needed was an over-all view from the top in order to examine how policy formulation might be better dovetailed and how action at the executive level might be better co-ordinated so as to arrive at a more closely integrated process for the planning and implementing of economic, social and humanitarian activities, on the one hand, and of political, legal and other activities, on

the other. Both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council now lacked a clear insight into what was being done, why it was being done, and what ideally should be done. In the first place, it seemed necessary to sift and digest the mass of data on on-going and future programmes. In the second place, it appeared essential to extend the programming-budgeting system to encompass not only the United Nations, but also the entire field of action of the specialized agencies. With regard to the machinery itself, the executive elements should be strengthened so that the individual secretariats might participate more actively in the preparatory work needed for a closer harmonization and an eventual consolidation of programmes and budgets. That would necessitate a considerable strengthening of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. ACC's more active role was long overdue; without it neither the Economic and Social Council nor the General Assembly could build upon the valuable experience of the executive bodies and the secretariats. ACC should show more initiative, for example in submitting proposals for system-wide action, indicating how on-going programmes could be further harmonized, and giving advice on the most effective use of the financial and staff resources available in the system.

48. Programming and planning functions should also be strengthened at the legislative level, as had been generally recognized for some time. In his delegation's view, the central issue underlying the various institutional exercises set in motion or contemplated by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly was how to achieve a better system of advance planning and determination of priorities, since the legislative bodies were now inadequately equipped to perform that task. One solution might be to set up an advisory expert body to assist both the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council by making recommendations on the programme and co-ordination aspects of the activities to be included in future programme budgets. Such an advisory body should not take any decisions; its function should rather be to analyse the basic data made available by the Secretariat and prepare the ground for policy decisions by making recommendations on proposals submitted by the Secretary-General or outlining alternative courses of action. As an advisory group, its functions would not infringe upon the decision-making authority of Member Governments. Its work would be conducive to a more orderly process of decision-making by the organs concerned, in the same way as the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions greatly facilitated the work of the Fifth Committee.

49. It was doubtful whether the Fifth Committee would be able to arrive at any clear conclusions at the current session. That was regrettable because the problems under consideration were of central importance to the future conduct of the Organization's work. Consequently, his delegation had held informal consultations with some members of the Committee on the possibility of referring the question to an *ad hoc* working group of limited size, consisting of governmental representatives appointed by the President of the General Assembly. Such a working group might examine the existing intergovernmental and expert machinery for the formulation, review, approval and evaluation of the biennial programme budget and make recommendations for improvements. The working group

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. IA, p. 1.

might take as its starting-point the discussions in the Committee and take into account the deliberations of the Economic and Social Council and of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation. It would report back to the General Assembly well in advance of its thirtieth session. If that suggestion met with a positive response, his delegation would gladly co-operate in formulating a decision for inclusion in the Committee's report.

### AGENDA ITEM 81

Personnel questions (*continued*)\* (A/C.5/L.1172):

- (a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)\* (A/9120 and Corr.1 and 2, A/9603 (chapter V, sect. D, paras. 479-486), A/9724, A/C.5/L.1170 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.1192; Economic and Social Council resolution 1857 (LVI));
- (b) Other personnel questions: reports of the Secretary-General (*continued*)\* (A/8454, A/8826, A/9608/Add.5, A/9841 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1600, A/C.5/1601 and Add.1, A/C.5/1603, A/C.5/1639, A/C.5/L.1195)

50. Mr. KARANGBA (Central African Republic) said that his delegation had taken careful note of the contents of the Secretary-General's report on the composition of the Secretariat (A/9724) and in particular of the statement in paragraph 29 (*d*) that: "... the term 'equitable geographical distribution' shall mean a distribution of the staff by nationality and region based on: (i) A minimum of staff recruited from among nationals of each Member State by reason of its membership in the United Nations".

51. The Central African Republic, despite the fact that it was a Member of the Organization, was entirely without representation either in the Secretariat or in the secretariats of the organizations of the United Nations system. His Government's attempts to secure recruitment of its nationals had all met with failure. Since its patience was not unlimited, it would appreciate a specific assurance from the Secretary-General that the Central African Republic was entitled to representation within the Secretariat and that it would shortly be represented.

52. His delegation shared the views of the representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, the Philippines and Trinidad and Tobago, and particularly those of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the item under consideration. His delegation hoped that, in the future, the Secretariat would: observe scrupulously the provisions of Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter; provide the Fifth Committee and all Member States with an annual list of countries over-represented, under-represented and without representation in the Secretariat, indicating in each case the number of posts to which they were entitled; cease recruiting candidates from over-represented countries until there was equitable representation for all the other

countries; and lastly, give assurances to his Government that the Central African Republic would soon be represented.

53. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the United States of America to introduce the draft decision (A/C.5/L.1195), co-sponsored by his delegation, and the amendments (A/C.5/L.1192) that he had proposed to the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1857 (LVI).

54. Mr. KELLER (United States of America) recalled that, in its original version, as submitted by the Commission on the Status of Women, the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption had contained an operative paragraph<sup>3</sup> that requested the Secretary-General and the executive heads of all organizations of the United Nations system to establish an advisory committee within their respective secretariats to assist in the formulation of measures and policies aimed at ending practices discriminatory to women. The Economic and Social Council deleted that paragraph when it adopted the text which became resolution 1857 (LVI). He further recalled that his delegation had announced in the Third Committee (2072nd meeting, on 24 October 1974), the intention of the United States Government to devise machinery to promote equality of opportunity for women.

55. The draft decision (A/C.5/L.1195), which had been sponsored by the delegations of Australia and Norway, as well as his own, should be viewed against that background. It recommended the establishment within the Joint Advisory Committee of a sub-committee which would give special attention to recruitment, training and promotion practices. It also urged the Secretary-General to recommend to the heads of all organizations within the United Nations system the establishment of similar machinery. The purpose of the draft decision was to remedy the shortage of qualified women candidates, which the Assistant Secretary-General for Personnel Services had described as the chief obstacle to the equitable representation of women in the Secretariat.

56. The amendments proposed in document A/C.5/L.1192 were mainly of a stylistic nature. In the context of the draft resolution, it appeared more appropriate to refer, in paragraph 1, to Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter than only to the principle of equitable geographical distribution. In paragraph 2, the word "greater" might imply that more attention should be given to the recruitment of women than of men; accordingly, his delegation proposed that it should be replaced by "increased". In paragraph 4, the intention of the drafters was apparently to seek data on the nationality of women within the Secretariat; consequently, the allusion to geographical distribution seemed to be out of place.

*The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.*

\* Resumed from the 1671st meeting.

<sup>3</sup> Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 4, chap. I, sect. A, draft resolution IX, para. 3.