

55. The CHAIRMAN invited members to vote on the draft resolution, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 79 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

56. The CHAIRMAN noted that the delegation of Ghana had proposed that the provision concerning the temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War should be deleted from the terms of reference of the Committee on Contributions (see A/9011 and Corr.1, annex). If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that proposal and that the Rapporteur would include a paragraph in the report to the General Assembly reflecting the Committee's decision.

It was so decided.

57. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the previous meeting the representative of Brazil had introduced a draft paragraph (A/C.5/L.1119) for insertion in the report of the Fifth Committee and that the representative of the Netherlands had requested that the vote on that proposal should be deferred until the following day. In the interim, the representatives of Algeria and Ghana had requested that the vote should take place at the current meeting. In view of the fact that the representative of the Netherlands had invoked rule 122 of the rules of procedure of the General

Assembly, he hoped that the representatives of Algeria and Ghana would not press their request.

58. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that he saw no point in deferring the vote. As the representative of Ghana had said, the proposal was quite straightforward and had already been foreshadowed by paragraph 35 of the report of the Committee on Contributions.

59. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) said that he would have gladly acceded to the request made to him but for the fact that he had been instructed to consult his Government whenever a proposal related to the criteria on which the scale of assessments was based. He therefore had had no option but to invoke rule 122 during the morning meeting and the Chairman had accordingly announced, with the concurrence of the Committee, that the vote on the draft paragraph would be postponed until the following day.

60. After a brief discussion in which Mr. McCARTHY (Australia), Mr. AL-ZEID (Kuwait), Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) and Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) participated, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should defer the vote until the following day.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

1585th meeting

Friday, 26 October 1973, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. C. S. M. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania).

A/C.5/SR.1585

AGENDA ITEM 84

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) (for the documentation, see 1583rd meeting)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee adopted the draft paragraph (A/C.5/L.1119) proposed for inclusion in the Committee's report.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. ZIEHL (Acting Head, Office of Financial Services), speaking on behalf of the Secretary-General, associated himself with previous speakers in praising the remarkable work accomplished by the Committee on Contributions. In addition, he wished to express his appreciation to Miss Petersen, who was retiring after having served as secretary of the Committee since its inception with unmatched competence, efficiency and modesty.

3. Mr. Amjad ALI (Chairman of the Committee on Contributions) thanked the members of the Fifth Com-

mittee for their warm words of praise for the Committee on Contributions. He noted that Mr. Rączkowski, who had terminated his duties as a member of the Committee on Contributions after serving from 1962 to 1973, had been elected a member of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. He expressed deep regret at the retirement of Miss Petersen.

AGENDA ITEM 79

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1974-1975 and medium-term plan for the period 1974-1977 (*continued*)* (for the earlier A/... and A/C.5/... documents, see 1582nd meeting; A/9008/Add.4 and 6, A/C.5/L.1109, A/C.5/L.1111, A/C.5/L.1118, A/C.5/L.1120)

*First reading (continued)**

SECTION 7—DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS (*concluded*)* (A/9006, A/9008 AND ADD.4, A/C.5/1506, A/C.5/1508, A/C.5/L.1111, A/C.5/L.1118, A/C.5/L.1120)

* Resumed from the 1582nd meeting.

4. The CHAIRMAN asked members to confine their remarks to the two proposals before the Committee (A/C.5/L.1118 and A/C.5/L.1120) and not to reopen the general debate.

5. Mr. DAMDINDORZH (Mongolia) said that a variety of views and suggestions had been put forward regarding section 7 of the budget, which dealt with problems of paramount significance for developing nations. Expenditure for programmes in the economic and social field for the biennium 1974-1975 amounted to over \$33 million, exceeding the total appropriation for the years 1972 and 1973 by more than 21 per cent. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had explained why the Committee had decided to recommend to the Fifth Committee a reduction in the amount requested by the Secretary-General. Since about 93 per cent of the expenditure proposed under section 7 was allocated to salaries and related costs, it was not surprising that most of the Advisory Committee's recommended reductions also concerned staff. Although the Secretary-General had requested 58 new posts, the Advisory Committee had decided to recommend a total of only 30. In accordance with the traditional position of his Government on the United Nations budget and manpower questions, his delegation was in complete agreement with the Advisory Committee's recommendations and hoped they would be regarded as reasonable despite the fact that many other delegations had indicated that they would find it difficult to accept them. The efficiency of an organization was not necessarily enhanced by additional funds and staff. His delegation felt that a redeployment of staff should enable the Department of Economic and Social Affairs to meet its manpower requirements.

6. With regard to the proposals in documents A/C.5/L.1117 and A/C.5/L.1118, he pointed out that while the sponsors of the first text were requesting the Committee to restore the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee under section 7 in respect of the programmes on statistics, natural resources, ocean economics and technology, and human settlements, the draft decision proposed in the second document appeared to relate to section 7 as a whole. Consequently, in order to give a clearer idea of the programmes in section 7 to which the sponsors attached particular importance and to enable the Fifth Committee, the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to prepare, as requested, recommendations of a defined and limited scope, his delegation proposed the addition of the following phrase at the end of the text proposed in document A/C.5/L.1118: "in the field of statistics, natural resources, ocean economics and technology and human settlements".

7. Mr. KITI (Kenya), referring to the draft decision (A/C.5/L.1118) he had introduced on behalf of the sponsors, said that, after having consulted the various delegations concerned, he wished to propose the addition in the second sentence of the words "in connexion with the statistics, natural resources, ocean economics and technology and human settlements programmes" after the words "the amount recommended by the Advisory Committee under section 7". He hoped that having spelled out the programmes to which many delegations attached particular importance, he had enabled the members of the Committee to accept the draft decision in question without difficulty.

8. Recalling that at the 1580th meeting he had requested the Chairman to indicate the procedure for considering document A/C.5/1506, which dealt with the organization of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, he said that he had not yet had a satisfactory reply.

9. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that his delegation, although it had always been concerned about the question of consultants, fully supported the proposal of the Philippines in subparagraph (a) of document A/C.5/L.1120. However, it would find it difficult to support subparagraph (b) of the document and wondered how the Philippine delegation had arrived at the figure of \$5,000 given in that subparagraph.

10. In his statement to the Committee (A/C.5/1526) introducing the proposed programme budget, the Secretary-General had expressed concern about some of the reductions proposed by the Advisory Committee, which he thought might have an adverse effect on the implementation of the United Nations programme. In particular, the Secretary-General had stated that he could not assume responsibility for the full and proper performance by the Secretariat of its obligations to Member States if at the same time he was expected, as a continuing arrangement, to keep staff resources actually at his disposal significantly below the level considered necessary and voted by the General Assembly. The Secretary-General had noted that certain reductions proposed by the Advisory Committee warranted further consideration, and had added that he had asked his representative to bring those to the Fifth Committee's attention at the appropriate time. Since half the session had already gone by, he himself wondered when the time would be appropriate for the representative of the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of the Committee the instances in which the position of the Secretariat differed from that of the Advisory Committee. While the Advisory Committee did excellent work and while the Fifth Committee would be unable without its guidance to decide on a number of complex matters, the Advisory Committee was nevertheless not always right, especially as its very composition influenced the tenor of its decisions. The Secretary-General should therefore help the developing countries to defend their interests and to obtain the restoration of the appropriations for certain programmes to which they attached very special importance. He wished to emphasize that his comments were made in a spirit of friendly criticism, but that the developing countries had very definite ideas on certain questions.

11. Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) said that, while it appreciated the conciliatory spirit which prevailed in the Fifth Committee, his delegation felt that members should not make mutual concessions simply in order to be rid of an embarrassing question. The sponsors of the proposal in document A/C.5/L.1117 had requested that the Fifth Committee should restore the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee in respect of new posts for the programmes relating to statistics, natural resources, ocean economics and technology, and human settlements. Without going into the substance of the problem, his delegation wished to state that the modified proposal contained in document A/C.5/L.1118 was much weaker. Of course, the problem would be reconsidered in second reading, since the modified proposal was only a provisional compromise and the Administrative Management Service was requested to make available to the

Fifth Committee, through the Advisory Committee, additional information on the manpower requirements of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. But the Advisory Committee had just submitted to the Fifth Committee its report on the question (A/9008/Add.4), which deserved special attention. In his view, it would be advisable to postpone consideration of that report.

12. In the circumstances, there were two possible solutions: section 7 could be adopted, in one form or another, without a decision being taken on the proposal in document A/C.5/L.1118; alternatively, consideration of the proposals made by the Advisory Committee in its report could be postponed. For its part, the Togolese delegation would prefer the second alternative, which would enable it to comment further on some of the points dealt with in the Advisory Committee's report which were not unrelated to the document submitted by the Secretary-General under the symbol A/C.5/1506.

13. Mr. JASABE (Sierra Leone) said that he had listened with interest to the various comments made on section 7 and would be prepared to approve the proposals made in first reading. He wished, however, to draw attention to an important point which had emerged from the discussion: the question of the reorganization of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. The Secretary-General's report on that question (A/C.5/1506), which mentioned some of the measures already taken to reorganize the Department, had been prepared in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 14 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1768 (LIV). Yet paragraph 14 of that resolution invited the Secretary-General to submit his views and recommendations for the further restructuring of the Department as early as possible for the Council's consideration and appropriate recommendations for final decision by the General Assembly; in addition, paragraph 19 of document A/C.5/1506 stated that the recommendations of the Administrative Management Service concerning the most efficient and effective deployment and utilization of staff resources would be made available to the Advisory Committee and later to the Fifth Committee at the time that that Committee considered the work programme and budget of the Department for 1974-1975. He would therefore like to revert to that question when the recommendations of the Administrative Management Service were made available to the Committee.

14. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines) said that he would like to reply to the question put by the representative of Ghana regarding the proposal by the Philippine delegation (A/C.5/L.1120) that the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee in respect of travel funds for the social development and humanitarian affairs programme should be reduced from \$15,000 to \$5,000. When the representative of the Secretariat, Mr. Saddler, had given the breakdown of the estimate for staff travel costs at the 1579th meeting, he had explained that, out of the \$45,000 requested under that heading for the social development and humanitarian affairs programme, \$18,000 were for travel in connexion with the preparations for the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, to be held at Toronto in 1975. Thus \$27,000 were left for the other travel costs connected with that programme. Since it was obviously necessary to

economize on travel costs, his delegation had thought that the amount of \$45,000 could be reduced by \$2,000 a year—a total of \$4,000—on the understanding, of course, that the rest of the appropriation would be used only for absolutely essential travel. In his proposal he had rounded off the figure just mentioned to \$5,000.

15. His delegation would not insist on its proposal being put to a vote, but had wanted to submit it in order to stress its concern about the adverse effects which too large a reduction in the estimate might have on specific activities or projects.

16. Mr. SADDLER (Secretariat), replying to various questions raised, said that the report of the Secretary-General on the organization of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (A/C.5/1506) was in fact the second interim report which the Secretary-General had submitted on that question. At the 1579th meeting, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had informed the Committee that the Administrative Management Service had just completed its survey and would transmit it as soon as possible to the Secretary-General and to the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, so that they could submit their comments to the Fifth Committee at the current session. He also recalled that the Secretary-General had stated in his report that he had already made a certain number of administrative changes, within the limit of available resources.

17. With regard to the proposed decision in document A/C.5/L.1118, in which the Committee would request the Secretary-General to make available to it the recommendations of the Administrative Management Service, he thought that it would be more useful to request the Secretary-General to make available the Service's recommendations on the whole of the Department rather than on the four programmes mentioned in document A/C.5/L.1117.

18. The representative of Ghana had recalled that, in his statement to the Fifth Committee, the Secretary-General had expressed definite reservations about certain recommendations of the Advisory Committee and had asked his representative to bring them to the attention of the Committee at the appropriate time: that meant that the representative of the Secretary-General would do so as and when the disputed reductions were considered by the Committee. Indeed, that was what the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had started to do on the occasion of the consideration of certain programmes in section 7.

19. With regard to the comments made by the representative of Sierra Leone, he drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 975 to 995 of the report of the Economic and Social Council on the work of its fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth sessions (A/9003 and Corr.1), which indicated that one of the documents before the Council had been a note by the Secretary-General on the organization of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs; the document in question had subsequently been issued under the symbol A/C.5/1506 and it contained the Secretary-General's recommendations for a further restructuring of

the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, as requested by the Council at its fifty-fourth session (resolution 1768 (LIV)). It could therefore be considered that the Council had duly taken note of the views and recommendations of the Secretary-General on that question.

20. Mr. KITI (Kenya), who had attended the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council, said that only six delegations had submitted comments concerning the views and recommendations of the Secretary-General. Those delegations had all stated that they needed more time to consider the recommendations and no decision in the matter had been taken at the fifty-fifth session.

21. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that he was not completely satisfied with some of the explanations given by the representative of the Secretariat, Mr. Saddler. When the Committee had considered in first reading section 22 of the budget, relating to the Department of Political Affairs, Trusteeship and Decolonization, the representative of Algeria had proposed at the 1568th meeting that the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General should be approved and not the amount recommended by the Advisory Committee. At that time the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had approved neither the proposal made by the representative of Algeria and a number of other delegations nor the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. On the other hand, in connexion with the total appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee under section 7, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management had said that the Secretariat did not expect to encounter any special difficulties if the only funds available to it for carrying on its activities were the reduced appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee. The clear impression was that most of the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General had been inflated and did not represent real needs. The Committee had thus far considered some 20 sections of the budget, but in no case had the representative of the Secretary-General objected to the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee. If the Secretary-General believed that certain reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee were unjustified, he should say so plainly.

22. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (Barbados) said that he was not entirely satisfied with the answers of the representative of the Secretariat, Mr. Saddler, to the question asked by the representatives of Sierra Leone, Ghana and Kenya in connexion with the reorganization of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, specifically in connexion with the report of the Secretary-General. Paragraph 4 of that document (A/C.5/1506) stated that, at its fifty-fourth session, the Economic and Social Council had decided, by resolution 1768 (LIV), to invite the Secretary-General to submit his views and recommendations for the further restructuring of the Department as early as possible for the Council's consideration and appropriate recommendations for final decision by the General Assembly. He emphasized that the final decision would in fact be taken by the General Assembly, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter.

23. Mr. SADDLER had stated that at its fifty-fifth session the Economic and Social Council had considered the text

of document A/C.5/1506. That document had been issued on 2 July 1973, that is to say, only a few days before the opening of the fifty-fifth session of the Council. Paragraph 18 of that document stated that the Secretary-General had already effected a number of administrative changes within available resources, whereas resolution 1768 (LIV) had expressly invited him to submit his views and recommendations to the Council in order that the latter might give its opinion concerning the changes to be made. The report of the Secretary-General therefore suffered from a lack of credibility, which was made worse by the fact that the Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions had been abolished only a few weeks before, whereas paragraph 15 of the report gave the impression that the Division had been abolished prior to the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council.

24. Apart from the lack of credibility of the Secretary-General's assertions, he pointed out that the Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions had played an extremely important role in providing assistance to developing countries, particularly in fields such as double taxation. The Director of that Division had been an African of exceptional ability as a jurist and an economist. It was unfortunate that a Division of such great importance to the developing countries was being eliminated. It was deplorable that the Secretary-General had not given Member States an opportunity to state their views on that proposed change and a number of others. To be sure, the Charter invested the Secretary-General with certain responsibilities, including those relating to personnel, but it was undeniable that the final decision should be taken by the General Assembly. Since the elimination of that Division affected a very large number of developing countries—in particular the 25 least developed countries—the African States would be fully justified in calling upon the Secretary-General to rescind his decision. It was incomprehensible that the Secretary-General had not informed the General Assembly in advance concerning the administrative changes he proposed to make.

25. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the comments made by the representatives of Barbados, Kenya, Sierra Leone and Ghana, the Committee should not continue the debate on the organization of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs at that time, but should resume it later, when it would have before it the report of the Secretary-General on the recommendations of the Administrative Management Service concerning the Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

26. Summing up the situation, he stated that the representative of the Philippines was not pressing for a vote on its proposal (A/C.5/L.1120) and that the Committee no longer had before it document A/C.5/L.1117. With regard to the draft decision of the Committee contained in document A/C.5/L.1118, he asked the representative of Mongolia whether, in the light of the suggestion he had made at the beginning of the meeting, he was satisfied with the subsequent change proposed by the representative of Kenya.

27. Mr. DAMDINDORZH (Mongolia) said that he would not press for a vote on his proposal because the concern which had prompted him to make it had since been

alleviated by the change proposed by the representative of Kenya.

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote first on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/9008, paras. 7.43 and 63) for an appropriation in the amount of \$32,275,000 under section 7 for the biennium 1974-1975.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation in the amount of \$32,275,000 under section 7 for the biennium 1974-1975 was approved in first reading by 18 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee now saw no need to vote on the proposal contained in document A/C.5/L.1118, since the results of the vote just taken indicated clearly that the Committee approved that proposal as well.

It was so decided.

30. Mr. SILWEYA (Zambia) said that he wondered what significance should be attached to the fact that a number of delegations had chosen not to participate in the vote.

31. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had voted against the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee. As it had explained in the general debate, it opposed in principle any increase in the staff of the United Nations. It shared the views expressed by other delegations concerning the establishment of new posts and reclassifications of proposed posts: such measures should be considered only when every possibility of reorganization through shifts between services had been exhausted.

32. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had been unable to approve the credit recommended by the Advisory Committee because, as it had already stated, it was opposed to the establishment of new posts and any unjustified commitment of funds for consultants and travel expenses in particular. It wished to reaffirm that personnel needs should be determined by the inherent needs connected with the execution of programmes and not by any desire for an automatic and arbitrary increase in staff.

33. Mr. KITI (Kenya) said that he had voted in favour of the recommended appropriation in spite of the reservations prompted by the reductions that had been made. He hoped that when the budget estimates for the next biennium came before the Committee for its approval, it would find that appropriations under section 7 had been increased appreciably and that the special situation of the developing countries had thus been taken into account.

SECTION 17—OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS
DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR (*continued*)*
(A/9006, A/9008, A/C.5/L.1111)

34. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) noted that the Committee had before it, in connexion with section 17, two main proposals from the Secretary-General, one of

which was designed to reinforce the staff of the Office of the Co-ordinator, while the other would include in the regular budget an appropriation of \$200,000 for emergency assistance to Governments. His Government had expressed its support for the activities of that Office on several occasions. At the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council, his delegation had expressed its satisfaction at the fact that, in spite of some initial difficulties, the Office had succeeded in taking on the responsibilities entrusted to it under General Assembly resolutions 2816 (XXVI) and 2959 (XXVII). Brazil had also given tangible evidence of its readiness to provide assistance to countries which had suffered natural disasters by taking part in the relief operations undertaken in Pakistan, the Philippines, Nicaragua and other countries; it was willing to continue to assist whenever necessary and would indicate the type of assistance on each occasion so as to avoid duplication.

35. The Office of the Co-ordinator had been established in order that the international community might tackle more effectively the problems arising from natural disasters. However, it should not be forgotten that disasters were unpredictable, a fact that had determined the position taken by his delegation when, at the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council, it had expressed reservations regarding the inclusion in the regular budget of an appropriation for emergency relief operations, on the ground that it was difficult and even impossible to estimate a suitable sum. His delegation had also expressed reservations concerning an increase in the staff of the Office, since it felt that local personnel should be recruited whenever possible. His delegation approved the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 17.11 of its report (A/9008), in which it stated that emergency assistance to Governments should continue to be provided through withdrawals from the Working Capital Fund. It also concurred in the recommendations in paragraphs 17.13 and 17.14 of that report and would therefore vote in favour of the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee.

36. Mr. BENLER (Turkey) said he would briefly review the background of the Office, whose establishment had been advocated by Turkey. The report of the Secretary-General on assistance in cases of natural disaster, submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session,¹ had shown how, even in the first few months of its existence, the Office had performed useful work in Mauritius, Madagascar, Peru, Haiti and the Philippines. Subsequently, assistance had been rendered to Pakistan, to the Philippines a second time, to Fiji, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Afghanistan, Democratic Yemen, Nicaragua, Iceland, Ecuador and the Gambia. The decision to establish the Office had thus been fully vindicated and his delegation had no doubts as to the important and useful role the Office had to play. In his most recent report on the subject,² the Secretary-General outlined some measures that would enable the Office to assume operational responsibilities, and his delegation supported without reservation the recommendations made to that end. In particular, it wished to draw attention to paragraphs 27 and 28 of that report, which

¹ Document A/8854, of 24 October 1972.

² Document A/9063, of 21 May 1973.

* Resumed from the 1582nd meeting.

stated that there were seldom fewer than 15 natural disasters in any given year. His delegation considered that the Office must be given sufficient resources to be able to carry out the tasks with which it would have to cope; otherwise it would find itself powerless to act and that, in view of the essentially humanitarian nature of its activities, would be extremely regrettable. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that the Office was not designed to assume operational responsibilities. Nevertheless it should, like any other United Nations body, undergo reasonable expansion and be provided with the human and financial resources it required. The suggestion made by the representative of Canada at the 1582nd meeting, regarding a fund financed by voluntary contributions, was therefore most welcome. Drawing attention to paragraph 17.5 of the Advisory Committee's report, he said that the Canadian suggestion deserved consideration and that his delegation intended to support it, as it would support any measure designed to strengthen the Office of the Co-ordinator.

37. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that, although the amount requested under section 17 was small, the Office of the Co-ordinator was required to play an increasingly important role and its humanitarian activities deserved special support at a time when drought had so severely stricken the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region. Nevertheless, it was disturbing to note that there were several United Nations bodies operating in the same field, thus leaving the way open to duplication. He would therefore like to be informed of the responsibilities of the United Nations focal point of co-ordination and those of the Office of the Co-ordinator, respectively.

38. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan) expressed his country's profound gratitude for the assistance it had received from the Office of the Co-ordinator during the recent floods in Pakistan.

39. The Advisory Committee had stated that the funds requested for the Office showed by far the largest rate of increase for any section of the budget estimates, although the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had acknowledged that the increase was more apparent than real. The Secretary-General had, *inter alia*, requested additional posts and, in paragraph 17.13 of its report, the Advisory Committee stated that it was not convinced that a case had been made for the establishment of a P-2 post to accommodate a speech writer for the Co-ordinator, or of the P-5 post for an officer in charge of relations with donor countries. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee with respect to the P-2 post, but it questioned whether the Committee was right in justifying those reductions by arguing that the functions that would be discharged by the incumbents of the new posts should be an integral part of the activities of the Co-ordinator. The

same might be said of any head of department, yet he should none the less retain the option of unloading some of his functions on his colleagues. His delegation had the greatest regard for the counsel of the Advisory Committee, but would suggest that it should reconsider its decision regarding the P-5 post. While it was undeniably necessary to avoid over-staffing, at the same time the Office should have something more than a skeleton staff.

40. It had been said that it was impossible to predict natural disasters and that it was therefore impracticable to include in the regular budget appropriations which could amount to substantial sums. The idea of entrusting operational responsibilities to the Office was nevertheless interesting and deserved consideration. One possibility might be to budget a sufficient amount to enable the United Nations to take the necessary emergency action without delay, supplementing that amount subsequently through voluntary contributions. His delegation supported the view of the Turkish delegation on that point.

41. Mr. ADAMOU (Niger) said that the large amount requested by the Secretary-General appeared to be justified in the light of the growing number of natural disasters which had occurred in recent years. When disaster struck, it was essential that immediate action should be taken at the scene. Only recently, in the drought that had affected the Sudano-Sahelian zone, the catastrophic effects of which had been described in the General Assembly by the representatives of the various countries concerned, it had been demonstrated that a delay of 24 hours could place thousands of human lives in jeopardy. The Advisory Committee had recommended that the funds required for emergency assistance should continue to be withdrawn from the Working Capital Fund and it was for members of the Fifth Committee to give their impartial views on that subject. It was true that the basic purpose underlying the establishment of the Office had been to ensure the co-ordination of the assistance and aid that specialized agencies, Governments and various intergovernmental or private organizations offered spontaneously to countries stricken by natural disasters. For example, 90 per cent of the aid received by the Niger in 1973 had been contributed by friendly countries and intergovernmental and private organizations, to which the people and the Government of the Niger remained profoundly indebted. However, the emergency aspect of the relief operations could not be overemphasized, and they could not be undertaken unless resources were immediately available. That was why his delegation felt that it might be more judicious to include in the regular budget an appropriation which would enable the United Nations to act without delay. It also wondered whether a lack of personnel might not hamper the smooth functioning of the Office of the Co-ordinator.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.