

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 1476th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 8 December 1971,
at 8.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 81

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (*continued*)* (A/8447/Rev.1, A/8490, A/8538, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35)

1. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, according to the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8447/Rev.1), the administrative and management procedures concerning the programme and budget of the International Atomic Energy Agency seemed, on the whole, highly satisfactory. In particular, a judicious balance had been established between the responsibilities of the Board of Governors and those of the General Conference.

2. The Advisory Committee had noted (*ibid.*, para. 24) that, with the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the safeguards responsibilities of the Agency—i.e., its role in ensuring that equipment and material used in peaceful applications of nuclear energy were not diverted to military purposes—had significantly increased. His delegation hoped, with the Advisory Committee, that the need to devote additional resources to that task would not detract from the Agency's capacity to carry out the other tasks devolving upon it under its statute, in particular those which involved the application of nuclear techniques to promote economic progress in the developing world. Similarly, it was to be hoped that the activities of the Agency would not be curtailed for lack of voluntary contributions, from which the operational budget was principally financed.

3. In paragraph 63 of its report, the Advisory Committee had noted with interest that IAEA applied, in the case of its seminars and symposia, a system of standard charges that was designed to make it easier for as many countries as possible to host such meetings. Under that system, developed countries were charged an amount that was higher than the amount charged to the developing countries. His delegation had proposed (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35) the insertion in the Fifth Committee's report of a paragraph recommending that the Secretary-General should inquire into the full operation of the methods of financing by the Agency of certain meetings and conferences held away from its headquarters. That was not intended as a criticism, as some seemed to think, nor was it an attempt to have that

method applied to all United Nations meetings. It was simply a matter of seeing whether it might be used for certain types of meetings.

4. He drew attention to an error in the proposed paragraph: the word "General" should be inserted after the word "Director". Furthermore, for the sake of greater precision, the beginning of the paragraph should be amended to read: "The Fifth Committee, noting paragraph 58 of document A/8490 and paragraph 60 of document A/8447/Rev.1".

5. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that he agreed with many other delegations that the existing system of co-ordination was far from satisfactory and that many examples of lack of co-ordination, duplication and overlapping of activities might be cited. The question therefore required a new and constructive approach. It would not be useful, for example, to ask for a new report or to create new organs for the co-ordination of co-ordinators. The primary task was for Member States in the General Assembly to elaborate new and constructive proposals, since under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations it was the function of the General Assembly, assisted by the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-Agency Affairs and his Office, to deal with co-ordination matters.

6. Experience had shown that the legal framework of co-ordination—namely, the Charter, the constitutional instruments of the specialized agencies and the relationship agreements concluded between the United Nations and the specialized agencies—was adequate and required no major changes. In particular, his delegation was strongly opposed to the revision of the relevant provisions of the Charter, both for reasons of practical utility and for political reasons. There were, however, some exceptions. The agreements concluded between the United Nations and the international financial organizations differed from those concluded with the other agencies and did not correspond fully to the relevant provisions of the Charter. However, it was not necessary to change the agreements in question; it would be sufficient to interpret them in such a way as to guarantee the powers of the United Nations to influence the policies and activities of those organizations to the extent necessary for effective co-ordination. Accordingly, the only constructive approach would be to improve the practical implementation of co-ordination and to adjust the existing machinery to meet changing circumstances and needs. In order to do so, the structure and functioning of the present machinery must first be reformed, because the current division of co-ordination powers and responsibilities between the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had proved unsatisfactory. The lack of a central organ for co-ordination and of a clear division of

* Resumed from the 1469th meeting.

competence created a risk of overlapping and duplication. It would therefore be more rational to have a pyramidal machinery, with a central organ at the top. That role would logically fall to the Economic and Social Council, which was sufficiently representative and was more operative and competent than the General Assembly in matters of co-ordination. His delegation doubted whether doubling the membership of the Council would enable it to fulfil its responsibilities in that respect more effectively. It would, in fact, produce the opposite result. The General Assembly should therefore transfer some of its co-ordination responsibilities to the Council, while reserving the right to decide on very general matters, such as the goals for development decades, the strategy for development, priorities, and so on.

7. There was also a need for reappraisal of the structure and functions of the subsidiary organs dealing with co-ordination, especially the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. He recalled in that connexion the proposal by the Yugoslav delegation (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.39/Rev.1) submitted during consideration of agenda items 83 and 26, that the Fifth Committee, the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat should arrange their time-tables in such a way as to facilitate each other's work. It was impossible to over-emphasize the importance for co-ordination of such subsidiary organs of the Assembly as the Advisory Committee and the Joint Inspection Unit and, at the level of the Economic and Social Council, of the role played by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. All those organs carried out their work independently and in advance of the sessions of the Assembly and the Council. It seemed that reappraisal of the subsidiary bodies was required in order to transform the co-ordination machinery into a more dynamic instrument. Whatever changes were made should enable the intergovernmental bodies to make full use of their existing powers. The United Nations should have more frequent recourse, where necessary, to such means of co-ordination as formal recommendations and requests for help and assistance, so as to be able to exercise more effective control and supervision over the activities of all the organizations within the United Nations system.

8. Two Main Committees of the General Assembly dealt with questions of co-ordination: the Second Committee, which concentrated on general policy and programme matters, and the Fifth Committee, which dealt with the finances of the United Nations system. In the view of his delegation, such a division of tasks was artificial and often led to policies and programmes being drawn up without regard to their financial implications. As the Joint Inspection Unit had recommended in its report (see A/8319 and Corr.1), therefore, the Second and Fifth Committees should hold joint meetings when discussing co-ordination matters and should take up that question fairly early in the session in order to be able to devote sufficient time to it. Lastly, it would be useful to have the benefit of the active participation of representatives of the specialized agencies during such joint meetings.

9. He thought that the consideration of co-ordination questions should not be limited to what might be called negative co-ordination, in other words the division of competence and tasks; it was important to seek to improve positive co-ordination, in other words co-operation among

various organizations in the execution of certain complementary programmes. For instance, the realization of the aims of the Second United Nations Development Decade required the co-ordination at all levels of very complex programmes executed by many specialized agencies and many United Nations organs.

10. In conclusion, he said that the improvement of co-ordination machinery depended mainly on the position of Member States and of the Secretariat. For its part, his delegation was ready to enter into consultations with other interested delegations in order to formulate more specific and more suitable proposals.

11. Mr. DE SILVA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the English, French and Russian texts of the second sentence of paragraph 36 of document A/8490 did not correspond absolutely and that the paragraph gave a misleading idea of the productivity of UNESCO's translation section as compared with the translation sections of other agencies. The table given in paragraph 32 compared figures which were not really comparable. First, it did not contain the figures relating to the United Nations, which were indicated separately and which were far lower than those for the specialized agencies. Secondly, the figures given for some agencies did not include revision. Lastly, the statistics relating to UNESCO were not comparable with those for other agencies since, because of the quota system, unrevised translations were counted as only 66 per cent of the total words and UNESCO's translation output had declined after the translation of records had been discontinued. In fact, the comparison between the translation sections, excluding revision, was favourable to UNESCO in French, Russian and Spanish. It would also be useful to take account in those statistics of the fluctuation in the volume of work year by year, according to the number of meetings. In the case of UNESCO, for example, the General Conference met only every two years.

12. With reference to paragraph 46 of document A/8490, he said that UNESCO needed a great amount of revision for three reasons: the great diversity of subjects dealt with, the large ratio of work to be split between several translators, and the high percentage of probationary staff members and freelance and contract translators.

13. He hoped that his remarks would result in an improvement in the comparability between the various organizations in order to permit a more objective judgement.

14. He welcomed the distinction made by the representative of Poland between negative co-ordination and positive co-ordination. The specialized agencies held consultations at the pre-programming stage and endeavoured to use the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC) and the existing co-ordination machinery in order to reach prior agreements. They were ready to continue their efforts in that direction in order to ensure the optimum co-ordination of programmes and budgets and to utilize the limited resources at their disposal to the best advantage.

15. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) supported the paragraph proposed by the Tanzanian delegation (A/C.5/

XXVI/CRP.35) for insertion in the Committee's report and proposed that, in order to avoid any possible *arrière-pensée*, the words "inquire into", which were somewhat reminiscent of a police investigation, should be replaced by the word "study" or "review".

16. His delegation supported the suggestions made by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of its report (A/8490).

17. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) said that he hoped that the Advisory Committee would not neglect its co-ordinating role in favour of its budgetary and financial role and asked what agency would be dealt with in the Advisory Committee's next report on the procedures of organizations.

18. He noted with interest that at IAEA the number of Professional and senior posts in the Department of Administration in 1970 had been only 10 per cent above the 1960 figure. He also noted that the Agency had no verbatim records and restricted the provision of summary records to a small number of bodies. That had resulted in economies, since the number of Professional staff in the Languages Division had shown little change, as had the volume of texts to be translated. In paragraph 70 of the report (A/8447/Rev.1), it was stated that, thanks to the generosity of the Government of the host country, the Agency's accommodation needs had been met at minimal cost; the Austrian Government appreciated that remark.

19. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that, in the report it had submitted at the previous session on the International Labour Organisation,¹ the Advisory Committee had announced that, after it had concluded the cycle of reviews of the administrative and management procedures of the specialized agencies, it would formulate general conclusions and recommendations on co-operation and co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. His delegation believed that the report on IAEA currently under consideration was the last of the cycle and it awaited with interest the Advisory Committee's general conclusions and recommendations.

20. With regard to paragraph 13 of the report of the Advisory Committee on general co-ordination matters (A/8490), his delegation would point out that CPC and ACC had agreed on a process of prior consultations so that the activities of all interested parties were taken into account from the outset, thus removing the need for *ex post facto* co-ordination. He would also like to know whether the remark made by the Advisory Committee in the last sentence of that paragraph was a general one or whether it related to specific cases.

21. His delegation was in general agreement with the observations of the Advisory Committee on electronic data processing, in particular on the need for organizations, when purchasing equipment, to avoid unnecessary expenditure and to take care not to adopt incompatible systems and methods. It was quite obvious that the expenditure should be commensurate with the benefits which could be

derived from the new techniques. His delegation noted that, in December 1970, the ILO had installed a larger computer when the General Assembly had already decided to establish an International Computing Centre at Geneva. It agreed with the Advisory Committee that the various organizations had not yet developed a common approach to computers and pointed out that, in the interests of economy and efficiency, the installations of the International Computing Centre should be fully utilized, in particular by all the agencies which had their headquarters at Geneva. The Advisory Committee, in paragraph 28 of its report, warned against the temptation to use computers unnecessarily for tasks which could be done more cheaply by other methods, and in that connexion it recommended that, before adopting new computer applications, the executive heads should consider thoroughly the cost-benefit relationship. The Advisory Committee also rightly pointed out that the ILO would save \$100,000 by introducing a computerized text storage system. His delegation thought that it was important always to seek out possible economies of that kind.

22. With regard to the productivity of translation sections, the Advisory Committee pointed out, in paragraph 33 of the same report, that the output of freelance translators was lower than that of staff translators, at least at UNESCO. His delegation thought that texts translated by retired translators working on a freelance basis could certainly not need revision and it considered that as much use as possible should be made of such translators; that would enable economies to be made without detriment to the interests of staff translators or of the Organization. His delegation would like to have more information on that subject.

23. It hoped that the Secretariat would deal with the problems raised by referencing, accommodation and typing referred to in paragraph 42 of the report.

24. He supported the proposal of the Tanzanian delegation (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35).

25. Turning to the report of the Advisory Committee on IAEA (A/8447/Rev.1), he said that his delegation agreed with the solution set out in paragraph 20 therein, whereby IAEA would appoint representatives to the regional economic commissions instead of establishing its own regional offices.

26. He noted from paragraph 21 of the same report that the budgetary procedures of the Agency were not strictly in line with the recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies but that they nevertheless enabled the objectives sought by the *Ad Hoc* Committee to be attained. He also noted, from paragraph 27 of that report, that the situation with regard to the appraisal and evaluation of programmes was not satisfactory. His delegation welcomed the fact, as stated in paragraph 32 of the report, that the General Conference of IAEA had decided to grant relief to member States having low *per capita* incomes, the minimum contribution of 0.04 per cent being too high for some countries.

27. With regard to paragraph 42 of the report his delegation disagreed with the Advisory Committee in that it

¹ Document A/8140, pertaining to item 79 of the agenda of the twenty-fifth session, issued separately (offset).

did not think that the proposed alternation in the distribution of costs between FAO and IAEA for the Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Atomic Energy in Food and Agriculture would have an adverse effect on co-ordination, provided that it was effected in an atmosphere of mutual understanding.

28. His delegation was satisfied with the measures taken to reduce the Agency's documentation.

29. It noted the observation in paragraph 58 that so far, the benefits derived by the Agency from the work of the Joint Inspection Unit had not been commensurate with its contribution towards the costs of the Unit.

30. He expressed gratification concerning the co-operation between the Agency and UNIDO in the use of computers. The Advisory Committee had recommended, in paragraph 75 of the report, that the Director-General of IAEA study the possibility of using the facilities of the International Computing Centre at Geneva; it would be a good thing if the agencies with headquarters in Geneva were to provide an example in that respect.

31. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that he wished to make a few comments on the proposal submitted by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35). He recalled General Assembly resolution 2609 (XXIV), which stated that United Nations bodies should plan to meet at their respective established headquarters, with certain specified exceptions. That principle should also be applied to seminars and symposia and he was certain that the Tanzanian proposal was not intended to depart from that general principle.

32. His delegation noted that the methods of financing referred to in the Tanzanian proposal made a distinction between developed and developing countries. Since no other system of financing made such a distinction, the proposal, if adopted, might have consequences in other areas.

33. Furthermore, the system under which the Governments of host countries were obligated to assume a specific portion of the charges, which were higher for the developed than for the developing countries, could operate only if there were a sufficient number of developed countries prepared to host meetings and conferences. In the event that there were not, the difference between the actual costs and the relatively low charges to the developing countries should be met from the regular budget. In paragraph 63 of its report (A/8447/Rev.1), the Advisory Committee indicated that the system of standard charges could work successfully only for a restricted number of standard-size meetings; that might create practical difficulties in introducing it into the United Nations.

34. In conclusion, his delegation found no serious reason to oppose the inquiry proposed by the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. However, it hoped that the Secretary-General would give careful consideration to those problems.

35. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to a

question raised by the Austrian delegation, said that the Advisory Committee had not yet adopted its work programme for 1972. There were only a few more agencies to be studied and the Committee might then be able to formulate general conclusions and recommendations based on its studies.

36. In reply to a question from the Pakistan delegation, he said that the comment made in paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/8490) was of a general nature.

37. In reply to the representative of UNESCO, he said that although the figures given in that report on the productivity of translation sections were not absolutely comparable, they at least indicated the general situation. He had been encouraged to note that the report had had the desired effect, namely, it had encouraged the various agencies to compare productivity and co-operate with each other.

38. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he accepted the oral amendment made to his proposal (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35) by the Argentine delegation.

AGENDA ITEM 101

Amendment to rule 156 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly (concluded) (A/8495 and Corr.1, A/C.5/L.1077, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.44)

39. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that there was an error in the statement of financial implications (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.44) of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1077: if the new member was based in his national capital, travel costs would include two round-trips to New York with a stopover in Geneva instead of one round-trip to Geneva and one round-trip to New York as stated in the document. He said that the Advisory Committee had approved those financial implications.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.5/L.1077.

It was so decided.

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/8408/ADD.18, A/C.5/1409 AND CORR.1)

41. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that his delegation found it disquieting for the Third Committee to be dealing with matters which were not within its competence, as the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had stated in paragraphs 5 and 6 of its report (A/8408/Add.18). Just as the Fifth Committee was always careful to deal only with the financial implications of proposals submitted by other bodies and to avoid going into their substantive aspects, so the other Committees should be scrupulously careful not to encroach on the competence of the Fifth Committee. Consequently, his delegation supported the proposal made at the previous

meeting by the representative of Brazil and amended by the Chairman.

42. His delegation had voted for the Third Committee's draft resolution (A/8430/Add.1, para. 9) on the creation of a post of disaster relief co-ordinator. It had found merit in the suggestions made in paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report, but felt that the co-ordinator would be called upon to exercise very important functions and should therefore hold the rank of Under-Secretary-General. As the representative of Norway had pointed out at the preceding meeting, the co-ordinator would have to consult representatives of Governments at a very high level as well as the executive heads of agencies concerned, he would sometimes have to take decisions on the spot and he should be capable of organizing and planning the activities of his office in liaison with various agencies and non-governmental organizations so as to be able to respond immediately to the needs of countries stricken by natural disasters.

43. The Advisory Committee's suggestion that an Under-Secretary-General currently in office could be appointed co-ordinator had merit but it would relegate the functions of the co-ordinator to second place whereas he should be working full time in that capacity. Under the terms of the Third Committee's draft resolution, he would be appointed for a period of five years so that the Fifth Committee would have an opportunity to review the whole question when that period expired.

44. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted for the Third Committee's draft resolution. It had felt at the time that the co-ordinator should have the rank of Assistant Secretary-General and not Under-Secretary-General and that his headquarters should be New York. It supported paragraphs 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the Advisory Committee's report and, in particular, the Advisory Committee's suggestion that the Secretary-General should appoint one of the existing Under-Secretaries-General as co-ordinator. It also felt that the staff to be assigned to the office of the co-ordinator should, so far as possible, be drawn from the staff of the Secretariat of the United Nations and from the secretariats of the specialized agencies.

45. His delegation supported the proposal made at the previous meeting by the Brazilian representative.

46. Mr. MERIGO AZA (Mexico) endorsed the comments made by the Philippine delegation. He supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation in paragraph 6 of its report aimed at ensuring better co-ordination between the Main Committees of the General Assembly.

47. His delegation too believed that the post of co-ordinator should be filled by an Under-Secretary-General already on the staff.

48. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that his delegation had supported in the Third Committee the draft resolution concerning assistance in cases of natural disaster, in spite of the reservations prompted by its belief that the post of co-ordinator might have been made a lower-level post. However, since the decision had already been taken in the Third Committee, his delegation would support the Advi-

sory Committee's recommendation that the post should be filled by an existing Under-Secretary-General. It also supported the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. Lastly, he favoured the proposal made by the Brazilian delegation.

49. Mr. MAKUFU (Zaire) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution in the Third Committee, but was not convinced that the co-ordinator should have the rank of Under-Secretary-General. It supported the comments of the Tanzanian representative on the subject.

50. In addition, his delegation endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendations contained in paragraphs 6, 9, 10 and 11 of its report.

51. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) said that his delegation, like many others, found substance in the comments of the Advisory Committee. No member of the Fifth Committee could fail to share the Advisory Committee's concern, expressed in paragraph 6 of its report, regarding the need for the observance of orderly budgetary procedures. On the question of the appropriate level for the post of disaster relief co-ordinator, his delegation wanted to make it clear that it had fully supported the proposal, as a sponsor of the draft resolution in question, on the understanding that a new post at the level of Under-Secretary-General was required. For reasons pertaining to the necessary prestige and effective functioning of the co-ordinator's office, it was prepared to support the proposal made in the first part of paragraph 9 of the Advisory Committee's report. It saw no objection, however, to having the Fifth Committee's report take account of the substantive comments of the Advisory Committee, which had been reflected in the Fifth Committee's discussion. In that way the General Assembly would be in a position to take a decision in full knowledge of the facts.

52. Mr. LENG SARIN (Khmer Republic) said that his delegation had always taken the greatest interest in questions relating to natural disasters, as evidenced by its statement at the 1429th meeting in support of requests from countries stricken by such disasters that the Committee on Contributions should review their recommended assessments for the period 1971-1973.

53. His delegation favoured the establishment of a post of disaster relief co-ordinator and would have no objection to any rank assigned to that post, although it hoped that the level would be high. He did not believe, however, that it was for the Fifth Committee to take a decision concerning the co-ordinator's rank, since that would be an encroachment on the competence of the General Assembly. Since emergency assistance in connexion with natural disasters was by its very nature unforeseeable, his delegation considered it essential that provision for the financing of such assistance should be permitted under the annual Assembly resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

54. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) recalled that his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution of the Third Committee. It endorsed the conclusions stated in paragraphs 6 and 10 of the Advisory Committee's report, and in particular the recommendation that the personnel to be

seconded to the office of the co-ordinator should be provided from within the Secretariat of the United Nations and those of the specialized agencies. With regard to paragraphs 8 and 9 of the report, since the Advisory Committee left it to the Fifth Committee to decide which of the proposed arrangements should be adopted, his delegation believed that, in view of the great importance of the co-ordinator's work, he should have all the authority necessary for effective action and that the appropriate level for the post was therefore that of Under-Secretary-General.

55. Mr. SANTAMARIA (Colombia) said that he had studied the Advisory Committee's report with great care. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Third Committee, subject, however, to the views to be expressed by the Fifth Committee on its financial implications. His delegation favoured the alternative recommended in paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report because, if it was accepted, no additional appropriation would be required, as was stated in the last sentence of paragraph 9.

56. Mr. FAYACHE (Tunisia) said that he had been keenly interested in but somewhat puzzled by the debate on the financial implications of the draft resolution which, in his view, had lasted too long. While his delegation appreciated the arguments advanced by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 6 of its report, it did not understand why the Fifth Committee should spend so much time on that question when there was too little time available for questions directly within its competence. He believed that, in view of the social aspect of the problem of assistance in cases of natural disaster, it was normal for the Third Committee to deal with the question. The delegations in the Third and Fifth Committees represented the same countries, and the consequences of the Third Committee's decision, which some members of the Fifth Committee seemed to take as a violation of their prerogatives, should not be exaggerated. However, his delegation supported the Ghanaian proposal that the secretariats of the two Committees should work together whenever the questions being dealt with had financial implications.

57. With regard to the level of the proposed post of co-ordinator, his delegation, a sponsor of the draft resolution in question, endorsed the Third Committee's decision that the level should be that of Under-Secretary-General. As several delegations had pointed out, that was the only suitable rank for an official called upon to play such a role; he would have to work full-time at his duties as co-ordinator. The size of the supporting staff, as the representative of Austria had pointed out, had nothing to do with the rank of the proposed co-ordinator, who should be based in Geneva. He hoped that the Fifth Committee would approve the financial implications of the draft resolution as quickly as possible, without change if possible, and would then take up the other items on its agenda.

58. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) said that he fully supported the proposal for the appointment of a disaster relief co-ordinator. With regard to the suggestion that the necessary personnel should be provided from within the Secretariat of the United Nations and the secretariats of the specialized agencies, the views of the United Nations Secretariat itself should be ascertained before a decision was taken. His

delegation hoped that the representative of the Secretary-General would give some indication of the day-to-day activities to be carried on by the officer in question. In addition, the Secretary-General's statement of the financial implications (A/C.5/1409 and Corr.1) included \$10,000 for consultants. He would like to have some detailed information of the nature of the work to be done by such consultants.

59. Mr. FAURA (Peru) said that Peru was a country which had recently suffered a dreadful earthquake that had caused 60,000 deaths and incalculable material damage. It was also a country which had had occasion to acknowledge and appreciate the speedy and effective aid rendered to it by the United Nations, especially through the efforts of the Secretary-General. Assistance in cases of natural disaster was not a continuous task, but a necessity which arose only when such disasters actually occurred. The draft resolution of the Third Committee, of which Peru was a sponsor, covered everything that should be taken into account whenever United Nations assistance became necessary. Nevertheless, the representative of Kenya was right to ask the Secretariat for a number of clarifications.

60. It would have been useful if the Chairman of the Fifth Committee had consulted with the Chairman of the Third Committee in order to see whether it was possible to reach an agreement, especially as his delegation had understood the Chairman of the Fifth Committee to say that the draft resolution belonged to the Third Committee and that there could therefore be no question of amending it.

61. His delegation supported the proposal of the representative of Brazil concerning the drafting of the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly. The report should also mention the interest which many delegations had shown in the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in its report.

62. The CHAIRMAN explained that he had not said that the draft resolution in question belonged to the Third Committee, but had simply advised members of the Fifth Committee not to make any amendments to it. With regard to the suggestion that he should have consultations with the Chairman of the Third Committee with a view to reaching an agreement, he pointed out that the full implications of the draft resolution could not be known until the Advisory Committee's report on it had been considered. In any event, the Fifth Committee would take its own decision, and it would be for the Rapporteur to reflect in the report the views that had been expressed by delegations.

63. Mr. JEREMIĆ (Yugoslavia) observed that the Advisory Committee's report was admirably clear and concise. In the interests of clarity, however, paragraph 9 of the report should be divided into two separate parts, the first of which would end at the words "indicated in paragraph 4 above".

64. The CHAIRMAN said that the real issue before the Committee was whether to opt for the recommendation in paragraph 8 or for the one in paragraph 9.

65. Mr. GUPTA (India) felt that the Committee should not waste any more time on the question, especially since whatever decision was taken might be reversed by the General Assembly.

66. Mr. STOTTEMYER (United States of America) said that he believed that some clarification was necessary. The Chairman had said that the Committee must opt for one or the other of the recommendations in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Advisory Committee's report. In the view of his delegation, there were at least three questions to be resolved, namely, the rank to be assigned to the coordinator, how he would be appointed, and the responsibility to be assumed by the proposed Director (D-2).

67. The CHAIRMAN said that the Director would be responsible for managing the routine business of the office. The Committee would have to take a decision on the whole question at the next meeting, when he hoped that the alternatives proposed would be stated more clearly and the representative of the Secretary-General would reply to the various questions that had been put.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.34 AND 43)

68. The CHAIRMAN asked whether any delegations would wish to comment at the next meeting on the question of programme budgeting or whether the Committee agreed to defer consideration of it until the next session.

69. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the organization of work had already been thoroughly discussed and no agreement had been reached on whether or not to postpone consideration of that question.

70. He recalled his statement (1475th meeting, para. 63), regarding a decision on programme budgeting, in which he had suggested that there should be five elements in the part of the Committee's report dealing with the question.

71. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation could not support the suggestion that a "mini-mock-up" of the budget should be prepared. The principles of programme budgeting did not change overnight. The Secretariat had already spent a great deal of time in preparing the mock-up, and the Committee seemed to favour deferring consideration of the question until the next session. That being so, there could be no justification, when another resolution on limiting the volume of documentation had just been adopted, for asking the Secretariat to prepare more new documents.

72. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said he would like to explain that the reason why he had mentioned a "mini-mock-up" was that when the Advisory Committee had considered programme budgeting, it had already had before it two alternative forms of presentation of the

budget and it had appeared that a request might be made for the preparation of a third version, in which case the Controller would have to do all the work over again. That being so, if agreement was reached on the adoption of one of the two alternatives, it might not be necessary to prepare any "mini-mock-up".

73. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that he appreciated the concern of the Indian delegation and the considerations expressed by the Tanzanian delegation and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. There was one possible approach which would not force the Secretariat to do the impossible by preparing another "maxi-mock-up". The Secretariat could not be asked to prepare a complete new draft in the space of a few months. However, the Secretariat would be able to provide the Fifth Committee with an outline of the future structure of the estimates, to which improvements could be made later. So far as requesting the Secretariat to comment on any institutional changes which might prove necessary was concerned, a separate report on that question could probably be prepared by the following spring; it was important that the Advisory Committee should be in a position to make a thorough study of the question and to submit a report on which the Fifth Committee could hold a serious discussion early in the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that, despite some reservations, the general feeling in the Committee seemed to be that consideration of the question should be deferred until the twenty-seventh session. There remained the question how the Rapporteur was to deal with the subject in the Committee's report. In that connexion, he would ask the Indian delegation to supply the Rapporteur with a written text of its suggestions.

75. Mr. GUPTA (India) welcomed the statement made by the Controller, and said he would like to emphasize that the only purpose of his suggestion that the Secretariat should be asked to submit a "mini-mock-up" of the 1973 budget was to enable comparisons to be made between the two forms of presentation of the budget, as was essential if the Committee was to be in a position to take a fully informed decision on the question later. His delegation had never intended to add still further to the volume of documentation or to the Secretariat's workload.

76. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that, while he appreciated the concern expressed by the Controller, he hoped that at the twenty-seventh session the Fifth Committee would have before it a proper document which it could consider, preferably early in the session.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.