



*Chairman: Mr. E. Olu SANU (Nigeria).*

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS  
OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE  
THIRD COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8430/ADD.1  
CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 59 (continued)  
(A/8400/ADD.18, A/C.5/1409 AND CORR.1)**

1. Mr. DE BELDER (Belgium) said that his delegation would vote for the appointment of a disaster relief co-ordinator. It fully endorsed the statement made by the Secretary-General on 16 September 1971 to the United Nations Correspondents Association to the effect that in the world of today it might perhaps be useful to add an Article 99 A to the Charter which would authorize the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of Member States global threats to human well-being other than those to peace and security.

2. His delegation accepted the Secretary-General's recommendation that the relief co-ordinator should be appointed at a level comparable to that of an Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations. It fully endorsed the remarks of the Turkish representative at the 1475th meeting on the special and very extensive duties and of the co-ordinator, which would be very different from those of the Red Cross, for instance. It also agreed with the remarks made in that connexion by the representative of Norway at the same meeting.

3. Turning to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution of the Third Committee (A/8430/Add.1, para. 9), he said that his delegation would prefer the permanent office to be in Geneva not only for reasons of economy but also because it agreed with the point made in paragraph 10 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8408/Add.18) that the personnel to be seconded to the office of the co-ordinator in cases of individual emergencies should to the extent possible be provided from within the Secretariat of the United Nations and those of the specialized agencies. In that connexion, his delegation shared the concern expressed by several others at the high level of estimated expenditure for renting office premises and engaging outside consultants.

4. With respect to the question of establishing the new post immediately, his delegation, acting on instructions from its Government, would not oppose the Fifth Committee's decisions if, unlike the Third Committee, it considered it unnecessary to set up the new post in 1972.

5. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway) said that his Government attached the greatest importance to setting up a permanent

office adequately staffed to be the focal point for disaster relief matters. His delegation believed that the rank suitable for the co-ordinator was that of an Under-Secretary-General and that the new post should be established and filled from 1 January 1972. He therefore did not support the suggestions in paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report, but was in favour of the draft resolution of the Third Committee and paragraph 6 of the Advisory Committee's report.

6. Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) asked for clarification concerning the third sentence of paragraph 8 of the report of the Advisory Committee. If he had understood the Advisory Committee's intention correctly, it was suggested that the Secretary-General might designate an Under-Secretary-General already on his staff to act as co-ordinator. He asked whether the Fifth Committee was going to take a vote on that point or whether it would merely ask the Rapporteur to mention in the report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly that the discussion had shown that the Fifth Committee, after due consideration, had agreed that the Secretary-General should appoint an Under-Secretary-General already on his staff to act as disaster relief co-ordinator. As the Advisory Committee had pointed out, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution of the Third Committee did not preclude that course of action.

7. With regard to the last sentence of paragraph 11 of the Advisory Committee's report, he asked what formula was to be used and whether operative paragraph 10 of the draft would become superfluous or not. His delegation thought it extremely important that the Committee should have the answer to those questions before taking a decision, and in that connexion he endorsed the relevant proposal of the Brazilian representative at the 1475th meeting.

8. Mr. N'DIAYE (Senegal) said that his delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution of the Third Committee, felt that the suggestions made by the Advisory Committee were in line with the Third Committee's recommendations. He therefore supported paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the Advisory Committee's report. The remarks in paragraphs 10 and 11 were sensible and worthy of the Fifth Committee's attention.

9. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon), referring to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in question, said that his delegation thought it contrary to all principles to ask for the establishment of an adequate permanent office to deal with matters that were not foreseeable, infrequent and not certain to occur. He therefore fully endorsed the remarks of the Advisory Committee. In view of the Organization's financial position his delegation was disturbed by the estimated requirement for the establishment of the office in question. It would therefore vote against the proposal as formulated.

10. Mr. JOHNSON (Togo) thought that it was in the interest of the developing countries that assistance should be efficiently and sensibly organized, but wondered whether the machinery proposed in the draft resolution was the most suitable for the purpose. He shared the concern expressed by the Advisory Committee in its report and did not support the establishment of a new post, whatever the rank.

11. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) thought that the relief co-ordinator should have the rank of Under-Secretary-General and should be appointed for five years beginning on 1 January 1972. He therefore approved the remarks of the Advisory Committee.

12. Mr. HULTGREN (Sweden) said that his Government attached great importance to the question of assistance in cases of natural disaster. Any measures to improve the efficiency of such assistance were welcomed, and he supported the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/1400 and Corr.1). Since, however, his delegation was against half-measures, it could not accept paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report.

13. Mr. EREN (Turkey) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution of the Third Committee, which had been sponsored by 60 countries and had been adopted by 85 votes in favour. The Fifth Committee could not oppose a decision taken by such a large majority. It was a decision based on past experience. The Third Committee had concluded that a permanent office headed by a high-ranking co-ordinator was necessary. An average of five natural disasters occurred every year; during the preceding few years over 10 million people had died in such disasters. It was therefore impossible to speak of infrequent phenomena. When a disaster struck, the help given was not always used effectively because co-ordination was lacking. It was necessary, therefore, to have a co-ordinator who could devote full time to the complex duties described in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

14. Mr. HILL (Consultant to the Secretary-General), in reply to the Kenyan representative's question whether the functions of co-ordinator could be exercised by an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff, said that the Secretary-General, in an effort to explore all possibilities of using existing resources, had decided to draw upon the specialized agencies and to restrict the staff of the permanent office acting as the focal point of disaster relief services to a few people under the direction of a high-ranking staff member.

15. The proposed establishment of a permanent office had had the support of a great many Governments and organizations, and the Economic and Social Council had requested the Secretary-General, in liaison with the specialized agencies and the League of Red Cross Societies, to take the necessary measures for the rapid organization of concerted action for relief and reconstruction. In its draft resolution the Third Committee had further broadened the co-ordinator's functions. The Secretary-General therefore considered that the post of co-ordinator should be a full-time post for a staff member with the rank of Under-Secretary-General. If the co-ordinator was to be effective, therefore, his functions could not be assigned to an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff.

16. Replying to the second question concerning the role of consultants, he said that they would be engaged for short periods and would be concerned with specific questions. The employment of consultants would make it possible to keep the permanent staff very small. However, they would have to be engaged during the first year, when co-ordination plans would be drawn up and technical questions would arise, whose solution would require the services of experts.

17. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. EREN (Turkey), Mr. JEREMIĆ (Yugoslavia), Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. PICK (Canada), Mr. NAUDY (France), Mr. JOHNSON (Togo), Mr. VANDER GOOT (Netherlands), Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), Mr. FAYACHE (Tunisia), Mr. TARDOS (Hungary), Mr. ABARA (Nigeria), Mr. STOTTLEMYER (United States of America), Mr. HULTGREN (Sweden), Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia), Mr. MARRON (Spain), Mr. RAKOTSIHANAKA (Madagascar), Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia), Mr. CLELAND (Ghana), and Mr. GONTHA (Indonesia) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that the recommendations in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/8408/Add.18) were only tentative, and invited the Committee to take a decision on the following proposals: first, in view of the decision taken by the Third Committee on the need for a disaster relief co-ordinator, the Fifth Committee approved the inclusion of a new post in the manning table for that purpose; secondly, the co-ordinator should have the rank of Under-Secretary-General; thirdly, the functions of co-ordinator should be assumed by an Under-Secretary-General already in office.

*At the request of the representative of Turkey, a roll-call vote was taken on the Chairman's first proposal.*

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

*In favour:* Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia.

*Against:* Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Zambia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, Mali.

*Abstaining:* Rwanda, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait.

*The first proposal was adopted by 44 votes to 24, with 16 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Afghanistan, a roll-call vote was taken on the Chairman's second proposal.*

*The Syrian Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden.

*Against:* Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, France, Ghana, Hungary, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Senegal.

*Abstaining:* Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Ethiopia, Gabon, Guatemala, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Mexico, Nicaragua, Philippines, Rwanda.

*The second proposal was adopted by 43 votes to 17, with 24 abstentions.*

18. Mr. MARRON (Spain) and Mr. ABARA (Nigeria) asked whether the Committee was going to take a decision on the Chairman's third proposal.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that since the Committee had decided, by the first vote, to create a new post of disaster relief co-ordinator, the third proposal would not have to be put to the vote.

20. Mr. JOHNSON (Togo) said that he was afraid that some delegations had not really understood the subject of the decision which they had been asked to make. For example, the delegations of Spain and Nigeria had apparently not realized that the adoption of the Chairman's first proposal eliminated the third proposal automatically.

21. Mr. NDURURUTSE (Burundi) explained that his delegation had abstained during the voting because although it recognized the need for a disaster relief co-ordinator, it felt that, whatever the rank of the person concerned, he should be chosen from among existing staff.

22. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the proposal to designate as co-ordinator an Under-Secretary-General already in office.

23. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) had expected, like the representative of Spain, that the Committee would also vote on the suggestion in the last part of paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report.

24. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. GOUAMBA (Congo), said that it was obvious that many delegations did not under-

stand exactly what they were voting on. He supported the remarks of the representative of Spain and asked that the Chairman's third proposal, namely, that the Secretary-General should designate an Under-Secretary-General already in office to act as disaster relief co-ordinator, should be put to the vote.

25. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that he also supported the request of the Soviet delegation and associated himself with the observations made by the representatives of Spain and Argentina.

26. Mr. EREN (Turkey) said that he regretted that the Fifth Committee was apparently making efforts to reverse the decision of the Third Committee: that attempt was being made by the delegations which had voted against the first proposal put to the vote by the Chairman.

27. Mr. MARRON (Spain) and Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that they had both voted for the first proposal.

28. The CHAIRMAN thought that the proposal to designate as co-ordinator for an initial period an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff was not incompatible with the first decision already taken by the Committee.

29. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) said that in voting on the Chairman's third proposal, the Committee would be going back on a decision which it had already taken. In that connexion, he cited rule 124 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which required a two-thirds majority of the members of the Committee in order that a decision already adopted might be reconsidered.

30. Mr. EREN (Turkey) said that in deciding to establish the post of co-ordinator, the Committee had decided to recruit a new official; it could not therefore assign the duties of co-ordinator to an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff.

31. Mr. GUPTA (India) recalled that he had abstained during the first vote and considered that the Committee had already taken a decision which it was not attempting to reverse. He therefore proposed that the Legal Counsel should be consulted on the procedures to be followed.

32. Mr. N'DIAYE (Senegal) thought that the principle of designating a co-ordinator had already been established in the Third Committee and that the first proposal voted upon involved the insertion of a new item in the budget. He had voted against that proposal, since he considered that the duties of co-ordinator could be assigned to one of the Under-Secretaries-General already on the staff.

33. Mr. ROPOTEAN (Romania) thought that the order in which the proposals had been put to the vote was not very logical.

34. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that in voting for the establishment of a new post, his delegation had understood that the post would be established on 1 January 1972. If it voted in favour of the proposal contained in the second part of paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report, the Fifth Committee would be going back on its first decision.

35. Mr. DE BELDER (Belgium) said that he shared the point of view of the Italian representative.

36. Mr. BARTUSEK (Czechoslovakia) thought, on the contrary, that the Committee had not approved the establishment of a new post from 1 January 1972, as it had not specified any date. It could therefore quite easily vote on the Chairman's third proposal without contradicting its first decision.

37. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that he had voted against the first proposal and had abstained from voting on the second as he was opposed to the establishment of a new post of Under-Secretary-General. He would have voted for the second proposal to appoint the co-ordinator at the level of Under-Secretary-General if the duties of co-ordinator had been assigned to an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff. He considered that in voting on the first proposal the Committee had already taken a decision on the third proposal.

38. Mr. TWAGILIMANA (Rwanda) said that he had abstained during the vote as the proposals put to the Committee seemed confused. He suggested that the Committee should vote again on proposals which were clearer.

39. Mr. MAKUFU (Zaire) said that he wished to know whether the establishment of the post of co-ordinator would necessarily involve recruiting a new official.

40. Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he had voted against the first proposal since he was opposed to the establishment of a new post; the duties of co-ordinator should be assigned to one of the Under-Secretaries-General already on the staff.

41. Mr. MARRON (Spain) said that he had voted as he had done on the first two proposals only because he thought that the Chairman would put the third to a vote.

42. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) strongly opposed a vote being taken on the third proposal and joined the representative of Austria in citing rule 124 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

43. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) supported the remarks of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania and pointed out that, at the time of the vote on the first proposal, the Chairman had called the attention of the Committee to the financial implications of the establishment of a new post. The third proposal was not a new one: it was only the second part of the same alternative.

44. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) thought that rule 124 of the rules of procedure did not apply in the present case because there was no contradiction between the decision already taken by the Committee and that which it might take by approving the third proposal. In his opinion, it was rule 132 of the rules of procedure which was applicable.

45. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) said that he shared the view of the Spanish and many other delegations that the Chairman's third proposal should be put to the vote in the same way as the first two proposals. He did not feel that

rule 124 of the rules of procedure was applicable in the present case, and pointed out that, when formulating the three proposals, the Chairman had not said that approval of the first two would dispense the Committee from voting on the third.

46. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to indicate, in accordance with rule 124 of the rules of procedure, if it wished to vote on the question of whether the Secretary-General should appoint, for an initial period, an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff to the post of disaster relief co-ordinator.

*At the request of the representatives of Turkey and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the vote was taken by roll-call on the proposal put to the vote by the Chairman in accordance with rule 124 of the rules of procedure.*

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

*In favour:* Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Congo, Cuba, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan.

*Against:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, France, Guyana, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic.

*Abstaining:* Malaysia, Morocco, Trinidad and Tobago, Zaire, Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Greece, India, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Khmer Republic.

*The result of the vote was 35 in favour and 27 against, with 15 abstentions.*

*The proposal was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.*

47. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Rapporteur should inform the General Assembly directly that, if it adopted the draft resolution of the Third Committee (A/8430/Add.1, para. 9), concerning the establishment of a post of Under-Secretary-General and the staff of the associated permanent office, it would be necessary to provide an additional \$62,500 in the budget estimates for the financial year 1972.

48. He also suggested that the Fifth Committee should request the General Assembly to endorse the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 6 of its report (A/8408/Add.18) and to draw the attention of its Main Committees to that recommendation; support the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 10 of its report that the personnel to be seconded to the office of the

co-ordinator in case of individual emergencies should to the extent possible be provided from within the Secretariat of the United Nations and those of the specialized agencies or provided by Governments and organizations on a non-reimbursable basis; and recommend that provisions for the financing of assistance in connexion with natural disasters be inserted in the annual General Assembly resolution on

unforeseen and extraordinary expenses, as had been the past practice, thereby obviating the need for paragraph 10 of the draft resolution of the Third Committee.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*