

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records*



FIFTH COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 16 November 1976
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Republic)

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

UN LIBRARY

NOV 22 1976

UN/SA COLLECTION

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 96: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 93: MEDIUM-TERM PLAN (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 102: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

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

* 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 LX-2332.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/31/SR.30
18 November 1976

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 96: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY CO-ORDINATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS WITH THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY: REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS (A/31/227, A/31/233; A/C.5/31/L.6, L.12, L.13) (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.6 (continued)

1. Mr. HAHN (Canada) said that he shared the reservations expressed by some delegations at the previous meeting regarding the draft resolution.
2. Mr. SERANO AVILA (Cuba) said that, when commenting on draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.6, the representative of the United States had become as excited and impatient as he usually did when faced with a Cuban proposal. That representative had said that, if the draft resolution was adopted, his country would be forced to ignore it. That showed an amazing lack of respect for the General Assembly. He had the impression that the representative of the United States had not read the draft resolution, which merely asked the Governments of developed countries in which headquarters of the organizations of the United Nations system were situated to inform the Secretary-General whether or not they could agree to what had been requested; nothing was being imposed on those Governments. If the resolution was adopted and the Government of the United States could not agree to the request, it need only inform the Secretary-General to that effect.
3. The representative of the United States had said that the draft resolution was unrealistic and unworkable. However, a system of fixed exchange rates had operated for 25 years, and there was no reason to suppose that the system could not now be applied in a limited manner to a specific case. The representative of the United States had also said that it was impossible to predict exchange rates, but, if the draft resolution was adopted, that would not be necessary. The parties concerned would merely agree to use the exchange rate which would prevail on 1 January 1978 as the fixed exchange rate.
4. The representative of the United States had said that the existing monetary system had been accepted by all members of IMF. He could not agree. For 25 years, the two main principles upheld by IMF had been fixed exchange rates and monetary convertibility. However, when the United States had found that those principles no longer suited its own ends, it had imposed the idea of fluctuating exchange rates on IMF. In reality, the Group of 10 dominated IMF. The developing countries wanted to play a more active role in the decision-making process of IMF, as shown by the resolutions adopted at the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly. Furthermore, not all countries agreed with the United States about the existing monetary system; the representative of Switzerland had said that his country favoured fixed exchange rates.
5. The representative of the United States had said that currencies would always be subject to change and that the United Nations could not be shielded from such fluctuations. While it was true that exchange rates changed, the adoption

/...

(Mr. Serano Avila, Cuba)

of the draft resolution would mean that international organizations and most Member States would not suffer such large losses. The representative of the United States had also said that fixed exchange rates could work to the disadvantage of the United Nations. That would be true if the United Nations was obliged to use fixed exchange rates, but, according to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the United Nations could opt for the fixed exchange rate or the prevailing market rate. When the representative of the United States said that the ideas behind the draft resolution were inconsistent with the views of the world's monetary experts, he was presumably referring to experts employed by the United States Government, who were of course bound to oppose the draft resolution. It had also been claimed that the draft resolution would represent an unfair burden on the developed countries in question, but the benefits enjoyed by those countries outweighed the burden. Furthermore, the existing system meant that all Member States had to bear the burden. In general, the fact that the draft resolution was a good one was shown by the fury with which the largest colonialist Power had attacked it.

6. The representative of Trinidad and Tobago had said that the two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution were contradictory. That was not true, since they established a logical sequence. The developed countries in question would be requested to agree to establish fixed rates. Those countries would then, possibly in the first quarter of 1977, provide the Secretary-General with the relevant information, so that the latter could report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session. The resolution would be adopted at that session and, shortly after, the fixed exchange rates would be established.

7. The representative of the Netherlands had said that the term "losses" was inaccurate. However, the term was used in the Financial Rules and Regulations of the United Nations (rule 111.6) and in other United Nations documents (for example, A/9008/Add.16, appendix I, para. 57 (f)), and was therefore appropriate. The representative of the Netherlands had also said that the draft resolution did not make it clear that action should be taken with respect to developing countries in which the headquarters of the organizations of the United Nations system were situated. The draft resolution did not apply to developing countries; all United Nations resolutions made a distinction between developed and developing countries in order to promote the interests of the latter. The representative of the Netherlands had then asked Cuba to withdraw its draft resolution until the Secretary-General had submitted his report on the matter. However, the original decision concerning the report dealt exclusively with inflation, not currency fluctuations. Furthermore, it was concerned merely with the methodology of dealing with inflation, and not with who would pay. Accordingly, his delegation could not withdraw the draft resolution.

8. The representative of the Federal Republic of Germany had asked who would be responsible for and who would benefit from any deficit or surplus that might result from fluctuations in exchange rates. Countries establishing fixed exchange rates would be entering into a commitment between themselves to exchange currency at those fixed rates for the transactions of international organizations. It was true that in the short run a country might incur losses, but in the long run those losses would be offset by corresponding gains. The proposed new system was therefore quite

/...

(Mr. Serano Avila, Cuba)

logical. Under the existing system, most countries suffered losses, and only those countries which had imposed the system gained. The United States, for example, earned several billion dollars each year from having the United Nations Headquarters situated in New York. Countries which reaped such enormous benefits must accept corresponding responsibilities and bear some losses. It was unfair that all Member States should lose. He therefore asked that a vote be taken on the draft resolution.

9. Mr. STUART (United Kingdom) said that the meaning of the draft resolution had now become clear. The developed countries in which the headquarters of the organizations of the United Nations system were situated would give guarantees, so that international organizations would not incur losses as a result of currency fluctuations. The organizations would, however, be able to register gains. In Switzerland, international organizations benefited from the low rate of inflation and since, according to the draft resolution, they would be protected by the Swiss Government from the effects of the appreciation of the Swiss franc, those organizations could only gain. In the United Kingdom, international organizations had gained as a result of the depreciation of the pound against the dollar, despite the pace of inflation. According to the draft resolution, the United Kingdom would be asked to guarantee that, if the pound recovered, there would be no loss to the United Nations budget, whereas if the pound continued to fall United Nations units in the United Kingdom would be allowed to benefit. The draft resolution was therefore just as unfair as those which had been submitted at the two previous sessions and which had been rejected by the Fifth Committee. Nothing had happened since then to persuade his delegation to alter its opinion. The Committee should therefore vote on the draft resolution as quickly as possible in order to be able to turn to other business.

10. Miss FORCIGNANO (Italy) said that she agreed with the United Kingdom representative; the draft resolution was unfair to countries such as Italy, the currency of which was depreciating against the dollar. The members of any organization must respect the principle of collective responsibility, for better or for worse. Her Government did not ask international organizations to pay rent but, if the draft resolution was adopted, it would have to reconsider that policy. It was unfair that one Member State should have to bear the burden of losses incurred because of currency fluctuations.

11. Miss MUCK (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft resolution was unrealistic, unworkable and unfair. Inflation and the consequent currency fluctuations were world-wide phenomena which did not respect national boundaries. Well-known financial experts had not found any generally acceptable solution to the problem and the Committee should not therefore hasten to pass judgement. Furthermore, any attempt to apportion blame for an economic problem which was both complex and outside the control of all Member States was unjustifiable. The Cuban approach was one-sided and simplistic, since the mere fact of being a developed host country did not imply any special responsibility for the impact of inflation and currency fluctuations on the United Nations budget. Her delegation could not, therefore, comply with the request contained in the draft resolution and would not vote for the text.

12. Draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.6 was rejected by 38 votes to 17, with 41 abstentions.

13. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the OPI press release on the previous meeting (GA/AB/1683) had reported him as opposing the Cuban draft resolution. In fact, he had not committed himself at the previous meeting. OPI should therefore follow the debate more closely. His delegation had abstained, since the draft resolution was not entirely satisfactory. If the idea was merely to ask the developed countries concerned if they could accept a fixed exchange rate, no particular difficulties should arise. However, the countries in question had made their opposition clear in the course of the discussion and there could be no doubt about their reply to such a request.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that he greatly appreciated the work of the press officer. The mistake would be corrected in the next press release.

15. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation had abstained, primarily because the explanation provided by the representative of Cuba had not been entirely satisfactory. He pointed out to the representative of Cuba that, at the previous meeting, he had not referred to any inconsistency in the draft resolution. He had merely requested information.

16. Mr. ANVAR (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Nicaragua had become a sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.5/31/L.12 and L.13.

Draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.12

17. Mr. RHODIUS (Netherlands), introducing the draft resolution, said that paragraph 1 reflected comments made during the debate. With respect to paragraph 6, annual reports on administrative and budgetary co-ordination were very useful to ministries. The items to be studied by ACABQ had not been enumerated, since it was important that the Advisory Committee should have some freedom of action and since the summary records of the discussion provided adequate guidance. It was the understanding of the sponsors of the draft resolution that, in accordance with the decision taken the previous year, the question of administrative and budgetary co-ordination would be studied in depth in off-budget years, but that it could be discussed in budget years if any urgent business should arise. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

18. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he would have no difficulty in supporting draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.12. However, he proposed that a second preambular paragraph be inserted, to read: "Concerned with the growing need for effective administrative and budgetary co-ordination within the framework of the United Nations system".

19. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.12 for providing in paragraph 6 guidance on the submission of the annual reports of the Advisory Committee. He suggested that the sense of that paragraph might be clearer if the

(Mr. Mselle)

words "its present practice of supplementing" were replaced by the words "to supplement, as appropriate, the". The paragraph thus amended would indicate clearly that special reports would not be required every year. It would be useful for such special reports to be submitted in off-budget years, but that did not rule out the possibility that the Advisory Committee might submit them in budget years if it deemed necessary.

20. Mr. RHODIUS (Netherlands) accepted on behalf of the sponsors the suggestion made by the representative of the Philippines. The suggestion made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee was also acceptable, as it spelled out the freedom of the Advisory Committee to submit special reports whenever it deemed necessary.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt by consensus draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.12 as amended.

22. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.13

23. Mr. HAHN (Canada) said that the draft resolution flowed naturally in content and intent from the draft resolution just adopted, particularly with regard to the role of ACABQ in ensuring co-ordination. The sponsors of the draft resolution had felt that there was a special need for administrative co-ordination measures in connexion with EDP and that it would be useful for ACABQ to identify the major issues, as well as examine the methods and criteria applicable to the use of both computer software and hardware. They had also felt that ACC could make a useful contribution to the co-ordination effort through its subsidiary body the Inter-organization Board for Information Systems and Related Activities, which was the appropriate body for providing the necessary background information to the Advisory Committee. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.13 by consensus.

25. It was so decided.

26. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that at a previous meeting her delegation had asked a question regarding expenditure on bodies exercising administrative and budgetary control in the various specialized agencies, particularly ILO, FAO, UNESCO and WHO. The Secretariat had provided her delegation with a brief document which had not adequately answered the question. The representative of UNESCO had provided her delegation with a much longer and useful document, but that specialized agency had been the only one to come forward with specific information. Consequently, it had not been possible to make comparisons of the expenditure of the various specialized agencies for administrative and budgetary control. She regretted that once again the Secretariat had failed to provide a specific answer to her delegation's question and expressed the hope that the Committee would not conclude its consideration of item 96 before a suitable answer was received.

AGENDA ITEM 93: MEDIUM-TERM PLAN (A/31/326; A/C.5/31/27; A/C.5/31/L.9/Rev.1, L.15, L.16, L.17) (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.9/Rev.1

27. Mr. RHODIUS (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the text before the Committee incorporated a number of improvements suggested by delegations in the course of consultations. It differed from the original version in that a specific reference had been added in the fourth preambular paragraph to the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3534 (XXX) and the related report of the Advisory Committee. Two new preambular paragraphs had also been added. Paragraph 3 (a) (i) had been shortened and minor changes had been made in paragraph 3 (a) (iv). The original paragraph 7 had been split in two in the revised draft in order to express more clearly the intentions of the sponsors. A new operative paragraph had been added reaffirming resolution 3534 (XXX) and stressing the responsibility of the Secretary-General to draw the attention of the competent intergovernmental bodies to activities that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective. That paragraph made it clear that the Secretary-General had an important role to play in that regard but that the power of decision remained with the competent intergovernmental bodies.

28. With regard to the first Soviet amendment in document A/C.5/31/L.15, the sponsors were prepared to replace the words "system-wide co-ordination" in the sixth preambular paragraph by the words "effective co-ordination of the activities of the United Nations system". They also accepted the second Soviet amendment, provided that the words "as far as practicable" were also added before it. The reason for adding those words was that the medium-term plan in its current form could not be specific in all respects and that it might be impossible to indicate precisely the time-phasing of all programme elements. The idea behind the third Soviet amendment was acceptable to the sponsors, but they would prefer to incorporate it in paragraph 9 by adding the words "indicating the resources which could be released" after the word "ineffective". The sponsors had some difficulty, however, in accepting the fourth Soviet amendment. It was their understanding that the medium-term plan was in fact proposed by the Secretary-General on the basis of legislative decisions and the views of Member States. It was not appropriate therefore to include reference to the views of Member States in only one paragraph and he appealed to the Soviet delegation not to press its fourth amendment.

29. The sponsors could accept the Philippine amendment in document A/C.5/31/L.16, which could be included as the penultimate preambular paragraph.

30. The sponsors believed that the Greek amendment in document A/C.5/31/L.17 would help to strengthen CPC and ensure that the best qualified persons would participate in its work. They therefore accepted it, on the understanding that the members of CPC would travel in economy class and not first class.

31. Finally, he hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

32. Mr. LAFAYE (Director of the Budget Division) suggested that the phrase

/...

(Mr. Lavau)

"programme component" in the English version of the second Soviet amendment might be replaced by the phrase "programme element" in order to conform with the standard budget terminology of the United Nations.

33. The Greek amendment in document A/C.5/31/L.17, if adopted, would have financial implications. Assuming that the length of the CPC session would be six weeks in off-budget years and four weeks in budget years and assuming that members of CPC would travel first class and receive per diem allowance at the rate of 140 per cent, the financial implications for the biennium would be \$183,130 at 1976 rates. If the members of CPC travelled in economy class and received per diem at the standard rate, the financial implications of the Greek amendment would be \$127,440.

34. Mr. STOFOROUPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation understood that the members of CPC would travel in economy class.

35. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) welcomed the inclusion in the fourth preambular paragraph of the reference to the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 3534 (XXX) and the related report of the Advisory Committee and the further reference to that resolution in paragraph 9.

36. His delegation had difficulties with the wording of the Philippine amendment in document A/C.5/31/L.16, since under the Charter the General Assembly did not have a role in co-ordinating decisions taken by sectoral and regional bodies. That was the function of the Economic and Social Council. If the Philippine amendment was to be incorporated in the draft resolution, the word "respectively" should be added after the word "Council" or the text revised in such a manner as to distinguish clearly between the respective roles of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

37. Mr. NAUDY (France) welcomed the change which had been made in paragraph 3 (a) (i) in order to bring that paragraph into line with paragraph 3 of Economic and Social Council resolution 2019 (LXI). While the provisions of paragraph 3 (a) (iv) had been somewhat toned down, his delegation continued to hold the reservations it had expressed in that connexion at the 23rd meeting of the Committee. His delegation wished to place on record its position that it would not consider itself bound by the preliminary and approximate indications of future costs referred to in that paragraph.

38. His delegation had no objection to the amendments proposed by the delegation of the USSR. However, with regard to the third Soviet amendment, which had been incorporated in paragraph 9, his delegation stressed that CPC should consider the resources released by the termination of activities that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective from the programming and planning angle and not from the budgetary angle, since budgeting was the concern of ACABQ.

39. His delegation had no objection to the Philippine amendment. It could not, however, support the Greek amendment which would authorize a departure from the rule that travel and per diem expenses of members of intergovernmental bodies were not paid by the United Nations. His delegation did not believe that the need to

/...

(Mr. Naudy, France)

encourage Member States to be represented at sessions of CPC at a high level of expertise necessarily and logically led to the conclusion that the Organization should defray the expenses of such government representatives. Furthermore, his delegation did not favour any measure which might blur the distinction between CPC and ACABQ. The former must retain its intergovernmental character in order to preserve its importance. Finally, the adoption of the Greek amendment would to some extent prejudge the future, since the Ad Hoc Committee on the Restructuring of the Economic and Social Sectors of the United Nations System had not yet taken a final decision on a number of related issues.

40. Mr. KRUMIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed to the change in terminology suggested by the Director of the Budget Division. His delegation would withdraw its fourth amendment, even though he believed that it would have further improved the text of the draft resolution. It would vote for the draft resolution provided that the Greek amendment was not accepted. If that amendment was retained, he would ask for a separate vote on it and would vote against it because the measure envisaged was unjustified. Once such treatment was extended to the members of CPC, it would be sought by the members of many other intergovernmental bodies.

41. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) asked the sponsors to explain the meaning of paragraph 3 (a) (iv). The words "as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions" could be interpreted as referring to either future or past recommendations.

42. Mr. HAHN (Canada) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, including the amendments accepted by the sponsors, with the exception of the Greek amendment. Although the intent of the Greek amendment, namely, to strengthen CPC, was laudable, it was not appropriate for the Organization to pay the travel and per diem expenses of members of an intergovernmental organ. If there was a separate vote on that amendment, his delegation would vote against it.

43. Miss FORCIGNANO (Italy) said that her delegation strongly supported the draft resolution and was in favour of the amendments of the Soviet and Philippine delegations but not the amendment submitted by the Greek delegation. With regard to that amendment, her delegation endorsed the arguments put forward by the representatives of France and Canada.

44. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation's reservations with regard to paragraph 3 (a) (iv) were similar to those of the delegation of Japan. In view of the content of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, he proposed that the words "as recommended by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions" should be deleted from paragraph 3 (a) (iv). He further suggested that, in the light of paragraph 3 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/31/27), the words "programme elements" should be added in paragraph 11 (b) in order to remove the impression that programme elements were not covered by that paragraph. As to the Greek amendment, he doubted whether, unless members of CPC were indicated by name, continuity of representation would be assured by the payment of travel expenses; rather the reverse might be true. If the amendment was put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that further consideration of draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.9/Rev.1 should be deferred until a second revised version had been prepared.

46. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 102: PERSONNEL QUESTIONS (continued)

(a) COMPOSITION OF THE SECRETARIAT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/31/154 and Corr.1-2; A/C.5/31/L.11/Rev.1 and L.18; A/C.5/31/CRP.1 and 3) (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.11/Rev.1 (continued)

47. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to an amendment to draft resolution A/C.5/31/L.11/Rev.1 which had been submitted by the delegation of Barbados in document A/C.5/31/L.18.

48. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had endeavoured to incorporate many of the suggestions made to them; the consequent changes were to be found in the third, fourth, sixth, seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 2, 4 and 6. The sponsors felt that they had gone as far as they could to accommodate the concerns of delegations and that any further changes would detract from the tenor and perspective of the draft resolution. Consequently, they would leave the Committee to decide on the amendment which had just been submitted by the delegation of Barbados.

49. Two editorial changes should be made: in the fourth preambular paragraph, the word "categories" should be replaced by "category"; and in the eighth preambular paragraph the word "States" after "any particular Member" should be replaced by the word "State".

50. Mr. CHANDLER (Barbados), introducing his delegation's amendment in document A/C.5/31/L.18, thanked the sponsors for taking into account a number of the points raised by his delegation in its statement at the 12th meeting. However, there was one important proposal - originally made by the Secretary-General at the thirtieth session - which was not reflected in the draft resolution, namely, an increase to 2 to 8 in the desirable range for Member States with the minimum assessment in the apportionment of United Nations expenses. His delegation believed that its amendment represented a modest compromise, in view of the considerable support for the idea that every Member State should be entitled to 12 Professional staff members in the Secretariat. Moreover, it would like an explanation from the Secretary-General as to why he had not maintained his earlier proposal for a desirable range of 2 to 8.

51. Mr. STOFOROPOULOS (Greece) asked the sponsors to add the word "all" before "developing countries" in paragraph 2 so as to make it clear that it was not their intention to exclude, for the purposes of that paragraph, Greece and countries like Greece whose economic structure and degree of industrialization

(Mr. Stoforopoulos, Greece)

were such that they shared problems and concerns of the Group of 77.

52. Mr. MATHIAS (India), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, accepted the oral amendment proposed by the representative of Greece and the interpretation he had given to it.

53. Mr. SEKYI (Ghana) said that his delegation strongly supported the Barbadian amendment and thanked the sponsors for their efforts to make the draft resolution generally acceptable.

54. Mr. REDHEAD (Grenada) said that his delegation also supported the Barbadian amendment, which would ensure a more equitable representation for developing countries in the Secretariat.

55. Miss MUCK (Austria) asked the sponsors to confirm her delegation's understanding of paragraph 2, namely, that it would in no way adversely affect the principle of equal opportunity for promotion for all qualified staff members already serving in the Secretariat, regardless of nationality.

56. Mr. THOMAS (Trinidad and Tobago) reassured the representative of Austria that the intent of paragraph 2 was not to deprive qualified members of the Secretariat of an equal opportunity for advancement.

57. Mr. OUEDRAOGO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had difficulties with paragraph 7. It would have been preferable if the sponsors had mentioned either an Ombudsman or a panel. His own delegation's predilection was for a panel, which would provide staff members with greater opportunity of recourse than they would have if an Ombudsman was appointed. His delegation therefore would like the sponsors to consider deleting the words "Ombudsman or".

58. He assumed that paragraph 7 would have financial implications and that the resources would have to come from within the regular budget.

59. In paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed its request to the Secretary-General to increase the number of staff from developing countries in senior and policy-making posts. To carry out that request it would be necessary to discontinue the existing practice of reserving a number of such posts for given countries. His delegation would therefore like future reports on the composition of the Secretariat to give data similar to that in Conference Room Paper 3 so that the Committee could ascertain how successful the Secretary-General was in putting into effect the provisions of the draft resolution. If necessary, his delegation was prepared to formulate a draft decision on the question.

60. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution but would abstain on the Barbadian amendment owing to the late stage at which it had been submitted.

61. Mr. SHARMA (Nepal) said that his delegation endorsed the views of the delegation of Barbados. In order to avoid a separate vote on the Barbadian amendment, perhaps the sponsors might consider deleting "of 2-7" in paragraph 1 (b) of the draft resolution.

62. Mr. SCHMIDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, as his delegation had stated in the debate on the item, his Government was prepared to accept the proposal of the Secretary-General for a new desirable range of 2 to 7 for Member States with the minimum assessment, despite the fact that the proposal further diminished the importance of the contribution factor. His delegation was not prepared to go any further than the Secretary-General's proposal, which it had accepted on the understanding that there would be no further review of the desirable range for at least three years. If the Barbadian amendment was accepted by the Committee, his delegation would be compelled to reconsider its position on the draft resolution. Furthermore, if it was intended to put the amendment to the vote, the Committee should be informed of the implications of a desirable range of 2 to 8 in terms of the geographical distribution of posts.

63. Mr. NAUDY (France) said that his delegation was grateful to the sponsors for their efforts to make the draft resolution acceptable to all members of the Committee. At the same time, there were a number of provisions which his delegation had difficulty in endorsing. With respect to the general tenor of the draft resolution, he wondered whether it was helpful to reaffirm rather incisively principles on which everyone was agreed and whose application, according to the information provided to the Committee, appeared satisfactory to everyone including - to judge by the fourth preambular paragraph - the sponsors. That general reservation applied to the sixth, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs.

64. With regard to paragraph 2, he said that, while it was proper for the Assembly to issue guidelines to the Secretary-General regarding the recruitment policy he should follow, it would be wrong for such guidelines to be too constraining or too comminatory. The Assembly should not supplement the provisions of Article 101 of the Charter; and it should allow the Secretary-General some latitude in applying that Article.

65. With respect to paragraph 7, his delegation had difficulty in visualizing the scope of the role to be played by the Ombudsman or panel and precisely what such a role was intended to achieve. The idea was based on a sound principle. However, care must be taken to ensure that the application of the principle did not further complicate whatever problems existed. It was not clear what was meant by "to investigate allegations of discriminatory treatment".

66. In connexion with paragraph 4, whose tenor his delegation fully endorsed, he would like an answer to his question concerning the difficulties which seemed to be holding back the recruitment of younger people to the service of the United Nations.

67. His delegation could not accept the Barbadian amendment for the reasons stated by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany. Like that representative,

/...

(Mr. Naudy, France)

he would appreciate some information concerning the consequences of that amendment translated into numerical terms.

68. Mr. AKASHI (Japan) said that, while his delegation fully endorsed the objective stated in the sixth to tenth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, it had reservations regarding the eleventh preambular paragraph and some of the operative paragraphs. The reference to the new international economic order in the eleventh preambular paragraph was out of place in a resolution dealing with administrative matters.

69. In the operative part of the resolution, his delegation would have preferred to retain paragraph 2 of the original draft, which had spoken of increasing the number of staff from developing countries in senior and policy-making posts without specifying whether the increase was to be achieved through recruitment or promotion. In his delegation's view, recruitment should be the main instrument for attaining the objectives of the draft resolution and, in that connexion, he endorsed the view of the representative of Austria that there should be complete equality of opportunity for promotion, irrespective of the nationality of the staff member concerned or the geographical region from which he or she came. It was his delegation's understanding that the Secretary-General must comply with the provisions of Articles 100 and 101 of the Charter and the guidelines issued by the Assembly in previous resolutions; any measures which went beyond those limits were inappropriate.

70. With respect to paragraph 4, his delegation attached great importance to attracting younger people to the service of the United Nations but wondered whether the objectives of that paragraph would conflict with those of paragraphs 2 and 5. It would appreciate a clarification on the use of the terms "senior posts" and "policy-making posts", which in paragraph 2 appeared to mean different things but in paragraph 5 were used interchangeably.

71. His delegation could endorse paragraph 7 if it had no financial implications. It understood that UNDP had several ombudsmen, who served on a part-time basis, and that their presence was helpful to staff morale. Perhaps the United Nations Secretariat might follow the example set by UNDP.

72. For the reasons he had outlined, his delegation would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. The Barbadian amendment was unacceptable for the reasons stated by his delegation on 5 October (A/C.5/31/SR.4, para. 6).

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.