



Thursday, 14 November 1968,
at 11.5 a.m.

Official Records

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 74:</i>	
<i>Budget estimates for the financial year 1969 (continued)</i>	
<i>First reading (continued)</i>	
<i>Section 3. Salaries and wages (continued).</i>	1
<i>Report of the Secretary-General on the salary scales for the Professional and higher categories (concluded)</i>	1

Chairman: Mr. G. G. TCHERNOUCHTENKO
(Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic).

AGENDA ITEM 74

Budget estimates for the financial year 1969 (continued)
(A/7125, A/7205, A/7207, A/7236, A/7255, A/7280,
A/7304, A/C.5/1169 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1175-1179,
A/C.5/1182, A/C.5/1183, A/C.5/1185, A/C.5/1186-
1189, A/C.5/L.943, A/C.5/L.944, A/C.5/L.947/
Rev.1, A/C.5/L.948, A/C.5/L.950)

First reading (continued) (A/C.5/L.943)

SECTION 3. SALARIES AND WAGES (continued)* (A/
7205, A/7207, A/7236, A/7255, A/7280, A/C.5/1169
AND CORR.1, A/C.5/L.944, A/C.5/L.947/REV.1,
A/C.5/L.948, A/C.5/L.950)

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE
SALARY SCALES FOR THE PROFESSIONAL AND
HIGHER CATEGORIES (concluded)* (A/7236, A/
7280, A/C.5/L.944, A/C.5/L.947/REV.1, A/C.5/
L.950)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had two draft resolutions before it: one submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.5/L.947/Rev.1) and the other prepared by the Secretariat (see A/C.5/L.944).

2. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, as it now stood, was not wholly consistent with the facts since the International Civil Service Advisory Board had in fact completed its examination of the "principles" to which it referred; to avoid any ambiguity, it would be better to reword the paragraph as follows:

"Noting that the International Civil Service Advisory Board had not yet completed the review which it started in 1966 of the methods to be applied in establishing salaries for international civil servants".

*Resumed from 1256th meeting.

3. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, if that proposal was accepted, the wording of the draft resolution would have to be amended accordingly.

4. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation accepted the new wording.

5. Mr. ZODDA (Italy) said that, in the course of the general discussion (1243rd meeting), his delegation had stated that it would be prepared to support any reasonable proposal to reduce expenditure. Nevertheless, it was undeniable that the cost of living continued to rise and that, as a result, the salaries and allowances of staff members had to be adjusted from time to time.

6. Since it considered that the Secretary-General's proposal and the recommendation of ICSAB were perfectly justified, his delegation, which thought it should be possible to economize on other budget items, would vote against the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union.

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.5/L.947/Rev.1), as orally amended, and said that they would be voting on the draft as a whole, since the representative of Pakistan had withdrawn his proposal for separate votes on the preambular and operative paragraphs.

The draft resolution was rejected by 41 votes to 7, with 26 abstentions.

8. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution prepared by the Secretariat (see A/C.5/L.944).

The draft resolution was adopted by 60 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

9. Mr. TILAKARATNA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union because, while it understood the intention of the preamble, it considered that the solution proposed in the operative part was inappropriate in view of the request made by the Secretary-General and the opinion expressed by ICSAB.

10. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said he understood the reasons for the Soviet Union proposal but had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because the operative part did not constitute a satisfactory solution to the problem.

11. His delegation had also abstained from voting on draft resolution contained in document A/C.5/L.944 because, while it agreed that the post adjustments were not entirely adequate to offset increases in cost

of living and that a revision of salary scales was needed, it was not entirely convinced, for the reasons it had adduced during the general discussion, at the 1242nd meeting, that an increase of 5 per cent was necessary.

12. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution prepared by the Secretariat because it had not been convinced by the relevant documentation that the proposal was justified, particularly in view of the principles adopted by the General Assembly at its twentieth session. His delegation considered that the present system of salary adjustments for United Nations staff was sufficient protection against cost-of-living increases, whether in the United States of America or elsewhere, until such time as ICSAB and the other competent bodies had studied the question thoroughly and made proposals.

13. Nevertheless, his vote should not be construed to mean that his delegation was opposed to the principle of a justified increase in salaries and was attempting to undermine the morale of the Secretariat. On the contrary, by advocating a comprehensive study with a view to establishing a salary system for international civil servants and encouraging the competent bodies to speed up their work, his delegation was protecting the morale of the staff as well as the interests of the majority of Member States. The assumption that the desires of the staff, on the one hand, and the unquestionably high standing of certain individuals on the other, constituted decisive criteria for a salary increase was indefensible, both from the financial and from the moral point of view, especially when facts and figures proved that, in the majority of cases, those desires were unjustified.

14. To avoid any misunderstanding, his delegation wished to emphasize that the views it had expressed referred only to the subject before the Committee, namely, salary scales for the Professional and higher categories.

15. Mr. FENSOME (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted against the Soviet Union draft resolution because it considered that the existing procedures, including those involving ICSAB, for determining the emoluments of the staff, should not be lightly discarded. Nothing had been said in the debate which would justify changing the existing procedures.

16. Mr. JERE (Zambia) said he had abstained from voting on the Soviet Union draft resolution because he was confident that the arguments on which it was based would be taken into consideration.

17. Mr. ELIAV (Israel) said he had voted in favour of the proposal for a 5 per cent increase in the salaries of the Professional and higher categories of staff, despite the misgivings he shared with many other delegations about the steady increase in the administrative expenses of the United Nations. That increase was due to many factors, including the establishment of new posts, increases in salaries, grants and allowances and expansion of Headquarters premises. All those requests were perhaps justified and unavoidable but cumulatively, they imposed none the less a heavy financial burden. His delegation had

therefore supported the proposal that the administrative machinery of the Organization should be carefully examined with a view to improving the output and utilization of staff. However, those considerations should not prevent the staff from receiving a fair wage. The recommendations made by two highly competent and impartial bodies should be implemented without delay.

18. His delegation nevertheless stressed that it shared the concern expressed by others concerning other categories of staff, especially the security guards, whose responsibilities were particularly heavy, as the representative of Trinidad and Tobago had mentioned at the 1256th meeting. It was gratifying to learn that efforts were being made to review all the problems affecting those categories of staff and his delegation hoped that the negotiations under way would be speedily concluded to the satisfaction of all.

*
* *

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider section 3 as a whole. In his budget estimates for the financial year 1969 (A/7205), the Secretary-General had requested an appropriation of \$64,862,000 under that section. In its main report (A/7207), the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions recommended a reduction of \$760,600, which would reduce the appropriation \$64,101,400.

20. In document A/C.5/1169 and Corr.1, the Secretary-General had submitted revised estimates amounting to \$105,100 under section 3, whereas the Advisory Committee, in its related report (A/7255) recommended a reduction of \$20,400 which would reduce the amount to \$84,700. Finally, in document A/7236, the Secretary-General was requesting an additional appropriation of \$2,480,900 which had been approved by the Advisory Committee (A/7280).

21. The total appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee for section 3 thus amounted to \$66,667,000.

22. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that under section 3, which was the largest item of budget expenditure, the Advisory Committee recommended a total appropriation of \$66,667,000, a reduction of \$781,000 as compared with the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General. In considering that section, the Advisory Committee had taken into account the information given it by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work programmes in the economic, social and human rights fields. The Committee had also acknowledged the improvement in the recruitment situation, but it still doubted whether it would be possible to fill all the new posts requested for 1969.

23. In recommending a modest reduction (23 per cent) in the number of posts requested by the Secretary-General under section 3, the Advisory Committee had recognized that, in the light of the priority programmes called for by Member States, there were valid reasons for a staff increase in 1969. In that connexion, the new

internal review group set up by the Secretary-General had been of assistance to the Advisory Committee in examining the requirements in the economic and social field.

24. However, the Advisory Committee had expressed its concern about staff utilization and deployment; in particular, it had doubted whether the essential requirement of the optimum use of resources was being fully observed throughout the Secretariat. For that reason, it had recommended in paragraph 50 of its main report that the Secretary-General should undertake on an urgent basis a careful and detailed survey, preferably desk by desk, of existing personnel available to him, their deployment and utilization. That recommendation was closely linked to the detailed recommendations and suggestions of the Advisory Committee on the level and growth of staff for 1969 and had a direct bearing on the Advisory Committee's observation, in paragraph 141 of the same report to the effect that that Committee would not expect to see any substantial change in the level of staff resources to be presented for 1970.

25. In his statement to the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/1176), the Secretary-General had asked the Committee whether the survey of staff utilization might not be extended over a somewhat longer period than that envisaged by the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee appreciated the Secretary-General's position and felt that initially consideration might be given to surveys of particular sectors of the Secretariat. At the same time, the Advisory Committee was concerned that the study should not be unduly delayed.

26. In summary, while the Advisory Committee had not fully supported the Secretary-General's proposal for additional staff resources in 1969 under section 3, it had nevertheless recommended an appreciable increase in the number of posts, which should considerably ease the situation, particularly in the economic, social and human rights fields and in the administrative and conference servicing areas.

27. Mr. BYKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that sections 3 and 4 accounted for approximately 60 per cent of the total expenditure. The Secretary-General was requesting the establishment of 607 new posts, a staff increase of 8 per cent; such an increase would be incompatible with the guidelines on reorganization and financial control.

28. For many years the Secretariat had found itself unable to discharge its functions without requesting the establishment of new posts. His delegation could not help but be concerned about the tendency automatically to request additional staff whenever a new programme was initiated. The Advisory Committee had indicated that the number of posts could be reduced by better utilization and deployment of staff; however, the proposals which it had made were not drastic enough and the Advisory Committee, with the assistance of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Secretariat should seriously consider the possibility of making a significant reduction in the present level of staff. Moreover, the recommendations of the Committee of Seven were still not known.

29. The survey of staff utilization should be initiated immediately, without waiting for the formal report of the Committee of Seven, and it should be completed before the next financial year. It was regrettable that the Advisory Committee had not taken those considerations into account when it had made its recommendations.

30. His delegation formally proposed,^{1/} therefore, that the manning-table should be maintained unchanged pending a report on the results of the survey on the utilization and deployment of staff in the Secretariat.

31. Mr. FINNY (New Zealand) noted that section 3 determined the level of the budget estimates to a very great extent and recalled that past efforts to hold down the rate of increase had met with little success. From a figure of \$30 million in 1959, the amount of appropriations requested by the Secretary-General under section 3 had risen to \$45 million in 1963 and had reached more than \$60 million for 1969. Of course, the expanded responsibilities of the United Nations inevitably brought about an increase in Secretariat staff, and as the cost of living went up, salaries had to be adjusted from time to time. Nevertheless, the New Zealand delegation shared the Advisory Committee's impression that all was not well in the Secretariat, and he wondered whether the manning-table was sufficiently "compact", whether, in other words, some posts were not redundant. The Advisory Committee had recommended that the Secretary-General should undertake a detailed and thorough survey of that matter with the objective of determining whether the staffing establishment was fully commensurate with the workload it was expected to carry. His delegation wholeheartedly supported that proposal and was pleased to note that it had so far met with approval from all delegations. That unanimity augured well for the success of the undertaking. The survey provided an opportunity for future delegations to be sure that the appropriations they approved for the maintenance or enlargement of Secretariat staff were fully warranted and fruitfully employed.

32. As to how the survey should be carried out, most delegations had not yet taken a final position. Some felt that the whole matter should be left to the Secretariat while others thought that the whole survey should be conducted by an organization outside the United Nations. Some delegations felt that the study should be carried out by a group specially brought together for that purpose within the Secretariat. All delegations were waiting with interest to learn what observations the Committee of Seven would make on the staff question, which was one of the key aspects of its mandate.

33. His delegation for its part had formed firm views on some points without having reached a final conclusion on the whole question. First of all, like a number of other delegations, it considered that the survey should begin at the earliest possible date consistent with the Secretary-General's request for a delay in which to do the preparatory work. The work which would be done prior to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, should give some tangible indication of the situation. If the survey itself

^{1/} Subsequently circulated in document A/C.5/L.952.

was begun in March 1969, which would seem feasible, the Secretary-General would have six months to spend on it before the twenty-fourth session. At the end of the six months, the work should have produced sufficient concrete results to enable the Fifth Committee at that session to look at the 1970 budget estimates, in particular the estimated expenditure under section 3, with greater and more specific knowledge than it currently had concerning the utilization of Secretariat staff.

34. His delegation felt that the survey should be entrusted to a team drawn from the Secretariat; however, without questioning the Secretariat's competence to perform the task, he suggested that the team should either be led by an independent chairman or supplemented by expert help from outside. The workings of a bureaucracy were being studied, and everyone was aware of the difficulties involved in such a study. With the best will in the world, an investigator on the staff of the Secretariat would inevitably be more or less influenced by the policy and procedures of the Organization, if not indeed a prisoner of them. To gain a clearer insight, he would need the assistance of competent persons outside the Organization who could go directly to the heart of the matter and could determine the vital sectors of activity and isolate those where staff increases might be unwarranted and of marginal utility. There was no doubt that recruiting outside experts would entail expense, but it would probably not be significant in relation to the results that could be obtained.

35. His delegation wished to know whether the Secretariat had developed its own thinking on the matter and, if so, what conclusions it had reached. As soon as other delegations had formulated their positions, it was to be hoped that the collective thinking of the Committee would take form before long in a specific proposal.

Mr. Olivier (Canada), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

36. Mr. ZIEHL (United States of America) also noted that the Secretary-General's estimate under section 3 alone represented a very large percentage of the budget and that, as the representative of New Zealand had pointed out, the increased expenditure proposed in that section was only part of the total increase in staff costs. The 607 new established posts requested under various sections of the budget, but particularly under section 3, would increase the number of established posts in the Organization to 8,435 in 1969. The Advisory Committee proposed that only 75 per cent of the new established posts requested by the Secretary-General should be approved.

37. As his delegation had stated during the general discussion (1255th meeting), it thought that personnel levels could be reduced even further than the Advisory Committee recommended. It should be possible to take action which would ensure that the most effective use was made of the existing staff and which would be reflected in savings in 1969 and in the lowest possible budget estimates for 1970. In other words, his delegation was convinced that improved management procedures—although it did not wish to criticize existing procedures—and the results of the manpower utilization studies could bring about a decrease in the esti-

mated expenditure on personnel in the budget for 1969 and be reflected in a smaller budget in 1970.

38. His delegation welcomed the Secretary-General's decision to establish an internal review group, which had already done excellent work and which would serve as a guarantee in the future that estimates would be carefully studied in the light of the activities and programmes for which they were intended. Other aspects of management which were currently receiving the attention of the competent services of the Secretariat should result in improved methods and procedures for the assessment of requirements.

39. The main problem was to determine whether the activities being carried out by the United Nations were really the essential ones. He was convinced that the Controller and the new Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management would review the methods used in that field. He had noted that the Secretary-General had informed the Fifth Committee (see A/C.5/1176) that he would submit to it certain parts of the report of the Committee of Seven which would be of great value when it considered section 3. He would like to know, for instance, whether the possible application of the recommendations of that Committee would be reflected in reductions in personnel, and, assuming that its report contained recommendations on that subject, how long their execution would require and if they would affect the budget for 1969. It would also be interesting to know whether the Committee of Seven had made recommendations for improving management methods and procedure, or recommendations relating to manpower utilization. The Fifth Committee should be apprised of the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee of Seven before taking a decision on section 3, and he hoped that the relevant information would be made available.

40. Turning to the survey recommended by the Advisory Committee, he recalled that during the general discussion, his delegation had considered in detail the Advisory Committee's observations on that subject, contained in paragraphs 47 to 50 of the Advisory Committee's main report. While sympathizing with the Secretary-General's reasons for requesting that the initiation of the survey should be deferred for several months, his delegation thought that the preparation should not take too long and that, in any case, some work could be put in hand at once. With regard to the question of the responsibility for carrying out the survey, the Secretary-General would probably request the assistance of outside consultants, who would be responsible for the design of the survey and for giving advice on the techniques and methods to be used. His delegation viewed the survey as essential, and had no doubt that the Secretariat would carry it out with the greatest competence. It might be necessary to bring up from the ranks and train the staff members to whom the Secretary-General intended to entrust that work. The Advisory Committee had recommended that the Secretary-General should himself undertake the survey, and the Fifth Committee should agree to give full responsibility for the bulk of it to the Secretary-General, although it would of course be able to make comments which might help him in his task, and to inform him of its views.

41. With regard to the timing of the survey as such, he thought that it should be tackled as soon as possible, so that the results could be taken into account in 1969. The fact that some staff categories could not be included in the survey in 1969 should not be an obstacle. It would be worthwhile trying to see if the recruitment of excessive numbers of additional personnel could be avoided for the time being by a more effective deployment of existing staff.

42. His delegation therefore proposed that the Fifth Committee, after approving the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee, should also decide that 25 per cent of all the new posts proposed by the Secretary-General for 1969 should not be filled unless and until the Secretary-General had determined, on the basis of selective manpower utilization studies, in some sectors at least, and preferably with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee, that he could not defer those hirings pending completion of the studies in question. Moreover, full consideration should be given by the Secretary-General to reductions which he anticipated might be possible as the result of those studies, with a view to avoiding any increase in posts for 1970. The text of that proposal could be included in the report of the Fifth Committee on the budget estimates for 1969. His delegation was not proposing that the manning table should be "frozen" at the current level, but merely that—before more than 50 per cent of the new posts proposed by the Secretary-General were filled—an attempt should be made to see whether part of the work could be absorbed by existing personnel.

43. He explained that in submitting that proposal, his delegation by no means intended to jeopardize the execution of programmes which had been approved by various United Nations organs; the proposal, which gave the Secretary-General great latitude, was intended to help him to discharge his task with the maximum economy. His delegation had asked that the text of its proposal be circulated ^{2/} in the hope that once the members of the Committee had studied it, they would realize that it provided a solution to their common objectives.

44. Before concluding, he repeated that his delegation had complete faith in the Secretary-General and his staff. It wished to see him carry out the survey recommended by the Advisory Committee and hoped that he would be able, on the basis of the results of that survey, to reduce expenditures for 1969 and to submit estimates for 1970 which were as low as possible.

45. Mr. TIEBA (Ivory Coast) said he realized that the appropriation requested under section 3—over \$60 million, or almost half the total expenditure foreseen for 1969—might seem excessive at first sight. Nevertheless, the figure could be fairly judged only by taking into account the nature of the Organization, its world-wide vocation and the new tasks which the Secretariat had to undertake in the economic and social field on the threshold of the second United Nations Development Decade. For that reason, his delegation, in view of the situation, would not hesitate to support the Secretary-General, since it felt that

he must be given a sufficient appropriation to enable all the work undertaken by the Secretariat to be duly carried out. Although his delegation accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendations, it hoped nevertheless that the reductions obtained, particularly those under section 21, would in no way hinder the implementation of programmes. It felt that a measure of flexibility in regard to the newly created organizations in no way justified a certain reticence shown by some delegations; in that connexion, it had misgivings about the Ukrainian delegation's proposal. It was absolutely essential, in his delegation's view, to provide the Secretary-General with the means to implement the current or planned programmes, which would otherwise be adversely affected.

46. His delegation also took the view that a more rational organization of the Secretariat, making better use of its staff, should make savings possible. In that respect, it had noted with interest the idea expressed by the Advisory Committee and taken up by many delegations, to the effect that a survey should be undertaken with a view to reducing staff requirements. His delegation would endorse the findings of such a survey, although it would expect that the personnel levels thus recommended would be sufficient to complete successfully all the work already undertaken, particularly in the economic and social field. The Fifth Committee should leave that task to the Secretary-General, who would carry out the required studies with the collaboration of all the competent bodies.

47. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said that the total appropriation requested under section 3, taking into account all the relevant expenditure items, would amount to roughly \$67 million for 1969; that represented an increase of 11 per cent over the relevant appropriation for 1968. The amount requested was to enable the establishment approved for 1968 to be maintained during 1969, to finance 452 new posts requested by the Secretary-General and to provide an interim adjustment of salary scales for the Professional and higher categories. Since the two latter items accounted for almost 9 per cent of the increased expenditure under section 3, it was important to check whether they were well justified and really inevitable.

48. In that respect, his delegation was not convinced by such general explanations as the constant growth of activities in certain fields or the increased meetings of specialized working groups as a justification for the creation of new posts. Such trends had long since been recognized, and attempts had been made to keep them within reasonable limits. For that reason, the delegations would be justified in expecting the Secretariat to show more concern for exercising control and economy in its requests for appropriations and to organize itself in accordance with the modifications inevitably involved in United Nations activities. All the reports of the programme-formulating bodies were not yet to hand; it could be assumed, however, that the over-all increase in United Nations activities for 1969 would be commensurate with that experienced in previous years. Furthermore, his delegation wished to observe that UNIDO, which, two years before had been an integrated part of the Secretariat, now had not only its own budget section

^{2/} See document A/C.5/L.951.

but also its own increased staff requirements for 1969. Those considerations made it hard for his delegation to understand why the request for additional posts for the Secretariat itself should be so high. His delegation was also astonished that the Advisory Committee's conclusions in regard to section 3 should, for 1969, differ so widely from those which it had reached in 1967, since the arguments on which they were based were more or less the same. The Advisory Committee currently recommended a reduction of only 20 per cent in the posts requested, although the reduction recommended for 1968 had been about 75 per cent. In his delegation's view, changes in United Nations activities were no justification for allowing new staff requests for 1969 to exceed the rate of increase recommended for 1968 by the Advisory Committee and approved by the General Assembly.

49. His delegation recalled the concern expressed by the Controller during the debate on the supplementary estimates for 1968, who had said that the recent speeding up in recruitment was endangering the turnover situation and also called for additional posts in 1969. The data and the documents submitted to the Committee did not appear to justify such concern. On the contrary, there had been 119 vacant posts in September 1968, against 110 at the end of 1967, 164 at 1 January 1968 and 131 at 1 June 1968. Such variations confirmed the reservations expressed by the Advisory Committee as to the possibility of filling the posts by the end of 1969.

50. In view of all those considerations, his delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee in thinking that a detailed survey of programmes, and a redeployment of Secretariat personnel, would result in more efficient use of staff without so many additional post requirements. Such a step would not only serve the Member States' interests but would also increase the efficiency of United Nations activities.

51. Finally, his delegation would like to receive from the Secretary-General's representative certain clarifications concerning the additional requirement of \$60,000 which appeared in table 3-2 of the budget estimates for 1969 under the heading "Assistant Secretary-General". Since the number of posts of Assistant Secretary-General was the same as for 1968, that amount apparently represented an increase of roughly 16 per cent in the annual salary of officials in that category, making it higher than that of the Under-Secretaries-General.

52. Mr. FAURA (Peru) said that he shared the views expressed by the previous speakers, particularly the New Zealand and United States representatives. All delegations were impatiently awaiting the report of the Committee of Seven, in which they were expecting to see some very important recommendations. If it was going to be submitted shortly to the members of the Fifth Committee, his delegation wondered whether it could possibly postpone its consideration of that report before voting on section 3.

53. The Secretary-General's staff requests for 1969 would, if approved, raise the total number of United Nations officials to 8,435. During the general discus-

sion (1253rd meeting) his delegation had already pointed out that the staff was too large. He reiterated that view, and felt that the number of new posts requested should be reduced by 50 per cent, at least, and that the United Nations should adopt a policy which would introduce more flexibility in staff deployment and a better allocation of work within the Secretariat. The survey recommended by the Advisory Committee was of the highest importance. However, his delegation felt that such a study must be entrusted to persons thoroughly familiar with the present functioning of the Secretariat, and in particular with the external and internal pressures which were bound to be felt, as in any bureaucratic organization.

54. Mr. S. K. SINGH (India) said that he detected three basic considerations in the statements made so far with regard to section 3 of the budget estimates. First, the idea that it might be possible to maintain the same degree of efficiency in the various activities of the United Nations in all fields without increasing the present number of staff members was gaining ground. Secondly, many delegations were thinking about the conclusions to which the careful and detailed staff survey which the Advisory Committee recommended the Secretary-General to undertake as a matter of urgency, if possible on a desk-by-desk basis, might lead. Lastly, the Fifth Committee was impatiently awaiting the report of the Committee of Seven, which had not yet been placed before it.

55. He felt that it might be useful, in that context, to recall the purposes and complex nature of United Nations activities, and to that affect he quoted certain passages from the statement made by his delegation in the general discussion at the 1253rd meeting of the Committee. His delegation had stated then that, in view of the efforts being made by the international community to maintain and strengthen peace, the rate of growth of the United Nations budget could only be called modest, since the sums invested for peace were insignificant in relation to the vast amounts that Governments spent on arms. In addition, it should be borne in mind that the problems which the Secretariat encountered in fulfilling the tasks of the Organization were in no way comparable with those of national administrations, which were not called upon to deal with numerous intergovernmental bodies with a variety of functions. In that connexion, he wished to stress how important it was for Member States, in accordance with Article 56 of the United Nations Charter, to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization for the achievement of its purposes.

56. The proposal put forward by the United States delegation, which had consulted his own delegation on the matter, was based on the Advisory Committee's report, but it diverged considerably from that report. Indeed, it seemed to his delegation, on the basis of paragraphs 50 and 141 of the Advisory Committee's main report, that the United States delegation took it for granted that the survey recommended by the Advisory Committee would necessarily reveal the existence of glaring disparities in the work load of the various departments of the Secretariat. It might well be that that was not the case at all, judging by the statements of the Secretary-General's representatives, who had repeatedly drawn attention to the difficulties that the

shortage of staff created for them. The Office of Conference Services, in particular, had great difficulty in coping with the proliferation of documents and conferences, to which attention had been drawn many times. For that reason, his delegation did not think that it was possible to try to reduce the excessive volume of some activities and at the same time to claim that there were vast areas of inactivity within the Secretariat. As his delegation had made clear in its statement at the 1253rd meeting, when speaking of co-ordination and long-term planning, it considered that all the activities of the United Nations were closely interconnected and it was impossible to place them in absolutely watertight compartments. For example, activities relating to the struggle against colonialism overlapped with those connected with the struggle against racism, which in turn were bound up with the commercial policies of certain developed countries, and United Nations activities in the field of international trade complemented its endeavours on behalf of the developing countries, endeavours which were themselves linked with those of other United Nations bodies, thereby justifying the role of the Assistant Secretary-General for Inter-agency Affairs. Such examples could be multiplied ad infinitum. In the circumstances, his delegation, while not denying the need for a readjustment of resources in the light of the needs of the Organization, did not think that any action should be taken which, on the pretext of deploying personnel in a more rational manner, was likely

to hamper the development of the United Nations. Consequently, while respecting the arguments of the United States delegation, his delegation could not associate itself with the United States proposal, nor could it support the views of the Hungarian delegation, until the results of the survey recommended by the Advisory Committee had been made known.

57. With regard to the report of the Committee of Seven, his delegation, recalling the statement to the Fifth Committee made by the Secretary-General during the twenty-second session (1225th meeting), wished to point out that the report was submitted, not to the General Assembly, but to the Secretary-General. In fact, at that time the Secretary-General had expressed his intention of appointing a small committee to study the organization and functioning of the Secretariat and to make recommendations to him on the subject. Consequently, while he hoped that the Committee of Seven had submitted a useful report to the Secretary-General, he did not think that the latter would transmit it to the Fifth Committee unless he thought it necessary to do so. It would be a misinterpretation of the terms of reference of the Committee of Seven to claim that the Fifth Committee should have the report before it in order to be able to reach a decision on section 3 of the budget estimates.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.