

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1338th
MEETING

Monday, 1 December 1969,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 84:	
Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board (continued)	281
Agenda item 83:	
Personnel questions (continued):	
(a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued)	283
Agenda item 82:	
Publications and documentation of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General	285

Chairman: Mr. David SILVEIRA DA MOTA
(Brazil).

AGENDA ITEM 84

**Report of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board
(continued)* (A/7609, A/7791 and Corr.1)**

1. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation, like certain others, did not altogether understand the reasons for the proposed increases in pensions. In 1949 the General Assembly had taken a decision to the effect that contributions to the Pension Fund should be calculated at the rate of 7 per cent of pensionable remuneration for the staff and 14 per cent for the participating organizations, making a total of 21 per cent. A contribution of that order had perhaps been justified at the time, when the Fund did not have adequate resources at its disposal, but the situation had since improved considerably. It should also be noted that the greater part of the Fund's capital was invested in stocks with an over-all yield of 8 per cent *per annum*—or \$11.5 million for the period 1967-1968. The question therefore arose whether there was any justification for maintaining the Organization's contribution at 14 per cent of pensionable remuneration. It should not be forgotten, either, that the nationals of many countries received a pension from their Government, and not from the Organization; and that meant that the Governments concerned had to shoulder a double financial burden.

2. The United Nations staff pension scheme had not been set up haphazardly. Salaries were calculated on the basis of United States salaries, in accordance with the Noblemaire principle; pensions were an integral part of the system of benefits paid to staff members, and should therefore be adjusted in line with changes made in the pension system of

the reference Government or Governments. Unfortunately, no accurate information was available on pensions paid by the Governments, and it was therefore impossible to study the question in detail.

3. Finally, he pointed out that the proposals of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board contained in its report (A/7609) had been submitted directly to the Fifth Committee without having been previously considered by the International Civil Service Advisory Board, which was responsible for studying questions relating to staff, salaries and benefits. His delegation felt that the proposals should first be studied by ICSAB, and then submitted to the Fifth Committee at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

4. For all those reasons, he would have to abstain in the vote on the proposals contained in the Board's report.

5. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that the Fifth Committee had before it several recommendations of different degrees of importance. First, there was a proposal to amend the Regulations of the Fund; that was an important question, but it was really only a matter of reviewing the current Regulations for the purpose of simplifying them. It did, of course, also involve making certain changes of substance, which had been summarized in annex VI of the report of the Board and were essential in view of decisions taken by the Board, particularly at its last session. It was natural that the Fifth Committee should be called upon to consider the question, but owing to the highly technical nature of the various articles of the Regulations, it was extremely difficult to study them individually; the Board itself had had to resort to the services of a working group. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had proposed an amendment to article 12, sub-paragraph (c) (A/7791, para. 19). His delegation thought it advisable also, in order to remove an element of uncertainty, to delete the second part of the proposed article 45, that is, the words "except as may specifically be provided in the Administrative Rules" (see A/7609, annex V).

6. With regard to the adjustment of benefits in respect of cost-of-living changes, he pointed out that the proposal was not new and amounted merely to prolonging for three years the existing system (A/7609, para. 27). The Board had acted with restraint in asking only for a temporary extension.

7. The most important recommendation contained in the report of the Board was the recommendation for an increase in the rate of accumulation of pensions from 1/55 to 1/50 of the final average remuneration (*ibid.*, para. 22). In that connexion two main questions arose: first, was the

* Resumed from the 1336th meeting.

increase justified by outside rates; and secondly, would the resources of the Fund enable it to finance the increase? It was obviously difficult to give a categorical answer to those questions, since they both involved an element of judgement. The Board had, however, answered both questions affirmatively and positively. The Fifth Committee must now consider them in the light of its responsibilities both to the staff and to Member States.

8. With regard to the first question, it was quite clear that the Board considered the measure to be justified in view of the rates applied outside the United Nations. The Secretariat could, of course, be asked to provide further details, but his delegation was satisfied by the assurances which the Board had given. Other arguments could also be adduced to justify the measure—for example, the fact that the practice of using the salary for the last five years of service to calculate the average final remuneration did not take inflationary trends fully into account, and the fact that post adjustments were not taken into consideration in calculating the pension.

9. The question whether the Fund could finance the increase could only be answered on the basis of assumptions relating both to the human element and to economic and financial factors. Those assumptions were obviously extremely difficult to verify; but the Board had taken all the necessary precautions and had availed itself of the assistance of experts and highly competent organs such as the Committee of Actuaries. It had based its decision on the opinions of those experts.

10. His delegation therefore saw no reason for not accepting the Board's recommendations. The Soviet delegation had proposed, basically, that consideration of the question should be postponed until the twenty-fifth session and that in the meantime it should be referred to ICSAB. ICSAB was of course concerned with salaries, and pensions might be regarded as being related to salaries. However, the question was extremely complex and could be studied only with the assistance of qualified experts. It should not be forgotten, either, that a substantial portion of the contributions to the Fund was paid by staff members themselves; and the question could hardly be referred to an intergovernmental body on which the staff was not represented. However, appropriate relationships could be established between the Board and ICSAB; and the fact that the Secretary of ICSAB had been present at the Board's session showed that such relationships already existed. For all those reasons, his delegation did not think it advisable to refer the question to ICSAB; in any case, if the question of pensions had to be reviewed in a few years' time, the task could always be entrusted to an *ad hoc* group of experts working in co-operation with ICSAB.

11. In conclusion, since the Fund was in a position to finance the proposed measures and the measures themselves seemed to be justified, it was difficult to see what reason could be given for refusing to accept the proposals. It might be that at some stage the question of the rate of contribution would need to be reconsidered but that question did not arise immediately. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the recommendations both of the Board and of the Advisory Committee.

12. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he would like the Secretary of the Board to provide a number of clarifications.

13. First, in paragraph 4 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/7791 and Corr.1), it was stated that the report on the results of the valuation had been reviewed by the Committee of Actuaries, "who had submitted a unanimous opinion to the Board that the resources of the Fund were confidently expected to permit significant improvements in benefits". The Philippine delegation understood that statement as meaning that the retirement benefits payable to a participant in the Fund would increase as the resources of the Fund permitted. Did that, in turn, mean that there was a plan to make further changes in the rate of accumulation after 1 January 1970? As the report made no mention of an increase in participants' contributions, was it to be understood that the increased benefits could be provided from profits on investment?

14. Secondly, what index was the Board using in determining the adjustments for cost-of-living increases every three years, and what bases were to be used in 1972 when another review was to take place?

15. Thirdly, it was stated in sub-paragraph 15 (d) of the Board's report that the Fund had "augmented its holdings in companies located outside the United States". His delegation would like to know the extent of those holdings.

16. Finally, the Philippine delegation supported the Advisory Committee's views on paragraph 28 of the Board's report and urged the Board to systematize and clarify the Fund's Regulations for the sake both of participants and of those administering the Fund. He hoped that when the computer facilities of the United Nations were broadened, the Fund would take full advantage of the opportunity they would offer to improve administrative procedures.

17. Lastly, his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation with regard to article 12 (c) of the Regulations, and also supported the Board's proposals.

18. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that his delegation fully agreed with the views expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom and would vote in favour of the recommendations contained in the Board's report, with the amendments proposed by the Advisory Committee and the representative of the United Kingdom.

19. On the other hand, the United States delegation could not support the Soviet representative's proposal to defer consideration of the matter, since it felt that the documentation currently before the Committee was quite sufficient to enable it to take a decision in full knowledge of the facts.

20. Mr. LIVERAN (Secretary of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board) said that since 1946, the question of determining the rate of accumulation used in calculating retirement benefits had been considered on many occasions by the Board and other bodies. Originally, the rate had been set at 1/60 for safety's sake, as it had been impossible to predict how the Fund's resources would balance out. In 1957, when the Board had planned to raise the rate of

accumulation of retirement benefits from 1/60 to 1/55, many members had felt that, as a matter of principle, retirement benefits should really be calculated at a rate of 1/50. However, in view of the resources then available to the Fund, it had seemed wiser not to exceed the rate of 1/55, on the understanding that a rate of 1/50 would be proposed as soon as the material situation of the Fund permitted, which it now did.

21. In comparing the new proposed rate with the rate used in the pension schemes of other international organizations, it should be noted that in IMF and IBRD, for example, the rate of accumulation was 1/40 for a period of participation of up to thirty-two years. It seemed, moreover, from an examination of the civil service pension schemes in force in various countries, that with the exception of the United Kingdom the rate of accumulation was in no case lower than 1/50. In the United Kingdom, the operative rate was 1/80, but certain provisions which enabled retired officers, for instance, to receive a capital sum, or benefit from a higher rate based on their period of participation, made it impossible to establish a true comparison.

22. In reply to speakers who had said that such an improvement in the pension scheme would only be of limited interest to Secretariat staff members who, on retirement, would be receiving an additional pension from their respective Governments, he wished to point out that the pension policy of the United Nations and its specialized agencies was based on the principle of equal treatment, and the special situations of individual beneficiaries arising from their nationality were not taken into consideration. In reply to the question raised by the representative of the United Kingdom, he said that the Administrative Rules did not currently include any provision for the payment of interest on benefits due but unpaid; and, owing to the complexity of the matter, it was not planned to include such a provision in the near future. In the circumstances, he thought that the point made by the United Kingdom delegation could be met by deleting the second part of the sentence in article 45—i.e. “except as may specifically be provided in the Administrative Rules”—on the understanding that that phrase would be reintroduced into article 45 as soon as it proved possible to make the necessary amendments to the Administrative Rules.

23. In reply to the questions raised by the representative of the Philippines, he said it was expected that the rate of accumulation of 1/50 would be maintained for a fairly long time, since the change currently proposed was only the second that had been made since the establishment of the United Nations. As for the system to be used for adjusting benefits in the light of cost-of-living increases after 31 December 1972, it was probable that the system currently in force would be continued.

24. In view of the complexity of the questions relating to United Nations staff pensions, the Board was planning to publish a pamphlet for staff members in all working languages, with a view to making the provisions easier to understand. The publication date for the pamphlet had not yet been decided, but the Board considered it a priority item.

25. Finally, he drew the Committee's attention to a typographical error in the English text of article 14 (b) of

the Regulations of the Fund as set out in annex V to document A/7609. The full stop after the words “United Nations Board of Auditors” should be deleted, and the semi-colon in the third line should be replaced by a full stop.

26. Mr. McCaw (Deputy Controller), replying to a question by the representative of the Philippines, said that as of 30 September 1968 the Fund's investments outside the United States had amounted to \$39.4 million and comprised bonds, convertible bonds and shares in companies located outside the United States. As of the same date, the market value of those holdings had been \$48.9 million. The Board had undertaken in 1960 to set up a portfolio of holdings in companies located outside the United States.

27. With regard to the statement in paragraph 13 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/7791 and Corr.1) concerning the delay in finalizing a report on the possibilities of improving handling procedures, recording systems and safekeeping arrangements, he said that the study had advanced considerably since 1968 and many improvements had already been made.

28. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the explanation given by the Secretary of the Board, he thought that the latter part of article 45 of the Regulations, as contained in annex V of the Board's report, should be deleted. The article would then read:

“The Fund shall not be liable for interest on any due but unpaid benefit.”

29. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement with regard to the adoption of the United Kingdom amendment.

The amendment to article 45 was adopted.

30. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was general agreement with regard to the amendment to article 12 (c) of the revised text of the Regulations which the Advisory Committee had proposed in paragraph 19 of its report (A/7791 and Corr.1).

The Advisory Committee's amendment was adopted.

31. The Chairman put to the vote the draft resolution proposed by the Board for adoption by the General Assembly (A/7609, annex IV), including the two amendments to the text of the Regulations of the Fund, which the Committee had just adopted.

The draft resolution was adopted by 63 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 83

Personnel questions (continued):

(a) **Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued)** (A/7745, A/C.5/L.992 and Add.1, A/C.5/L.1007/Rev.2 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.1009)

32. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) said that he was convinced that a consensus could be achieved on the question of equitable

geographical distribution of staff. All delegations recognized that a certain amount of progress had been made in the implementation of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly in that connexion in previous years and were also aware that much remained to be done to ensure such equitable distribution. Furthermore, no delegation wished to propose any new guidelines for the Secretary-General or to change any of the existing ones. The common view seemed to be that the Secretary-General should continue and perhaps step up his efforts. With those views in mind, a number of delegations had prepared draft resolution A/C.5/L.1009, which he wished to introduce on behalf of the thirteen sponsors.

33. The fourth preambular paragraph was simply a reiteration of the principles laid down in General Assembly resolution 1852 (XVII). A number of delegations had hoped to bring the population factor into play in the determination of desirable ranges but had concluded that it would not be feasible to do so in view of the difficulty of applying that factor at the country level. The best solution had seemed to be to reiterate the three principles adopted in 1962, allowing the Secretary-General the discretion he had hitherto enjoyed. That was a compromise solution. The fifth preambular paragraph repeated—in a slightly different form, more acceptable to certain delegations—the idea expressed in paragraph 28 (c) of the Secretary-General's report (A/7745), namely, that experience was a pre-condition for efficiency, particularly in the case of certain posts entailing complex duties and responsibilities.

34. Operative paragraph 1 was a restatement of paragraph 3 of resolution 2480 A (XXIII) but included, at the request of certain delegations, two additional elements. Operative paragraph 2 corresponded to the third preambular paragraph of resolution 2480 A (XXIII) but placed emphasis on appointments to senior posts and did not mention paragraph 73 of the report of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat¹ because it was felt that it should be left to the Secretary-General to decide whether a country was "over-represented" rather than interpret that term strictly to mean that a country had exceeded the upper limit of its desirable range. Exclusive emphasis on desirable ranges tended to invite references to the population factor, which had been specifically recognized by the Assembly in 1962; it was a sensitive problem and any reference to paragraph 73 would be inappropriate. Operative paragraph 3 had also given rise to discussion. Certain delegations had wanted to request information concerning the staff of organizations other than UNDP and UNICEF. The sponsors had explained that the draft resolution did not seek any new decision by the Assembly, that it was not their intention to take any action, even in respect of UNDP and UNICEF, without regard to the competence of their governing bodies, that the information included in the Secretary-General's report on the staff of UNDP and UNICEF had been submitted pursuant to paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 1852 (XVII) and that, as no new steps were envisaged in the draft resolution, it would be inappropriate to request information on the staff of other bodies or programmes. Finally, operative paragraph 4 repeated and expanded the recom-

mendation in sub-paragraph 28 (d) of the Secretary-General's report. Two main considerations had been kept in view in that connexion; first, that the recommendations of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat, on which the recruitment plan was to be based, had not been discussed in detail or approved by the Assembly, and, secondly, that the proposed plan should be as comprehensive as the Secretary-General saw fit. The General Assembly could examine the long-term recruitment plan at its twenty-fifth session, judging it on its merits, regardless of the origin of the ideas on which it was based.

35. The sponsors of the draft resolution had taken full account of all the conclusions and recommendations in chapter IV of the Secretary-General's report. The proposed text represented a compromise which should be found generally acceptable without major changes. However, the sponsors were willing to examine any amendments which delegations might deem essential. They would not be opposed to having the text put to the vote during the current meeting.

36. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that the word "undue" in operative paragraph 1 was superfluous and proposed its deletion.²

37. With regard to the text (see A/C.5/L.1007/Rev.2 and Corr.1) which the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, supported by Belgium and France, had proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report, his delegation proposed an amendment³ to the effect that after the words "necessary measures", the following phrase should be inserted: "consistent with Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter".

38. Mr. DE CURTON (France) said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1009 was, on the whole, in line with his delegation's thinking, with a single exception which, however, related to a very important point. The draft contained no reference to part B of resolution 2480 (XXIII), with the result that an essential point—linguistic balance—was completely overlooked. His delegation would be prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution if a reference to linguistic balance was inserted in the third preambular paragraph and in operative paragraphs 1 and 4.⁴

39. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) submitted an oral amendment⁵ to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1009. He proposed that the words "provided their qualifications are equal to those of other available candidates" should be added at the end of the paragraph. The purpose of the amendment was to take into account the paramount consideration laid down in Article 101, paragraph 3 of the Charter and referred to in operative paragraph 1. It was unlikely, of course, that the Secretariat, for reasons relating to the geographical distribution of posts, would appoint candidates who did not satisfy all requirements, but it might be advisable to indicate that such a possibility must be ruled out.

² See document A/C.5/L.1011, circulated subsequently.

³ *Idem*, A/C.5/L.1012.

⁴ *Idem*, A/C.5/L.1013.

⁵ *Idem*, A/C.5/L.1014.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes*, addendum to agenda item 74, document A/7359, annex.

40. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) supported the amendment suggested by the United Kingdom representative to the text (see A/C.5/L.1007/Rev.2 and Corr.1), which the Ukrainian delegation had submitted for inclusion in the Committee's report.

41. He also supported the United Kingdom representative's suggestion that the word "undue" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1009 should be deleted. He was glad to find that his delegation's position was reflected in operative paragraph 4 of that draft and, more specifically, in the final clause of that paragraph, but he thought that the wording of the English text, as it stood, was lacking in clarity. He therefore proposed⁶ that the part of the text following the words "distribution of the staff" should be replaced by the following: "and, taking into account the recommendations of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat, to ensure the existence of satisfactory opportunities for career development in order to induce the best-qualified staff members to remain in the Secretariat". He also proposed that the words "to accelerate" in the same paragraph should be replaced by "of accelerating".

42. He would support the amendment to operative paragraph 2 proposed by the representative of Norway.

43. Mr. MARRÓN (Spain) supported the proposal of the French representative to the effect that the whole of resolution 2480 (XXIII) should be taken into consideration in the draft resolution; the need for linguistic balance warranted the same emphasis as the need for equitable geographical distribution.

44. Mr. MEYER PICÓN (Mexico) expressed his support for the proposal of the French representative to which the representative of Spain had referred.

45. However, he was not altogether happy about some provisions of the draft resolution and he would like to be able to consult the sponsors about operative paragraph 2, which was causing his delegation some concern. That paragraph, in which the Secretary-General was invited to give preference to nationals from countries not yet represented or inadequately represented, particularly in regard to appointments to posts at the senior level, would be prejudicial to the interests of countries which had secured their desirable number of posts but only at the P-1 to P-5 levels, for example, and which might be prevented by the provisions of operative paragraph 2 from claiming posts at higher levels for their nationals.

46. Mr. RODIONOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to have a little more time to consider the text of the draft resolution, which his delegation had just received and had not had time to examine thoroughly. His delegation might want to submit amendments and it would accordingly prefer that further consideration of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1009 should be deferred until a later meeting.

47. Mr. BYKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) associated himself with the view expressed by the representative

of the Soviet Union: the Committee might wish to turn its attention to the draft paragraph (see A/C.5/L.1007/Rev.2 and Corr.1) which his delegation had proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report.

48. Mr. LAVERDE (Colombia), referring to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1009 and operative paragraph 4 in particular, said that he thought the text should spell out one of the measures which might induce staff members to make their careers in the Secretariat. He was thinking particularly of a training course for staff members at the lower levels which would give them opportunities for promotion. He therefore proposed⁷ that the second clause of operative paragraph 4 should be amended to read: "and to ensure that the most qualified staff members are given proper incentive, such as training courses, which would permit them to make progress and remain in the Secretariat, taking into account the recommendations of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat".

49. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said with reference to the draft paragraph submitted by the Ukrainian delegation that he was not clear about the meaning of the phrase "but being of the opinion that that progress is insufficient" and wondered on what criterion that judgement was based. He presumed that the sponsor of the document was not intentionally referring to action taken by the Secretary-General, and thought it might be best to delete the phrase and merely to state that the Committee "nevertheless" renewed its request to the Secretary-General to take all necessary measures to implement the decisions taken by the Committee.⁸

50. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the best course might be for delegations which wished to suggest amendments to the two documents before the Committee to consult the sponsors and submit their proposals in writing at a later meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 82

Publications and documentation of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/7576 and Corr.1, A/7579, A/7789, A/C.5/1247, A/C.5/1257 and Corr.1)

51. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the Advisory Committee's report (A/7789), containing the observations and recommendations of that Committee on the Secretary-General's three reports on the question of publications and documentation (A/7579, A/C.5/1247 and A/C.5/1257 and Corr.1) and the observations on the same question by the Committee on Conferences (A/7626 and Corr.1).⁹ The Advisory Committee had considered it best to bring together in a single document all its comments on the information in those documents in order to present a composite picture comparing the various recommendations and indicating the Secretary-General's response to them. The Advisory Committee was grateful to the Under-Secretary

⁷ *Idem*, A/C.5/L.1017.

⁸ *Idem*, A/C.5/L.1018.

⁹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 26 and erratum.*

⁶ *Idem*, A/C.5/L.1016.

tary-General for Conference Services for his assistance in the preparation of the composite document.

52. The annex to the report of the Advisory Committee contained the various recommendations, grouped together under broad headings. In the body of the report, where the same broad headings were used, the Advisory Committee had indicated the action taken by the Secretary-General and added its own observations and recommendations. The Advisory Committee's principal recommendations were contained in paragraph 5 of the report.

53. The Advisory Committee considered that since the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, encouraging progress had been made in keeping the volume of documentation in check. However, given restraint by all concerned and a determination not to lose the gains already achieved, much more could be done. The Committee therefore hoped that its recommendations in the matter would be endorsed by the Fifth Committee and that the debate on the question of publications and documentation would bring forth ideas that would help the Secretary-General in his endeavours to rationalize and, where possible, reduce the volume of documentation.

54. Mr. CHMELA (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation, which had been one of the sponsors of the text of General Assembly resolution 2292 (XXII), was understandably interested in the implementation of that resolution, the main purpose of which had been to limit the volume of publications and documentation. The degree to which that resolution had been implemented would indicate the effectiveness of the measures advocated by the Assembly.

55. The reports on the matter by the Joint Inspection Unit and the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat, together with the reports and comments of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee showed that the Fifth Committee needed to give further attention to the problem of publications and documentation. The facts indicated that in spite of considerable progress, the efforts so far made had not succeeded in limiting the volume of publications and documentation to the extent desired. The Secretary-General had been right to observe, in paragraph 33 of his report (A/7579), that there had so far been no reversal in the overall trend to an increase in documentation. The reasons for that situation were well known; they included the creation of new bodies and the increase in the number of meetings and conferences.

56. The Czechoslovak delegation felt that any draft resolution on publications and documentation recommended by the Committee to the General Assembly should take into consideration all the measures taken with regard to publications since the adoption of resolution 2292 (XXII), and in particular all the recommendations submitted by the competent bodies of the Assembly in 1969. The recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit and the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat were particularly important.

57. In the Secretary-General's comments (A/C.5/1247) on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (see A/7576 and Corr.1), the Unit's twenty-eight recommendations, contained in the annex to its report, were divided into three

major groups: the first group contained the recommendations whose implementation required approval by the General Assembly; the second contained the recommendations to be examined by the Economic and Social Council in January 1970; and the third group contained recommendations which, in the Secretary-General's view, fell within the competence of the Secretariat.

58. On the subject of recommendation 23, which was in the first group and which established rules to be followed by organs in implementing financial regulation 13.1 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, he drew the Committee's attention to the very serious conclusion of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat (A/7359, para. 145 (a)), that in many cases the provisions of financial regulations 13.1 and 13.2 were either not implemented at all or were not treated with sufficient seriousness. The Joint Inspection Unit reached a substantially similar conclusion in stating, in paragraphs 164 and 165 of its report, that information on the financial implications of a document which the Secretariat was asked to produce was generally given in a hurry at the end of a discussion when the body in question was on the point of voting on the draft resolution in which the document was requested. He believed that laxity in applying the prescribed procedures was one of the major factors that made it necessary for the Secretary-General to submit requests for additional funds. He therefore hoped that the Committee would recommend that the General Assembly should approve recommendation 23 of the Joint Inspection Unit, and also its recommendation 11 (b) on printing costs, which, if adopted by the General Assembly and added to recommendation 23, could enable savings to be made under section 11 of the budget.

59. With regard to the recommendations that were to be discussed by the Economic and Social Council at its forty-eighth session—namely, recommendations 3, 9, 12 and 25 (a) of the Joint Inspection Unit—his delegation awaited with great interest the report to be presented on the subject by the Council; it also welcomed the extremely useful measures which had been adopted by the Council at its forty-seventh session¹⁰ with a view to improving the organization of its work and which dealt mostly with documentation.

60. Paragraphs 7 to 21 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1247) concerned recommendations falling generally within the competence of the Secretariat, including recommendation 4 in which the inspectors called for the issuance of a manual on documentation and publications. The Secretary-General, both in his report on publications and documentation (A/7579) and in his comments on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (A/C.5/1247), drew the attention of the General Assembly to document A/INF/124,¹¹ which he had had drawn up in pursuance of resolution 2292 (XXII) and which stated the policy of the General Assembly regarding the control and limitation of documentation. But if such a document was to be genuinely useful and effective, it was essential for members to bear it constantly in mind, otherwise it would have no

¹⁰ *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-seventh Session, Resolutions*, p. 18 and 19.

¹¹ Document dated 14 March 1968 (mimeographed).

more effect than the numerous resolutions on documentation adopted by the General Assembly in the past. Yet for reasons of economy, document A/INF/124 was not distributed to members who had received a copy at an earlier session; still more regrettable was the fact that the members of the committees had not been informed that the document was available in the conference rooms as the Secretary-General had recommended (A/7579, para. 6).

61. Since States were not always represented by the same persons in the various organs of the United Nations, it would be desirable for the Secretariat to adhere strictly to the provisions of paragraph 2(b) of resolution 2292 (XXII), in which the Secretary-General was requested to present the document in question to members prior to each session of a council, board, commission, committee or other body. Moreover it would be useful if the General Assembly called upon all United Nations organs to include in the agenda of every session an item entitled "Document A/INF/124: information by the Chairman (or Secretary)".

62. Recommendations 7(a) and 7(b) concerning the terms of reference of the Publications Board were related to recommendations 13(a) and 13(b) as well as to recommendations 14 and 24. During the discussion of section 11 (Printing) of the budget estimates for 1970, his delegation had expressed (1310th meeting) doubts as to whether the Publications Board was in a position to exercise effective control over United Nations publications and had said that, particularly in the case of chapters II (Recurrent publications) and III (Studies and Reports) of that section, control of United Nations publications should be made the responsibility of the reconstituted Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. Paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's comments (A/C.5/1247) on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit confirmed that view. The reconstituted Committee for Programme and Co-ordination should be responsible for the control not only of United Nations publications dealing with economic and social and human rights questions, but of all the documentation on those subjects. It would therefore be useful if the General Assembly, through the Economic and Social Council, requested the

Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to discuss at its next session recommendations 7, 13, 14 and 24 of the Joint Inspection Unit and to submit to the General Assembly proposals concerning the way in which it could implement the recommendations within the limits of its competence.

63. On the subject of summary records, his delegation noted with satisfaction the information contained in paragraph 16 of the Secretary-General's report (A/7579) and welcomed the measures which were described in paragraph 17 of that document and which had made it possible to reduce the cost of producing summary records. It had also taken note of the information in paragraph 18 and wished to point out that the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat and the Joint Inspection Unit had both objected to the reproduction in United Nations documents of the full text of statements made in meetings by representatives and members of the Secretariat. The Committee should take the recommendations of those two bodies into consideration and, in its new draft resolution on publications and documentation, should recommend that the General Assembly should adopt measures that would solve the problem unequivocally. The General Assembly should also take a decision to the effect that no organ should be entitled to request summary and verbatim records simultaneously.

64. The recommendations which he had just made were reflected in the draft resolution that was to be submitted to the Committee on behalf of the sponsors by the Canadian representative. It was the outcome of joint efforts by the Canadian and Czechoslovak delegations, which had decided to combine in a single document the two draft resolutions which they had prepared separately. The final text to be submitted to the Committee had been completed after consultations with the delegations which had joined the sponsors and with many other delegations, and it should therefore receive wide support in the Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.