

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1214th
MEETING**

Friday, 1 December 1967,
at 11.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Statement by the representative of Gabon. . . .</i>	265
<i>Agenda item 82:</i>	
<i>Personnel questions:</i>	
<i>(a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued);</i>	
<i>(b) Other personnel questions (continued) . . .</i>	265

Chairman: Mr. Harry MORRIS (Liberia).

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF GABON

1. Mr. MVONE OBIANG (Gabon) thanked those delegations that had offered condolences to his country upon the cruel loss it had suffered in the person of Mr. Léon Mba, President of the Gabonese Republic.

AGENDA ITEM 82

Personnel questions:

- (a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/6860 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1140, A/C.5/L.900 and Add.1, A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.916, A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1);
- (b) Other personnel questions (continued) (A/6877)

2. Miss CILIA (Malta) said that her delegation had been glad to become one of the sponsors of the amendments (A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1) to draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 and hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously with those amendments.

3. Her reservations concerning operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution stemmed from the fact that subsidized language programmes already existed, that the acquisition of proficiency in the working languages of the United Nations should be required, after a certain period of international service, of Professional staff subject to geographical distribution and that the introduction of a language bonus for Professional staff was likely to be an unnecessarily expensive attempt to solve the problem of linguistic balance. The amendments in question recognized the need to proceed carefully in seeking a solution to that problem. The introduction of language bonuses might prove to be the most practical method, but before the Committee accepted that expensive solution the Secretary-General should carefully study all other suggestions made in the Committee, including the one made by her delegation (1211th meeting), and report to the General Assembly on the matter at its twenty-third session. The Committee would thus be able at that session to select with full understanding the solution which appeared most appropriate to it. Her delegation

did not think that the General Assembly should pronounce itself in favour of any particular solution until all suggestions had been carefully studied and evaluated.

4. Mr. GANEM (France) said that, in essence, the amendments set out in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1 would replace operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 with a provision that would serve to delay any decision on the proposals put forward by the sponsors. At the twenty-first session, the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly had affirmed by a majority that ways and means should be sought of ensuring a better use of the Organization's working languages and a better linguistic balance. Most members of the Committee appeared to acknowledge that no effective solution was being proposed to that end at present. For that reason, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 had been prompted to suggest several practical measures which in their view represented the minimum that should be done at present. Admittedly, one of those measures—the introduction of a language bonus—had financial implications, although the Secretariat had greatly overestimated them. The sponsors recognized, however, that the implementation of that measure required thorough study, as a result of which reasonably well substantiated estimates could be prepared. His delegation therefore believed, with the Tunisian delegation (see 1213th meeting), that the Secretariat could be allowed a period of one year in which to study the ways in which operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution could be carried out. The adoption of the draft resolution would thus have no budgetary implications during 1968. In line with the Tunisian representative's suggestion, he said that the implementation of that sub-paragraph should not begin until 1969, and, in order that there might be no doubt on that score, he requested that that interpretation should be recorded in the Committee's report.

5. He believed that delegations that had had misgivings concerning the immediate implementation of certain provisions should thus find it easier to accept the draft resolution. He accordingly could not support the amendments (A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1), which would have the effect of needlessly prolonging the period of study, with the risk, and possibly for some the hope, that practical measures would never be taken. His delegation wished to reiterate the importance it attached to the adoption of the draft resolution in its present form and in accordance with the interpretation which the sponsors placed on the implementation of operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b). The question at issue was whether the General Assembly would demonstrate its intention of continuing logically along the path it had traced out in adopting resolu-

tion 2241 B (XXI), or whether it would engage in delaying tactics, which to the sponsors would mean that it was not prepared to give practical recognition to the equity and pertinence of the provisions of that resolution, and that it therefore did not intend to go beyond reaffirming a principle it had already accepted in 1966. He accordingly hoped that the draft resolution would be put to the vote as quickly as possible.

6. Mr. FENSOME (United Kingdom) observed that his delegation had already voiced its reservations (1205th meeting) concerning the original draft resolution (A/C.5/L.914), and despite the changes made by the sponsors in operative paragraph 3 he could not lend his support to the revised text. Sub-paragraph (a) still seemed to him an undesirable departure from past procedure, in that the General Assembly would give directions to the Secretary-General on the staffing of specific departments or services of the Secretariat. His delegation took the view that those matters were the responsibility of the Secretary-General and that the General Assembly should not seek to restrict in any way the exercise of that responsibility. It also believed that the changes introduced in sub-paragraph (b) did not really alter its sense. His delegation was opposed to the introduction of a system of language bonuses, which would have a material effect on the regular budget of the United Nations. It was clear from what the Director of Personnel had stated (1212th meeting) that Member States must also expect an appreciable rise in the budgets of the specialized agencies and IAEA, if the payment of language bonuses were approved by the General Assembly and the common system continued to be observed by the agencies. Furthermore, the terms of sub-paragraph (b) were imprecise, as had been well illustrated by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions at the previous meeting. The Fifth Committee should not recommend for approval by the General Assembly a draft resolution on which the Secretary-General clearly required further guidance.

7. It was for all those reasons that his delegation would vote in favour of the amendments to operative paragraph 3 set out in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1. He believed that the debate in the Committee had revealed that a most thorough study was needed of the whole question of languages, their use and the implications for Member States and the Secretariat. To adopt draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 at the present time would be to anticipate the results of that study. In connexion with the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, his delegation agreed with the statement made at the previous meeting by the Netherlands representative and would support the amendment relating to that paragraph.

8. His delegation was not unsympathetic to the expressed aims of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1, and it fully recognized the potential advantages to be derived from a bilingual Secretariat. It had intervened in the debate not in support of any particular language, but because the financial and other implications of the draft resolution were so considerable and some of its terms so imprecise that the Secretary-General, in collaboration with ACC and, as necessary, with the advice of the

International Civil Service Advisory Board, should be allowed to consider the whole question in detail during 1968.

9. Mr. URABE (Japan) said that he had pointed out at the 1211th meeting that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, where the language system of Organization was concerned, had introduced, in contravention of the spirit of the United Nations Charter, an element of discrimination against Member States whose national languages were not widely used, and that the present system had been agreed to as a matter of expediency and economy. His delegation had hoped that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1, realizing the inconveniences suffered by those Member States, would amend the draft resolution in such a way that no additional expenses would be imposed upon the Member States discriminated against. Its hopes had been disappointed and it deeply regretted that the sponsors refused to try to understand the standpoint of other Member States.

10. His delegation, as one of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1, wished to explain its views on draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1. The wording of the fourth preambular paragraph seemed to be rather obscure. It was so ambiguous, in fact, that his delegation could not see how to improve it. He wished therefore that the sponsors would try to improve it themselves, so that its real meaning would be clear to the Committee. If the present wording was retained without further explanation, his delegation would be unable to vote for it. He had already made some comments on operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b); and, as the Italian delegation (1212th meeting) had supported those comments, his delegation had intended to submit an amendment itself. Subsequently, however, it had decided to become one of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1, which appeared to be a reasonable compromise. The draft resolution in its present form would undermine the financial discipline of the Organization, and his delegation hoped that the sponsors would realize the dangers of pursuing that course.

11. French and Spanish were beautiful languages widely used in the United Nations, but their standing would be impaired if financial inducements were introduced to encourage staff members to study them. If the proposed amendments were adopted his delegation hoped that the words "a language incentive system" would not be interpreted by the Secretary-General as encouraging financial rewards. After all, a knowledge of foreign languages would bring many rewards for the staff members concerned, including promotion. The Secretariat should not be transformed into a gigantic language school. It would be preposterous for the Secretariat to start a language instruction course during working hours in order to distribute bonuses, particularly if the under-privileged Member States were made to share the costs. Such were the implications of operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b), as his delegation saw them. Self-restraint on the part of Member States was required now more than ever. Linguistic balance to the extent called for by the sponsors of the draft resolution was alien to the Charter, and excessive. His delegation assured the

sponsors that it fully sympathized with their feelings, and it hoped that its sympathy would be reciprocated. The French representative had suggested that the introduction of the system envisaged in the draft resolution could be deferred until 1969. His delegation, like the other sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1 could not commit itself before receiving the report which the Secretary-General was to submit at the twenty-third session.

12. Mr. ABDULDJVALIL (Indonesia) wished to clarify his delegation's position on draft resolutions A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1 and A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1.

13. Some progress had been made over the past years towards the achievement of an equitable geographical distribution in the Secretariat, but it would still take a long time before that goal was reached. His delegation tended to think that in many cases the achievement of an equitable geographical distribution was not determined by factors within the Secretary-General's control, and that the latter's possibilities of achieving such a distribution were therefore limited.

14. Draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1, while noting with appreciation the efforts made by the Secretary-General, also recognized the need for a more equitable distribution of staff among the Member States between regions and within each region, in particular at the levels of senior posts; and his delegation shared that view.

15. With regard to draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1, he agreed that the use of several languages by the United Nations would not constitute a hindrance, but rather an enrichment and a means of attaining the objectives of the Charter. He also thought that linguistic balance was in the best interests of all Member States and was essential for the efficient operation of the Secretariat. The amendment submitted by Iran (A/C.5/L.918) and accepted by the sponsors had greatly improved the draft resolution, since the principle of equitable geographical distribution should be regarded as an overriding consideration. But his delegation had some reservations regarding the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3, particularly sub-paragraph (b). The third preambular paragraph stated that inadequate progress had been made in implementing resolution 2241 B (XXI) of the General Assembly. But his delegation, after a careful study of the report of the Secretary-General (A/6860 and Corr.1) and particularly paragraphs 42 to 68, could not agree with that view. If inadequate progress had been made in implementing the resolution, that was due to circumstances beyond the Secretary-General's control. Moreover, it appeared from the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/L.1140) that language classes had been organized long before the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2241 B (XXI).

16. With regard to operative paragraph 3, his delegation felt that it was indeed highly desirable that as many staff members as possible should be familiar with more than one of the working languages; but that consideration should be carefully weighed against other qualifications offered by candidates for Secretariat posts. For staff members who happened to have one of the working languages as their mother tongue, it

was relatively easy to learn a second; but nationals of other countries—that is, the majority of countries—who had valuable qualifications to offer the Secretariat would find it excessively difficult to learn two languages in addition to their mother tongue. Staff members in that position were often nationals of countries which were under-represented in the Secretariat. Further, payment of a language bonus would obviously operate to the advantage of nationals of the minority of countries whose native language was also a working language. Both the Director of Personnel and the Controller had given their reasons for opposing such a system. The question had already been reviewed and found contrary to the best interests of a truly international civil service. More important still, the system would have considerable financial and administrative implications, as was clear from document A/C.5/L.1140 in which the Secretary-General had listed the language classes already available and had given a detailed statement of the very substantial expenditure required to operate a system of bonuses. For the first year, the proposed programme would cost more than \$850,000, and the benefits which the Organization would gain would not be commensurate with such a large sum, particularly at a time when many delegations were already concerned at the amount of the budget estimates. The burden of the increasing budgetary requirements would be felt most acutely by the developing countries, whose nationals in the Secretariat would in many cases be the last to benefit from the bonus system.

17. His delegation had carefully studied the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1, and would be able to support draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 if those amendments were accepted by the sponsors.

18. Mr. O'CONNOR (United States of America) also believed that the United Nations should take new steps to increase the capacity of the staff to communicate in the official working languages. But the Committee's discussions and the remarks made by the Director of Personnel indicated that it was not so easy as it might at first sight appear to take effective measures to that end. His delegation was anxious that the Committee's recommendations to the Secretary-General should represent the most practical and economical means of achieving that objective.

19. It was essential to maintain the Secretary-General's prerogatives in decisions relating to personnel—that is, the selection of staff on the basis first and foremost of integrity, competence and efficiency. In that connexion, he recalled the statement he had made at the 1209th meeting in reply to questions by the representatives of France and Italy. He wished to make it clear that, in referring to the force with which the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 had recommended adoption of their draft, he had not had the slightest intention of offending anyone and was sorry that his words had been interpreted quite differently.

20. Reverting to the matter under discussion he said that, as the Director of Personnel had pointed out, the Committee should also consider how any decision it might adopt would affect the United Nations common system. It was unthinkable that the United Nations

should adopt decisions with far-reaching administrative and financial implications without consulting the specialized agencies, preferably through the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of ACC, and without giving them an opportunity to express their views. Some time would, of course, be needed for such consultations.

21. The common system had been developed to assure uniform and equitable treatment of personnel throughout the United Nations family with respect to compensation and allowance. That was a very sensitive area in United Nations administration, which had a direct bearing on the status and morale of the thousands of persons in United Nations employment throughout the world. It was for that reason that such bodies as ACC, the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions and ICSAB reviewed carefully every proposal to modify the system in any respect. Any change relating to the elements of compensation—of which the introduction of a language bonus would certainly be one—inevitably affected the system as a whole. Therefore it was most unwise to consider in isolation the potential cost to the parent organization—the United Nations—alone. Whatever the Committee did was bound to have implications for the budgets of all the agencies in the common system. The Governments of most Member States were contributors to those agencies' budgets. His delegation was not opposed in principle to the idea of a language-learning incentive plan for staff in the Professional category subject to geographical distribution, but it was convinced that before any specific change was adopted, all the possible alternatives must be thoroughly looked into. If after appropriate study the Secretary-General and the agencies arrived at the conclusion that some particular system of incentives was the best means of accomplishing the desired results, his delegation would give that system sympathetic consideration. It was clear from tentative data, however, that the cost would be a good deal more than might have been guessed. Even the sponsors of the draft resolution could not minimize the financial implication, which was in the range of half a million to several million dollars. Therefore the Committee should know much more precisely how such a plan would work out in practice before it took a hasty decision committing the United Nations and its family of organizations.

22. Would a bonus scheme really produce the envisioned result? Given the great number of Secretariat officials who could immediately qualify for proficiency in two or three languages, often known by them from birth, how could a sudden very substantial outlay be avoided in their case? How would that contribute to achieving greater linguistic balance or promoting wider use of more working languages among those who did not already possess them? How many Secretariat officials, whose professional duties occupied their full time, would be motivated to add language study to their busy day in order to qualify for an extra \$500 a year? The very fact that the Committee did not have any clear answers to such questions should be sufficient reason for further thought and that was why his delegation was one of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1.

23. In summary, the United States delegation was not opposed to the principle of attaining a linguistic balance in the Secretariat. In fact, it was very much in favour, as it would make the work easier for all. At the same time, any draft resolution adopted by the Committee should reflect the maturity and responsibility which all its members would want the General Assembly to express.

24. Mr. VIEIRA (Brazil) said that his delegation's position with regard to the composition of the Secretariat had always been that the primary responsibility for recruitment lay with the Secretary-General, that the existence of an adequate proportion of career staff was essential for the efficiency and independence of the Secretariat, and that the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity must indeed be the paramount consideration in the employment of staff.

25. His delegation reiterated its opinion that the target schedule of 25 per cent for fixed-term contracts should be retained. At the twenty-first session, it had accepted increased recruitment on the basis of fixed contracts only as a temporary measure especially designed to facilitate the participation of developing countries in the work of the Secretariat.

26. Equitable geographical distribution of posts was of course desirable, but should remain a secondary criterion, in the spirit of Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter. His delegation did not believe, however, that such distribution should be tied to rigid and sophisticated mathematical formulas. Considerations of national prestige in that context were misplaced, and not in keeping with the spirit of international solidarity with which the Member States should be imbued. Emphasis should be placed on a regional rather than a national balance.

27. The Secretary-General should not be overburdened with directives and formulas that would restrict his freedom of action in recruiting staff. Great progress had been achieved in the past few years in the direction of a more equitable distribution of posts, and the Member States had every reason to expect that the Secretary-General would continue his efforts in that regard.

28. His delegation would vote for draft resolutions A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1 and A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1, with the understanding that their intention was to promote a more equitable geographical distribution of posts at all levels and a wider knowledge and utilization of all working languages, without further restricting the Secretary-General in his recruitment policy, subject to the paramount consideration of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity.

29. With regard to draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1, his delegation reiterated its reservations on the creation of a language bonus, which in its view would have considerable administrative and financial implications affecting the whole United Nations family. It therefore welcomed the amendments in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1; if those amendments were not approved, his delegation would vote against operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, in case there was a separate vote on that paragraph.

30. Mr. HENNINGSEN (Norway) remarked that he shared the views expressed by the Netherlands representative in introducing, at the 1213th meeting, the amendments in document A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1; he had become a co-sponsor of those amendments without any particular enthusiasm, but rather in the hope that the majority would support what he considered the best possible compromise. The amendments suggested at the preceding meeting by the representatives of France and Tunisia did not go far enough to make draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 acceptable to his delegation, which wished to place it on record, however, that it was not opposed to the principle of a linguistic balance in the Secretariat.

31. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) stated that his delegation attached great importance to the principle of a linguistic balance at all levels of the Secretariat. The debate and draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 had brought to light strong differences of views which, if they persisted, would jeopardize that balance. There was no great gap between the draft resolution and the amendments to it (A/C.5/L.921 and Add.1), especially since the Tunisian representative had given assurances that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not expect the provisions of operative paragraph 3 to be applied immediately and that they would wait a year for the Secretary-General to submit a report on the feasibility of their proposal. In the hope of bridging that gap, his delegation would like to submit a compromise text ^{1/} requesting the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps to ensure a linguistic balance within the Secretariat at all levels by the early introduction of an accelerated language instruction programme and of such incentives as he considered appropriate to encourage staff in the Professional category to broaden their linguistic knowledge, and to report on the subject to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session. That text would combine the substance of the draft resolution and the amendments and would make it possible to take steps to ensure a linguistic balance without a year's delay. With regard to incentives, the best authority on the subject was the Secretary-General, who might hold that the bonus system was not the best way of encouraging people to learn languages. He would not press his proposal if it did not reconcile the differences of views between the sponsors of the draft resolution and those of the amendments.

32. Mr. MORALES QUEVEDO (Cuba) said that the debate on draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 had been a long and thorough one and that in view of the fact that the Committee was behind in its work, he drew its attention to rule 118 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure.

33. The CHAIRMAN did not think that the application of rule 118 could be envisaged, because the Committee already had before it amendments to the draft resolution in question. The draft resolution was to be put to the vote after draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1, probably at a later meeting.

34. Mr. CISS (Senegal) noted that despite the efforts made by the sponsors of the amendments, to whom he wished to pay a tribute, there was still a deep gap between them and the sponsors of the draft resolution, which it would not be possible to bridge even after a

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/L.923.

lengthy debate. His delegation would vote against the amendments and wished to point out that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not envisage the introduction of a language bonus in 1968 and that they proposed that the Secretary-General should be allowed a delay of one year in order to study the administrative and financial aspects of their proposals before reporting to the General Assembly. That should make the draft resolution perfectly acceptable.

35. He thanked the representative of Iran for his suggestion, but said that while the first part of his text fitted in with the ideas of the sponsors of the draft resolution concerning the language instruction programme, the second part differed greatly from their ideas on the introduction of a language bonus. He believed that the sponsors would not be able to accept the suggestion. He hoped that the representative of Iran would withdraw it and that the Committee would be able to take a decision soon on draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1.

36. Mr. GANEM (France) said that he fully shared the views expressed by the representative of Senegal.

37. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that after the assurances given by the representative of Tunisia and in view of the fact that the amendments to operative paragraph 3 would deprive the draft resolution of any meaning, his delegation would not vote for the amendments.

38. Mr. O'CONNOR (United States of America), referring to rule 121 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, suggested that the vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1 should be postponed to a later meeting in order to give delegations time to study the written text of the Iranian proposal.

39. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea), speaking on a point of order, asked whether the Iranian proposal was a formal one. If not, the Committee could take a decision forthwith on draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1.

40. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that if there was a separate vote, his delegation would abstain on operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b), of the draft resolution, in accordance with the position it had stated at the 1209th meeting. Nevertheless, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution as a whole. It would abstain on the amendments, because it considered that they did not solve the problem.

41. As far as draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1 was concerned, his delegation would vote for the text as a whole, but would abstain on operative paragraph 1 if it was put to the vote separately.

42. Mr. ESFANDIARY (Iran) pointed out that the word "incentives" used in his suggestion covered not only the system of language bonuses but all other measures that would encourage staff to increase their linguistic knowledge, which was, after all, the aim of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1. His delegation had no doubt that the Secretary-General would propose the introduction of a language bonus, if he considered it the most effective way of achieving that aim.

43. He would like to hear the views of any delegations which wished to comment on his suggestion, and if it

appeared that it had little chance of getting enough support, he would withdraw it.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with rule 121 of the rules of procedure, the text of the amendment submitted by the representative of Iran would be circulated in writing to members of the Committee, who, however, need not wait to state their views on the subject.

45. He invited the Committee to vote on the Italian amendments (A/C.5/L.916) to draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1, and on the draft resolution itself.

46. Mr. FRANZI (Italy), referring to the opinion expressed by the representative of Japan at the previous meeting that the Italian delegation's position on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.913 and Add.1 might have been different if in the French text the words "avec appréciation" had been used instead of "avec satisfaction", said that there could be no question of expressing any "appréciation", a word which had a quite different meaning in French from the English word "appreciation", which it was supposed to translate. Basing itself solely on the English text, his delegation, while confident that the future efforts of the Secretary-General would lead to an improvement in the geographical distribution of staff, could not change its attitude any more on the efforts already made by the Secretary-General. The very wording of the third and fourth preambular paragraphs, which spoke of "reflecting" the various cultures—and not, be it noted, of continuing to reflect them—and of "Reiterating" an invitation—to which there had not yet been sufficient response—showed that the sponsors of the draft resolution themselves were not fully satisfied. In the seventh preambular paragraph, indeed, they declared themselves "Concerned". His delegation therefore confirmed that it would like a vote on its first amendment; in the French text that would now delete the words "avec appréciation" from draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1, though that was an erroneous translation.

The first of the Italian amendments (A/C.5/L.916) was rejected by 45 votes to 24, with 28 abstentions.

47. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) withdrew his second and third amendments, but asked for a separate vote on the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution (A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1).

The sixth preambular paragraph was adopted by 59 votes to 7, with 33 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 104 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

48. Mr. ZAITSEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had voted for the draft resolution, but wished to state that if it had been voted on paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would have abstained on operative paragraph 3, which seemed to it so unclear that it even wondered whether the proposal it contained was entirely rational.

49. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution because it considered that the final wording of the text did not correspond to the views expressed by the great majority of dele-

gations who had spoken and because the draft resolution did not give sufficient indication of the criteria to be adopted in the steps the Secretary-General was asked to take in order to arrive at an equitable distribution in the Secretariat. His delegation hoped that the Secretary-General would not only take into account the inadequate and sometimes contradictory contents of the draft resolution, but also all the opinions expressed by the various delegations.

50. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) reminded the Committee that at the 1203rd meeting his delegation had introduced draft resolution A/C.5/L.913 on behalf of the sponsors and had stated at that time that they did not all agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion that the introduction of a system of weights for each level of posts would not lead to a useful refinement of the present system of establishing desirable ranges. In fact, none of the sponsors had agreed with that conclusion. The impression that some of them might have shared the Secretary-General's view was due to the fact that he (Mr. Mirza) had expressed himself in that way in order not to appear to trespass on the prerogatives of the Secretary-General as the chief administrative officer of the Organization and in order not to give too strong expression to a disagreement, which was nevertheless shared in various degrees by all the sponsors of the draft resolution. As he had added, however, they had felt some satisfaction at the recognition of the importance of the level of posts in the calculation of desirable ranges and had expressed the hope that account would be taken of the concern they had repeatedly voiced over the distribution of senior posts among the various regions and among Member States within those regions, while recognizing unanimously that the Secretary-General must remain the final judge of his own administrative policies.

51. Mr. URABE (Japan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.913/Rev.1, thanked members for the support they had given it.

52. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Bolivia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.914/Rev.1.

53. Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand), Rapporteur, read out the final text of a proposal put forward by the Soviet delegation and amended by the Mexican delegation, which he had been asked to include in the Committee's report:

"Taking note that in practice the distinction between the working languages and the other official languages in the organs of the United Nations has been steadily diminishing, the Fifth Committee requests the Secretary-General to study the questions connected with the inclusion of Russian among the working languages of the United Nations organs, with the exception, at the present stage, of the Secretariat and the International Court of Justice, and to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-third session."

He asked for the text to be circulated in writing to members of the Committee,^{2/} who would have to decide what action was to be taken on the proposal.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

^{2/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/L.926.