



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 64:</i>	
<i>Personnel questions (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat (continued);</i>	
(b) <i>Proportion of fixed-term staff (continued).</i>	189

Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).

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.1, A/C.5/L.684, A/C.5/L.686, A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1) (continued);
- (b) **Proportion of fixed-term staff (A/C.5/891) (continued)**

1. Mr. HODGES (United Kingdom) said that the Polish representative had made a most interesting statement at the 879th meeting, to which he would like to reply. He endorsed the opinion quoted by the Polish representative that, in a truly international civil service, the national loyalties of members of the staff could and must be transformed into international loyalties. The United Kingdom delegation's point was not that the Secretary-General should recruit "émigrés" or persons whose ties with their home country were broken; its point had been that the Eastern European countries' share of posts in the Secretariat might be more easily filled if the Governments of those countries allowed the Secretary-General to recruit freely, without insisting that all recruiting operations should be channelled through Governments. Lastly, the Polish representative had asserted that the United Kingdom delegation's attitude would be inconsistent with the obligations stemming from paragraph 3 C of article 9 of the draft treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests (A/4772), which the United Kingdom had circulated. The fact was that the provision in question represented a compromise which the United Kingdom Government had accepted simply in order to reach the greatest possible measure of agreement with the Soviet Union on the vital problem of discontinuance of nuclear tests. The United Kingdom hoped that that compromise would not create the sort of difficulties for the control organization that were experienced in United Nations recruitment. The United Kingdom Government was being neither inconsistent nor illogical in expressing that hope; and in emphasizing the greater responsibility and initiative given to the Secretary-General by the United Nations Charter.

2. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors—Afghanistan, Ceylon, Ghana, Iraq, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Sudan, Venezuela and Yugoslavia—draft resolution A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1 on the

geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat. The United States representative, in introducing the original version of his delegation's draft resolution on the same subject (A/C.5/L.683), had said that the acting Secretary-General would need time to study the question and that his hands should not be tied by imposing any rigid formula upon him; but if that draft resolution had been adopted, its effect would have been to postpone a settlement of the matter for more than a year, since the question of the appointment of a Secretary-General would arise again in 1962. Furthermore, even in its revised form (A/C.5/L.683/rev.1), which was an improvement, the United States draft resolution did not give the Acting Secretary-General any specific guidance regarding the action he was being requested to take in operative paragraph 2. The Secretariat could not solve the problem of geographical distribution on its own initiative, and the fact that the Acting Secretary-General was new to his office made it all the more necessary for the General Assembly to give him some guidance. Lastly, it was incumbent on the Fifth Committee to express its views on the report of the Committee of Experts on the Activities and Organization of the Secretariat (A/4776 and Corr.1), which was before it by virtue of General Assembly resolution 1559 (XV); otherwise, the same problem would continue to exist and the Secretariat might feel that the Committee had tacitly accepted the formula proposed in paragraphs 74 and 75 of the report of the Committee of Experts. Yet a number of delegations had pointed out that that formula was not satisfactory and would simply increase the rigidity of the existing rules. That was why the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had thought it advisable to lay down some targets and principles rather than a rigid formula. The purpose of the two draft resolutions was exactly the same; only the methods differed. At all events, the Fifth Committee had a responsibility to give the chief administrative officer of the Organization the guidance he expected from it. It was not a question of curtailing the acting Secretary-General's freedom of action, but of allowing him to exercise his judgement in accordance with principles laid down by the General Assembly.

3. The provisions of the joint draft resolution, and particularly those of operative paragraph 1 (a) and (c), paragraph 2, paragraph 3 (c), (d) and (e), and paragraphs 4 and 5, were based on the unanimous or majority recommendations submitted by the Committee of Experts in chapter IV of its report, the only exception being the unsatisfactory formula he had previously mentioned. The sponsors of the draft resolution considered that the principle of geographical distribution should not be applied to each department or service separately, but to the Secretariat as a whole, thus permitting the adoption of a more flexible recruitment policy. Lastly, the sponsors did not expect all the provisions of the draft resolution to be implemented immediately. The Secretary-General

might perhaps need five years or more to achieve the targets proposed.

4. With regard to the General Service category, it seemed illogical to apply the principle of geographical distribution to staff at the G-5 level at Headquarters only; hence the reference, in operative paragraph 1 (a), to "staff of equivalent level at other duty stations". The staff referred to in operative paragraph 1 (c) was recruited by the Secretary-General and the Director of Personnel, and it was therefore logical to apply the principle of geographical distribution to such staff, but in a flexible manner, by including the posts concerned in the total subject to geographical distribution. That did not apply, for example, to the International Court of Justice, the staff of which was recruited by the Registrar; the position of such staff was dealt with in paragraph 5. Paragraph 3 (a) and (b) might be somewhat controversial, but they were meant only as a guide towards the achievement of certain targets over a comparatively long period. The sponsors of the draft resolution had attempted to find a more satisfactory formula than that of the Committee of Experts for the weight to be given to the population factor (A/4776 and Corr.1, para. 75 (ii)), for the Committee's formula presented no advantage for the two-thirds of the Member States which had a population of less than ten million; the sponsors had also tried to give some indication of the weight to be given to the population factor in relation to the size of contributions. They had, however, left it to the Acting Secretary-General to work out the formula which would benefit the greatest number of Member States. In operative paragraph 4, the sponsors had wished to stress that application of the principle of geographical distribution should be without prejudice to the contractual rights of staff members holding permanent or fixed-term contracts.

5. In conclusion, he pointed out that the joint draft resolution simply gave the Acting Secretary-General the specific guidance which was strictly necessary, whereas, if the revised draft resolution submitted by the United States were adopted, the acting Secretary-General would have no alternative but to apply the unsatisfactory formula proposed by the Committee of Experts.

6. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that the aims of the two draft resolutions before the Committee were very similar. Everyone recognized that the Acting Secretary-General would have to take urgent steps to remedy the present imbalance. But if no consensus of opinion emerged, the Committee should not give him confusing and obscure directives which might prevent him from reaching his own conclusions. In any case, the revised draft resolution submitted by the United States, which was based on the principle of the continuity of the functions of the Secretary-General, "Requested the Acting Secretary-General to report to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly"; hence, the argument put forward by the representative of Nepal had little weight. The United States had amended operative paragraph 1 (c) of its original draft resolution, not in order to establish a formula but to make it possible for the Acting Secretary-General to do so.

7. It was in no way his intention to defer the settlement of the problem nor did he have any reason for such action. Should the joint draft resolution be adopted, it would be difficult for the Acting Secretary-General not to view it as a specific directive. The arguments

put forward in support of paragraph 1 (c) of the proposal were of questionable validity. If the principle of geographical distribution were applied to the posts in question, Member States' contributions to the programmes would likewise have to be taken into account. In that connexion, he would point out that the United States provided some 40 per cent of the funds for the technical assistance programmes, but the number of United States experts had never exceeded 11 per cent. He found the arguments put forward by the Secretary-General on the matter (A/4794, para. 39) much more convincing than those of the representative of Nepal.

8. While he was most anxious to find common ground with other delegations, he trusted that the Committee, in laying down directives for the Acting Secretary-General, would not make it morally incumbent on him to follow them. The important point was to call his attention to the fact that the Fifth Committee wanted action in the matter. It was necessary to proceed with caution and to avoid prejudicing the interests of the under-developed countries by taking decisions that might impair the effectiveness of programmes of particular interest to those countries.

9. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) said that, as a result of the extensive documentation prepared by the Secretariat and the special interest of Member States in the question of the geographical distribution of the staff, the Committee's discussion had been broad in scope and had at times embraced more general problems such as the structure of the Secretariat and the concept of an international civil service. At a time when the admission of many new Members was bringing about considerable changes in the composition of the United Nations, such a discussion could do nothing but good.

10. The Secretariat must have the efficiency, competency and integrity required by the Charter, and at the same time be sufficiently international to reflect the outlook of the various parts of the world. The international civil servant must be fully independent of his Government and be accountable only to the United Nations. Argentine nationals were, therefore, recruited for service with the United Nations on a competitive basis and on the strength of their personal qualifications. The Argentine delegation was satisfied with the efficiency and integrity of the Secretariat and any criticisms it had expressed had concerned matters of administrative policy and not the manner in which the Secretariat was discharging its duties. Argentina had constantly pressed for Latin America to be better represented at the highest level and the situation had in fact improved in that respect. There was still, however, an imbalance and inequality in the geographical distribution of the staff which had impressed the Committee of Experts, and their recommendations (A/4776 and Corr.1, chapter IV) should serve as the basis for any solution.

11. The Argentine delegation endorsed in principle the criteria proposed by the Committee of Experts, particularly those in paragraph 74 of its report, although it had some doubts regarding the weight to be given to the population factor. The complicated formulae worked out to take account of the views expressed during the discussion and, especially, of the desire that the minimum number of posts allocated to each Member State should be fixed at more than two, might result in substantial improvement. The Argentine delegation hoped that the final formula adopted would be

as close as possible to the recommendations of the Committee of Experts.

12. The joint draft resolution was an attempt to reconcile the different attitudes and to put forward a solution that would be approved by most delegations. The text was generally acceptable, but he was doubtful of some provisions which departed from the Experts' recommendations, particularly the proposal to fix the minimum number of staff for each Member State at five. He also had reservations about the sponsors' proposal to increase the proportion of fixed-term posts to 25 per cent. As far back as 1956, the Salary Review Committee had expressed similar reservations, based on considerations of efficient administration, staff morale and promotion opportunities which were still valid.

13. The Argentine delegation was not fully convinced of the need for applying the principle of geographical distribution to the categories of staff referred to in operative paragraph 1 (c) of the joint draft resolution. Its doubts had been strengthened by the arguments the United States representative had advanced.

14. The revised text of the United States draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.1) was much to be preferred to the original, although it would amount to instituting a moratorium that would postpone a settlement of the problem for a year. In other respects, its recommendations were quite acceptable to the Argentine delegation, which preferred, in particular, the way in which the proposal reflected the Committee's views. He hoped, however, that it would be possible to combine the two draft resolutions into a single text, especially as the differences between the two were insignificant.

15. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said he was concerned to note that so many speakers appeared to be primarily concerned with the national interests of their countries. Reference had been made to "entitlement" of Members and groups of Members to Secretariat posts, to "gains" and "losses" arising out of the application of one or another formula. That view was wholly out of line with the Charter, whose provisions were designed to ensure the efficiency of the Secretariat and not to confer "rights" on Member States. Australia did not regard its national interests as being affected by the fact that the number of Australian nationals holding Secretariat posts was below the median of the desirable range.

16. The members of the Committee of Experts had been unable to reach agreement and their recommendations did not commend themselves to the Committee; there was no objection to the Fifth Committee doing their work over again but care must be taken not to attempt to produce a final formula which would be forced upon the Acting Secretary-General. The Committee should respect the Acting Secretary-General's wish to be given time to study the problems confronting the Organization and should request him simply to press on as best he could with the task of improving the geographical distribution of the staff. The revised United States draft resolution rightly laid no claim to provide a final solution, but it made the consensus of the the Committee clear to the Secretary-General. Operative paragraph 1 (c), for instance, indicated that weight should be given to certain factors but did not specify how much weight should be given; that indicated the spirit in which the proposal had been drafted. It was accordingly acceptable to the Committee as a whole. The word "moratorium" had been unfairly used in regard to operative paragraph 2, for if there was

any moratorium, it related to the development of a final formula and not to geographical imbalance. The Australian delegation could support the draft resolution as a whole, as it was uncontroversial in character.

17. The joint draft resolution was the outcome of sincere efforts to produce an acceptable and essentially moderate formula. He considered, however, that it attempted to be too specific.

18. Operative paragraph 1 (a) provided that the principle of geographical distribution would apply to posts at the principal level of the General Service category (G-5), yet no delegation had as yet seriously suggested that those posts should be filled by international recruitment. The consequence was that locally recruited staff were treated as international staff for the purposes of geographical distribution. That abnormal situation would probably be brought to an end when the Acting Secretary-General made the special survey recommended in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, but the Australian delegation would prefer it to be corrected at once.

19. The proposal to apply the principle of geographical distribution to the staff of TAB and the Special Fund was unacceptable to his delegation. Although a majority of the Committee of Experts had recommended it, his delegation endorsed the very pertinent observations that had been so well expressed by the late Secretary-General in paragraph 39 of document A/4794.

20. His delegation believed that it was inappropriate for the General Assembly to determine the recruitment policy of those bodies, but it would not object to a proposal that the views of the Assembly should be made known to TAB and the Special Fund. He did not understand the attitude of some delegations which proposed to treat TAB and the Special Fund in such a peremptory manner whilst elsewhere in the Assembly they were asking that voluntary contributions to those programmes should be increased.

21. As it stood, operative paragraph 2 seemed to imply that certain General Service posts should be made subject to geographical distribution; that impression could be corrected by inserting the words "if any" between the words "posts" and "should".

22. In operative paragraph 3, there was a contradiction in the English text of sub-paragraph (a) between the words "target" and "minimum", and it would be advisable for the words "on the basis of membership" to be deleted. As to the substance of that paragraph, the sponsors of the draft resolution were laying down the principles and factors by which the Acting Secretary-General should be guided in his efforts to achieve a more equitable geographical distribution, and they said that there should be a minimum of five staff members from each Member State. Certain delegations admitted that they were not able or willing to provide five staff members to the Secretariat but argued that they wished to have recognized a right which they could claim later when they were in a position to do so. However, the adoption of a formula which bore no relation to present possibilities would gravely compromise the Secretary-General's chances of success. It was, in addition, to be wondered whether the 515 posts thus reserved could be left vacant, or whether the Secretary-General would be free to fill them as he thought best or in accordance with other criteria, or whether they should be regarded as "belonging" to some geographical area. At all events, if the sponsors of the draft resolution were not willing

to adjust the minimum number of posts recommended by them, they could at least state that the target set was a long-term one. A compromise might be found between their recommendation and that of the Committee of Experts by advising the acting Secretary-General to aim at recruiting two to five staff members from each of the Member States that might be regarded as being on the "minimum range".

23. His delegation, as also the Committee of Experts, was fully aware of the importance of the factors of population and contributions. However, it seemed arbitrary to decide that both factors should be given equal weight. He would therefore prefer that the expression "equal regard to be paid" should be replaced by the words "due regard to be paid", or that the first six words of sub-paragraph (b) should be deleted. As the relative importance of the two factors deserved careful study, the Secretary-General must not be obliged to accept a solution which placed them on a footing of equality.

24. He was glad to see that the sponsors of the draft resolution requested in operative paragraph 4 that due regard should be paid to existing contractual obligations, because it was important to avoid impairing the morale and the efficiency of the Secretariat by dismissing staff before the termination of their contracts. Operative paragraphs 5 and 6 were fully acceptable.

25. Mr. ITO (Japan) welcomed the United States revised draft resolution. Not only was its wording concise and exact but it had the great merit of entrusting the question to the Acting Secretary-General without imposing rigid decisions on him or limiting his freedom of action. The Acting Secretary-General naturally needed general directives, but it was his business to sum up the consensus of the Committee's discussions and recommendation, and to take the practical measures he thought fit. The Japanese delegation therefore had no objection to the adoption of a draft resolution conceived in general terms. While he was not sure that each Member State should have a minimum of four of its nationals in the Secretariat, he was prepared to support the United States draft resolution in its present form. It would, however, be useful if constructive suggestions could be incorporated in that text for the benefit of the Acting Secretary-General, on condition, of course, that they had the support of the majority of the Committee.

26. Turning to the joint draft resolution, he paid a tribute to the earnest efforts of the delegations which had drafted it and said that he would have no difficulty in approving the preamble and operative paragraphs 2, 4, 5 and 6. Operative paragraphs 1 and 3 seemed more debatable. His delegation felt that it would be preferable to draw the attention of the Executive Chairman of TAB and the Managing Director of the Special Fund to the desirability of equitable geographical distribution; in other words, the provisions of operative paragraph 5 concerning the International Court of Justice and other bodies should be applied to TAB and the Special Fund, rather than the principle of geographical distribution. He would like to know what the members of the Committee thought on that subject, since the Acting Secretary-General's policy would be based on the Committee's opinion. Subject to those considerations, his delegation reserved its position on the joint draft resolution. It hoped, moreover, that the sponsors of the draft resolutions would reach agreement on a single text, given the fact that the two drafts differed

more in their method of presentation than in their intention.

27. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) deeply regretted that there had been attempts to give the impression, so soon after the unanimous election of the Acting Secretary-General, that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution were seeking to tie the Secretary-General's hands. U Thant had himself stated that he would make it a rule to consult the Fifth Committee and take account of its views, and the Director of Personnel had informed the Committee at the 879th meeting that if there was a consensus of opinion in the Committee on any of the major points involved, particularly on the method of determining the desirable range or the target figure for posts to be occupied by the nationals of each Member State in the Secretariat, the Acting Secretary-General would be glad to take it into account. As the very terms of operative paragraph 3 showed, the sponsors of the joint draft resolution restricted themselves to requesting the General Assembly to recommend that the Acting Secretary-General should be guided by certain principles and factors. If there was anything against those terms, it was the business of the Acting Secretary-General's representative to object. Rightly anxious not to restrict the Acting Secretary-General's freedom of action, the sponsors had reflected at length on the ideas set forth in the draft and had pondered each word.

28. With regard to criticisms of the text itself, he pointed out in connexion with operative paragraph 1 (a) that the sponsors had restricted themselves to taking up the recommendation of the Committee of Experts (A/4776, para. 53) regarding G-5 posts. They knew that there were powerful arguments for and against the inclusion of such posts in the categories subject to geographical distribution; they thought the Committee should not at that stage prejudge the results of the survey which, according to the Experts, should be made on the entire range of General Service posts, and that while those results were being awaited, the posts in question should continue to be provisionally included amongst those which were subject to geographical distribution. In that connexion he saw no reason why the words "if any" should not be inserted between the words "posts" and "should" in operative paragraph 2, as proposed by the Australian representative.

29. In operative paragraph 1 (c), too, the sponsors had taken up a recommendation by the Committee of Experts, and one of the few which the eight experts had formulated unanimously (A/4776 and Corr.1, para. 57). In his report (A/4794, para. 39), the late Secretary-General had neither supported nor opposed the Experts' proposal concerning TAB and the Special Fund; he had simply urged that it be the subject of careful reflection. That was exactly what the sponsors had done. They all represented under-developed countries which were receiving technical assistance and could not do without it. It would therefore be odd, to say the least, if those delegations, as some speakers were given to understand, attempted to have adopted a measure which might have harmful repercussions on the operations of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. Iraq, for instance, which was receiving infinitely valuable technical assistance, contributed twice as much to the Expanded Programme and the Special Fund as it did to the United Nations regular budget. Nevertheless, the sponsors of the draft categorically rejected the idea that there should be a relationship between the

size of voluntary contributions to those two programmes and the number of nationals from the donor countries on the staff of TAB and the Special Fund. Both were United Nations programmes, and therefore the principle of the equality of Member States was applicable. If the formula tying the distribution of posts to the size of contributions was now being rejected as unsatisfactory for other United Nations bodies, it should also be rejected when it came to TAB and the Special Fund.

30. With regard to operative paragraph 3 (a), the Australian representative did not seem to have grasped its essential significance. In that case too, the sponsors had wished to follow the recommendations of the Committee of Experts, that the first factor to be taken into consideration for the distribution of posts should be membership of the Organization. That paragraph meant that by the very fact of its membership in the Organization, each State would be able to have at least five of its nationals in the Secretariat. That figure represented a target for each State and the more easily a State could spare the services of some of its nationals, the shorter would be the time taken to reach it. That was, moreover, a minimum figure, since on the basis of the other factors each Member State would be able to claim other posts in the Secretariat over and above the five to which it was entitled as a Member of the Organization. In view of the need to improve geographical distribution, and of the views that had been expressed in the Committee, the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had considered that a minimum figure of five posts was not too high.

31. Most of the criticisms which had been levelled at the draft resolution seemed to indicate that the critics were adopting a very rigid attitude with regard to the question of geographical distribution. They were clinging desperately to the formula linking the desirable quota of posts to the proportional contribution of States to the United Nations budget, although the debates during the fifteenth session and the current session, as well as the report of the Committee of Experts, had shown beyond doubt that that formula was not satisfactory and that consequently the Secretary-General could not retain it.

32. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had taken pains to set forth what had seemed to them to be the consensus of opinion in the Committee so that the Secretary-General might obtain the wished-for guidance. If the results of the vote showed that the sponsors were mistaken and that there was no consensus of opinion in the Committee, the Acting Secretary-General would clearly not be able to obtain any guidance and would be entirely free to draw his own conclusions.

33. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) considered that the joint draft resolution of which he was a sponsor would at last permit the principle of the sovereign equality of all States to be made manifest in the every-day tasks of the Secretariat, which would then be able to enjoy the inestimable advantage of being aided by all countries and all peoples belonging to the United Nations. In operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (a), which was a crucial passage of the draft resolution, the sponsors had fixed, in respect of each Member State, a minimum target to be achieved under precise conditions. To carry that recommendation out would in effect be to acknowledge the right of each Member State to be represented on the Secretariat by virtue of its membership of the Organization.

34. Those who doubted whether it was opportune to apply the principle of geographical distribution to certain categories of staff which had hitherto not been affected should bear in mind that such a decision could not fail to have a fruitful and stimulating effect on the United Nations. He therefore hoped that the joint draft resolution would be unanimously approved.

35. Mr. ARNOULD (Canada), noting that the representatives of Iraq and of the United States had both expressed concern that the Secretary-General should not be deprived of his freedom of action, said that the consensus of opinion in the Committee should be formulated by its members so that the Acting Secretary-General might be guided accordingly. It was clearly impossible for the question of geographical distribution to be settled once and for all, because it must be constantly reconsidered in the light of the changes taking place within the Organization itself. The Committee must therefore attempt to determine what could be done at the present time and in the present circumstances to bring about an improvement in the geographical distribution.

36. It was obvious that the old formula, under which posts had been allotted to Member States in proportion to their contributions, had now been rejected by all delegations and that there was general agreement that three additional factors should be taken into consideration. The first of those, namely, membership in the Organization, was considered by his delegation to be of the utmost importance.

37. With regard to posts in the G-5 category, he was willing to accept the point of view of the Iraqi representative. He considered that the drafting of operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution would be improved if the words "if any" were inserted between the words "posts" and "should".

38. He expressed the hope that the other delegations would understand the concern that he could not help feeling with regard to the possible threat to the operations of TAB and the Special Fund, the programmes of which had been financed by Canada from the outset to an extent of which it was proud. Although it was true that the staff of TAB and of the Special Fund were recruited by the United Nations Office of Personnel, it should not be forgotten that appointments were the prerogative of the two senior officials who administered those programmes. The appositeness of the comments made by the late Secretary-General in that connexion (A/4794, para. 39) could not be overstressed. He had pointed out, *inter alia*, that those programmes had their own governing bodies, which were responsible for assessing the programmes and for laying down policies. However, policies could not be dissociated from the way the programme was run, and that included all matters pertaining to personnel. Under those conditions, if the sponsors of the joint draft resolution could not see their way to deleting sub-paragraph (c) of operative paragraph 1 and to mentioning TAB and the Special Fund in operative paragraph 5, then he would prefer that a paragraph should be added in which the General Assembly would recommend that the Technical Assistance Committee and the Governing Council of the Special Fund should study the question of geographical distribution in the light of the views expressed in the Fifth Committee. Such a recommendation would undoubtedly be productive of the results desired by all the members of the Committee.

39. With regard to the minimum number of posts that would be reserved in the Secretariat for nationals of each Member State, he preferred the more general formula put forward by the United States representative (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.1, para. 1 (c)) to that given in joint draft resolution A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1, para. 3 (a), the implementation of which would give rise to difficulties in the Secretariat. If, for example, twenty or thirty Member States were unable to supply more than one or two staff members to the Secretariat, the posts which should, properly speaking, have been reserved for those States would have to be filled by nationals of other States.

40. Since the United Nations was composed mainly of small States, sixty-three of which had a population of 10 million or less, the application of the formula proposed in operative paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (b), of joint draft resolution A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1 would

also give rise to difficulties. The use of so precise and rigid a wording as "equal regard" seemed hardly judicious. Sub-paragraphs (c) and (d), on the other hand, were entirely acceptable, but in sub-paragraph (e), the percentage of fixed-term staff should preferably not exceed 20 per cent. In operative paragraph 4, the word "due" should be replaced by "full".

41. Both draft resolutions were clearly intended to fulfil a similar purpose, namely, to set forth the consensus of opinion in the Committee so that the Acting Secretary-General could be guided by it while retaining his freedom of action. It seemed clear from the debate and from the texts of the two draft resolutions that delegations were in broad agreement on the main issues. He therefore associated himself with the representative of Argentina in requesting the sponsors of both draft resolutions to agree on a single text.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.