



Chairman: Mr. Max H. WERSHOF (Canada).

**AGENDA ITEM 73**

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1971 (continued)** (A/7822, A/7937, A/7968, A/7987 and Add.1, A/8006, A/8008 and Add.1 to 5, A/8032, A/8033, A/8072, A/8122, A/8133, A/C.5/1296, A/C.5/1298, A/C.5/1302 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.5/1303 and Add.1, A/C.5/1305, A/C.5/1307, A/C.5/1309, A/C.5/1310, A/C.5/1315 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1317, A/C.5/1319, A/C.5/1320 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1322 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1329, A/C.5/1331, A/C.5/1332, A/C.5/1333, A/C.5/L.1049/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.1055)

**Salary scales for the Professional and higher categories (concluded)** (A/8008/Add.3, A/C.5/1303 and Add.1)

1. Mr. CONNOLLY (Ireland) said that his delegation's silence in the debate in no way meant that it lacked interest in a question as important as the salaries of international civil servants. The decision to be taken had been a delicate one in view of its impact on the material well-being and morale of the Secretariat staff. His delegation had been conscious of that and also wished, as the Secretary-General had asked, not only that justice should be done but that it should manifestly be seen to be done. His delegation's silence had rather reflected some uncertainty in the face of such a highly complex problem, and above all the desire to evaluate all aspects of the question so as to arrive at a decision which might be fair both for the Member States, who supplied the funds, and for the staff, which served them. His delegation fully accepted the competence of ICSAB in the field of salary determination, but it also recognized that one of the basic principles employed by ICSAB in calculating salary scales was no longer generally considered appropriate. Indeed, for many years past ICSAB itself had been very conscious of the anomalies of the present system, and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had been quite explicit in acknowledging that both the ICSAB recommendations and its own flowed directly from the existing system, with all its imperfections.

2. Hence his delegation had not been able to accept in their entirety the conclusions of a review based on a principle whose continued validity seemed to be very much in doubt. Nor had it been able to agree with the Advisory Committee's conclusion that, pending a thorough review of the United Nations salary system,

the only reasonable approach to the problem was to increase salaries by 8 per cent. But his delegation had also felt that, despite the operation of the post adjustment system, it would be both unrealistic and unfair not to acknowledge that the Secretariat staff should receive some increase in salary. It had at first favoured a compromise solution on the lines suggested by the Canadian delegation (1389th meeting), and while it had not found the original United States proposal acceptable, it had finally reached the conclusion that in its revised form—an increase of 5 per cent from 1 July 1971, after the incorporation of two classes of post adjustment—that proposal came closest to what it considered to be an equitable interim solution. But when it had become clear, in the light of the voting on the procedural motion, that the majority of the Fifth Committee favoured the solution recommended by the Advisory Committee, his delegation had agreed to it in deference to the majority opinion and so as to give the staff the benefit of any doubt that might exist and to ensure the acceptance of an increase at the current session, with, however, the reservations he had indicated. His delegation fully endorsed the Advisory Committee's conclusion—in paragraph 58 (a) of its report (A/8008/Add.3)—that a thorough review of the United Nations salary system should be undertaken, and it hoped that a more satisfactory basis for salary determination would be found. Since his delegation's preference had been for draft resolution A/C.5/XXV/CRP.16 and Add.1, it had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1053/Rev.1.

3. Mr. FERNANDEZ MAROTO (Spain) said that his delegation had voted in the manner it had indicated at the 1388th meeting. He welcomed the agreement reached and the solution that had been found to a problem which had occupied the Fifth Committee over the course of many meetings. The excessive amount of time taken by that discussion would certainly entail a change in the calendar and in the work of the Committee during the current session. He urged members to confine themselves henceforth to brief statements and not to make undue use of the rules of procedure, so that the discussions during the rest of the session might be as efficient as possible. Co-operation from all members would help to preserve the reputation which the Fifth Committee rightly enjoyed with respect to the regularity and efficiency of its work.

4. Mr. KAWAH (Liberia) said that his delegation had voted for a salary increase of 8 per cent based on the Advisory Committee's recommendation, although it had not been convinced by all the arguments presented in the report of the Advisory Committee. Consistent with its position, it had therefore also supported an

early thorough review of the United Nations salary system.

5. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1053/Rev.1, with the understanding that the Secretary-General would take the necessary steps to keep the expenses of the intergovernmental committee of experts to a minimum and would make maximum use of available financial and staff resources.

6. Mr. DAMAR (Indonesia) recalled that his delegation had stated at the 1388th meeting that it could not support a salary increase of 8 per cent, either from 1 January 1971 or from 1 July 1971, but that it was not irrevocably opposed to any increase whatsoever. His delegation considered that the Noblemaire principle, which had governed the determination of the salaries of international civil servants for half a century, was out of date and no longer corresponded to the present composition of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore have preferred to await the outcome of a review of the salary system before deciding upon an increase. But as the Fifth Committee had been at an impasse, his delegation had felt that a solution might be found in an interim salary adjustment or a transitional measure, pending the formulation of new criteria that would be based on the results of a review of the system and would be better attuned to the present and long-term needs of the Organization with regard to salary determination for the Professional and higher categories. It was with that in mind that his delegation had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1053/Rev.1; it would also have voted in favour of an interim salary increase, but it had not been able to agree to the amount proposed and had abstained in the voting.

7. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that, although his delegation had not spoken during the salary debate, it had definitely considered—and those considerations had guided it in the voting—first, that international civil servants should be granted some increase in salary in order to bolster the international civil service and, secondly, that savings must be made in the regular budget. His delegation's first inclination had been to support the 5 per cent increase proposed by the United States delegation, but when that proposal had been presented in the procedural vote, it had opted for the figure of 8 per cent recommended by the Advisory Committee, which had the support of most members of the Fifth Committee while at the same time satisfying the staff. With regard to the proposed review, he emphasized the importance of reforming the United Nations salary system. His delegation would have voted for the proposal which the United Kingdom had submitted, with other delegations, in document A/C.5/XXV/CRP.16 and Add.1. Now that the Committee had voted for the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts, his delegation hoped that that body would meet the expectations of Member States, and it looked forward with interest to the report which the committee was to submit to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session.

8. Mr. STEWARD (South Africa) said that one of the causes of the problems besetting the salary system for international civil servants was the fact that the system was intended to apply not only to the United Nations itself but also to the entire family of United Nations organizations, whose headquarters were situated in various countries and continents. The arguments presented to the Fifth Committee during the debate had convinced his delegation that it was difficult to devise a salary system which could be applied uniformly and satisfactorily to all the organizations in the United Nations system. As the present system might not be the best, a general review should be undertaken. ICSAB would have been the body best equipped to perform the task if it was authorized to call, if necessary, on independent consultants. His delegation had voted accordingly. Those considerations had led his delegation to a second conclusion, that a salary increase was not at the present time justified in all duty stations but might be in some. Despite the various arguments for and against an increase, a satisfactory solution could not be reached before the general review had been carried out. But because of the possible impact of a decision on the morale of the staff, and because it believed that the opinions of the expert bodies and the Secretary-General presented to the Committee should be taken into account, his delegation had felt that, even with the uncertainties surrounding the issue, some immediate increase should be approved. It had accordingly voted for the Advisory Committee proposal, with the clear understanding that it did not consider that the 8 per cent increase should necessarily and automatically be applied to every organization involved, regardless of circumstances.

9. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) said that he was pleased that the Fifth Committee, after having spent forty hours of debate, or the equivalent of sixteen meetings, on the professional salary question, should finally have voted on the matter. That unbridled exercise of democratic rights had resulted in chaos, made even worse by a rigid use of rules of procedure, and had set an unfortunate precedent in the Fifth Committee.

10. His delegation had voted for the Advisory Committee's recommendation, as the most appropriate compromise solution, because it thought that Member States owed a debt to the United Nations family of organizations for the work which it had done over the past twenty-five years in the field of economic and social development. It was, indeed, on the initiative of his delegation that the Economic and Social Council, at its forty-ninth session, had recorded its appreciation of that work. The Prime Minister of Jamaica, in his statement to the General Assembly on 20 October 1970 (1875th plenary meeting), had also paid a tribute to the staff of the United Nations for the way in which it performed its arduous tasks.

11. He felt that now that the Committee had completed its discussion of Professional salaries, it should consider the position of staff members in the General Service category, to which it had not given due attention. It was important for the Committee to keep their position under continuous review in order to

ensure that their remuneration was at least comparable to the salaries offered in the private sector; there was a particularly striking difference between the remuneration of nurses in the United Nations and that of their counterparts outside.

12. Mr. LENG SARIN (Cambodia) said that if he had been present during the voting, he would have voted for the 5 per cent increase proposed by the United States, which he regarded as reasonable.

13. Mr. MOMBOULI (People's Republic of the Congo) expressed satisfaction at the decision to establish an intergovernmental committee of experts to study the present salary system with a view to eliminating its imperfections. His delegation had abstained during the voting on salaries, believing that all United Nations staff members of whatever category were entitled to a salary increase, as they all suffered from the steady rise in living costs, particularly in the United States.

14. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) noted that his delegation's position had been stated several times during the debate. If he had been present during the voting, he would have abstained on the Advisory Committee's recommendation, since he believed that the United States proposal was a reasonable and satisfactory compromise both for Member States and for the staff.

15. Mr. McGOUGH (Argentina) said that a remodeling of the present salary system was of paramount importance for the smooth functioning of the Organization, as the present system had produced a great many anomalies and even errors. His delegation would have preferred the review to be undertaken by ICSAB, and it had therefore abstained in the vote on the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts. In any event, his delegation did not think that the timing was right; the entire exercise ought to have been deferred until 1972, at the earliest. With regard to the salary increase, his delegation would have preferred it to be kept to 5 per cent.

16. Mr. HANSEN (Denmark) said that the silence of his delegation during the debate did not denote a lack of interest in the questions at issue. It had stated on many occasions its concern to maintain the efficiency and integrity of the Secretariat. For that reason, it opposed the rejection of a set of principles which had been tested and had satisfied Member States over a long period of time, before a new and better system had been evolved to take its place. Furthermore, the fact could not be ignored that two expert committees of unquestioned competence had, after careful analysis of all relevant data, arrived at the conclusion that the existing principles required an 8 per cent increase. In the interests of the Organization's efficient functioning, it was important to rely on accepted principles, factual information and expert judgement, and to exclude as far as possible political factors and the disagreements to which they gave rise. The facts and arguments adduced during the debate had not convinced his delegation that there was a better founded answer to the question of a salary increase than the 8 per cent

figure arrived at by both ICSAB and the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee's recommendation had had the added advantage of enjoying the broadest possible support in the Fifth Committee.

17. His delegation had been a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/XXV/CRP.16 and Add.1, and it had accordingly voted against the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts.

18. Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia) said that if he had been present during the voting on the salary increase, he would have voted for the Advisory Committee's recommendation. His delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1053/Rev.1, while recognizing its merits, because it felt that ICSAB's competence and experience made it the body best suited to undertake a comprehensive review of the United Nations salary system.

19. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) recalled that his delegation had indicated during the discussion that it could not endorse the Advisory Committee's recommendation and that, in the light of the statistics in ICSAB's report, it had preferred the United States proposal as amended by Argentina. Nevertheless, in order to take into account the requirements of the common system and the interests of the staff, it had not wished to vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendation and had abstained.

20. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted against the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts at the present stage because it had feared that it would duplicate the work of another committee of experts—ICSAB—which was entrusted with the same task, and that additional expenditure would be involved. If ICSAB had been given the time and the means, it would certainly have worked out an acceptable formula on salaries. Its expertise and experience would have enabled it to accomplish that task more rapidly than the new committee could in the relatively short period of time allotted to it.

21. His delegation had wished to adopt a moderate position in the Fifth Committee on that sensitive issue, which would not have been possible if it had been a sponsor of the draft resolution on the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts, a document which owed its existence not only to a desire to review the salary system but also to considerations of a different nature. Now that the Fifth Committee had endorsed the proposal to establish an intergovernmental committee of experts, his delegation welcomed the decision, but it wished to stress that the expert committee's composition should not be such as to represent preponderantly the views of those who favoured salary reduction at all cost, for under those circumstances it would be difficult to assure the Secretariat staff that their interests would be safeguarded. The desire to economize in itself was a negative concept unless its objective was to generate more resources, material or otherwise. Economy through salary reduction would in the long run have a negative effect on the quality of the staff. Member States must set an

example if they wished international civil servants to display idealism. The question of salaries was not one which divided developed and developing countries, but was of common interest to all—Secretariat staff, developing countries and developed countries alike.

22. In conclusion, his delegation would have voted in favour of the recommendation in paragraph 58 (a) of the Advisory Committee's report if it had been voted on first.

23. Mr. SIKIVOU (Fiji) said that his delegation had favoured a 5 per cent increase, although with some hesitation, for it felt that the contributions of Member States could be better used to help the poor throughout the world rather than to raise the already high salaries of well-paid international civil servants. Furthermore, it had been necessary to bear in mind the position of the countries making the highest contributions, for they could also use those funds to help their own impoverished nationals. Those countries had voted in favour of a 5 per cent increase. Lastly, he wondered how the United Nations could grant such sizeable increases at a time when efforts were being made throughout the world to curb inflation.

24. Mr. DIXIT (India) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the salary increase not because it had considered such an increase unnecessary, but because it had not been convinced of the validity of the reasoning on the basis of which the proposed amount had been determined. The salary scale should be based on well-defined principles; over the past twenty years, however, salary questions had always been subject to "ad hocism". His delegation had abstained because it had felt that, if an increase was necessary, it should not stand in the way. His delegation was pleased that the intergovernmental committee of experts had been entrusted with the task of carrying out the first comprehensive review of the salary system in fourteen years; if, however, some who had supported the committee's establishment saw it as an opportunity to reduce the salaries of international civil servants, that certainly was not the motivation of his own delegation, which approached the review with an open mind and was prepared to endorse increases if they proved justified.

25. Mr. BERGER (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of an 8 per cent salary increase with effect from 1 July 1971 because it wished to see that staff quality remained high in order to ensure that programmes were effectively implemented. It had opposed the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts and would have preferred to entrust the review of the salary structure to ICSAB.

26. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) said that his delegation's views were well known. It had voted against the establishment of the intergovernmental committee of experts for the same reasons as the Pakistan delegation, for it felt that, as long as ICSAB was in existence, its services should be used. Now that the Fifth Committee had decided to establish an intergovernmental committee, it must see to it not only

that its membership was balanced geographically but also that all views expressed during the debate in the Fifth Committee were equitably represented. His delegation still had doubts as to the usefulness of the new body, the purpose of which, for some delegations, was to reduce the salaries of international civil servants.

27. Mr. CEPEDA ORTIZ (Colombia) said that in formulating its views, his delegation essentially had borne in mind the requirements of the Second United Nations Development Decade and the need to motivate the Organization's staff to achieve its objectives. It would have preferred an 8 per cent increase with effect from 1 January 1971 and had therefore been a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.5/XXV/CRP.14; in the end, however, it had been obliged to support the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. It had opposed the establishment of an intergovernmental committee of experts because it felt that ICSAB had discharged its task most admirably.

28. Mr. MAKUFU (Democratic Republic of the Congo) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the 8 per cent but had abstained in the vote on the establishment of the intergovernmental committee because it felt that ICSAB had not failed in its task and should have been given the time and the means to complete it.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION V SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8203/ADD.1 ON AGENDA ITEM 12\* (A/C.5/1341)**

29. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1341) on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution on the increase in the production and use of edible protein submitted by the Second Committee (A/8203/Add.1, para. 47, draft resolution V). Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of independent experts and in close consultation with the agencies and organizations of the United Nations system, a report which would, *inter alia*, suggest the role of Governments and the contribution of the United Nations system in closing the protein gap. The Secretary-General was requested, in operative paragraph 4, to submit the report to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session.

30. The Secretary-General had indicated that the implementation of the draft resolution would involve the convening of a group of experts at Headquarters for a period of one week in 1971 and the preparation of pre-session papers by consultants, at a total estimated cost of \$14,000. The Secretary-General had stated that he would undertake to try to meet that cost from within the total resources made available

\* Report of the Economic and Social Council



to him in 1971. In the circumstances, the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly, that, if it adopted the draft resolution of the Second Committee, no additional appropriations would be required in the budget estimates for the financial year 1971.

31. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to inform the General Assembly that if it adopted the draft resolution of the Second Committee, no additional appropriations would be required.

*It was so decided.*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION VI SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8203/ADD.1 ON AGENDA ITEM 12\* (A/C.5/1343)**

32. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee had considered the note (A/C.5/1343), in which the Secretary-General stated the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution on the economic and social consequences of disarmament submitted by the Second Committee (A/8203/Add.1, para. 47, draft resolution VI). Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultations with such advisers as he might deem it necessary to designate, suggestions to establish the link between the Disarmament Decade and the Second United Development Decade, and to propose measures for mobilizing world public opinion in support of such a link, with a view to encouraging intensified negotiations aimed at progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In addition, operative paragraph 3 requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on that subject, through the Economic and Social Council, in time for consideration by the General Assembly at the first biennial review of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, to be undertaken in 1973.

33. To implement the draft resolution, the Secretary-General envisaged the convening of a committee of ten experts, who would meet at United Nations Headquarters, once in 1971 and once in 1972, for a period of two weeks each time. Moreover, the services of consultants would be required for a period of eight months in 1972 and four months in 1973. The Secretary-General had stated that he would endeavour to provide for the 1971 costs, which he had estimated would amount to \$37,500, from the resources available to him for that financial year. The 1972 costs, estimated at \$27,500, would be taken into consideration in the budget estimates for that year. The Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the Second Committee would not necessitate additional appropriations under the budget for 1971.

34. The Advisory Committee was aware that the Fifth Committee would also have to deal with the statement of the administrative and financial implications of the First Committee's draft resolution on the economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security,<sup>1</sup> which would also involve the convening of a group of experts. The Advisory Committee would report later to the Fifth Committee on the financial implications of that draft resolution.

35. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) noted that in document A/C.5/1343 the Secretary-General made no mention of the expenditure which the meetings of the committee of experts would involve, including shorthand and typing services, interpretation and documentation.

36. Mr. COIDAN (Director of the Budget Division) said that no additional appropriation was envisaged for the documentation and other services which the committee of experts might need, since the Department of Economic and Social Affairs was to provide the necessary staff.

37. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) said that he was surprised that the Committee was not considering simultaneously the administrative and financial implications of the two draft resolutions from the First and Second Committees dealing with the economic and social consequences of disarmament. The two drafts probably had similar administrative implications, which might involve some overlapping, and the Committee should draw attention to that circumstance in its report to the General Assembly.

38. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the draft resolution of the Second Committee was to be considered by the General Assembly in plenary meeting on the following day. The Advisory Committee had not yet had time to consider the draft resolution of the First Committee, which had been transmitted to it only the day before and was to be considered in plenary meeting on Monday, 14 December.

39. Mr. VAN VLOTEN (Netherlands) said that he concurred in the New Zealand representative's comments regarding the possibility of overlapping as a result of the administrative implications of the two draft resolutions on the consequences of disarmament. The Fifth Committee should point out that danger to the General Assembly, which might perhaps defer adoption of the Second Committee's draft resolution at its plenary meeting. The question was a purely administrative one and not one of substance.

40. Mr. SERBANESCU (Romania) said that he felt that the Fifth Committee should not intervene, since the two draft resolutions referred to two distinct questions which had been considered by two different committees and included separately on the agenda of the General Assembly. Accordingly, the objections raised

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94, document A/8184, para. 7.

\* Report of the Economic and Social Council.

by the representatives of New Zealand and the Netherlands did not seem to him to be valid.

41. Mr. McGOUGH (Argentina) said that he agreed with the Romanian representative that the Fifth Committee should not intervene in questions of substance. He proposed that consideration of the question should be deferred until the next meeting, so as to enable the Advisory Committee to examine the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee.

42. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he felt that the Committee should not confine itself to stating in its report that, if the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution of the Second Committee, the Secretary-General would "endeavour" to provide for the 1971 costs from within the resources available to him in that year, as was stated in paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/1343; it should declare categorically that no additional appropriation would be required in the budget estimates for the financial year 1971.

43. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that, in accordance with the formula proposed by the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee was to inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution of the Second Committee would not necessitate an additional appropriation under the budget for 1971.

44. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that he agreed with the comments of the representatives of New Zealand and the Netherlands and also felt that what was involved was not a matter of substance but one of administrative procedure in which the Fifth Committee had a role to play. If the Committee decided to approve there and then the administrative and financial implications of the Second Committee's draft resolution on the consequences of disarmament, it would have to take those implications into account when it came to consider the implications of the First Committee's draft resolution on the same subject.

45. Mr. LAWRENCE (United States of America) said that he shared the view expressed by the representatives of New Zealand, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

46. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he appreciated the concern of the representatives of the United Kingdom, New Zealand and the Netherlands, but, like the Romanian representative, he felt that the two draft resolutions in question were completely different.

47. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that he was in agreement with the Philippine representative and thought that the Committee ought not to delay the adoption by the General Assembly in plenary meeting of the draft resolution of the Second Committee.

48. Mr. McGOUGH (Argentina) proposed that the Committee's report should state that in future the

Advisory Committee should review simultaneously the administrative and financial implications of draft resolutions adopted by different committees on similar subjects and submit them at the same time to the Fifth Committee.

49. The Chairman noted that no formal motion for adjournment had been made. He therefore suggested that the Committee should request the Rapporteur to include in his report the views expressed during the debate by the representatives of New Zealand, the Netherlands, Romania, and Argentina and to inform the General Assembly that if it adopted the Second Committee's draft resolution, the resulting additional costs would amount to \$37,500 in 1971 and \$27,500 in 1972, but it would be possible to meet the 1971 costs without any additional appropriation and that the 1972 costs would be taken into account in the budget estimates for that financial year.

*It was so decided.*

## AGENDA ITEM 82

### Personnel questions (continued):\*

#### (a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued)\* (A/8156, A/C.5/L.1046)

50. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the list of speakers wishing to participate in the debate should be closed at 6 p.m. that day.

*It was so decided.*

51. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that in general the conclusions and recommendations contained in chapter V of the Secretary-General's report (A/8156) were acceptable to his delegation. In particular, it agreed with the view expressed in paragraph 41 that the remaining imbalances in the nationality composition of the staff would have to be corrected on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the needs of the Secretariat during the next few years. It hoped that the Secretariat would maintain its high competence and integrity and felt that an adequate balance should be maintained between competence and geographical representation. His delegation also supported the view expressed by the Secretary-General in paragraph 42 of his report that apart from the immediate problem of achieving a better composition of the staff, it had become evident that recruitment for the Secretariat needed to be looked at in a broader framework. His delegation considered it timely that a review should be made of the adequacy of existing practices concerning the recruitment of staff. He was pleased to see in the same paragraph that the Secretary-General intended to study the problem of whether the traditional methods of recruitment, which relied on academic degrees, references and interviews, should not be supplanted or supplemented by competitive examinations and more accurate assessments of the equivalence of academic degrees. The Japanese delegation fully supported the initiatives taken by the Secretary-General

\* Resumed from the 1402nd meeting.

to re-examine current personnel policies. Lastly, it supported the guidelines for the recruitment of Secretariat staff, which appeared in paragraph 43 of the report. He hoped that those recommendations would be accepted by the General Assembly and that they would be implemented.

52. With regard to the distribution of posts by nationality, he noted, in paragraph 26 of the report and table 2 of the annex, that 12 countries had not been represented in the Secretariat as of 31 August 1970 and 5 countries—China, Italy, Japan, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—had been significantly below the lower limit of their desirable number of posts. His delegation was aware of the efforts made by the Office of Personnel to achieve a more equitable geographical representation. It had noted with satisfaction, in examining table 4 of the annex to the report, relating to appointments to posts subject to geographical distribution from 1 September 1969 to 31 August 1970, that the number of new appointments from under-represented countries had increased in comparison with the number from other countries. However, that number was still not as high as it should be and, while the situation was improving, much remained to be done. His delegation therefore hoped that the Secretary-General would redouble his efforts to achieve a better balance in the composition of the Secretariat and to remedy the excessive under-representation of several countries, including Japan. The introduction of new methods of recruitment, based on examinations and a more accurate assessment of the equivalence of academic degrees, should make it possible to improve the selection of candidates. It would also be useful to send recruitment missions more frequently to the different regions, particularly to distant and under-represented countries.

53. Mr. KEENLEYSIDE (Canada) said that the remarks which the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had made (1401st meeting) concerning his delegation's comments at the 1397th meeting on the question of allowances and other social benefits available to the staff of the United Nations gave the impression that the Under-Secretary-General believed that the Canadian delegation was opposed to that aspect of staff remuneration. In fact, it had merely wished to point out that the existence of those benefits should not be ignored. Indeed, there had been almost no reference to such benefits in the General Assembly since early in 1956, although they were the equivalent of 20 to 30 per cent of the base salaries of United Nations personnel. His delegation had therefore raised that question because it had been entirely overlooked in the course of the discussion of Professional salaries, because it constituted an important aspect of the remuneration of United Nations staff and because there had been no examination of the subject since 1956. In his delegation's view, the question should be included in the general study of remuneration.

54. He wished to make it clear that the list of social benefits which his delegation had presented was not

intended to be taken as a definitive, precise and all-inclusive catalogue, since it was given merely as an indication of the general scope and importance of the subject. He pointed out that, for example, he could have mentioned the United Nations garage in his list of social benefits available to the Secretariat staff. If the rate of \$6 per month for parking in the garage was compared with the average commercial rate of \$70 per month for such parking in town, it would be seen that that service was equivalent to a grant of more than \$750 a year. It would perhaps be useful if the Under-Secretary-General himself prepared a list of all those benefits and presented it to the Committee which was to study the whole problem of remuneration. His delegation would also point out that, contrary to what the Under-Secretary-General had said, United Nations staff members received a higher pension than United States civil servants. In addition, United Nations staff received a discount on their purchases at the souvenir shop, the gift shop and the United Nations bookstore as well as in the delegates' dining room. The fact that in the latter case staff members were not the only ones granted a discount did not alter the fact that it was a benefit.

55. With regard to annual leave, he pointed out that United States civil servants had to work fifteen years before they were entitled to a maximum of twenty-six days' leave and that the situation of industrial workers was even less favourable. Furthermore, United Nations staff enjoyed exceptional advantages in the case of sick leave.

56. In conclusion, he said that he made those comments merely to show that the question should be examined more carefully than in the past. He hoped that the special committee which was to be set up would bear them in mind.

57. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that his Government attached great importance to the principle of equitable geographical distribution with regard not only to the Organization as a whole but also to its various departments and the different categories of posts. It would appear that in certain sectors some nationalities were at a particular disadvantage with regard to recruitment—for example, in the case of all posts in the management, financial and administration services. His delegation therefore hoped that the Secretariat would provide all relevant information and explanations on that situation.

58. Mr. STOBY (Guyana) hoped that the representatives of the various delegations would have an opportunity to comment on the information which would be furnished in response to the Indian representative's request, even if their names were not on the list of speakers for the general discussion.

59. Mr. KEENLEYSIDE (Canada) hoped that some time would be reserved for the consideration of the report on the Office of Public Information.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Document A/C.5/1320 and Corr.1, relating to agenda item 73, issued separately (offset).

60. The CHAIRMAN said that all necessary arrangements would be made in that regard.

### AGENDA ITEM 79

**Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*continued*)\* (A/7938, A/8031, A/8131, A/8140, A/8155, A/8158)**

*General co-ordination matters, administrative budgets of the agencies and administrative and management procedures concerning the programme and budget of specialized agencies (continued)\* (A/8031, A/8140, A/8155, A/8158)*

61. Mr. VIEIRA (Brazil) expressed his appreciation of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8031) in which it reviewed in depth the administrative and management procedures for the programme and budget of WHO and very clearly set out its observations and conclusions. His delegation concurred in general in the views of the Advisory Committee, but had some reservations about some of its observations.

62. His delegation's attention had been drawn first to the observations pertaining to the structure of WHO and its implications in terms of the programme formulation process in that organization. As the Advisory Committee pointed out in paragraphs 14 to 17 of its report, WHO had six regional organizations, each consisting of a regional committee and a regional office. The regional offices had considerable autonomy and were entirely responsible for the negotiation of agreements with Governments for the establishment of health projects within the region and for organizing and administering those projects. While pointing out that it was not suggesting that consideration should be given to changing the regional structure of WHO, the Advisory Committee clearly indicated in subsequent paragraphs of the report that it considered the autonomy of the regional offices to be excessive. In paragraph 22 it said it was concerned that the programmes and projects recommended by the WHO regional directors, regional advisers and country representatives be considered in the wider context of the programme of work and priorities approved by the central intergovernmental organs. It contended that the programme proposals approved by the six regional committees left little scope for further review and appraisal by the Director-General and the Executive Board in the light of the specific directives of the World Health Assembly. The Advisory Committee then expressed the view, in paragraph 24, that more active participation of member States of WHO in the programme formulation and approval process, and more central control at headquarters, were necessary since WHO was a unified organization governed by the Health Assembly and its subsidiary organs and should not be regarded as a federation of local or autonomous organizations. His

delegation was inclined to interpret those remarks as an expression of the Advisory Committee's well-justified concern with the rationalization of administrative practices and procedures, but it believed that at the same time due account should be taken of the special characteristics of each organization in the United Nations system. An attempt to subject all of them to the same pattern of administrative arrangements might adversely affect the capacity of some of them to gain the objectives for which they had been created. Perfection from the point of view of management techniques might in some cases lead to operational sterility. His delegation believed that in the case of WHO a certain degree of decentralization was in order. The somewhat federative structure of WHO was not simply due to the fact that some of its regional organizations antedated WHO itself; it was also the structure which was best suited to the needs in its particular field of activity. The Advisory Committee itself referred to that *sui generis* character of WHO when it pointed out in paragraph 40 that the regions played a much more important role in the budget-building process in WHO than in other international organizations, including the United Nations.

63. His delegation agreed that as a rule programmes should follow the directives of the Health Assembly, but it did not consider that those directives should constitute a rigid mould into which programmes had to fit exactly. Furthermore, the directives were not being totally disregarded, since the draft programmes prepared at the regional level took into some account the organization's policies and priorities. As to the need for more active participation by States members of WHO in the programme formulation and approval process, he noted that the views of member States could be expressed in both the regional and the central intergovernmental organs. His delegation could not therefore give unqualified support to the Advisory Committee's call for more centralized control of programmes in WHO. It believed that the decentralized process of programme formulation and building being applied in WHO helped to preserve the experience of the regional organizations and the valuable connexions established through the years between those organizations and the national health administrations. In view of the technical nature of WHO's activities, the autonomy of the regional organizations, far from being harmful, was a help to the work of the organization as a whole.

64. As to the budget-building process, his delegation noted that WHO had for three years been applying a procedure whereby the World Health Assembly adopted resolutions on the general order of magnitude of the budget for the year following the one for which funds were appropriated. That procedure was akin to the planning estimate system. The experience of WHO in that respect would therefore be useful to the United Nations inasmuch as it afforded an opportunity of ascertaining how the system worked in practice and what was its degree of usefulness. It would perhaps be unfair to pass judgement on the basis of the experience of only three years, but certain conclusions could already be drawn. It appeared that the resolution on

\* Resumed from the 1401st meeting.



the general magnitude of the budget for the planning period had not exerted a great influence on the size of that budget and that in drawing up the estimates for any given year the Director-General was guided to a large extent by what the Advisory Committee called the "climate" of the discussions in the central intergovernmental organs rather than by the formal decisions on general orders of magnitude. It seemed, therefore, that the usefulness of a planning estimate type of procedure was only marginal, basically because of the difficulty of determining more than two years in advance what would be the developments in the area of programme, something which depended primarily on the interests of member States. The use of such a procedure confronted a budgetary organ with a dilemma: if the planning estimate was binding, it could unduly inhibit programmes by removing the necessary flexibility, whereas if the planning estimate was only a very general framework it had little effect in terms of subjecting programmes to a certain discipline. His delegation wished to state once again that it was inappropriate to try to impose order on programmes by means of restrictive budgetary procedures and arrangements and that action must be taken by the programme formulating organs, through better planning of their activities and the establishment of priorities.

65. His attention had also been drawn to the question of financing the budget of WHO, and he was glad to note from paragraph 51 of the report that the WHO scale of assessments was based on the latest available United Nations scale, account being taken of the difference in membership. His delegation had for a long time stressed the importance of harmonizing the scales of assessments in the United Nations family of organizations with a view to reducing disparities between the scales of the agencies and that of the United Nations. It was with that objective in mind that the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2190 A (XXI) of 15 December 1966.

66. The Advisory Committee had omitted to note that the expenditures of the Pan American Health Organization, which acted as the regional committee of WHO for the Americas, were only in part financed through WHO's regular budget, while the greater part of the expenditure was financed by the Pan American Health Organization alone. Such an arrangement imposed a heavy burden on the organization's member States—which contributed to it on the basis of the scale of assessments of the Organization of American States—and particularly on the region's developing countries. His Government felt, therefore, that WHO should study ways and means of increasing its participation in the financing of the budget of the Pan American Health Organization. It would also be helpful to the developing countries if the expenditures deriving from certain essential and costly programmes could be apportioned among member States in accordance with a special method designed to give more relief to developing countries, as had been done at the United Nations in the financing of peace-keeping operations, and at WHO itself in the case of the malaria eradication programme.

67. He wished, finally, to express his delegation's concern with the fact, according to paragraph 55 of the report, that the level of extra-budgetary funds in WHO had remained more or less static during the period 1964-1968, whereas the level of the effective working regular budget had increased in the interim by some 65 per cent, and that an analysis of the shifts of emphasis within the over-all total of extra-budgetary funds showed a decline in the role of the Voluntary Fund for Health Promotion. That situation showed the hazards of relying upon voluntary contributions to finance multilateral programmes.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*