

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1117th  
MEETING**

Monday, 20 December 1965,  
at 11 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 21:</i>	
<i>United Nations Emergency Force:</i>	
(b) <i>Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force (concluded)</i> . . . . .	273
<i>Agenda item 78:</i>	
<i>Pattern of conferences: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly</i> . . . . .	278
<i>Agenda item 84:</i>	
<i>Personnel questions (concluded):</i>	
(a) <i>Composition of the Secretariat: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded);</i>	
(b) <i>Other personnel questions: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly</i> . . . . .	278
<i>Agenda item 82:</i>	
<i>Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (concluded):</i>	
(a) <i>Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (concluded);</i>	
(b) <i>Inter-organizational machinery for matters of pay and personnel administration: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly</i> . . . . .	278

*Chairman:* Mr. Najib BOUZIRI (Tunisia).

## AGENDA ITEM 21

United Nations Emergency Force:

- (b) Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force (concluded) (A/6059, A/6060, A/6171; A/C.5/1049; A/C.5/L.862)

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862) had accepted the proposal made by the representative of Ghana to add the words "without prejudice to the positions of principle which may be taken by Member States on the eventual recommendations of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations on this question" after the words "Decides as an *ad hoc* arrangement" in section II, paragraph 1, and section III, paragraph 1, of their text.

2. Mr. LYNCH (New Zealand) said there were no more important items on the agenda of the General Assembly than those which related to the maintenance of peace, for the failure of the Organization to meet its obligations in that sphere must inevitably prejudice its ability to fulfil commitments in others. His delegation therefore welcomed the initiative taken by Canada and the other sponsors of the draft resolution. The success of the peace-keeping operation in the Middle East would constitute a critical test of the Organization's ability to discharge its peace-keeping role in the future. A serious responsibility therefore rested upon the Committee. It must adopt a pragmatic approach, acknowledging both the differences of view which remained over the principles of peace-keeping and the political instability which made the continued presence of the Force imperative.

3. In his report on the Force (A/5919) the Secretary-General had stressed that the Force continued to serve effectively as a stabilizing influence in the Gaza/Sinai area. The Survey Team had confirmed that view (see A/C.5/1049). The Committee therefore had no alternative but to recognize that for the present and foreseeable future the presence of UNEF must be maintained and the burden of its financing must continue to be carried. The business of maintaining peace was costly, but decidedly less expensive than open hostilities.

4. His delegation favoured the equitable distribution of the expenses of UNEF among the entire membership of the United Nations. Peace-keeping, which benefited all Member States, should be a collective obligation. Of course, the fact that certain delegations held the contrary view could not be ignored, but that did not mean that the only course now open was financing on a voluntary basis. Collective financial measures must remain the first recourse and, where such an approach would be impractical, a range of alternative financing methods should be examined before adopting voluntary financing as a last resort. To take a practical example, the alarming financial situation of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus showed how unsatisfactory it was to rely on voluntary contributions.

5. His delegation was prepared to vote in favour of the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862) because the formula it proposed would be workable, equitable and more reliable than any other mode of financing immediately available. However, it was strictly an interim measure which could in no case constitute a precedent or prejudice the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations in seeking a long-term solution. It represented a reasonable solution of the problem of financing UNEF in 1965 and 1966.

6. Mr. TURINE (Belgium) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. It understood the sponsors' motives, but it intended to adhere to the principle that any activity must be financed by the collective membership of the United Nations and not by voluntary contributions. The expenses of the Force must be allocated according to the scale of assessments and not according to some other system which would arbitrarily impose additional burdens on certain countries. The developing countries should benefit from reductions only to the extent that those reductions were offset by voluntary contributions. That point had been made clear in General Assembly resolution 1983 (XVIII), for which his delegation had voted.

7. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) said he would vote for the draft resolution, but with some reservations. According to section II, paragraph 1 (c), and section III, paragraph 1 (b), the twenty-six Member States described as "economically developed" were to pay an additional amount of 25 per cent in order to meet reserve requirements. That was an extremely heavy additional burden, for it would mean that Japan would have to contribute 3.95 per cent of the total expenditure of UNEF. It would be very difficult for Japan to agree to continue paying such sums in future. Obviously, it was impossible to withdraw UNEF immediately but, in view of the tendency of peace-keeping operations to preserve the *status quo*, a point brought out by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization,<sup>1/</sup> the Japanese delegation appealed to the parties concerned to intensify their consultations with a view to terminating rapidly the United Nations operation in the Middle East. He would vote for the draft resolution, but the formula proposed could only be an *ad hoc* arrangement. It could in no case constitute a precedent and in no way prejudged Japan's attitude towards the work of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

8. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) said his delegation appreciated the efforts which, after long consultations and negotiations, had resulted in the submission of the draft resolution. However, he could not vote for that text, for it was merely a new version of an old formula which in no way solved the problem of the Force's future. The preamble merely expressed the hope that the present arrangement would not be repeated, whereas there was every indication that the problem would remain exactly the same in 1966. No solution was proposed for past peace-keeping operations; at most, an attempt was made to furnish solutions for the future. The draft resolution could not be effective in the long run and, in tackling the immediate problem, it proposed a method of financing which was unacceptable to his delegation because, instead of applying the scale of assessments, it would impose on Member States certain obligations which Argentina could not agree to. It would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

9. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica) said he would vote for the draft resolution because the General Assembly was entitled to allocate peace-keeping expenses among

Member States as it saw fit. However, his delegation had reservations on certain points on which it would have requested a separate vote if the Committee had not been pressed for time.

10. With reference to section II, paragraph 1 (a), of the draft resolution, he recalled that Jamaica had made a voluntary contribution in response to the General Assembly's appeal. That contribution was intended to help the United Nations to solve its financial difficulties, i.e., to cover past and not future expenditure. His delegation therefore regretted that the draft resolution proposed that voluntary contributions already paid should be used to meet future commitments. Furthermore, all contributions should be paid in cash and not in the form of supplies and services, an option that was provided for in section II, paragraph 3, and section III, paragraph 3. The provisions of section II, paragraph 5, ran counter to the very concept of voluntary contributions. A clear distinction must be drawn between such contributions and the assessments to be paid by Member States. It was also doubtful whether a reserve of 25 per cent would be enough; it would have been wiser to set a target of at least 30 per cent.

11. Finally, there was absolutely no justification, in the present case, for granting reductions to the developing countries, since such a small total was involved.

12. Mr. CUREÑO PEREZ (Mexico) said his delegation would vote against the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862). The financing of UNEF was closely linked to the general problem of financing peace-keeping operations. Mexico did not believe that a decision to establish a peace-keeping force could be taken lightly. Neither the parties concerned with UNEF nor the great Powers had taken a stand on whether the Force should be maintained. There was therefore no need to take a hasty decision. The General Assembly had decided that the whole question of peace-keeping operations should be studied. It would be inappropriate to take an isolated decision now on one specific aspect of the question which might prejudice the conclusions to be reached by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. If the Fifth Committee decided on the financing of UNEF without waiting for the question of substance to be settled, it would infringe the rules for the allocation of items set forth in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. The Assembly had divided item 21 into two parts. Sub-paragraph (a) concerned the political aspects and sub-paragraph (b) the financial aspects. The Fifth Committee could not take a decision on the financial aspects until the political aspects had been decided. Only then would it be possible to estimate the expenditure of UNEF and to consider how it was to be allocated. His delegation supported the Argentine representative's remarks on that point.

13. He expressed the hope that the Secretary-General's report on UNEF (A/C.5/1049) would be brought up to date and completed before the twenty-first session of the General Assembly and that it would be studied as a matter of priority by a competent organ—possibly the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations—before the Fifth Committee was called upon to take a decision on the

<sup>1/</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 1A, section VII.*

financial implications. He proposed that the Rapporteur should make specific mention of the Argentine proposal in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

14. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) felt that the amendment proposed by the Ghanaian representative was well-advised. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution. It was not for the Fifth Committee to judge whether UNEF should have been established or whether it should now be maintained, for that question fell within the competence of the appropriate political organs of the United Nations. If certain Member States wanted to put an end to UNEF, there were various ways of doing so outside the Fifth Committee. If UNEF was to continue, however, provision must be made for its financing, and that was the business of the Fifth Committee. Since the establishment of UNEF in 1956, its financing had always given rise to interminable negotiations in the Committee. The present draft resolution was not perfect, but it represented the best solution at the moment; it set forth ways of raising as much money as possible for the Force, and its object was thus within the Fifth Committee's terms of reference. Since it concerned a peace-keeping operation already underway, the draft set no precedent for the future and would certainly not restrict the freedom of action of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. The fact that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution did not mean that it accepted the method of financing proposed in it as applicable to future peace-keeping operations. Ireland was a co-sponsor of a draft resolution on the financing of future peace-keeping operations (A/SPC/L.121/Rev.1) which was now before the Special Political Committee and which would also be considered by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. In supporting draft resolution A/C.5/L.862, his delegation was in no way repudiating the principles it had supported in the draft resolution submitted to the Special Political Committee.

15. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) asked for a separate vote on paragraph 5 of section II of the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862).

16. Mr. OLARTE (Colombia) said that his country's position was the same as that of Argentina and Mexico. Colombia would vote against the draft resolution. Although it had paid all its contributions for the maintenance of the Force up to 1964, it would not feel bound by that resolution, should it be adopted, or by any similar resolution concerning the expenses incurred by UNEF since the General Assembly's nineteenth session. He agreed with the Mexican representative that the Secretary-General's report, brought up to date, should be studied by a competent body between now and the Assembly's twenty-first session, before the Fifth Committee was called upon to take a decision on the financing of UNEF.

17. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (United States of America) said that his country had for many years regarded the creation and maintenance of UNEF as one of the Organization's finest achievements of peace-keeping. The presence of UNEF was an essential factor in the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. Despite differences of opinion on the question of financing, no

delegation had contested the usefulness of UNEF's work. Nevertheless, the fact that the Force had been in the Middle East for nine years had led some Member States to wonder whether it should still be kept going, since it had originally been created to deal with an emergency situation. Quite apart from the financial burden, it was a fact that the continuation of a peace-keeping operation over a very long period limited the Organization's capacity to take the necessary action in other situations. That was why Member States and the Secretary-General had seriously considered the possibility of reducing the strength and costs of the Force without impairing its effectiveness. However, it was obviously too late now to reduce the 1965 costs. Where the cost estimates for 1966 were concerned, the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1049) showed that he would endeavour to keep expenses at the lowest level possible, taking into account the co-operation of Member States in regard to the relief of contingents; without such co-operation, of course, the Secretary-General could not make all the necessary reductions.

18. As to the mode of financing the Force, his delegation considered that the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862) had great merits: it took account of the principle that peace-keeping costs should be apportioned among all Member States, thus underlining the collective responsibility of the membership and ensuring the continuity of the United Nations as an effective peace-keeping instrument.

19. Nevertheless, his delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote, because the apportionment of the costs provided for in the draft was such that the United States contribution would exceed 33.33 per cent of the total. As delegations were aware, the Eighty-Second Congress of the United States had enacted Public Law 495 under which no United States delegation could commit its country to contributions exceeding 33.33 per cent of the total costs in any international organization. Nevertheless, if the draft resolution was adopted, the United States Government would ask Congress, which had sole jurisdiction in the matter, to appropriate funds for a contribution.

20. Mr. CARRASQUERO (Venezuela) said that the circumstances outlined in the Secretary-General's report and in that of the Survey Team (A/C.5/1049) indicated that there was a need to maintain UNEF.

21. His delegation recognized the General Assembly's authority to determine the estimate for the Force and to apportion the financial burden among Member States, but it considered that the apportionment should be effected on the basis of a special scale of assessments, taking into account the principles set forth in General Assembly resolution 1874 (S-IV).

22. His Government had complied with all the obligations laid upon it by the Assembly in respect of the costs of UNEF, and would continue to follow the same course until there was a peaceful settlement of the problems involved.

23. Accordingly, his delegation would support the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862), which incorporated the observations it had made.

24. Mr. GANEM (France) recalled that, despite its reservations on the conditions in which UNEF had been set up, France had always contributed to the financing of UNEF, even though it had abstained on General Assembly resolution 1733 (XVI) which had amended the scale of assessments in what France had considered to be an arbitrary manner. At the fourth special session of the General Assembly, his delegation had stated in the Fifth Committee (1003rd meeting) that it was aware of the difficulties with which the financing of UNEF presented the developing countries and that in consequence it would continue to pay its assessed share of the costs of UNEF for 1963; France had also made voluntary contributions to lighten the burden upon the developing countries.

25. His delegation therefore fully understood the concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution, but considered that its adoption would be ill-timed; it was not advisable to establish new financing arrangements, even provisionally, when the fundamental positions on that question were still very far apart. Certainly it was hardly the time to start considering a new formula, when the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations was about to draft proposals in that regard. If the latter Committee completed its work before the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, its conclusions would obviously have repercussions on the arrangements for financing UNEF. Moreover, the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, which the General Assembly had just decided to establish, would soon clarify the financial aspects of the question. It might be wondered whether it was logical to amend earlier provisions, before that Committee had had time to express its views; that could only complicate the final solution of a thorny problem.

26. Consequently, his delegation would abstain on the draft resolution. If there was a separate vote, however, it would vote for section I of the draft in order to stress the importance it attached to the continued operation of the Emergency Force and its intention of participating in its financing through voluntary contributions.

27. His delegation paid a tribute to the efforts of delegations and the Secretary-General to reduce the costs of the Force in 1966; that seemed to point the way to a final settlement of the question in the near future.

28. Mr. HEMSLEY (Canada) emphasized that the draft resolution was the result of a compromise aimed at securing the maximum funds for the financing of UNEF. It constituted a comprehensive solution arrived at only after laborious negotiations. His delegation fully understood the Mauritanian representative's request for a separate vote, but appealed to him to withdraw that request. If he did not see fit to do so, Canada would, on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, call for the application of rule 91 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

29. Mr. EDWARDSSEN (Norway) supported the Canadian representative and likewise appealed to the Mauritanian representative to withdraw his request; the draft resolution was a compromise solution which

could not satisfy everyone and which had been dictated by the need to ensure the continued financing of UNEF. It would be difficult for the Norwegian Government to ask Parliament for further appropriations to pay its contribution to the Force. The solution proposed in paragraph 5 of section II would make matters easier for the Norwegian Government and probably for other Governments too, and would ensure the continued operation of the Force while reducing to a minimum the danger of a refusal by national parliaments to appropriate further sums.

30. Mr. KOCHMAN (Mauritania) paid a tribute to the countries which were helping to restore the Organization's finances through their voluntary contributions. Regarding paragraph 5 of section II of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to point out that the Member States which had made voluntary contributions had done so in order to restore the Organization's solvency, as the paragraph stated. Their contributions had been purely voluntary, but some delegations now wanted to change that. It was in order to defend certain principles that his delegation had asked for a separate vote on the paragraph in question. Nevertheless, in a spirit of conciliation and co-operation, and in response to the appeals of the Canadian and Norwegian delegations, his delegation would withdraw its request.

31. Mr. AL-RIFAE (Kuwait) said that his country had paid its share of the expenses of UNEF since it had joined the United Nations, as an indication of its support for the Organization. In the Special Political Committee at the 486th meeting on 10 December 1965, Kuwait had declared itself in favour of the principle that the Organization was responsible for the maintenance of international peace and that all Member States were collectively responsible in that respect. It wished to make it clear, however, that neither its sharing of the expenses of UNEF nor its vote for the draft resolution modified its position of principle on the origin of UNEF: the Force should be financed by those responsible for the Suez aggression. It also wished to explain that in its view the list of "economically developed" countries in paragraph 6 of section II and paragraph 4 of section III of the draft resolution was only valid for the present case.

*At the request of the representative of Hungary, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Romania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Greece, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines.

*Against:* Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Argentina, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Mongolia, Poland.



*Abstaining:* Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Congo (Brazzaville), El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Guinea, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Pakistan.

*The draft resolution (A/C.5/L.862), as amended, was adopted by 38 votes to 14, with 37 abstentions.*

32. Mr. POCOCK (Australia), explaining his delegation's vote, stressed Australia's concern for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of harmonious relations in the Middle East. It had supported the efforts made by the United Nations in that connexion, and had always borne its share of the cost of UNEF and had joined other Member States in making necessary voluntary contributions. Its vote in favour of the draft resolution indicated its continuing support for UNEF, including its intention to maintain practical financial support. The constitutional crisis of the past two years had had important consequences. The settlement of the question of Article 19 of the Charter had not in itself solved all problems and had even created new ones. His delegation had explained its position on that subject on 29 September 1965, during the general debate in the Assembly (1341st plenary meeting), and in the statement it had made on 26 November to the Special Political Committee (467th meeting). It wished to stress that its support for the present draft resolution was without prejudice to the views it had expressed on those two occasions. The General Assembly, having adopted at its 1331st plenary meeting the consensus of 1 September 1965,<sup>2/</sup> and particularly the second part concerning the applicability of Article 19, must recognize the practical consequences of that decision. It was in that context that the Australian delegation approached the draft resolution in question. Those practical consequences would obtain until agreement was reached on methods of financing that were considered more satisfactory. His delegation had therefore welcomed the decision to extend the mandate of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, and hoped that the negotiations in that Committee, and particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, would result in agreement on acceptable and orderly procedures under which the United Nations could fulfil its duty to maintain international peace and security.

33. In addition to those reservations on certain constitutional implications of the draft resolution, his delegation had reservations on certain of its financial implications. He drew attention in particular to the provision for meeting "reserve requirements" by calling for additional contributions equal to 25 per cent of this apportionment from the developed countries. In view of his earlier remarks, his delegation would regard any such contribution as a matter for decision by the Australian Government. That decision would be made in the light of the extent to which other Member States contributed to the financing of UNEF on a fair and equitable basis.

34. His delegation hoped that all Member States, without prejudice to their positions on certain fundamental points, would give their closest attention to the amounts, expressed in the resolution, which should be contributed if adequate financial support for UNEF was to be assured on an equitable basis.

35. He supported the proposal put forward by several Latin American delegations for a study of the whole question of UNEF, including its mandate, by the appropriate organ of the United Nations.

36. Mr. HENNIG (Austria) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution without prejudice to the position it had stated in the Special Political Committee (482nd meeting) or the position of principle it might adopt with respect to any recommendations by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. If there had been a separate vote, it would have abstained on paragraph 1, sub-paragraphs (b) and (c), of section II because of their financial implications.

37. Mr. S. K. SINGH (India) stated that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution on the understanding that any decision by the Committee concerning the financing of UNEF would be an *ad hoc* and temporary arrangement. It had also been particularly influenced not only by the prime importance of keeping the peace in the Middle East, but also by the general principles laid down by the General Assembly in resolution 1874 (S-IV) of 27 June 1963. Regarding those principles, his delegation would like the Committee to state in its report that it had taken as a basis, in particular, the principle set forth in paragraph 1 (e) of that resolution, namely: "Where circumstances warrant, the General Assembly should give special consideration to the situation of any Member States which are victims of, and those which are otherwise involved in, the events or actions leading to a peace-keeping operation." His delegation had taken note of the observations made at the 1116th meeting by the Controller on paragraph 5 of section II. In connexion with the financing of UNEF, his delegation had always tried to help work out an acceptable scale of assessment and for that reason had joined the sponsors of document A/AC.113/18,<sup>3/</sup> which was at present before the Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations. It hoped that before the end of the twenty-first session the General Assembly would be able to work out a satisfactory permanent scale on the basis of that document. Finally, he wished to remind the Committee of the part played by his country in helping to finance peace-keeping operations, particularly in the Middle East. In addition to a contribution of \$2.5 million, India had provided the largest contingent of troops for UNEF and had bought \$2 million worth of United Nations bonds. It had also been the first country to accept the principle of the annual rotation of contingents, which had made it possible to reduce UNEF's expenses.

38. Mr. TOTHILL (South Africa) said that, although his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution, it was not against the appropriations for UNEF for 1965 and 1966. It could not, however, agree to the adoption of such formulas for allocating the expenses as were to be found in paragraph 1 (c) of

<sup>2/</sup> Ibid., Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 21, document A/5916.

<sup>3/</sup> Ibid., Fourth Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 7.

section II and paragraph 1 (b) of section III without the Governments concerned having had an opportunity to consider them in detail. His delegation would have voted against those sub-paragraphs if they had been put to the vote separately.

39. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland), referring to the Indian representative's request that the principle stated in paragraph 1 (e) of General Assembly resolution 1874 (S-IV) should be included in the Committee's report, said that, if it was decided to include it, his delegation would ask for all the general principles enunciated in the resolution to be included in the Committee's report.

40. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that its report would have to be drawn up in a very short space of time. He appealed to the members not to insist on the report being very detailed. If there was no objection, it might be agreed that the report would not go into statements in detail, on the understanding that delegations could refer, if necessary, to the summary records of meetings.

*It was so decided.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 78

Pattern of conferences: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)\*

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.859)

*The draft report (A/C.5/L.859) was adopted.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 84

Personnel questions (concluded):\*\*

- (a) Composition of the Secretariat: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded);\*\*\*
- (b) Other personnel questions: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)\*\*

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.861)

41. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) reminded the Committee that his delegation had reserved the right during the

\*Resumed from the 1112th meeting.

\*\*Resumed from the 1104th meeting.

\*\*\*Resumed from the 1093rd meeting.

general discussion to speak again on the agenda item under discussion. The draft report on personnel questions contained an excellent account of the apprehensions to which the problem gave rise and the efforts made to solve it. His delegation considered, however, that in the draft report the Committee should have returned to the matter of certain criteria applied in recruiting, with the developing countries particularly in mind. The legacy of colonialism prevented Guinea from responding to the Secretary-General's appeal and seconding competent Guinean personnel to the Secretariat. It was essential to revise certain recruiting criteria which were based on purely academic considerations. The Secretariat was no longer merely responsible for administrative and financial questions. It also had a role to play in the practical problems of peace-keeping. Its staff should therefore have a thorough knowledge of such problems.

42. His delegation hoped that, in the recruitment of Secretariat staff, due heed would be paid to the special situation of the developing countries.

*The draft report (A/C.5/L.861) was adopted.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 82

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency (concluded):\*\*\*\*

- (a) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (concluded);\*\*\*\*
- (b) Inter-organizational machinery for matters of pay and personnel administration: reports of the Secretary-General (concluded)\*\*\*\*

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.863)

*The draft report (A/C.5/L.863) was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

\*\*\*\*Resumed from the 1107th meeting.