



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 61st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KOBINA SEKYI (Ghana)

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

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.19,  
L.32 and L.35 concerning agenda item 47 (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 109: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUBSIDIARY  
ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

(f) INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 110: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Implementation of personnel policy reforms (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 106: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT  
(continued)

Women in the Professional category and above in the United Nations system  
(continued)

Draft resolution presented by the Chairman of the Working Group on Personnel  
Questions (continued)

Financial implications of draft resolution A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2

Amendment of the Staff Regulations of the United Nations

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of  
the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief,  
Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/33/SR.61  
11 January 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 8 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 100: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1978-1979 (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.19, L.32 and L.35 concerning agenda item 47 (A/C.5/33/80) (continued)

1. Mr. BUJ FLORES (Mexico) read out the following revised text of a draft decision which he had introduced at the preceding meeting on behalf of his delegation and the delegations of Argentina and India:

"The Fifth Committee recommends to the General Assembly that it request the Committee on Conferences to study, on a priority basis, the possibility of rearranging the calendar of conferences in such a way as to enable the Disarmament Commission and its committee of the whole to hold simultaneous meetings, if necessary; and request the Secretary-General to provide the plenary meetings of the Disarmament Commission with verbatim records and to provide the meetings of the committee of the whole, should it be established, with summary records."

2. The aim of the draft decision was to give guidance to the Committee on Conferences in deciding on the possibility of rearranging the calendar of conferences and to relieve it of the responsibility of determining whether the Disarmament Commission and its committee of the whole should have verbatim or summary records.

3. His delegation was fully aware of the difficulties involved in rearranging the calendar of conferences. However, it should be borne in mind that other changes in the calendar were likely to be necessary if the General Assembly decided to reconvene the current session or the Second Committee decided to establish a preparatory committee on the international development strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade. His delegation was also aware of the serious physical limitations created by construction work under way but felt that the Disarmament Commission and its committee of the whole, if it should meet, should be given preferential treatment.

4. Mr. DIAMOND (Budget Division) said that the cost of convening a committee of the whole, should it be established and provided with summary record coverage, would amount to \$385,200, \$123,700 of which would be for interpretation, \$237,300 for summary records and \$24,200 for reproduction and distribution. However, in the light of the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee at the preceding meeting, the Secretary-General would undertake not to request additional appropriations for the work of the committee of the whole in the context of the consolidated statement of conference servicing requirements.

5. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said his delegation was prepared to support the revised draft decision read out by the representative of Mexico.

6. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) noted that the Secretary-General had alluded in his statement of the financial implications (A/C.5/33/80) to the possibility of additional financial requirements should the Disarmament Commission

/...

(Mr. Cunningham, United States)

establish a committee of the whole which would meet simultaneously. As indicated in the Secretary-General's statement, the additional financial implications would result from the need to reschedule a number of important meetings in the economic and social areas. There were extreme pressures on conference facilities during 1979 owing to construction and remodelling work approved by the General Assembly and there was a physical limit on the number of meetings which could be held at any given time.

7. The draft decision should therefore be revised to take into account the statement just made by the representative of the Budget Division, and accordingly he proposed the addition of the words "and without additional financial implications" after the words "if necessary". The purpose of the amendment was to indicate clearly to the Committee on Conferences that the costs relating to the meetings of the committee of the whole should be met from within the already generous appropriation for the Department of Conference Services for 1979.

8. Mr. EL-AYADHI (Tunisia) said that it was difficult for his delegation to take a decision on the draft decision and the oral amendment just proposed by the representative of the United States without having the proposals in writing. He noted that the Mexican draft decision had been introduced only at the preceding meeting, and he therefore appealed to the Chairman to apply the relevant time-limits provided for in the rules of procedure.

9. Mr. IYER (India) said that his delegation, for one, was not unaware of the reason why the text of the Mexican draft decision had not yet been circulated in writing as an official document, not even in the language in which it had been submitted.

10. There seemed to be some misunderstanding as to the question of priority referred to in the draft decision. In the view of his delegation, the Committee on Conferences was not being asked to accord priority to the Disarmament Commission but rather to act on a priority basis in deciding on the rearrangement of the calendar of conferences.

11. His delegation had been astonished by some of the comments made by the representative of the Department of Conference Services at the preceding meeting, which seemed to represent an attempt to introduce surreptitiously the notorious concept of a quota system for meetings. His delegation took strong exception to that concept.

12. The United States proposal was unclear and superfluous since, to his knowledge, the Committee on Conferences was not competent to authorize any additional expenditure.

13. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the appeal made by the representative of Tunisia, read out rule 120 of the rules of procedure and stressed that the requirement that proposals and amendments should be submitted in writing and not be put to a vote unless circulated to delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting was intended as a general rule but that in view of the time constraints it need not be applied strictly. For example, it was normal at the end of the session, for the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to report orally to the Committee rather than in writing.

/...

14. Mr. BUJ FLORUS (Mexico) said that the co-sponsors were willing to defer a decision on their proposal to a subsequent meeting and to take a decision on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolutions on the basis of document A/C.5/33/80.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the course of action proposed by the representative of Mexico would enable the plenary Assembly to take a decision on the draft resolution without having to wait for a decision on the three-Power proposal. Accordingly, he suggested that the Committee request the Rapporteur to report directly to the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.19, L.32 and L.35, an additional appropriation of \$88,700 would be required under section 2C of the programme budget for the biennium 1978-1979 and that conference servicing costs not exceeding \$900,000 would be included in the consolidated statement of conference servicing requirements to be presented before the close of the current session.

16. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had stated at the preceding meeting that it could not support any additional appropriation for the Disarmament Commission and requested that the Chairman's suggestion be put to a vote.

17. The Chairman's suggestion was adopted by 70 votes to 10.

18. Mr. CUNNINGHAM (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Chairman's suggestion because of its strong support for United Nations activities in the disarmament field. It continued to have misgivings, however, regarding the provision of verbatim records for the Disarmament Commission and hoped that consideration would be given to the possibility of reducing that body's documentation requirements.

19. Mr. EL-AYADHI (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted against the Chairman's suggestion because it did not see the point of providing summary records for the committee of the whole, which, by its very nature, was intended to facilitate informal discussions among the entire membership of the Commission.

20. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Chairman's suggestion. However, if records were to be provided for the Disarmament Commission, his delegation hoped that they would be summary records and not verbatim records since the former would cost some \$300,000 to \$400,000 less than the latter.

AGENDA ITEM 109: APPOINTMENTS TO FILL VACANCIES IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF SUBSIDIARY ORGANS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

(f) INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (continued) (A/C.5/33/92)

21. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the recommendations of the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/33/92 to the effect that the Fifth Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it appoint Mr. Richard Akwei (Ghana), Mr. Pascal Frochaux (Switzerland), Mr. Jiří Nosek (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Raul Quijano (Argentina) and Mr. Moulaye El Hassan (Mauritania) as members of the International Civil Service

Commission for terms of four years, beginning 1 January 1979; that it appoint Mr. Jean de la Grandville (France) to replace Mr. J.-L. Plihon as a member of the Commission to serve for the unexpired portion of the latter's term of office, i.e. until 31 December 1981; and that it designate Mr. Quijano as Chairman and Mr. Akwei as Vice-Chairman of the Commission to serve until 31 December 1982. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the Secretary-General's recommendations.

22. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 110: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) OTHER PERSONNEL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Implementation of personnel policy reforms (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 106: JOINT INSPECTION UNIT: REPORTS OF THE JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (continued)

Women in the Professional category and above in the United Nations system (continued)

Draft resolution presented by the Chairman of the Working Group on Personnel Questions (continued) (A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2)

23. The CHAIRMAN recalled that when the 59th meeting had been adjourned, the Committee had been on the point of voting on draft resolution A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2, having decided to entertain no further amendments to sections I, II and III. He proposed to put those sections to the vote and invited delegations which wished to explain their vote before the voting to do so. The Committee would then decide on section IV, followed by a decision on the additional appropriations required to implement the provisions of the draft resolution, if adopted.

Sections I, II and III

24. Mr. TALIEH (Iran) said that the Chairman seemed to be ignoring the fact that the representative of Saudi Arabia had also proposed at the 59th meeting that the draft resolution should be adopted by consensus. If the Chairman intended to put the draft resolution to a vote, why had so much time been spent in the Working Group in an effort to draw up a text that could be adopted by consensus? Obviously, the draft resolution as it stood was not entirely satisfactory to the Group of 77, but the Group recognized that consensus required that concessions be made by all. The aim of the proposal to take separate decisions on sections I, II and III, on the one hand, and section IV, on the other, had been to enable the Committee to adopt at least sections I, II and III by consensus. However, it appeared that not even that aim would be achieved.

/...

25. The CHAIRMAN said that despite all the efforts of the Working Group it had proved impossible to reach consensus and a vote had been requested on sections I, II and III. He had consulted the Soviet delegation to ascertain whether it would be willing to accept the draft resolution on a no-objection basis but that delegation maintained its request for a vote.

26. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) appealed to the Soviet delegation to accept sections I, II and III of the draft resolution on a no-objection basis.

27. Mr. BIRICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's position on paragraph 4 of section II continued to be that any increase in the representation of developing countries at senior and policy-making levels should be in keeping with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. Some developed countries, especially the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, were also inadequately represented in senior posts; the General Assembly should not overlook that situation or fail to take appropriate remedial action. His delegation maintained its request for a vote and would abstain in the voting.

28. Mr. HOUMA GOLO (Chad) said that his delegation had serious reservations regarding the inclusion of the phrase "and post-secondary educational qualifications" in paragraph 1 (g) of section I. That phrase had not appeared in the text agreed upon in the Working Group and had been added only in the Committee by the Chairman of the Group. It would be unfair to require post-secondary educational qualifications in addition to all the other requirements laid down in paragraph 1 (g) for movement of General Service staff to the Professional category. His delegation interpreted the phrase to mean some form of in-service training to prepare potential candidates for the proposed competitive methods of selection. Subject to that interpretation, his delegation could vote in favour of sections I, II and III of the draft resolution. He requested a recorded vote on those sections.

29. Mr. SCALABRE (France) endorsed the interpretation of the phrase "post-secondary educational qualifications" just given by the representative of Chad. Should that interpretation not meet with serious objection from the Committee, his delegation would not press its proposal for the deletion of that phrase and would be able to vote in favour of sections I, II and III. His delegation would follow closely the efforts of the Secretary-General to implement the provisions of paragraph 1 (g) of section I and reserved its right to reopen the discussion of the question of movement of General Service staff to the Professional category, if necessary, at the thirty-fourth session. He deeply regretted that, despite the concessions made by numerous delegations, it would be necessary to put the draft resolution to a vote when a consensus was desirable and had been within reach. In voting in favour of the draft resolution, his delegation intended to express its participation in the consensus which should have been reached. Its vote in favour of the resolution, however, did not mean that it in any way abandoned the positions it had taken with regard to the various issues dealt with in the draft resolution.

30. Mr. KENSMIL (Suriname) expressed his delegation's belief that the implementation of the measures proposed in the draft resolution would lead to greater balance and a more equitable composition of the United Nations Secretariat. He particularly approved of paragraph 1 of section II since his was an unrepresented country. Suriname had only recently become a Member of the United Nations and the Government had decided to use its human resources primarily for its own development purposes. That should not, however, be interpreted as a lack of interest on the part of Suriname in the work of the Organization, and his delegation was confident that the adoption of the draft resolution would facilitate the eventual entry of Surinamese nationals into the Secretariat.

31. Mr. PICO DE COAÑA (Spain) said that his delegation had listened with interest to the statement made by the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management at the 58th meeting conveying to the Committee the concerns and aspirations of the General Service staff. He reiterated his delegation's satisfaction over the fact that examinations for the passage of General Service staff to the Professional category would become a reality in 1979 and stressed, in that connexion, that due regard should be had to the provisions of Staff Regulation 4.4. A figure of 30 per cent for the proportion of vacancies at P-1 and P-2 levels to be filled from among General Service staff would have been acceptable to his delegation despite the fact that his country continued to be inadequately represented in the Secretariat, especially at the senior levels.

32. With regard to section III of the draft resolution, his delegation was of the view that it was incumbent on the General Assembly to take positive action to give effect to Article 8 of the Charter, which stipulated that no restrictions should be placed on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations.

33. It was regrettable that the efforts made in the Working Group to achieve consensus had not borne fruit. While his delegation had reservations regarding the final text of the draft resolution, it would vote in favour of it.

34. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that, while agreeing that the draft resolution might require additional expenditure for travel and publicity, his delegation did not see the need to recruit additional staff to implement its provisions.

35. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that his delegation could support the draft resolution but had reservations regarding a number of its provisions. It also strongly regretted the decision taken by the Committee not to receive any further amendments to the text. As a result of that decision, delegations which wished to see the consensus maintained were obliged to accept a phrase in paragraph 1 (g) of section I which had not appeared in the version agreed upon in the Working Group. The reference to "post-secondary educational qualifications" had been added by the Chairman of the Working Group on his own initiative, and, to his delegation's recollection, there had not been wide acceptance of that phrase in the Group. His delegation had therefore supported the French proposal to delete the phrase since one of the purposes of competitive methods of selection was to enable persons who did not have the formal educational qualifications required for entry into the Professional category to demonstrate by some other objective means that they



(Mr. Green, New Zealand)

possessed the intellectual capacity to undertake professional work assignments. The requirement of post-secondary educational qualifications constituted an arbitrary restriction on eligibility to compete for Professional posts in the Secretariat.

36. As to the argument that all Professional staff should be required to have post-secondary educational qualifications, his delegation felt strongly that such a requirement, if applied to General Service staff, would be incompatible with the principle that merit deserved recognition. The competitive methods of selection provided for in the draft resolution would enable the Secretary-General to identify deserving candidates for transfer to the Professional category, while adequately safeguarding entry standards. Paragraph 1 (f) of section I called upon the Secretary-General to draw up standards for entry, promotion and rotation of staff in both the Professional and General Service categories, and it was therefore the responsibility of the Secretary-General to determine what educational qualifications should be required. That was a complex task and the General Assembly should not complicate it further.

37. Mr. DOUGLAS (Guyana) said that his delegation was pleased to support the draft resolution and that it would have had no difficulty in accepting an increased percentage in paragraph 1 (g) of section I. His delegation considered the phrase "post-secondary educational qualifications" to be too nebulous. In addition, it would have preferred formulations of paragraphs 2 and 4 of section II which met more fully the concerns of the developing countries.

38. Mr. P. L. FALL (Senegal) said that, in voting in favour of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to reaffirm the need to formulate and implement a bolder personnel policy and to give the Secretary-General a clear mandate to solve the problems relating to the representation of developing countries in the Secretariat, particularly at the senior and policy-making level, promotion possibilities for General Service staff, the practice of "inheriting" posts, and conditions of service for women.

39. With regard to paragraph 1 (g) of section I, his delegation would have preferred a higher figure for the percentage of vacancies at the P-1 and P-2 levels to be filled by promotion of General Service staff; it considered the requirement of post-secondary educational qualifications to be pointless and even dangerous, and would have voted in favour of the French proposal to delete it. Moreover, if paragraph 5 of section II was interpreted in the light of the requirement that General Service staff should have at least five years' experience in order to be eligible for advancement to the Professional category, it was clear that the possibilities for internal promotion of General Service staff were very limited indeed and, in fact, arbitrarily limited. For those reasons, his delegation would have preferred a more flexible approach to the questions.

40. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said it was regrettable that the Committee would apparently not adopt the draft resolution by consensus. His delegation would have preferred a higher percentage figure in paragraph 1 (g) of section I and shared the reservations of earlier speakers regarding the requirement of post-secondary

/...



(Mr. Aksoy, Turkey)

educational qualifications. Accordingly, his delegation would have supported the French proposal to delete the reference to post-secondary educational qualifications had it been put to a vote. Lastly, it was concerned that competitive examinations for recruitment to the P-1 and P-2 levels should not adversely affect efforts to increase the representation of the developing countries in the Secretariat.

41. Mr. BELYAEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the draft resolution failed to give adequate weight to a number of very important principles of personnel policy which had been laid down in the Charter and repeatedly reaffirmed in resolutions of the General Assembly. For example, while the third preambular paragraph referred to the urgent need to secure an improved representation of developing countries at senior and policy-making levels and to achieve adequate representation of unrepresented and under-represented countries, the specific measures proposed in paragraph 4 of section II fell short of what was needed to attain those objectives. While the fourth preambular paragraph stressed that the paramount consideration in the employment of staff was the need for the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity and asserted that those standards were compatible with the principles of equitable geographical distribution, certain provisions of the draft resolution, particularly paragraph 1 (g) of section I, seemed to suggest that the principle of equitable geographical distribution could be disregarded in certain circumstances. In that connexion, he stressed that the movement of General Service staff to the Professional category should be the exception and not the rule, and said he did not understand what was meant by the vague phrase "post-secondary educational qualifications". It was a well-known fact that some 20 per cent of staff in the Professional category had no university degree. The Joint Inspection Unit had rightly recommended that only persons with higher educational qualifications should be recruited for Professional posts. The draft resolution also failed to deal effectively with the problem of unrepresented and under-represented countries. His delegation maintained that posts vacated by nationals of over-represented countries should be filled by candidates from unrepresented and under-represented countries.

42. Lastly, his delegation was astonished that the Fifth Committee, which was responsible for carefully husbanding the resources of the Organization, seemed prepared to adopt a draft resolution that would have excessive financial implications. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on sections I, II and III.

43. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation had participated in good faith in the negotiations in the Working Group and had put forward a number of amendments which had not been accepted. It had accepted the draft resolution prepared by the Working Group without great enthusiasm in order not to stand in the way of a consensus. If it had known that the draft resolution would be put to a vote, it would have put forward in the Committee a number of amendments which, he was certain, would have won the support of a large number of delegations. If the various paragraphs of the resolution were to be put to a separate vote, his delegation would abstain on paragraphs 2 and 4 of section II for the reasons given in its statements at

/...

(Mr. Lahlou, Morocco)

previous meetings. With regard to those provisions of the draft resolution relating to so-called equitable geographical distribution, his delegation would vote in favour of them but had serious misgivings regarding the manner in which that concept was understood by some.

44. Mr. ANDERSSON (Sweden) said that his delegation would have joined in a consensus on the draft resolution and fully supported the provisions of section III regarding the employment of women. His delegation also fully agreed with the demand for as wide a geographical distribution of posts in the Secretariat as possible. It was, however, concerned over the percentage limit stipulated in paragraph 1 (g) of section I and regretted that candidates who met all the requisite conditions for recruitment to the Professional category might be barred from employment solely on the grounds that they were General Service staff. He agreed with the view expressed by the Chairman of the Staff Committee in document A/C.5/33/CRP.7 that the standards applied to General Service staff should not be more rigorous than those applied to outside recruits.

45. Mr. EL-AYADHI (Tunisia) recalled that the Group of 77 had intended to submit a draft resolution of its own on personnel questions but that it had heeded the Chairman's appeal to seek a compromise solution in the Working Group in the hope of achieving a consensus. His delegation was therefore dismayed at the sudden turn of events and regretted that the draft resolution would be put to a vote because of the intransigence of some delegations, thereby depriving the Committee of at least the moral satisfaction of consensus. His delegation would, nevertheless, vote in favour of the draft resolution.

46. Mr. CARRASCO (Chile) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution although it regretted the fact that a consensus had not been achieved. His delegation could have supported a higher percentage in paragraph 1 (g) for the proportion of vacancies at the P-1 and P-2 levels to be filled by General Service staff. It considered that the requirement of "post-secondary educational qualifications" included in-service training and, in any event, did not mean a university degree.

47. Mr. FALL (Mauritania) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution although it would have preferred a figure of 30 per cent in paragraph 1 (g) of section I in order to provide greater opportunities for the advancement of General Service staff. The requirement of post-secondary educational qualifications was superfluous since experience was an adequate substitute for formal training.

48. Mr. WILSKI (Poland) said that if the preamble and sections I, II and III of the draft resolution were voted on separately, his delegation would vote in favour of the preamble and section III and would abstain in the vote on sections I and II.

49. At the request of the representative of Chad, a recorded vote was taken on sections I, II and III of the edited text of draft resolution A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

50. Sections I, II and III of draft resolution A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2 were adopted by 81 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

#### Section IV

51. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) recalled that at a previous meeting his delegation had proposed that the words "for the same occupations" should be added after the words "equivalent grades" in paragraph 1 of section IV.

52. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) proposed that in paragraph 2 of section IV the words "in the light of the observations" should be replaced by the words "with due regard to the need for economy as suggested in the report".

53. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt section IV, as amended, by consensus.

54. It was so decided.

#### Financial implications of draft resolution A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2

55. Additional appropriations of \$65,000 under section 22 C, \$24,500 under section 22 J and \$26,400 for staff assessment under section 25 for the biennium 1978-1979 were approved in first reading by 76 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions, the latter amount to be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

#### Amendment of the Staff Regulations of the United Nations (A/C.5/33/CRP.9)

56. The CHAIRMAN recalled that document A/C.5/33/CRP.9 had been submitted by the

Secretariat in response to a request made by the Japanese delegation at the 57th meeting. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend to the General Assembly that it should adopt the text set out in document A/C.5/33/CRP.9, to be incorporated into the Staff Regulations of the United Nations as paragraph 10 of annex I, entitled "Salary scales and related provisions".

57. It was so decided.

58. Mr. BIERING (Denmark), speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.5/33/L.32/Rev.2, said that his delegation deeply regretted that the efforts of the Working Group to achieve a consensus on the draft resolution had been in vain. Although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it was disappointed that there was no reference in the text to the concept of positive career development. His delegation would have liked to propose the inclusion of a seventh preambular paragraph welcoming the intention of the Secretary-General, within his plan of action on personnel questions, to continue to establish career development committees for staff in all occupational groups as an important element of the implementation of the personnel policy reforms. His delegation had raised that matter several times in the Working Group and had intended to raise it once again at the 59th meeting of the Committee but had been prevented from doing so by the strange turn which events had taken.

59. With regard to the proportion of vacancies at P-1 and P-2 levels to be filled by General Service staff, his delegation would have preferred a figure of 30 per cent.

60. Mr. PEDERSEN (Canada) said that his delegation had been prepared to accept the draft resolution presented by the Working Group despite its reservations concerning a number of its provisions. It was therefore disappointed that the consensus which everyone had expected had not materialized. His delegation had nevertheless voted in favour of the draft resolution in the belief that on the whole it provided a solid foundation on which the Secretariat could build, particularly with regard to recruitment policy and the employment of women.

61. As to the limit on the movement of General Service staff to the Professional category, his delegation was prepared to reconsider that question at the thirty-fourth session in order to determine whether the ceiling imposed in paragraph 1 (g) of section I should be raised.

62. With regard to paragraph 4 of section II, his delegation felt that the developing countries were, on the whole, reasonably well represented at the senior levels of the Secretariat, both in terms of numbers and importance of posts occupied. The measures provided for in section II should be implemented having due regard to the paramount considerations referred to in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter and the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

63. Mr. SADDLER (United States of America) said that, while the draft resolution did not fully meet the concerns of all delegations, it represented the triumph of

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

solidarity over division. Obviously the adoption of the resolution would not have been possible if each delegation had not felt that its advantages outweighed its disadvantages. The draft resolution was a remarkably clear and far-sighted statement of the will of the General Assembly and was in the higher interests of the Organization as a whole. The Secretariat seemed to recognize clearly the importance of the draft resolution and apparently intended to implement it in good faith. It was premature to take the occasion of the adoption of the draft resolution to determine the agenda for future actions of the General Assembly on personnel matters.

64. His delegation had announced early in the session its intention to propose a separate draft resolution aimed at fostering equal employment and career development opportunities for women in all the organizations of the system. Such a resolution would have been timely and justified in the circumstances, but in a spirit of conciliation and compromise, his delegation had agreed to have its proposals relating to the employment of women incorporated into the general draft resolution which had just been adopted. His delegation would have welcomed the inclusion in section III of its proposal that the Secretary-General should designate a high-ranking Secretariat official to serve as a focal point for all matters relating to career development and equal employment opportunities for women. It was regrettable that that proposal had aroused some misunderstanding on the part of the Secretariat, as well as considerable reticence among delegations. His delegation had agreed reluctantly to withdraw that proposal on the understanding that the Secretary-General might on his own initiative designate such an official should he deem it advisable to do so. Section III of the draft resolution provided the legislative mandate for the United Nations and the other organizations of the system to eliminate all practices which discriminated against women. His delegation did not expect the implementation of the provisions of section III to undermine existing standards for recruitment and promotion, nor did it expect the target for the employment of women to be attained at the expense of the representation of any Member State.

65. His delegation did not agree with the premise in the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 4 of section II that the developing countries were, on the whole, inadequately represented in the Secretariat, particularly at the senior levels. The statistics showed that the developing countries were above the mid-point of their desirable ranges at the D-1 level and above.

66. It would have been preferable to leave the Secretary-General greater latitude to grant extensions beyond the retirement age since, in the view of his delegation, staff members did not automatically lose their professional capabilities upon reaching the age of 60.

67. In the Working Group his delegation had supported greater flexibility on the issue of the movement of General Service staff to the Professional category both with regard to the percentage of posts to be filled by General Service staff and the requirement of five years' service. It was best as a general rule to leave it to the Secretary-General to determine precise targets and his delegation had accepted the specific limitation set in paragraph 1 (g) of section I only when it

/...

(Mr. Saddler, United States)

had become clear that a majority of delegations strongly favoured such an approach. The experience of the Committee with regard to legislated quotas in other areas amply demonstrated the short-comings of such an approach.

68. His delegation had noted with interest the statements made in the debate concerning the methods currently used to calculate desirable ranges and would welcome a frank exchange of views on that matter prior to the thirty-fourth session.

69. Mr. LEMP (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution but regretted the failure of the Committee to take a decision by consensus. The text was a meaningful compromise made possible by the many concessions made by various delegations, and by the valuable input received from the Joint Inspection Unit.

70. His delegation would have supported the French proposal to delete the phrase "post-secondary educational qualifications" in paragraph 1 (g) of section I, and it agreed with the interpretation of that phrase set forth earlier by the representative of Chad.

71. His delegation had misgivings with regard to a number of provisions, including the fifth preambular paragraph. The need to achieve equitable geographical distribution, as defined in the resolutions of the General Assembly establishing the current desirable ranges and the concept of regional population reserves, should prevail, in cases of conflict, over the requirements laid down in section III of the resolution.

72. The faithful implementation of the draft resolution would bring the United Nations closer to the objective of equitable geographical distribution and a coherent personnel and recruitment policy. Accordingly, his delegation felt that the amount of \$89,500 appropriated for the implementation of the resolution would be well spent indeed.

73. Mr. IYER (India) reiterated the views expressed by his delegation and the amendment it had proposed at the 58th meeting, and said he looked forward to a fundamental review at the thirty-fourth session of the principles governing the representation of Member States in the Secretariat.

74. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that paragraph 4 of section II fell far short of his delegation's expectations. His delegation had accepted the draft resolution only in a spirit of conciliation and compromise, and it deeply regretted that the same spirit was not fully shared by all. Since the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus, his delegation reserved the right to reopen a number of issues at the appropriate time.

75. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution and had voted against the additional appropriations required to implement its provisions. His delegation had participated in the work of the Working Group and had joined in the efforts to achieve consensus on the draft resolution submitted by the Group of 77. However,

/...

(Mr. Palamarchuk, USSR)

some delegations were attempting to give the impression that the Soviet delegation had retreated from an agreement to adopt the text by consensus, and his delegation firmly denied such allegations. The Soviet delegation had made it clear to the Chairman of the Working Group and to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee that, if its amendments to the draft resolution were not accepted, it would be forced to abstain in the vote.

76. Mr. GASS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite misgivings regarding a number of its provisions. It was particularly regrettable that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus. His delegation expected that the resolution would be implemented in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the existing principles governing United Nations personnel policy, including desirable ranges. The figure of 40 per cent mentioned in paragraph 1 of section II as the proportion of vacancies in Professional posts subject to geographical distribution to be filled by Professionals from unrepresented and under-represented countries should be viewed as a desirable target and not a fixed or mandatory quota.

77. His delegation strongly approved the action taken by the Committee to give effect in the Staff Regulations to the provision in General Assembly resolution 31/193 B II concerning non-payment of salary to staff members in respect of periods of unauthorized absence from work. He trusted that the Secretary-General would keep the Committee informed of consequential measures taken, such as the promulgation of derivative staff rules and the issue of Secretary-General's bulletins.

78. Mr. MARVILLE (Barbados) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, having endured the painful process of negotiations in the Working Group in the hope of achieving a consensus. Unfortunately, a consensus had not been reached, and it might be better in future for like-minded delegations to prepare draft resolutions for submission rather than to subject themselves to weeks of fruitless negotiations which might fail to produce the hoped-for consensus.

79. Mr. RAMOS (Cape Verde) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution although it would have preferred a decision by consensus.

80. His country, like other countries that had recently attained independence, needed all available trained persons for the national development effort. His country's difficulties in providing professional staff for employment in the Secretariat was, however, only temporary. Accordingly, the period for the appointment of nationals of unrepresented and under-represented countries mentioned in paragraph 1 of section II should not be considered to be a rigid deadline, and efforts to recruit nationals from countries like his own should, of course, continue beyond that period.

81. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and hoped that the Secretary-General would, in implementing it, give particular attention to the concept of career development. His delegation trusted that the Secretary-General would continue to be guided in the recruitment of staff by the provisions of Article 101 of the Charter.

/...



(Mr. Garrido, Philippines)

82. His delegation supported paragraph 1 of section IV because of the glaring differences between General Service grades in Geneva and New York.

83. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation had cast its vote in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that it would be transmitted to bodies such as UNDP and UNICEF in order to promote coherent personnel management policies.

84. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) said that he had supported the draft resolution because it was in the best interests of the Organization. He appealed to the staff who might be contemplating a job action to put aside their personal interests since all was not yet lost and there was still much that could be done to redress their grievances. His delegation, for its part, was not entirely happy with the figure of 25 per cent in paragraph 1 (g) of section I and would do its best to have it raised to 30 per cent. The staff should realize that unacceptable tactics used by some to influence the deliberations of the Fifth Committee had provoked an unfavourable reaction.

85. It was to be hoped that recruitment missions undertaken in pursuance of the draft resolution would be carefully planned to ensure that contacts were made with appropriate institutions in the target countries.

86. The CHAIRMAN said that, as the Committee was concluding its consideration of agenda item 110, he wished to convey to the staff the fact that the Fifth Committee was fully cognizant of their interests and took decisions on personnel questions only after careful and exhaustive consideration of the issues involved. The Committee sometimes arrived at conclusions which did not meet the expectations of some of the staff, but very often its decisions did not satisfy all Member States either. It appreciated the position taken by the staff and expected that its own position, arrived at after exhaustive deliberations, would also be understood and respected.

87. Mr. IYER (India), speaking as Chairman of the Working Group on Personnel Questions commended those delegations which had made important concessions for the common good of the Organization and thanked them for having facilitated his task as Chairman of the Group.

88. Mr. BERTRAND (Joint Inspection Unit) expressed the satisfaction of JIU at having been able to provide an input for the Committee's consideration of the item on personnel questions. Virtually all the recommendations of JIU had been accepted and were reflected in the draft resolution just adopted, which constituted the most clear, precise and comprehensive statement of personnel policy ever issued by the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 11.15 p.m.