



Chairman: Mr. E. Olu SANU (Nigeria).

AGENDA ITEM 76

Budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (*continued*) (for the A/... and A/C.5/... documents, see the 1462nd meeting; A/C.5/L.1063, A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1 A/C.5/L.1066, A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1069 to L.1071, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.3 and Corr.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.8, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.10 and Add.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.11 to 14, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.16, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.18 and Add.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.22, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.24/Rev.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.25, E/5038)

First reading (continued) (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.3 and Corr.1)

SECTION 15. UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (*concluded*) (A/8406 AND CORR.1 AND 3, A/8408 AND CORR.1 AND 2, A/C.5/1362)

1. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Secretary-General had requested an amount of \$11,880,900 under section 15, or \$1,808,600 more than the 1971 appropriation. The increase was attributable in part to the fact that the third session of the Conference on Trade and Development was to be held in 1972, but it basically reflected the increase in staff costs and the cost of the proposed new posts. The number of authorized posts was 297 in 1971; with the addition of the 180 posts representing services provided to UNCTAD by other administrative units of the United Nations—administrative services, conference services and miscellaneous services—as well as the staff of the Joint UNCTAD/GATT International Trade Centre—91 posts, UNCTAD had a total staff of 568, not including consultants and temporary assistance. In the circumstances, and in view of the financial situation of the Organization, the number of posts requested might have been expected not to exceed the figure approved in 1971. Yet, a total of 14 new posts had been requested by UNCTAD. The Secretary-General of UNCTAD had stated at the previous meeting that the staff was overburdened with work because of the preparation of the third session of the Conference. It would be recalled that the UNCTAD secretariat had already prepared two sessions with fewer staff than it had now.

2. He noted that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in paragraph 233 of its first report (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2) on the budget estimates for the financial year 1972, had drawn attention to the dangers of large-scale transfers of posts among offices within UNCTAD. He also shared the concern expressed by

the Advisory Committee in paragraph 240 of its report regarding temporary assistance expenditure by UNCTAD.

3. Notwithstanding the explanations given by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD at the previous meeting, his delegation could not support the proposal to charge the cost of GATT staff employed full-time on work for the International Trade Centre against the budget of the Centre. The Secretary-General of UNCTAD should estimate the cost of services provided free to the Centre by UNCTAD, including the cost of premises, in order to ensure a more equitable sharing of the Centre's costs between UNCTAD and GATT.

4. He requested a separate vote on chapters III, IV, and XII of section 15.

5. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) pointed out that about two thirds of the resources of UNCTAD were absorbed by the cost of documentation and conference services. That might be justified by the working methods of UNCTAD which, unlike the General Assembly, did not take decisions by majority vote, but always tried to reach a consensus. Nevertheless, as a developing country, Ghana would like to see UNCTAD adopt more rational working methods so as to be able to direct a larger proportion of its resources towards more productive ends. In that connexion, he had been pleased to learn that UNCTAD documentation could be reduced by at least 50 per cent by 1973.

6. Informal contacts between delegations represented in UNCTAD could be increased so as to save time during official meetings. Furthermore, those delegations serving on the Trade and Development Board and those aspiring to serve on it might consider opening permanent missions in Geneva; that would be another way of saving time and reducing costs.

7. He assured the Secretary-General of UNCTAD that his country would continue to participate actively in UNCTAD's work, to which it attached great importance.

8. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) thanked the Secretary-General of UNCTAD for the explanations he had given at the previous meeting.

9. His delegation regretted that the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction of \$240,500 in the amount requested by the Secretary-General for UNCTAD. He stressed that the voluntary contributions made by certain States members to the International Trade Centre should not be used as an excuse for limiting the Centre's regular budget. While his delegation was against the growing rise in administrative costs, it did favour a rational increase in staff and expenditure for organizations like UNCTAD and

UNIDO, which were endeavouring to meet the needs of the developing countries. Moreover, it was perfectly natural for UNCTAD expenditure to increase if UNCTAD was to attain the objectives established in the International Development Strategy adopted for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

10. The least developed countries saw in UNCTAD their best hope for extricating themselves from underdevelopment and therefore could not remain indifferent to any attempt to cut its budget, because that would also accentuate the gap between the developed and the developing countries.

11. The developing countries expected a great deal from the rational utilization of the technical assistance provided by the International Trade Centre and from the transfer of technology. In that connexion, his delegation hoped that the States members of UNCTAD would unreservedly support the Intergovernmental Group on Transfer of Technology in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2726 (XXV), particularly by providing the necessary budgetary backing for the Group to discharge its functions efficiently. It expected a great deal from the programme of work established by the Group at its first session held at Geneva from 14 May to 21 June 1971.

12. The third session of UNCTAD was to be held at Santiago, Chile, in 1972. The Conference would have many important problems to resolve, particularly the problem of commodities which were priced on world markets in currencies which had undergone *de facto* devaluation. His delegation hoped that it would reach more definite agreement on the issues which had not been fully resolved.

13. With regard to the amount requested for the International Trade Centre shown in chapter XII, he said that his delegation attached the greatest importance to the role of the Centre in carrying out the expanded programme of technical assistance which was specifically directed towards helping the developing countries to promote their exports.

14. It also endorsed the proposal to transfer 17 GATT staff members employed full-time by the Centre from the GATT manning-table to that of the Centre, as recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 247 of its first report.

15. Lastly, his delegation considered that the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General should be approved and hoped that the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee would have no adverse effects on the work of the Trade and Development Conference.

16. The CHAIRMAN, acting in accordance with the request of the Soviet delegation, called for a separate vote on chapters III, IV and XII of section 15.

17. He recalled that the Secretary-General had requested an amount of \$4,831,600 for chapter III and that the Advisory Committee had recommended that it should be reduced by \$76,000.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2, paras. 232 and 235) for an

appropriation in the amount of \$4,755,600 for chapter III was approved in first reading by 60 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

18. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Secretary-General had requested an amount of \$1,171,000 for chapter IV and that the Advisory Committee had recommended that it should be reduced by \$9,000.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (ibid., para. 236) for an appropriation in the amount of \$1,162,000 for chapter IV was approved in first reading by 61 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

19. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Secretary-General had requested an amount of \$917,200 for chapter XII and that the Advisory Committee had recommended a reduction of \$25,500.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (ibid., para. 249) for an appropriation in the amount of \$891,700 for chapter XII was approved in first reading by 62 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions.

20. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the total appropriation for Section 15.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (ibid., para. 250) for an appropriation in the amount of \$11,640,400 under section 15 was approved in first reading by 62 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

(The Committee then turned to consideration of agenda item 84 (see paras. 41 to 84 below). Later, the Committee resumed consideration of agenda item 76.)

Review and reappraisal of United Nations information policies and activities (continued) (A/8404/Add.4, A/C.5/1320/Rev.1 and Add.1, A/C.5/L.1066, A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1069, A/C.5/L.1070, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.10 and Add.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.11, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.12, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.18 and Add.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.24/Rev.1)*

21. The CHAIRMAN said that the general discussion on the subject was closed, and invited the Committee to consider the specific proposals before it.

22. Mr. MATTHEWS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that the Secretary-General had asked him to refer to a statement made on his behalf in the Fifth Committee at the 1456th meeting to the effect that authority had been given at the highest level in the Secretariat to inform the Committee that the Centre for Economic and Social Information would shortly be integrated in the Office of Public Information. The Secretary-General had also asked him to remind the Committee that in his statement he had given assurance that "the comments made in this debate will be studied and taken into account, and the administrative arrangements will be reviewed in the light of those comments, as well as the proposals of the Administrative Management Service", which the Secretary-General had not yet had the opportunity to discuss with his

* Resumed from the 1462nd meeting.

colleagues concerned. The Secretary-General had still not had the opportunity to hold those discussions. When they did take place, it would be his purpose to spare no effort to improve the performance of the information machinery in general, and not least in the field of economic and social development.

23. Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had studied with great interest draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1. He wished to thank the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania and the other sponsors for the changes which made the draft closer to the views of other groups of countries. His delegation particularly appreciated the inclusion of paragraph 6, which reflected the views of the countries that had expressed the desire that the draft resolution should not omit the role of the Consultative Panel on Public Information. However, despite the recommendation in that paragraph, no task had yet been entrusted to the Panel, and the question of its functions remained unresolved. His delegation had therefore submitted amendments, in document A/C.5/L.1070, to the draft resolution with the aim of postponing until the twenty-seventh session consideration of the Secretary-General's proposals concerning the acquisition and replacement of equipment (A/C.5/1320/Rev.1/Add.1, annex I), in order to give the Consultative Panel time to obtain technical advice on the effectiveness of various new facilities. In addition, his delegation proposed, in operative paragraph 4, temporary elimination of the reference to paragraph 261 (xii) and (xiv) of the Secretary-General's related report (A/C.5/1320/Rev.1), concerning travel funds for seminars and conferences and periodic meetings of information centre directors. In view of the Organization's serious financial situation, his delegation recommended that for the time being there should be no endorsement of new seminars and conferences, which would involve heavy travel expenses, and that the Consultative Panel should undertake consultations to study the effectiveness of such actions. The amendment to paragraph 8 of the draft resolution was meant to emphasize the need for the Secretary-General also to intensify his efforts to eliminate shortcomings in information activities in the political sphere, because of the undoubted importance of that field for the activities of the United Nations. The amendment to paragraph 9 was intended to express the view that not every resolution adopted by the General Assembly should automatically lead to the allocation of new funds and that many resolutions, particularly in the field of information, could be fully implemented within the limits of the resources normally allocated. His delegation was convinced that the amendments which it proposed would ensure much wider support for the draft resolution and that, consequently, its sponsors would study them carefully.

24. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that his delegation had suggested at the 1456th meeting that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1 should include two further points in their text. First, it had proposed the addition, at the end of the first preambular paragraph, of the words "and the statements made by the representatives of the Secretary-General and by the delegations of Member countries during the discussion in the Fifth Committee on the review and reappraisal of United Nations information policies and activities". His delegation believed that the General Assembly could not confine its consideration of so

important a question as that of information to the report of the Secretary-General and the related reports of the Advisory Committee. Secondly, his delegation had also proposed that the first part of paragraph 7 should be amended to read "Professional staff highly qualified in the field of information". His delegation further considered that it would be a mistake to deprive information centres of their directors, who were specialists in information work, and to entrust functions in the field of information to Resident Representatives of UNDP. The delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania had stated, at the 1462nd meeting, that the sponsors of the draft resolution could not accept the inclusion of the words "in the field of information" in paragraph 7, which was concerned with information centres. That being so, the Colombian delegation felt that the draft resolution did not go to the heart of the problem of information but was confined to its administrative aspects. As it stood, therefore, it did not go far enough, even though it was a first step towards a solution. He understood that the sponsors of the draft resolution were anxious to put it to the vote without delay. If circumstances permitted, however, his delegation would like to propose further amendments which, in its view, would direct it more nearly to the core of the problem. First, it would like to insert, in the penultimate preambular paragraph, after the words "United Nations information centres" the words "as appropriate instruments for informing the peoples of the world of its objectives and activities". Second, a new preambular paragraph might be added, which would read:

"Recognizing the right of the Councils and Main Committees of the General Assembly to make recommendations and advise the Secretary-General on public information".

Finally, a new operative paragraph could be included whereby the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to take immediate steps to reorganize the Office of Public Information with a view to enabling it to carry out its mandate more effectively in accordance with the basic principles set forth in General Assembly resolutions 13 (I) of 13 February 1946 and 595 (VI) of 4 February 1952.

25. If the views which it had expressed were not taken sufficiently into account, his delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1.

26. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Colombia whether he intended to submit his amendments formally, in which case he should submit them in writing.

27. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that he was prepared to submit the amendments formally.

28. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said that, while his delegation could agree to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1 as a whole, it had some doubts as to the wisdom of paragraph 10 as it now stood. A merger of the Centre for Economic and Social Information and the Office of Public Information might give rise to legal problems. Clearly the special rules for the Centre could not be applied to the body which would result from the amalgamation of the two

entities, but it was doubtful whether the rules would not simply cease to exist with the disappearance of the body for which they were given.

29. Mr. GONCHARENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) proposed the addition to the text of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1 of a new operative paragraph 7, which would read:

“Requests the Secretary-General to adopt measures to achieve the necessary balance in the geographical distribution of the staff of the Office of Public Information with a view to further improving the work of the Office and, in particular, preparing and disseminating information on United Nations activities concerning the strengthening of peace and international security, disarmament, social and economic progress and the struggle against apartheid, racism and colonialism.”¹

30. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that the Committee had already delayed too long in taking a decision on the issue under consideration. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1 would be meeting on the following morning to consider the various amendments proposed by delegations, after which the Committee could proceed to the vote.

31. On behalf of the sponsors, he could state already that the amendments proposed by the Australian delegation at the 1462nd meeting were accepted, provided that the Canadian delegation withdrew its proposal (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.11).

32. Mr. PICK (Canada) said that, in the circumstances, his delegation would withdraw its proposal.

33. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the representative of Denmark had suggested that the Centre for Economic and Social Information should continue to function independently and that operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1 should be amended accordingly. However, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had now read out a statement by the Secretary-General from which it appeared that the decision to integrate the Centre in the Office of Public Information had already been taken. If that was the case, he did not see how the sponsors of the draft resolution could change paragraph 10.

34. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) wondered whether the representative of Denmark had been referring to paragraph 10 as it appeared in document A/C.5/L.1068/Rev.1 or to the text as revised to take account of the amendments which had been accepted by the sponsors—who could no longer agree to anything but drafting changes in that version.

35. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said that the Soviet representative's latest comment left him somewhat perplexed; he would like some clarification from the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management as to the interpretation to be given to the Secretary-General's

statement, which the Under-Secretary-General himself had read out.

36. Mr. MATTHEWS (Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management) said that he had nothing to add to the statement. The Secretary-General had simply wished to confirm the statement made on his behalf at the 1456th meeting.

37. The CHAIRMAN asked the Soviet representative whether the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (A/C.5/L.1066) was still before the Committee.

38. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was, and the Committee would have to take a decision on it.

39. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) asked whether the full text of the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management could be made available to the Committee.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the full text would be issued as a press release.

[See note at end of paragraph 20 above.]

AGENDA ITEM 84

Personnel questions (*continued*)* (A/8454, A/8483, A/C.5/1371, A/C.5/1398, A/C.5/L.1061 and Add.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.26 to 31)

(a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)* (A/8483, A/C.5/L.1061 and Add.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.29 to 31)

41. Mr. YEREMENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) thanked the delegations that had supported the proposal submitted by his delegation and the delegation of Poland (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.29). Although there had been some amendments to that proposal, it had not given rise to any fundamental objections. His delegation and the delegation of Poland had already accepted the first three amendments proposed by the United States delegation (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.30). The fourth United States amendment had created some difficulties for the sponsors since it proposed the deletion of the words “to serve as a means of expediting” in connexion with the long-term plan of recruitment. At the 1461st meeting, the delegation of India had appealed to the sponsors of the proposal not to oppose the fourth United States amendment. The representative of India had pointed out that General Assembly resolution 2539 (XXIV) already specified that the long-term plan of recruitment should be a means of accelerating the achievement of an equitable geographical distribution of the staff, and the reference to the decision of the Assembly implied also a reference to that specific provision. On that understanding the sponsors could accept the fourth United States amendment as well.

42. He thanked the Colombian delegation for not pressing for the incorporation of its oral amendment in the draft decision before the Committee. Taking account of the

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/L.1072.

* Resumed from the 1461st meeting.

wishes of the Swedish delegation, the sponsors had decided to replace the words "concerned at the lack of progress" in the first sentence of his proposal by the words "concerned at the inadequate progress". They hoped that that change would meet the wishes of the Swedish delegation and that the draft paragraph for inclusion in the Committee's report on the composition of the Secretariat, as amended, would be adopted unanimously by the Committee.

43. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) explained that his delegation had agreed to withdraw the amendment it had first proposed to the draft paragraph submitted by the Polish and Ukrainian delegations because it had later proposed a new paragraph for inclusion in the report (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.31).

44. Mr. HULTGREN (Sweden) thanked the Ukrainian delegation for agreeing to change the words "concerned at the lack of progress" in its draft to a wording closer to what his delegation wanted and more in keeping with the spirit of the text agreed on at the previous session for inclusion in the Committee's report to the General Assembly. However, his delegation would like the wording to be made even more positive; it might, for instance, be replaced by the words "believing that further progress is possible".

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should accept the proposal submitted by the Polish and Ukrainian delegations (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.29), as modified by the various amendments, and that it should proceed to consider the Colombian delegation's proposals (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.31).

It was so decided.

46. Mr. MARRON (Spain) said that his delegation had endorsed the proposal submitted by the Polish and Ukrainian delegations because it had always supported any proposals aimed at ensuring the application of the principle of equitable geographical distribution. It felt that that proposal would have the same results as that submitted by the Colombian delegation, so that there was no need also to include the latter in the report. The principle of equitable geographical distribution was clearly enunciated in Article 101 of the Charter of the United Nations and had since been repeatedly reaffirmed in many General Assembly resolutions. It was normally the responsibility of the Secretariat to put those principles into practice as best it could. However, since the question was once again being raised, his delegation believed that there was discrimination against certain regions, and also against certain countries in regions which, taken as a whole, were "over-represented". Spain was in the latter category, since, despite the fact that its contribution to the United Nations budget was more than 1 per cent, it was the only country contributing more than 1 per cent not to have one of its nationals in any senior-level post among the 21 which were available. In view of the foregoing, his delegation felt that the draft paragraph submitted by the Colombian delegation, which spoke only of giving greater participation to nationals of countries in the geographical regions of Latin America, Asia and Africa, was not entirely balanced and might result in some discrimination. In contrast, the proposal in document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.29 was entirely balanced, since it stressed that "preference should be given to qualified candidates of under-represented countries".

47. Mr. MERIGO AZA (Mexico) said his delegation supported the Colombian delegation's proposal because it considered that the United Nations should give urgent consideration to the benefits which might accrue from recruiting into the Secretariat qualified young men and women who were trained in the latest techniques. The Organization must appeal to young people, who everywhere in the world, and particularly in the developing countries, wanted to make their contributions to solving the problems which confronted their countries.

48. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation had favoured the proposal submitted by Poland and the Ukrainian SSR. Although it agreed with the ideas expressed in the Colombian delegation's proposal, it could not support it, since the Colombian delegation had mentioned expressly only Latin America, Asia and Africa; yet as the Spanish delegation had pointed out, there were certain countries in other regions which were also under-represented. Italy was a particular case in point. If the Colombian delegation's draft was put to the vote, his delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting on it.

49. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) said that his delegation agreed in principle with the Colombian delegation's proposal, which stressed the fact that, although certain countries were adequately represented from a purely numerical standpoint, the only posts occupied by their nationals were at the lowest levels.

50. Mr. PICK (Canada) agreed that it would be desirable to lower the average age of the Secretariat by making an effort to recruit more young people. In order to attract them, it would be necessary to offer them—as was done everywhere—the prospect of an interesting career. However, appointing young people directly to permanent senior-level posts would have an effect opposite to what was sought, since they could be expected to occupy those posts until their retirement, thus blocking for many years any possibility of promotion and consequently preventing the recruitment of other young people, who would have no hope of advancing to senior positions.

51. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that the main purpose of the paragraph which he was proposing for inclusion in the Committee's report was to emphasize the qualitative aspect of the questions, which in his view was more important than its purely quantitative aspect. The anxieties of the under-represented countries had already been expressed in the paragraph proposed by Poland and the Ukrainian SSR, which the Committee had now decided to include in its report. Some representatives had noted that Latin America, Asia and Africa were expressly mentioned in the paragraph submitted by his delegation. That was simply because of the interest which Colombia, as a developing country, took in that group of countries, and the purpose was certainly not to discriminate in any way.

52. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that he was in favour of the Colombian proposal for the reasons stated by the representative of Nigeria.

53. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) requested the representative of Colombia to insert in the first sentence of his text the words "Eastern Europe", since that region was under-

represented. If that amendment was accepted, he would support the inclusion of the paragraph proposed by the Colombian delegation in the Committee's report.

54. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) questioned the desirability of inserting in the Committee's report texts dealing with points which had not been discussed in detail. Recruitment was a complex matter, since care had to be taken not only to achieve equitable geographical representation but also to make the Secretariat an effective instrument. As the representative of Canada had pointed out, it seemed to be going rather too far to propose that young people should be appointed immediately to permanent senior-level posts. His delegation would therefore have difficulty in agreeing to the inclusion in the Committee's report of the full text proposed by Colombia.

55. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had given careful consideration to the paragraph submitted by Colombia, since the question of the composition of the Secretariat was extremely important. Certain countries—for example, the Soviet Union—were clearly under-represented. The Colombian delegation seemed to be stressing the fact that the posts to which persons from Latin America, Africa and Asia were appointed should include senior-level posts. That idea was worthy of support, since all regions of the world should be equitably represented at that level of the Secretariat, without any discrimination. However, his delegation had a few comments to make on the Colombian text.

56. First, table 18 of the Secretary-General's report under consideration (A/8483) indicated that, of the three regions mentioned by Colombia, only Africa was in fact under-represented. Those three regions should not, therefore, be placed in the same category. Furthermore, it should be noted that the various countries in each region were very far from being equally represented. In the case of Africa, for example, the representation of the People's Republic of the Congo was lower than the minimum weighted figure, while that of South Africa was above the maximum weighted figure. Thus, to speak simply of regions gave no clear indication of the real situation.

57. Second, his delegation noted that the Colombian text referred twice to permanent posts, which suggested that Colombia approved of the system of permanent contracts. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was opposed to it, since the system was used principally as a means of perpetuating a geographical distribution that was inequitable. Furthermore, if, as the Colombian delegation proposed, the Secretary-General appointed young men and women to permanent posts at a senior level, it would not be possible for all countries to be represented at that level, since the number of posts involved was clearly smaller than the number of Member States. It would therefore be better to establish a system of rotation, but it was clear that the posts in question could not be rotated at reasonable intervals if they were filled on a permanent basis.

58. Finally, the proposal that young people should be appointed to such high posts was open to question. They would need to have acquired sufficient experience, in both a general and a professional sense, to discharge their administrative functions satisfactorily. Before giving orders,

one must learn to obey. It was therefore preferable to appoint to such posts persons who had already spent a number of years in a national or international administration. That was all the more desirable if the contracts were permanent, since it would be impossible, should officials recruited on that basis not give satisfaction, to replace them until they reached retiring age. If the Colombian text were adopted, it would require the Secretary-General to give a young candidate who had not proved himself preference over an older candidate whose reputation was well established. That could be detrimental to the efficiency of the Secretariat.

59. For those reasons, his delegation hoped that the Committee and the sponsor of the proposal would seek to improve the text so as to retain what was good and eliminate what was questionable.

60. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) expressed full support for the comments made by the representatives of Canada and the Netherlands regarding the Colombian proposal. His delegation was unable to accept it because, if it were adopted, it might run counter to the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

61. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said he appreciated the concern which had motivated the representative of Colombia, but some improvements could perhaps be made to the wording of the proposed paragraph, and in general it would be better to study the question more closely. He therefore hoped that the Colombian delegation would accept the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

62. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that he supported the Colombian proposal and would favour the inclusion in the Committee's report of the paragraph submitted by the delegation of Colombia. He considered, however, that the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union should be taken into account, and he would like the second sentence of the Colombian text to be amended through the deletion of either the words "senior level" or the word "young".

63. The CHAIRMAN noted that delegations were not in unanimous agreement on the inclusion in the Committee's report of the paragraph proposed by the Colombian delegation. He therefore suggested that it should be left to the Rapporteur to draft a text reflecting the various views expressed.

64. Mr. PICK (Canada) requested that the Rapporteur should indicate clearly that, while some delegations had favoured the Colombian proposal, others had not supported it. Otherwise, a separate vote should be taken on the two parts of the Colombian proposal.

65. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that the Committee should not proceed to a vote, since what was involved was only a paragraph in the Committee's report and not a draft resolution. In any case, the text drafted by the Rapporteur could be discussed and amended if the Committee so desired.

66. The CHAIRMAN said he believed that the Rapporteur would try to accede to the representative of Canada's

request by preparing, after consultations with the Colombian delegation and others, a text reflecting in a balanced way the various views that had been expressed.

67. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) said he hoped that the report would indicate clearly that some delegations had been definitely opposed to the inclusion of the paragraph submitted by the Colombian delegation. He for one could accept neither part of that text.

68. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said he appreciated the concern of the Colombian delegation but felt that the wording of its text could be improved. While his delegation attached great importance to geographical distribution, it considered that the paramount consideration in the employment of the staff should, as stipulated in Article 101 of the Charter, be the necessity of securing the highest standards of competence. That was why it had supported the proposal submitted by Poland and the Ukrainian SSR, as amended by the United States and Sweden. Furthermore, it considered that there should not be an express reference to three regions, as in the Colombian text; and a word such as "requests" or "recommends" would have been more appropriate than the word "appeals" in the second sentence of the English text of that proposal. The word "give" which came a little later in that sentence was also questionable, since it could not be said that the Secretary-General "gave" posts. His delegation was not opposed in principle to the recruitment of young people, provided, however, that they were qualified, since competence and not age must be the main criterion. The task of the Secretary-General with regard to recruitment should not be made too complex through the introduction of additional considerations. It would be useful, however, if the Committee's report reflected the two points of view expressed, so that the Secretary-General could take them into account.

69. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said he hoped that his proposal would be put to the vote, so that the report would indicate clearly what support it had received.

70. The CHAIRMAN urged the representative of Colombia not to press for a vote on his text, since it was not a draft resolution.

71. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Chairman. However, if the representative of Colombia insisted that a vote should be taken on his text, he would ask to be allowed to submit amendments.

72. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said he did not agree with the representative of the Soviet Union on that point.

73. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) requested that the Committee should not spend too much time in debating a question that would be considered in detail in 1972. He urged the representative of Colombia to accept the Chairman's suggestion.

74. Mr. GUPTA (India) urged the Colombian delegation to withdraw its proposal in favour of the Chairman's proposal. If the two proposals were voted on, his delegation would like the Chairman's to be put to the vote first.

75. Mr. JEREMIĆ (Yugoslavia) suggested that the Committee should not vote on either of the two proposals, since that was not the Committee's normal procedure in the case of a passage in the draft report.

76. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) said that he fully supported the Chairman's proposal, the aim of which was simply to ensure that the report submitted to the General Assembly would objectively reflect the views expressed by delegations.

77. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) said that he agreed with the Soviet delegation, inasmuch as he supported the general idea behind the Colombian proposal without endorsing the draft paragraph in question in every detail. Consequently, if the Committee decided to vote on that proposal, his delegation would be obliged to submit an amendment.

78. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) urged the Colombian delegation to withdraw its proposal. Although his delegation supported the general considerations underlying the proposal, it considered that the Chairman's proposal was logical and reasonable, and that it would be better to leave it to the Rapporteur to draft that part of the report in the light of the various views expressed.

79. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that he was prepared to agree to the Chairman's proposal, provided that the Rapporteur included an account of his delegation's proposal in the report.

80. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the debate on the question should be closed and that the Committee should accept his proposal, which was to leave to the Rapporteur the task of reflecting in the report the substance of the Committee's discussions.

It was so decided.

81. Mr. GUPTA (India) said he wished to make some comments on the proposals in documents A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.26 and A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.28, which had been approved by the Committee.

82. At the 1461st meeting, when the Committee had approved the proposal in document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.26, it had also approved the Indian delegation's amendment (1461st meeting) requesting the Secretary-General to include in his annual report on the composition of the Secretariat information on measures taken to safeguard the interests of members of the Secretariat whose mother tongue was not one of the official or working languages of the Organization. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of those measures and determine whether the application of General Assembly resolution 2480 B (XXIII) resulted in undue discrimination, the Secretary-General's reports should contain certain specific information. It would be useful to know how many staff members had received faster within-grade increments, or between-grade promotions, as a direct result of the application of the resolution in question. The information should be given both by linguistic group and by nationality. There should also be a report on how many staff members whose mother tongue was not one of the official or working languages of the Organization had received faster within-grade and between-

grade promotion, and how many had advanced at the normal rate. Lastly, there should be a table showing how many staff members whose mother tongue was not an official or working language had been promoted, in comparison with 1971, when the resolution was not applicable. A similar table should be drawn up in respect of those whose mother tongues were official languages.

83. With regard to document A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.28, he said that the table asked for should consist of two main columns, headed "Permanent staff" and "Fixed-term staff", each of which should be further divided into two columns, headed "Percentage" and "Absolute figures". It

was only on the understanding that the information would be submitted in the above format that his delegation had supported those proposals.

84. Mr. FAUSTINO (Philippines) said he wished to make it clear that, contrary to what appeared to be the belief of some speakers, the Philippines was not one of the over-represented countries. Although it was true that many Philippine nationals held posts at the lower levels, none held any senior post.

The meeting rose at 10.50 p.m.