

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 887th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 22 November 1961,
at 3.20 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 57:</i> <i>Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (continued)</i>	229
<i>Agenda item 63:</i> <i>Public information activities of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General . .</i>	230
<i>Agenda item 64:</i> <i>Personnel questions (continued):</i> <i>(a) Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat (continued);</i> <i>(b) Proportion of fixed-term staff (continued)</i>	232

Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).

AGENDA ITEM 57

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (A/4775 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.690 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.5/L.692 and Add.1 (continued))

1. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said that, following consultations with a number of other delegations, his delegation wished to propose the addition of a new paragraph at the end of the draft resolution (A/4775 and Corr.1, para. 39) which the Committee on Contributions had recommended for adoption. That paragraph would read as follows:

"5. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 of the present resolution, the Committee on Contributions shall at its meeting in 1962 examine the scale of assessments for the years 1962-1964 in the light of the discussion in the Fifth Committee at its sixteenth session and in the light of such further information as might be made available to it, and shall report thereon to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session. In the event that the General Assembly should at its seventeenth session revise the scale set out in paragraph 1 above, the contributions for 1962 shall be adjusted accordingly."

2. Under his proposal, the scale of assessments recommended by the Committee on Contributions would be approved by the Fifth Committee with the proviso that the points raised during the discussion would be re-examined by the Committee on Contributions in 1962. If the latter then deemed a revision of the scale advisable, it would so report to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session. Any revision which it recommended would apply, not only to the 1963 and 1964 contributions, but also to those for 1962, and any payments already made by Members

would be adjusted in accordance with the revised scale.

3. The proposal was the result of a compromise and was put forward as such. It would probably not have the whole-hearted approval of all delegations, but he hoped that it could be generally accepted.

4. Mr. CARNEIRO (Brazil) expressed satisfaction with the work done by the Committee on Contributions whose report was approved by his delegation. Brazil was prepared to accept its new assessment, which would require it to pay a higher contribution, notwithstanding the fact that many new States had joined the Organization during the past three years and that the country was passing through a period of financial difficulties. It should also be noted that Brazil was meeting its obligation to contribute towards the cost of UNEF, having paid its assessment in full for the current year. Such sacrifices were called for from all countries which had joined the United Nations in good faith.

5. His delegation wished to commend Chile for its acceptance of its recommended assessment, which was only 0.01 per cent lower than its assessment under the previous scale, although the country had suffered serious losses as a result of natural disasters.

6. Its attitude contrasted with that which appeared to have motivated the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.690 and Add.1, whose arguments he had not found convincing. He could not agree that the Committee on Contributions should consider itself bound only by the provisions of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its first session and should ignore subsequent resolutions.

7. At present, the Committee on Contributions followed the practice of expressing the difference between a country's per caput income and the amount of \$1,000 as a percentage, half of which was deducted from the country's national income for the purpose of arriving at its assessment. His delegation felt that that practice should be reconsidered. The annual per caput income of the majority of Members was less than \$500. His delegation, therefore, suggested that the Committee on Contributions should consider the possibility of introducing a new system with effect from 1965, under which 60 per cent would be deducted in the case of countries whose annual per caput income was less than \$500; 50 per cent would be deducted, as at present, in the case of countries whose annual per caput income was between \$500 and \$750, and 40 per cent would be deducted in the case of countries with a per caput income between \$750 and \$1,000. The adoption of such a system would not greatly modify the present levels of assessment, but would assure more equitable treatment, particularly for the less developed countries. He believed that the countries in the higher per caput income bracket

would be able to accept the resulting increases in their assessments.

8. Mr. MOLEROV (Bulgaria) said that, under the new scale proposed by the Committee on Contributions, the assessments of the Western capitalist Powers were reduced whereas those of the socialist countries were increased. That had, in fact, been the tendency ever since 1947. While the reductions during that period had ranged from 20 per cent in the case of the United States to 45 per cent in the case of Sweden, the assessment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had increased by 136 per cent and that of Czechoslovakia by 30 per cent. His own country was now called upon to accept a 25 per cent increase in its assessment.

9. In preparing the new scale, the Committee on Contributions had apparently been guided by four factors: capacity to pay, as indicated by estimates of national income; comparative per caput incomes; consequences of the Second World War; and difficulty in securing dollars or other acceptable currency. His delegation considered that the first and the last of those factors were of primary importance.

10. In order to achieve the comparability of data necessary for consideration of the first factor, a very careful study was required in which experts fully conversant with the economies and statistical methods of the world's two different economic systems should take part. He did not question the competence of the members of the Committee on Contributions, but the errors of interpretation to which the Hungarian representative had drawn attention indicated the need for such expert participation as long as mechanical comparison of data from the capitalist and from the socialist countries was not possible. He regretted that the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions did not consider it feasible to reconvene that Committee for the purpose of examining the claims made by the Hungarian and USSR delegations.

11. With regard to the last factor, the Committee had not proposed any reductions in assessments on account of difficulty in securing foreign currency, but had merely recommended that the Secretary-General should be authorized to facilitate the payment of contributions in currencies other than United States dollars. Foreign trade was the principle source of foreign exchange for most countries and his own country was making every effort to expand its trade with other nations. However, like the other socialist countries, it was experiencing considerable difficulties in its efforts to expand trade with the Western countries and with the United States of America, in particular. The latter were not making reciprocal efforts and frequently raised barriers to trade by the adoption of discriminatory measures. Since the establishment of the European Common Market, the difficulty of securing United States dollars and other currencies had increased. The Committee on Contributions appeared to have disregarded all those facts in establishing the new scale of assessments. The situation would be entirely different if—as should be the case—Members were allowed to pay their contributions in their own national currency. In the present circumstances, the factor "difficulty in securing foreign currency" should be taken into account by making a proportional reduction similar to that made in respect of per caput income. For those reasons, his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.692 and Add.1.

12. The General Assembly, at its third and twelfth sessions, had decided that the "ceiling principle" should be applied only when normal conditions prevailed in the world. Such conditions could not be said to exist until a treaty of peace had been concluded with Germany, the two German States had been admitted to membership and the People's Republic of China had been reinstated in its rights in the United Nations. Pending those developments, the United States of America should not continue to benefit from the "ceiling principle" at the expense of the other Members. In fact, that country should bear the financial consequences of the present situation, for which it was itself responsible. It already benefited greatly from the fact that the United Nations Headquarters was situated in New York.

13. The minimum assessment of 0.04 per cent which the Committee on Contributions proposed to maintain, was, in his delegation's opinion, too high for many of the newly independent States.

14. The proposed new scale of assessments had been prepared on the basis of a study which had not been sufficiently thorough and objective. The new scale was not equitable and was not, therefore, acceptable to all Members. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.690 and Add.1, of which it had become a sponsor. In supporting that proposal, it was motivated, not by a desire to secure a small reduction in Bulgaria's assessment, but by the wish to secure a more careful preparation of the scale of assessments and to increase the mutual trust on which the Organization was based.

15. The CHAIRMAN suggested that consideration of the agenda item should be resumed at a later meeting.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 63

Public information activities of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/4770, A/4814, A/4927 and Corr.1)

16. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had before it, in addition to the Secretary-General's report (A/4927 and Corr.1), references to public information activities in paragraphs 37-40 of the Secretary-General's foreword to the 1962 budget estimates (A/4770), in annex III to the expenditure estimates (A/4770) and also in the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/4814, paras. 70-75).

17. Mr. TAVARES DE SA (Under-Secretary for Public Information) said that the documents before the Committee gave a picture of the manner in which General Assembly resolution 1558 (XV) had been implemented. They reflected substantial progress in the decentralization of the operations and services of the Office of Public Information (OPI), which was designed to achieve the maximum efficiency in output and impact at the lowest possible cost. Various plans and projects were described, such as the establishment of an audio-visual production unit in Africa, the strengthening of the existing production units in Asia and Latin America and the co-ordination of the production centres at Geneva and in Paris for the purpose of increasing the output of radio, television and cinema material for the under-developed countries.

18. Efforts to establish new information centres in Africa had been intensified. It was hoped to have forty information centres in full operation early in 1962. New centres had recently been opened in Colombo, Dar es Salaam and Usumbura. The establishment of two further centres was planned, one to serve the Caribbean area and the other the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua. Centres were also expected to be in operation shortly in Morocco, Senegal, Togo, the Ivory Coast, Cameroun and Nigeria. It was probable that other centres would also be established in the Middle East and in South-East Asia during 1962.

19. Every effort was being made to ensure that the information centres functioned efficiently and economically, and senior officers of the department maintained close contact with operations in all areas.

20. The staff for the new centres was being provided within the existing international manning tables of OPI, through a rationalization of output and of patterns of production in other areas of activity. However, further measures of that nature could not be taken without impairing the efficiency of the services rendered. Any sizable increase in the number of centres would necessarily require an expansion of the manpower and funds available to OPI. The recent growth in the membership of the United Nations had placed an increased responsibility on OPI, which the General Assembly had already recognized. Ever-widening responsibilities could not permanently continue to be met within existing budgetary limitations.

21. Radio was at present the most readily available and the most potentially effective medium for reaching the largest number of people in Africa. Priority would, therefore, be given to that medium in the immediate future. In addition, however, it was planned to increase the production of United Nations television programmes for Africa and for the other developing regions of the world during 1962. Every effort would be made to keep that expanding field of activity under strict budgetary control and to apply strict priorities, but the increasing demand for services could not be met without additional budgetary resources.

22. He wished to draw attention to two fellowship programmes that had been carried out in 1961 in implementation of recent resolutions and recommendations of the General Assembly—the Senior Fellowship Programme and the Triangular Fellowship Programme. Under the former programme, thirteen eminent editors and managing directors in the press and radio fields from Eastern and Western Europe, Latin America, Africa and Asia had been invited to spend two to four weeks at Headquarters, during which time they had been given an opportunity to study any questions concerning the United Nations that were of special interest to them. Under the latter programme, fourteen newspapermen and broadcasters from Latin America, Africa and Asia had been selected to take part in a six-week programme.

23. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, as a result of its consideration of the report of the Secretary-General on library resources and services^{1/} at the fifteenth session, the Fifth Committee had in its report^{2/} suggested, *inter alia*, that

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 56, document A/4545.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, document A/4630, para. 4 (b).

the Advisory Committee should consider the question of the improvement of library facilities at United Nations information centres and report to the General Assembly at its sixteenth session. At the same time, the Fifth Committee had suggested in paragraph 4 (a) of its report that the development of United Nations library services in general might be examined by the Committee of Experts on the Review of the Activities and Organization of the Secretariat. The latter Committee had made its findings available to the Advisory Committee (A/4776 and Corr.1, annex IX). The Committee of Experts had expressed the view that the Headquarters Library should include in its scope of work the task of rendering such assistance as it might find possible to the regional economic commissions and information centres in the development of their reference services. It had further suggested that that assistance might take such forms as guidance in the use of United Nations documents, expansion of the programme of indexing all United Nations documents and the preparation of topical bibliographies.

24. The Advisory Committee had examined the matter in conjunction with the 1962 estimates for public information activities. It had ascertained that all information centres maintained reference libraries. As those facilities were being used to an increasing extent by Governments, diplomatic representatives and members of the public, OPI attached great importance to their further development. The availability of library space was, therefore, an essential consideration in selecting office premises, and steps were being taken to equip all libraries with the required material. Hitherto, no special librarian posts had been considered necessary; the Director of the United Nations Library had been requested to prepare a special manual to assist the directors of centres and their staff in administering the libraries. Consideration would also be given to the possibility of holding occasional regional seminars for staff members who had been entrusted with library responsibilities in information centres. The Advisory Committee would keep the question under review and report on further developments in its annual reports on the budget estimates.

25. Mr. CUTTS (Australia), supported by Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America), Mr. ZARROUG (Sudan) and Mr. QUAO (Ghana), congratulated the Under-Secretary for Public Information on the excellent progress made by his Office over the past year.

26. Mr. GANEM (France) associated himself with the tribute to the Under-Secretary. In doing so, he recalled the unflagging interest of the late Secretary-General in the information activities of the United Nations, his constant endeavour to make them more international in character, and his unflinching support of the present Under-Secretary.

27. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) also expressed appreciation of the work done by OPI. He welcomed the new and encouraging trend in the United Nations information activities, particularly the expansion of services for delegations without any lowering in the standard of those provided for correspondents at Headquarters, and the publication of a useful and popular press review, *Coup d'œil*. He also approved of the manner in which the policy of decentralization recommended by the Committee of Experts on United Nations Public

Information in its report^{3/} was being implemented. It was most satisfactory that it had been possible to staff new information centres from Headquarters without affecting the quality of the work in New York and without any increase in the budget of OPI. His delegation hoped that more information centres would be opened and was willing to support any proposal to make more resources available for that purpose.

28. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) felt that gratifying progress had been made in the United Nations information activities since the fifteenth session, thanks largely to the practical experience of the new Under-Secretary. He was happy to note that new information centres had been opened, for that was one of the best ways of bringing information about the United Nations directly to the peoples of Member States. The Triangular Fellowship Programme and the Senior Fellowship Programme, from which several Argentinian journalists had greatly profited, were practical and well conceived. The publication of the review of the Press, Coup d'oeil, was an interesting and welcome innovation. OPI was to be congratulated on its practical approach to its task.

29. He expressed the hope that, while continuing to extend the activities of his Office, the Under-Secretary would bear in mind the \$5 million limit for the public information programme laid down in General Assembly resolution 1405 (XIV). In order not to exceed that ceiling, he should establish a clear system of priorities.

30. Mr. HODGES (United Kingdom) also expressed appreciation of the work done by OPI. He strongly endorsed the remarks by the previous speaker regarding the \$5 million ceiling and the need to establish a system of priorities for information activities.

31. Mr. FENOCHIO (Mexico) felt that the policy of decentralization now being applied by OPI was a sound one. He endorsed the remarks made by the Argentinian and United Kingdom representatives regarding the need to respect the \$5 million ceiling on public information expenditure.

32. Mr. ALLENDE (Chile) welcomed the dynamic approach to its activities which was now apparent in OPI, particularly the trend towards decentralization. He endorsed the remarks made by previous speakers regarding the value of Coup d'oeil.

33. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) said that OPI had made most satisfactory progress over the past year, particularly in opening new information centres in accordance with its policy of decentralization. He welcomed the two fellowship programmes and the plans to expand the radio and television programmes for Africa, Asia and Latin America. Referring to publications, he said he had heard that the United Nations Review was to appear in a different form; he would not express any views on the change until he had been able to examine the new publication.

34. Mr. LIM (Federation of Malaya) paid a tribute to the Under-Secretary for the new impetus he had given to the work of his Office. The Malayan delegation was happy to note that more information centres were planned. He expressed the hope that the needs of South-East Asia would be borne in mind when the situation of new centres was being considered.

35. Mr. TAVARES DE SA (Under-Secretary for Public Information) thanked the Committee for the appreciation it had expressed of the work of his Office and associated himself with the tribute paid by the French representative to the late Secretary-General.

36. Where the \$5 million ceiling on expenditure was concerned, the record of the past year showed that he was bearing it constantly in mind. The fact that it had been possible to open eight new information centres, instead of only three, without any increase in overall expenditure spoke for itself. However, the point would soon be reached at which no further expansion of activities would be possible without an increase in financial and staff resources. It would not, for instance, be possible to staff any more information centres from Headquarters, as the staff in New York had now been reduced to the minimum. The question needed serious consideration, for the Office would undoubtedly receive many more requests to establish new information centres, to which it would like to accede. The reduction of the Headquarters staff to its present level was not without its dangers; no member of the staff could be away from his post without detriment to the services rendered by the Office.

37. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should conclude its consideration of the item.

38. Mr. HASRAT (Afghanistan) said that he wished to make a statement on the item, but would be unable to do so at the present meeting.

39. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take action on the item forthwith on the understanding that the Afghan representative would be free to make his statement at a later meeting.

It was so decided.

40. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in the absence of any proposals, the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General (A/4927 and Corr.1), on the understanding that the information on the public information programmes contained in annex III to the expenditure estimates in the 1962 budget estimates (A/4770) would continue to be provided and that, in consultation with the Consultative Panel on Public Information, the Secretary-General would report to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session on any special questions not covered by the material contained in that annex.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 64

Personnel questions (continued):*

(a) Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat (A/4776 and Corr.1, chap. IV; A/4794, paras. 31-40; A/4901, A/C.5/890, A/C.5/L.683/Rev.2, A/C.5/L.684, A/C.5/L.686, A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3) (continued);*

(b) Proportion of fixed-term staff (A/C.5/891) (continued)*

41. The CHAIRMAN announced that Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Republic had signified their desire to become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1 and 2, which was now, therefore, a thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3).

42. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) said that he wished to take up some of the points made during the debate with regard to the thirteen-Power draft resolution

*Resumed from the 882nd meeting.

^{3/} Ibid., Thirteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 55, document A/3928.

(A/C.5/L.689). That proposal incorporated most of the recommendations contained in the report of the Committee of Experts on the Review of the Activities and Organization of the Secretariat (A/4776 and Corr.1), the only points of divergence being operative paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b) of the draft resolution, relating to the minimum number of staff members from each Member State, and to populations and contributions. The sponsors had decided to formulate their own recommendations on those points because it had been clear from the debate that the majority of the Committee was not in favour of the corresponding recommendations of the Committee of Experts.

43. The sponsors felt that the Secretary-General should be given some guidance about how to deal with the problem of geographical distribution, a view that was shared by the Committee of Experts, the only differences of opinion being about the content of the directives and the amount of latitude to be left to the Secretary-General.

44. Operative paragraph 1 (c) of the United States draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.2) gave equal importance to the factors of United Nations membership, the financial contribution of States and the population of States without indicating to which factors greater weight should be given; but that was precisely the crux of the problem. As the words "due regard" in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter had been given such divergent interpretations, it was now essential to define their meaning. It was also necessary to stress that membership in the United Nations was a factor of paramount importance.

45. With regard to the weight to be given to the factor of population, he pointed out that the words "equal regard" in operative paragraph 3 (b) of the joint draft resolution did not give undue importance to that factor, since it was only one of a number of factors to be included in the formula and would also be applied progressively. The sponsors were leaving it to the Secretary-General to devise the precise formula to be followed.

46. He would welcome suggestions aimed at improving the wording of the joint draft resolution, provided that its spirit was preserved. In particular, the guiding principles given to the Secretary-General in operative paragraphs 3 (a) and (b) must be maintained as they stood.

47. If States were unable to present enough suitable candidates to fill their quota, candidates from other countries of the same region might be appointed on a fixed-term basis. Even when quotas were filled, it was desirable, in the interests of greater flexibility, that 25 per cent of the staff should hold fixed-term rather than permanent contracts.

48. The Soviet Union representative's objection that, if the existing contractual obligations were maintained, any redistribution of posts would have to be made at the expense of the fixed-term staff, most of whom were nationals of the socialist States, was an over-simplification of the problem and failed to take account of staff turn-over. In that connexion, he would find it helpful if the Secretariat provided some information on the normal rate of turn-over.

49. Mr. TAZI (Morocco) said that all delegations and the Committee of Experts had been impressed with the existing imbalance and inequality in the geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat. Some delegations had counselled prudence in ap-

proaching that delicate question and others had preferred to place the whole responsibility on the Acting Secretary-General. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3) had followed a middle course.

50. The second revision of the United States draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.2) represented a considerable improvement over the earlier version, which merely maintained the *status quo*. In that regard, he recalled that the Director of Personnel had stated at the 863rd meeting that, in the absence of new instructions, the Secretariat would continue to apply the present policy. Nevertheless, the second revision was still unsatisfactory to his delegation, because it left everything to the discretion of the Acting Secretary-General. While it was true that the Secretary-General was responsible for recruiting personnel, he discharged that responsibility in accordance with rules laid down by the General Assembly; if the Assembly failed to give the Acting Secretary-General the instructions he expected, his future reports would merely follow the same lines as in the past.

51. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had no intention of imposing any rigid formula; they had merely wished to submit a text that took account of all reasonable criteria and that would facilitate specific measures by the Acting Secretary-General that would prove satisfactory to all Member States. The proposal would have the further advantage of confirming the principle of the sovereign equality of Member States. The Committee had an excellent opportunity to settle the problem and to strengthen the confidence which Member States placed in the Organization. He, therefore, hoped that the joint draft resolution would be adopted.

52. Mr. JAYARATNE (Ceylon) said that the issue of geographical distribution was one of the most perplexing problems before the United Nations because, for historical reasons, a small group of nations enjoyed a dominant position in the Secretariat and were naturally opposed to any change. Several arguments had been advanced which, in his opinion, raised irrelevant questions that might cause the Committee to lose sight of the principal issue.

53. The first argument was that the paramount considerations in the recruitment of staff should be efficiency, competence and integrity. He supported that proposition, but failed to appreciate its relevance to the issue under consideration. The General Assembly had already held that the requirement of the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity was not inconsistent with the principle of broad geographical distribution and no one believed those qualities were monopolized by any nation or region. Moreover, the concept of standards was relative and not absolute; an expert familiar with local conditions might in certain circumstances be more useful than one with higher qualifications. A Secretariat staffed by personnel drawn exclusively from one social environment, whatever their degree of competence, was not likely to be a sensitive instrument for international action.

54. The second argument was that the Fifth Committee should refrain from doing anything which might create difficulties for the Acting Secretary-General or infringe upon his responsibilities under the Charter. He could not agree with that view, for the problem of geographical distribution was not a

mere administrative matter but a political problem of the first magnitude. For the Committee to convey the various views expressed by its members without indicating any specific lines of action would be a sheer abdication of its responsibility. The proper course would be to provide the Secretary-General with precise guidance on the policy to be followed in meeting the requirement of equitable geographical distribution, but to leave him free to decide how the policy should be applied in practice. His delegation could not accept an interpretation of the Charter giving the Secretary-General exclusive responsibility in matters concerning the Secretariat. The Secretary-General appointed staff under regulations established by the General Assembly, to which he was fully accountable.

55. Another argument was that the Fifth Committee should do nothing to affect the careers of existing staff members. While no one wanted to cause hardship, revolutionary changes affecting nations, institutions and social systems inevitably had their impact on individual lives. It was not unusual for national Governments, in certain circumstances, to terminate the services of persons employed in their public services and that situation had arisen on two occasions in Ceylon. That was neither an unusual, inhuman or improper course of action in view of the fact that, within limits, the individuals affected were compensated for the loss of their careers.

56. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had given only minimal weight to the factor of membership. Their purpose had been to broaden the base of the Secretariat as far as was practicable and to reduce the importance given to contributions. Only a minority of Members paid significant contributions towards the expenses of the United Nations and if they honoured their obligations, it was because they, too, needed the United Nations, which, in difficult world situations provided an alternative to ceaseless international competition and friction. No nation should, therefore, expect to have more of its nationals employed in the Secretariat because it made a greater contribution to the expenses of the Organization. Contributions had been used as the basis for computing the entitlement of Member States in the early stages of the United Nations; the Organization had then been predominantly made up of countries in a position to pay substantial contributions with the result that the staff had democratically reflected the membership. Conditions were now very different and if weight continued to be given to the factor of contributions, it would result in the perpetuation and even the exaggeration of the existing imbalances in the staff. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had included the factor of contributions mainly in recognition of the fact that, for some years to come, the countries which were able to make substantial contributions in money could also make substantial contributions in personnel. The situation must, however, be progressively improved, until the principle of the equality of Member States was fully reflected in the Secretariat.

57. While his delegation agreed with the Polish representative that the term "geographical" was used in Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter in a political sense, his delegation felt that the present political divisions between Member States should not be rigidly reflected in the composition of the Secretariat, because international relations were subject to change.

58. The joint draft resolution already represented a compromise between the views of those in favour of immediate action and those in favour of gradual change. The sponsors had taken account of the views of many other Member States and had done their utmost to ensure that the stability and integrity of the Secretariat would not be seriously affected, that the minimal changes proposed would be carried out under the guidance of the Secretary-General and that contractual obligations would be safeguarded to the fullest possible extent.

59. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) urged the sponsors of both draft resolutions to consult together in an effort to reach an agreement which would have the support of more than a bare majority of Member States.

60. His delegation had no objection to the substance or the wording of the United States draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.2). He regretted that the unjustified impression had been created that its effect would be to impose a moratorium on the question of geographical distribution. Since the United States representative had displayed a spirit of compromise in submitting two revisions to his original text, he hoped that he might be able to bridge the gap between the two proposals by modifying certain points in his proposal; for example, in operative paragraph 1 (c), he might increase from four to five the nationals from each Member State to be included in the staff of the Secretariat and in operative paragraph 2, he might give a specific indication of the period of time in which the Secretary-General would be asked to bring about an improvement in the geographical distribution of the Secretariat.

61. With regard to the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3), he felt that, since there was broad general agreement on the principles involved, a compromise could be reached on certain points of detail without jeopardizing the sponsors' intentions. He agreed that the *status quo* should be maintained in regard to G-5 staff pending completion of the study proposed in operative paragraph 2, but felt that the same principle should have been applied to the staff of TAB and the Special Fund. He recalled that the late Secretary-General had had doubts on the matter, which the Acting Secretary-General might well share; in any case, it was not unreasonable to ask that the Acting Secretary-General should be given an opportunity to study the matter and to state his views at the seventeenth session. A decision at the present time might well be irrevocable. The sponsors should take account of the fact that no delegation opposed a wider geographical distribution; a difference of opinion had arisen only on the arrangement that would be most feasible and desirable. His delegation would welcome a statement of the views, not only of the Acting Secretary-General, but also of the Executive Directors of the agencies concerned.

62. With regard to the actual formula proposed in operative paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b), which was the major controversial issue, a comparison of the present situation with that prevailing in 1960, when the only criterion had been the size of a Member State's contribution, showed how much progress had been made. There was now a new set of generally accepted criteria and it seemed to him that nothing would be lost if the sponsors refrained from suggesting any rigid formula for their application, especially since such a formula might not prove practicable. The question should be further studied at the seventeenth

session in the light of the Acting Secretary-General's report.

63. Some changes might be made in the wording of the joint draft resolution. It would be more in accordance with the views expressed in the Committee, if operative paragraph 6 stated that the Committee was merely establishing certain guiding principles for the Secretary-General to follow and asking for his views. Moreover, the formula proposed in operative paragraph 3 was very rigid and his delegation doubted the wisdom of adopting it until its full implications were known. It would be preferable to leave it to the Acting Secretary-General to propose a formula for implementing the principle of geographical distribution at the seventeenth session.

64. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said, in response to the Irish representative's appeal, that the sponsors of the two draft resolutions had already engaged in consultations, but that no progress had been made.

65. He requested that priority be given in the voting to the joint draft resolution under rule 132 of the rules of procedure. The Committee's proceedings would be simplified if it had a single text before it. The joint draft resolution was more suitable for that purpose, since it was more comprehensive and could stand even if some controversial points were eliminated, which was not true of the United States proposal. If priority was accorded to the joint draft resolution, the sponsors would be able to take account of a number of suggestions that had been made, in particular by the Irish representative. It would be willing to accept an amendment to operative paragraph 6 along the lines that representative had suggested as well as an amendment giving the Secretary-General time to implement the proposals.

66. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) took strong exception to the Indian representative's proposal. Despite the plea of the representative of Ire-

land for further consultations among the sponsors of the two proposals, the representative of India was proposing that the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3) should be given a priority to which it was not entitled merely because the Committee would find it easier to work on one text than two. His own delegation had twice revised its draft resolution in an effort to reach agreement, but the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had not moved one inch towards the United States view. In the circumstances, there was more of a case for adjourning the discussion for further consultations than for according priority to one draft resolution.

67. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) pointed out that the joint draft resolution bore an earlier date than the United States draft resolution and therefore had chronological priority in any event. He did not insist that it should be put to the vote at the present meeting, but felt that, as previous consultations had failed to lead to a compromise, further prolonged discussion in the Committee was likely to prove futile.

68. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) pointed out that his delegation's draft resolution in its original form (A/C.5/L.683) had been submitted one week before the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3). He requested the Chairman to give a ruling on which of the two proposals before the Committee would normally be voted upon first in the absence of any motion for priority.

69. The CHAIRMAN considered that, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the United States draft resolution would normally be voted upon first, notwithstanding the fact that it had been the subject of two revisions. However, since the Committee was seized of a motion to give priority in the voting to another draft resolution, that motion would have to be voted upon first.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.