

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 797th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 23 November 1960,
at 10.55 a.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 52:

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions . . . 213

Agenda item 60:

Personnel questions (continued):

- (a) *Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued);*
(b) *Proportion of fixed-term staff (continued)* 215

Chairman: Mr. Mario MAJOLI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 52

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (A/4566)

1. Mr. JHA (Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) presented the report of that Committee (A/4566) and drew attention to its main features. The percentage rates of assessment for the new Member States for 1961 were those shown in paragraph 11; those assessments would be additional to the scale approved by the General Assembly for Member States' contributions to the United Nations budget for 1959, 1960 and 1961. For 1960, the new Members would contribute one-sixth of the percentage rates fixed for 1961 applied to the net budget for 1960.

2. In making those recommendations, the Committee on Contributions had followed the same methods and principles as in establishing the scale of assessments for 1959, 1960 and 1961. It had used as a basis for its work averages of national income estimates for the three-year period 1955-1957. In most cases, however, it had had only incomplete statistics at its disposal; in the case of the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville), for example, the Committee had not had sufficient information to enable it to judge the extent of the present impairment in that new Member's capacity to pay. It had accordingly recommended the minimum assessment of 0.04 per cent. Since the Committee on Contributions was required to undertake in 1961 a general review of the scale (General Assembly resolution 1308 A (XIII)) for the purpose of establishing a new three-year scale for 1962-1964, it had felt that it should not at present attempt to adjust the scale to include the new Members. It therefore recommended that for 1961 the assessments for the new Members should be additional to the scale of assessments as approved by the General Assembly for 1959, 1960 and 1961.

3. Lastly, in view of the problems with which the new Members would be faced, the Committee on Contributions proposed that their contribution for the year of admission should be fixed at one-sixth of the sum obtained by applying the assessment for 1961, instead of being fixed in accordance with the one-third rule laid down by the General Assembly (resolution 69 (I)).

4. In conclusion, he drew the Fifth Committee's attention to paragraphs 20 and 21 of the report of the Committee on Contributions, concerning the unpaid balances of contributions to the regular United Nations budget and for UNEF. The arrears totalled \$14.4 million and \$22.7 million respectively.

5. Mr. POLO (Togo) pointed out that the States which had recently attained independence, and Togo in particular, had heavy burdens to bear in developing their economies; he requested that their contributions for 1960 should be, if not waived altogether, then at any rate reduced to one-ninth of the percentage rates fixed for 1961 applied to the net budget for 1960. As to their contributions for future financial years, he approved the rates of assessment fixed by the Committee on Contributions.

6. His request for exemption in respect of 1960 was justified by the fact that the new Members had attained independence in the course of a budgetary year, whereas their budgets, generally of the colonial type, had not provided for the special expenditure involved in the attainment of their independence. It should also be borne in mind that those States' incomes were usually over-estimated and their expenditures under-estimated. No immediate new sources of income could be anticipated in countries whose under-development was due to an excessively rigid economic structure. His delegation therefore hoped that the General Assembly would waive a contribution from the new Members to the expenses of the United Nations for the current year, or that it would at any rate agree to reduce the proportion they had to pay from one-sixth to one-ninth.

7. Mr. EL HAKIM (United Arab Republic) supported the Togolese delegation's request. Many exceptions had already been made to the rule laid down in resolution 69 (I), and the financial situation of most of the new Members was such as to justify reducing to the minimum their contributions for the year of admission. He urged members of the Committee to grant the Togolese request.

8. Mr. RAJAPATRANA (Ceylon) congratulated the Committee on Contributions on its report. He appreciated the special difficulties it had confronted owing to the inadequacy of the available statistics. It was satisfactory to note that no delegation had criticized that Committee's conclusions, and the only point at issue was that raised by the Togolese representative. The same question had arisen when Ceylon had been admitted to membership in December 1955, when the

proportion adopted had been one-ninth. The new Members had been admitted in September 1960, but some of them faced considerable financial difficulties and the question of their exemption deserved serious consideration.

9. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) associated himself with the congratulations addressed to the Committee on Contributions. However, he supported the Togolese delegation's request and felt that the Fifth Committee might consider reducing or waiving contributions from the new Members for 1960. The sums involved would not appreciably alter the financial situation of the United Nations but were of some significance for that of the countries concerned.

10. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) and Mr. GREZ (Chile) also supported the Togolese request.

11. Mr. JHA (Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) explained that the Committee on Contributions was a group of experts which was bound by financial regulations and General Assembly resolutions in carrying out its task. On the basis of General Assembly resolution 69 (I), under which new Members were required "to contribute to the annual budget of the year in which they are first admitted, at least 33 1/3 per cent of their percentage of assessment determined for the following year, applied to the budget for the year of their admission", and in view of certain exceptions sanctioned by the Assembly itself, the Committee had felt that it could reduce the contributions of new Members from one-third to one-sixth. There had been only one case of a Member State not being required to pay a contribution for the year of its admission and that had been Thailand, which had been admitted a day or two before the adjournment of the second part of the General Assembly's first session. That precedent could not be invoked in the case of Member States admitted in September 1960. But the Assembly could always reduce or even waive the contribution recommended by the Committee on Contributions.

12. Mr. BUNCHOEM (Thailand) pointed out that Thailand had not had to pay a contribution for the year of its admission because it had been admitted to the United Nations on 15 December 1946, the last day of the second part of the General Assembly's first session, and had not formally become a Member of the Organization until the following day. It had not been able, therefore, to take part in the work of that session.

13. With regard to Member States admitted in 1960 his delegation felt that their contribution might be reduced, the precise amount of the reduction being a matter for the Fifth Committee to decide.

14. In regard to the observations in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the report of the Committee on Contributions, his Government had always paid its contribution to UNEF, since it considered that that aspect of the Organization's activities formed part of its normal functions relating to the maintenance of peace and security. However, if certain Member States persisted in their refusal to pay their contributions, his Government might have some difficulty in justifying its future payments.

15. Mr. POLO (Togo) formally proposed that the word "one-ninth" should be substituted for the word "one-sixth" in operative paragraph 3 of the draft

resolution in paragraph 19 of the report of the Committee on Contributions.

16. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) felt he should point out that the Committee's decision would certainly establish a precedent; it should, therefore, proceed with caution. Moreover, the Organization had to incur certain expenditure during the session as a result of the admission of the new Members, and it seemed fair that those States should bear part of that expenditure. Perhaps the Togolese representative would agree to modify his proposal and to fix the contribution of new Member States for the year of admission, not at one-sixth or one-ninth of their normal contribution, but at a fraction somewhere between those two figures. His original proposal could be retained in the case of States admitted at the end of the session.

17. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) said he would support the Togolese representative's proposal because the Committee should take account of the fact that admission to the United Nations and the attainment of independence already entailed a financial burden which was relatively heavy for the new Member States in view of their economic situation.

18. Mr. MONTERO BUSTAMANTE (Uruguay) pointed out that, on becoming sovereign States, the new Member countries assumed financial and economic obligations such as, for example, the settlement of debts, which were a heavy drain on their scanty resources. It would be a humane and considerate gesture to exempt those countries completely from their first contribution to the United Nations budget. In any case, a contribution equivalent to one-ninth of their normal contribution would be sufficient to cover the expenditure incurred by the admission of those countries.

19. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) wondered whether the Togolese representative was speaking on behalf of all the new Member States. Some of them were perhaps prepared to pay a sum equal to one-sixth of their normal contribution or, if unable to do so, to regard themselves as in debt to the Organization.

20. Mr. POLO (Togo) said his idea was that the procedure he was proposing would apply to Togo and certain States which were in a weaker budgetary position than others.

21. Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) said that, in principle, he was favourable to the Togolese representative's proposal; however, he would be compelled to abstain if it was to be put to the vote at such short notice.

22. Mr. HAILEMARIAM (Ethiopia) expressed his support for the Togolese representative and requested a vote by roll-call.

23. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Liberian representative that the Togolese representative's proposal concerned only his own country; where the other new Member States were concerned, it would be preferable to wait until they raised the question themselves. Without changing the actual wording of the draft resolution in the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/4566, para. 19), mention could perhaps be made in the Fifth Committee's report that the Togolese representative's request had been considered and action taken upon it.

24. Mr. AIKEN (United States of America) said that his delegation would support the proposal of the

representative of Togo that the contributions of new Member States should be reduced to one-ninth of the percentages of rates fixed for 1961 applied to the net budget for 1960. He did that on the understanding that it would apply to all new Members.

25. He wished, however, to register his delegation's concern at the arrears which had accumulated to a dangerous point. The very existence of the Organization was in danger if Members failed to meet their obligations.

26. Mr. CURTIS (Australia) felt that a decision should be postponed until the Committee had the further information it needed. His delegation was prepared to approve the report of the Committee on Contributions. It had thought at first that the Togolese representative's proposal was meant to apply to all the new Member States; it now seemed that it concerned only Togo. The Togolese representative would perhaps like to consult the representatives of other new Member States and it would therefore be wiser to wait until the result of such consultations was known.

27. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said that he would be prepared to approve the Togolese representative's proposal if it concerned his country only. It could be assumed that the Committee on Contributions had examined the case of the new Member States with its customary care and competence. Moreover, the other new Member States had not asked for their contributions to be reduced. The case of Togo should, therefore, be the subject of a separate vote.

28. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the Committee on Contributions was carrying out a difficult task with remarkable skill and that its proposals appeared to be broadly supported by the Fifth Committee. The Togolese representative had naturally cited the case of his own country when urging a reduction for the new Member States, but it would seem that his proposal had a more general application. Indeed, if there were any questions of special treatment for Togo and some other countries, difficulties might arise to the fact that the Committee lacked data on which to base an opinion. The Committee on Contributions had not discriminated between the various new Members, which all seemed to be in the same situation so far as financial burdens were concerned. The French delegation would therefore support the Togolese representative's proposal provided that it was applied to all the new Member States.

29. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that during the first year after their admission to the United Nations new Members often experienced economic and financial difficulties. He therefore associated himself with what the Togolese representative had said and requested the same reduction for his own country.

30. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) felt that the General Assembly could not make exceptions and that it would be unfair to take a decision in favour of Togo and Cyprus only, without consulting the other new Member States. It certainly seemed as if the other new Member States were in a similar situation, since several of them were unable to have representatives on all the committees of the Assembly. It would therefore be wiser to consult them before taking a decision.

31. Mr. VERRET (Haiti) said that the achievement of independence was generally attended by some

financial instability. He therefore supported the Togolese representative's proposal, but urged that all the new Member States should enjoy the same advantages.

32. Mr. PRATT (Israel) considered that, in view of the economic difficulties the new Member States had to face, their situation should be very sympathetically considered. It was not absolutely necessary for the Committee to hear representatives of the other new Member States: it could decide, on the basis of the report before it and of the information given during the discussion, whether the Togolese representative's request was justified. The delegation of Israel would support that representative's proposal, on the understanding that it applied to all the new Member States.

33. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said that the Committee was in an awkward position. Normally the Indian delegation accepted the advice of the Committee on Contributions, which drew up its conclusions on the basis of a full knowledge of the facts. It was to the Committee on Contributions that countries wishing to have their assessments altered should apply. He interpreted the fact that the other new Member States had not taken part in the debate to mean that they accepted the conclusions of the Committee on Contributions. He formally proposed that the debate should be adjourned in order to enable the new Member States to hold consultations.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 60

Personnel questions (continued):

- (a) Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat: (report of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/833 and Corr.1 and Add.1) (continued);
- (b) Proportion of fixed-term staff (A/C.5/834) (continued)

34. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) said his delegation was following with interest the Secretary-General's efforts to give progressive effect to the provisions of Article 101 of the Charter. In the light of the circumstances in which the Organization had been established, it was easy to understand why the composition of the Secretariat was weighted in favour of the nationals of certain States. It was none the less true that that state of affairs was abnormal at the present time, as almost every delegation had pointed out.

35. The geographical distribution of the staff was a basic question which involved the very existence of the Organization. To recognize the truth of that, it was sufficient to recall the difficulties encountered by the League of Nations for reasons of a similar nature—difficulties for which, incidentally, the United States could scarcely be held responsible.

36. It should now be possible to lay down certain criteria which would provide a satisfactory formula for fixing the desirable number of posts. The number of persons with university degrees and the annual rate of economic growth should be determined for a given country or region. That information would give an idea of the extent to which the country or region could afford the luxury of supplying staff to the United Nations.

37. Certain delegations had suggested that the Secretariat should be divided into three equal groups

representing the "socialist", "imperialist" and "neutralist" countries, respectively. It might be asked with some disquiet what, according to that formula, would be the position of countries like Liberia which strictly speaking belonged to none of the three groups in question and which might very likely find themselves regarded as pieces of small value on the international chess-board. Actually there was at present only one neutral entity in the world, the United Nations, where it was expected that each Member State, while bearing its own interests in mind, would renounce anything that might be contrary to the basic purposes of the United Nations and would thus gradually come closer to true international neutrality. For his part, he could conceive of no other definition of neutrality.

38. In the opinion of Mr. ANDONI (Albania), the question under discussion raised a political problem of the greatest importance; an improvement in the composition of the Secretariat would do much to strengthen the United Nations. The founders of the Organization, in the conviction that the United Nations should be based, not on the principle of domination by one State or group of States, but on that of the equality of all Members, had drafted Article 101 of the Charter, which sought to combine harmoniously the requirements of efficiency and competence with those of geographical distribution. Because of the one-sided attitude adopted by the Secretary-General, however, the current situation with reference to the geographical distribution of the staff was completely abnormal.

39. In the first place, it was incorrect for the Secretary-General to maintain that Secretariat personnel could be recruited only from some parts of the world. In order to discharge its duties, an organization like the United Nations needed the enriching participation of persons representing different regions, cultures, traditions and social systems. Every country, large or small, regardless of its degree of economic development, could make a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations by placing at its disposal the knowledge of highly qualified persons. Wisdom was a matter of quality rather than quantity, and a commodity of which no country could claim a monopoly at present.

40. In the second place, the Secretary-General should be realistic when he asked Governments to nominate candidates, instead of trying, as he did in paragraph 20 of his report (A/C.5/833 and Corr.1), to evade the problem. It was extremely difficult for the Governments of small countries, especially underdeveloped countries, to supply the United Nations with specialists, who were urgently needed at home. Moreover those Governments realized that, by supplying such specialists, they made no appreciable contribution towards strengthening the United Nations, for there was not much difference between, for example, a statistician from Europe or Asia and a Latin American statistician. It was an entirely different matter when those Governments were requested to nominate candidates with a general administrative or diplomatic background and experience. Moreover, it was to that category of personnel that the principle of geographical distribution must be applied as a matter of priority if the situation was to be improved.

41. That did not mean that Albania opposed the geographical distribution of specialist staff; on the

contrary, the Secretariat staff should obviously be internationalized at all levels, including that of G-5; but specialist posts could, up to a point, be filled more easily by recruiting nationals of the developed countries.

42. It was not surprising, of course, that the delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and some of their allies, whose nationals had a preponderant position in the Secretariat and which viewed the United Nations in terms of their own interests, should defend the Secretary-General's erroneous policy. In the absence of valid arguments in support of their position, those delegations sought to give the impression that the socialist countries wished to weaken the United Nations; and they alleged that, in contrast to their own nationals, those of other States did not fulfil the requirements of loyalty. Such assertions, however, would convince no one. The socialist countries had always striven to strengthen the United Nations on the basis of the principle of equality among its Members, and to equip it with a Secretariat capable of performing its functions with complete impartiality. As early as the General Assembly's second session, the USSR representative had drawn attention to the grave political dangers implicit in a biased treatment of the problems with which the Secretariat had to deal.

43. If the United Nations was not as strong today as could be desired, that was because the Secretary-General, in disregard of the principle established in the Charter, had taken a position which was favourable to the policy of the Western Powers and which took no account of reality. At the present day no international problem could be solved without the participation of the socialist countries, and the vitality of the Secretariat would be sapped beyond repair if the nationals of those countries were systematically passed over or isolated. In that connexion he objected strongly to some recent remarks by the Secretary-General, who had attempted to legalize the discrimination practised against certain regions of the world in the recruitment and use of the staff; he would, if necessary, raise that subject again.

44. The Secretariat could not be impartial when the key posts were occupied almost exclusively by nationals of countries which were determined to turn the United Nations into an instrument of their policy. If the Secretary-General had taken into account the proposals and suggestions made in the past by certain countries—especially the socialist countries—the United Nations would not be faced at present with such problems as that of the Congo, where the Secretariat had undertaken operations which suited the interests of the colonialist countries and endangered the people's freedom.

45. Since the establishment of the United Nations, there had been great changes in the world; the colonialist system had had its day, States had formed different groupings, and there was now a strong socialist camp. For those reasons, the world needed an organization free from domination by one group of States and equipped with a truly international Secretariat. The Secretary-General should therefore make drastic changes in the composition of the Secretariat, in the light of the principles of the Charter and taking into account the requirements of the present situation and the wishes expressed by Member States.

46. His delegation fully supported the suggestions made by the Czechoslovak and USSR representatives and would support any proposal aimed at improving the geographical distribution of the staff.

47. Mr. PRIMELES (Cuba) expressed the view that the composition of the Secretariat should reflect the international character of the Organization, in conformity with Article 101 of the Charter. There was still much to be done to achieve that end, as the Secretary-General himself acknowledged in paragraph 19 of his report (A/C.5/833 and Corr.1).

48. With regard to the method of determining the desirable range of posts, the scale of assessments must not be the only criterion applied. Even those States whose assessment was fixed at the minimum must be duly represented in the Secretariat, for, apart from other considerations, their nationals would thereby be enabled to acquire experience which they could use in the service of their fellow countrymen when they returned home.

49. The Secretary-General had stated that he found it easier to recruit staff from certain parts of the world. There would be no fault to find with that observation if it referred to certain stages of the recruiting operations or to staff needed for particular posts; on the other hand, it was quite unacceptable if—as he feared—it was to be interpreted literally.

50. The Cuban delegation welcomed the steps taken to accelerate progress which were mentioned in paragraph 21 of the Secretary-General's report. It was confident that, given good will and good faith, those steps should make it possible for every one of the ninety-nine Member States to be represented, equipping the Organization with a truly international Secretariat.

51. Mr. JEREMIC (Yugoslavia) said that the question of the geographical distribution of staff had been an important item on the Committee's agenda for several years; that was not only because staff costs accounted for two-thirds of the annual budget of the Organization, but also because the changes which had occurred in the structure and membership of the Organization made it imperative to strive yet harder to solve the problem.

52. In spite of the efforts which had been made during the last few years and the progress which had been made, the situation was not yet satisfactory.

The difficulties should not be underestimated, but they were not, in the view of the Yugoslav delegation, insurmountable. It was of prime importance to alter the method of determining the desirable range of posts. Some delegations considered that the use of the scale of assessments, which was a necessity in financial matters, was in some degree obsolete and unjust, and that that scale could not be mechanically applied in fixing the quota of staff for each Member State. The principle of a symbolic or low contribution in the case of the majority of Member States was justifiable on economic and political grounds, for it would be impossible to achieve equality in that respect; but it would hardly be possible to agree that the great majority of Member States should have purely symbolic representation in the Secretariat. The participation of most small and medium States in the activities of the United Nations at the present time was not of a symbolic nature.

53. The Yugoslav delegation endorsed the view that a new approach must be sought in order to achieve the best possible geographical distribution and thus to make the Secretariat truly international. The proposals made in the course of the debate regarding methods of determining the desirable range of posts deserved the Committee's attention, and the Yugoslav delegation supported the suggestion that the Committee of Experts set up to review the activities and organization of the Secretariat should examine those proposals and submit a report on the matter at the sixteenth session.

54. Posts at the G-5 level should be included in the tables on geographical distribution, in view of the importance and the role of that category of staff. In addition, it was essential that the principle of geographical distribution should be applied as fully as possible to posts at the policy-making level. That would be an important advance towards the goal set forth in the Charter.

55. The Yugoslav delegation was well aware of the complexity of the Secretary-General's task and realized that it was hard to achieve a solution which would satisfy everyone. It felt, however, that means could be found of coming as near as possible to universality in the composition both of the United Nations itself and of its Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.