



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 78: Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (<i>continued</i>)	163
Agenda item 74: Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (<i>continued</i>) First reading (<i>continued</i>) Section 18. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	166
Section 3. Salaries and wages (<i>continued</i>)	167
Agenda item 81: Implementation of the recommendations of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions	169

**Chairman: Mr. David SILVEIRA DA MOTA
 (Brazil).**

AGENDA ITEM 78

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations: report of the Committee on Contributions (*continued*) (A/7611 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.5/L.994, A/C.5/L.995, A/C.5/L.997, A/C.5/L.998)

1. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) said that his delegation would find it difficult to accept some of the texts submitted for inclusion in the Fifth Committee's report on the item under consideration. It therefore reaffirmed its support of the general conclusion of the Committee on Contributions contained in paragraph 47 of its report (A/7611 and Corr.1 and Add.1). He fully endorsed the view expressed by the delegation of the United Kingdom (1319th meeting) that the Fifth Committee should let well enough alone and allow the Committee on Contributions to pursue its task unfettered and to sift the views expressed in the current debate, together with the additional statistical data which would be available to it early in 1970. The paragraph proposed by the delegation of the United States of America (see A/C.5/L.994) or some simpler formula along the lines suggested by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (1320th meeting) would be acceptable.

2. Mr. SUM (Malaysia) offered condolences to the Tanzanian delegation on the death of Mr. Danieli, Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations. He thanked the Indonesian delegation for its condolences on the death of Mr. Ismail, Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations.

3. He commended the Committee on Contributions for its informative and comprehensive report, which fully complied with the requests made in resolution 2472 B (XXIII) of the General Assembly. The Brazilian representative's statement in that connexion at the 1311th meeting had largely anticipated the views of his own delegation, which agreed that the \$1,000 level was still the best indicator of low *per capita* income. He was generally impressed by the general conclusions of the Committee on Contributions and was gratified to note that the guidelines given to that Committee by the Assembly had withstood the test of time and permitted the establishment of a balanced and equitable scale based primarily on the principle of capacity to pay. However, there was still room for improvement in those guidelines. The views expressed in the current debate deserved the closest attention, and it was to be hoped that a generally acceptable consensus could be achieved.

4. Mr. MAKUFU (Democratic Republic of the Congo), after congratulating the Committee on Contributions upon its report, said that the existing scale of assessments had been based on criteria which no longer reflected current realities. However, it was quite clear from the variety of views expressed during the current debate that the establishment of generally acceptable new criteria was obviously a highly complex operation. The concern of Member States to establish an equitable scale of assessments stemmed from their desire to contribute to the Organization's budget to the full extent of their financial capacity. How could the developing countries do so when that budget steadily increased while their own resources steadily decreased? Consequently, the task of the Committee on Contributions was vital; its work was to lead to the establishment of criteria which would allow each State to make the maximum contribution to the budget with the minimum sacrifice. His delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on the item introduced during the previous session because it had had misgivings with regard to specific trends towards the upward adjustment of the minimum level of contributions. Whereas the report¹ of the Committee on Contributions to the Assembly at its twenty-third session had in no way challenged the scale of assessments adopted in 1967, the value of that Committee's current report lay in the fact that all suggestions, criticisms and views had been examined before the conclusions were stated. In that connexion, he quoted the conclusion in paragraph 47 of that report (A/7611 and Corr.1 and Add.1).

5. The considerations in paragraph 23, sub-paragraph (c), of the report deserved the Fifth Committee's special attention, particularly the consensus in the Committee on

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 10.*

Contributions that special consideration should be given to the developing countries in view of their economic problems. The implementation of the recommendations that such attention should be given to the developing countries would be a tangible demonstration of the Organization's concern to assist the developing countries in coping with their special economic and financial problems. His delegation had full confidence that the Committee on Contributions would competently discharge the tasks entrusted to it

6. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that, in its excellent and informative report, the Committee on Contributions had reviewed all the conflicting views expressed in the Fifth Committee during the previous session. The substantive conclusion of the report was that it was for the General Assembly, not the Committee on Contributions, to set guidelines for the scale of assessments. The general mood of the Fifth Committee during the current debate was that the Committee on Contributions should not be instructed specifically to change any of its guidelines. The hopes and desires expressed by various delegations could not be interpreted as instructions. One of the main problems was the question of changing the maximum allowance for low per capita income from 50 to 60 per cent. Yet even if proposals to that effect were adopted, some sixty countries now paying the minimum contribution would still not benefit. Consequently, their views were bound to differ from those of the Governments which proposed the change and those which would have to assume the burden of that change.

7. Given the current mood of the Committee, he proposed—as a compromise solution—that the Fifth Committee's report on the item should include a paragraph consisting of the first sentence of the paragraph proposed by the United States (see A/C.5/L.994) combined with the full text of the Italian amendment (A/C.5/L.995) to that paragraph, thus taking into account all the views expressed in the Fifth Committee.

8. Mr. KITI (Kenya) commended the Committee on Contributions on its lucid, detailed report. It was the first report prepared with the participation of two African members of the Committee on Contributions, whose presence would ensure that the views expressed in future reports were fully representative.

9. His delegation had always had doubts with regard to the criteria used in establishing the scale of assessments and felt that the time had come for a broad review of those criteria. In that connexion, he whole-heartedly endorsed the Pakistan representative's comments at the 1320th meeting to the effect that the Fifth Committee was not fulfilling the task assigned to it, namely, to provide the Committee on Contributions with guidance as to which of its criteria were still valid. At the same time, however, he was aware that the division of the Fifth Committee into opposing camps would not serve the interests of the United Nations.

10. His delegation was dissatisfied with some of the criteria now being applied. Although the factor of temporary dislocation of national economies arising out of the Second World War had not been operative for some time, it was no longer relevant and should be abolished. While the Assembly had reviewed the criteria on various occasions

and had laid down guidelines, such as the ability of Members to secure foreign currency, it had overlooked the most important reasons for the anomalies in the scale. It would have been appropriate, for example, to study the effects of colonialism on capacity to pay. Although difficult to assess, capacity to pay was still the fairest basis for a just and equitable scale. He was therefore gratified that the Committee on Contributions had devoted much attention to the special economic and financial problems of the developing countries. Nevertheless, evidence had emerged during the current debate that the criteria used by the Committee on Contributions were not always applied strictly, and a situation had arisen in which the assessments of poor countries had been increased and those of rich ones reduced. The United Kingdom representative had explained (1319th meeting) that the apparent paradox was due to the accelerated development of the developing countries by comparison with the reduced rate of development of the industrialized States. That curious explanation reflected a mathematical as opposed to a realistic approach to the economic problems of the developing countries. He appreciated the efforts of the Committee on Contributions to alleviate the burden borne by the developing countries and hope that it would give further thought to the equitable distribution of that burden.

11. The most important obstacle to the establishment of an equitable and just scale was the decision to fix the maximum contribution of any one Member State at 30 per cent of the total budget. The application of that criterion coupled with the expanded membership of the Organization had resulted in an increased burden on certain States which should be alleviated. The ceiling of 30 per cent had originally been set, not because it was regarded as just or because it would result in a fairer distribution of financial responsibility, but because of the fear that if a given Government made a large contribution to the Organization its influence in United Nations affairs would be correspondingly great. His Government had always regarded the United Nations as a forum where great and small Powers considered each other to be equals. It had therefore been concerned by implications during the current debate that the greater a Government's contribution the greater the weight to be attached to its views. The corollary of that argument was that the less a Government contributed, the less influence it wielded. The equation of a Government's financial contribution with its participation in policy formulation was an extremely dangerous and divisive attitude. Some delegation would always argue that its Government was unable to increase its financial contribution. He urged the Committee on Contributions not to be unduly reticent in giving its opinions with regard to the wisdom and practicability of establishing the ceiling of 30 per cent.

12. Turning to the paragraphs proposed for inclusion in the Fifth Committee's report on the item under consideration, he said that every effort should be made to achieve a consensus in a spirit of conciliation. It was regrettable that the twelve Powers had been unable to prevail upon the Committee to accept their proposal (see A/C.5/L.997). Given the importance of the issues, the interests of individual delegations should be subordinated to those of the world as a whole. The developing countries were aware of the reasons for the collapse of the League of Nations and

were concerned that the United Nations should not be allowed to disintegrate. They therefore appealed to the richer Powers to give sympathetic consideration to their views.

13. Mr. ROGERS (Canada) said that the language of the paragraph proposed by the United States of America for inclusion in the Fifth Committee's report was conciliatory and his delegation was prepared to support it. In view of the subsequent divergence of views, however, his delegation wished to stress that the criteria used by the Committee on Contributions had been adopted by the General Assembly over a period of years as a result of careful study and were applied with flexibility and discretion. The resulting scale of assessments was a conscientious attempt to take account of a whole variety of economic, political and financial considerations which were extremely difficult to reconcile. Consequently, any significant change in the criteria would undermine the whole scale of assessments. The current scale was not perfect but it was based on the principle of capacity to pay; that was the most reasonable approach. The way in which the criteria were applied was just and his delegation supported the conclusions of the Committee on Contributions.

14. The current debate in the Fifth Committee had been valuable and the views expressed would be reflected in the Fifth Committee's report, to which the Committee on Contributions would undoubtedly pay close attention. It was therefore to be hoped that the delegations which had suggested paragraphs for inclusion in the Fifth Committee's report would not press their proposals to a vote.

15. Mr. PAPADEMAS (Cyprus) observed that many members seemed to feel that the various proposals before the Committee should not be put to the vote, but it was generally agreed that all the views expressed in the course of the debate should be taken into consideration by the Committee on Contributions and should be reflected in the Fifth Committee's report. His delegation shared the opinion that particular attention should be paid to the views of the developing countries in the preparation of the Fifth Committee's recommendations to the General Assembly.

16. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation and those of Guyana and Barbados supported the text proposed by the twelve Powers; it thought that the Fifth Committee would be in a better position to discuss the item at the twenty-fifth session, when a new scale of assessments was to be established, if the factors referred to in that text were first considered by the Committee on Contributions.

17. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said that the draft proposed by the twelve Powers (see A/C.5/L.997) represented an approach which differed from that of his own delegation's proposal (see A/C.5/L.994), which had been an effort at conciliation, designed to assure the developing countries that their interests would be protected and to avoid a confrontation in the Fifth Committee. It was essential that all members should work together to solve the serious financial problems facing the Organization, and a confrontation on the issue of the scale of assessments could only exacerbate the situation and make that task more difficult. His delegation could not support the twelve-Power

proposal, which presented a point of view that, as was apparent from the statements of other delegations, was not shared by a substantial proportion of the members: it proposed an additional allowance for certain countries with a low *per capita* income, which his delegation had already rejected. Further, by emphasizing certain paragraphs in the body of the report of the Committee on Contributions, it removed the emphasis from other paragraphs, notably the conclusions, which many delegations considered to be more important. His delegation particularly objected to the emphasis on paragraph 38, because it did not agree with the comment contained in the second sentence of that paragraph and believed that the Committee on Contributions must continue to carry out its mandate as laid down in resolution 1137 (XII) of the General Assembly. He wished to stress, however, that his delegation would agree to the Fifth Committee's taking note of all the comments and conclusions contained in the report.

18. Further, the twelve-Power proposal expressed the hope that the Committee on Contributions would give due attention to the desirability of raising the limit for the concession of allowance for low *per capita* income. The Committee on Contributions had in fact already considered that question, and the majority of its members had felt that it would not be appropriate to raise the limit above \$1,000 at the current time, because such a step would necessitate radical changes in the scale of assessments. There was no reason to doubt the judgement of the Committee on Contributions on that point.

19. He was glad that the sponsors of the twelve-Power draft were not pressing for a vote on their proposal. His delegation would take the same position with regard to its own draft paragraph, and hoped that the sponsors of the other proposals would do likewise. The report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 78 would thus contain no decision, but would simply reflect all the views expressed in the course of the debate.

20. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation and that of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would not press for a vote on their proposal (see A/C.5/L.998), and agreed that the views expressed in it, like those expressed in other proposals, should be reflected in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly.

21. Mr. McGOUGH (Argentina) said his delegation felt that the conclusions in the twelve-Power proposal with regard to the allowance for low *per capita* income were realistic and showed a spirit of conciliation. It therefore supported them and hoped that the Committee on Contributions would take them into account in preparing the new scale of assessments. The continual growth of United Nations membership made it essential to raise the maximum allowance for low *per capita* income; to offset that change, however, it would of course be necessary to revise the criteria used in determining the contributions of all Member States. At the current time the developing countries were carrying an unduly heavy burden, while the contributions of the highly industrialized countries had been reduced. His delegation felt that it was the contributions of the countries with a *per capita* income below \$1,000 that should be reduced, and agreed with the Committee on Contributions that further reductions in the

assessment of the largest contributor might not be appropriate in the existing circumstances. Argentina's assessment had been substantially increased over the years and the country had to make considerable efforts to meet that obligation. His delegation was therefore always willing to help in formulating new criteria which would bring relief to the developing countries.

22. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) made a request, on behalf of the sponsors of the twelve-Power proposal, that no formal decision should be taken on the item under discussion at the current meeting, and that members should be allowed a day or two in which to consider the various proposals before the Committee and hold consultations. His delegation had joined the sponsors of the twelve-Power proposal only after hearing statements by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America to the effect that they appreciated the difficulties faced by the developing countries but felt that the current balance in the scale of assessments should not be upset. His delegation had not found their arguments convincing and still believed that the most important criterion in establishing the scale of assessments should be the capacity to pay. The Fifth Committee was trying to gloss over such factors as deteriorating trade balances and external debts, which impaired the capacity to pay of the developing countries. The preparation of a new scale of assessments, however, afforded a suitable opportunity for the Committee on Contributions to consider those factors.

23. In reply to the comments of the United States representative, he said that the developing countries did not wish to create an atmosphere of confrontation or make it impossible to find a solution to the problems facing the Organization. They merely wished to present their views to the Committee in an effective manner.

24. Mr. RHODES (United Kingdom) said that he hoped that the consultations to which the Nigerian representative had referred would not be restricted to those members who had already put their views in writing by sponsoring proposals. There were other delegations which had felt diffident about submitting texts to the Committee at that stage of the proceedings but nevertheless wished to have their views taken into account.

25. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that he agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom and felt that the Fifth Committee could best convey its views to the General Assembly, and hence to the Committee on Contributions, by simply reflecting the opinions of all members in its report, rather than by adopting formal proposals. He added that he wished the ideas he had expressed at the previous meeting on the possible consequences of the twelve-Power proposal to be included in the report.

AGENDA ITEM 74

Budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (continued)
(A/7606, A/7608, A/7710, A/7726, A/C.5/1230, A/C.5/1231 and Corr.1 and 2, A/C.5/1233, A/C.5/1234, A/C.5/1245, A/C.5/1248, A/C.5/1249, A/C.5/L.990, A/C.5/L.993)

First reading (continued) (A/C.5/L.990)

SECTION 18. OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES (A/7606, A/7608)

26. The CHAIRMAN said that in the initial budget estimates for the financial year 1970 (A/7606) the Secretary-General had made provision for the Office of the High Commissioner in the amount of \$4,170,100. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in its main report (A/7608, para. 305) had recommended a reduction of \$25,000, leaving a total of \$4,145,100.

27. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General's initial estimate for section 18 was some \$247,000 more than the revised appropriation of \$3,923,200 for the current year. Almost the whole of the that increase was due to higher personnel costs, which, in turn, resulted from the increased cost of continuing the existing establishment and from the request for 22 new established posts—an increase from 286 to 308. However, 6 of those posts were already filled on a temporary basis against additional credits approved by the General Assembly at its twenty-third session, and 10 were available to the High Commissioner in 1969 on an interim basis from programme allocations and from the Emergency Fund of the High Commissioner: the net new staffing requirements for 1970 thus amounted to 6 posts.

28. The Advisory Committee was grateful to the High Commissioner for the very detailed explanations given in support of the estimate, and had noted the concern for economy underlying that presentation. In considering the estimates, the Advisory Committee had inquired into the possibility of saving money by replacing some of the High Commissioner's representatives in Europe and the Americas by correspondents, as had already been done in many countries. In making its recommendation, it had taken into account that potential source of economies, and the possibility that savings due to staff turnover might prove higher than had been budgeted for.

29. Mr. AKYAMAC (Turkey) said he felt that a tribute was due to the High Commissioner and his staff on their work for refugees, who whatever their nationality, deserved the protection of the international community. It was regrettable that developments with which the United Nations had been occupied for years had created immense problems in certain parts of Africa and Asia. As a result, attention had been concentrated on those areas. His delegation endorsed the unanimous conclusion of the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme (see A/7606, para. 18.6) that there should be no break of continuity in the protection activities of the High Commissioner's Office in any area or in respect of any group of refugees within the competence of that Office. It also appreciated the efforts made to foster inter-agency co-operation, which was bound to make assistance to refugees in Africa more effective.

30. He drew attention to the important contribution made by personnel in the field offices; the branch office in Ankara, thanks to its excellent staff, had performed very

valuable services and co-operated fruitfully with the Turkish Government. He noted from paragraph 295 of the Advisory Committee's report that 6 posts were to be eliminated, and hoped that that decision had been based on operational needs rather than on considerations of economy. His delegation was glad that the Advisory Committee had recommended only a minimal reduction, and it would vote in favour of that reduction.

31. Mr. EL-BARADEI (United Arab Republic) noted the additional staff requirements under section 18 and the purposes for which the new posts were to be used. His delegation felt that the needs of the High Commissioner's Office were of a very special nature and hoped that the General Assembly would spare no effort to meet them.

32. Mr. SADRY (Iran) observed that the initial estimate for 1970 under section 18 showed a very small increase over the revised appropriation for 1969, considering the new problems which the High Commissioner had had to face in Africa and Asia. He noted that the High Commissioner had heeded the past recommendations of the Advisory Committee concerning the redeployment of staff to new areas of activity and the recommendations of the General Assembly on inter-agency co-ordination. It had thus been possible to meet the minimum needs of refugees, including their need for legal protection, and yet keep the 1970 estimates at a reasonable level. Like the Advisory Committee, he noted the concern for economy underlying the High Commissioner's extremely well-prepared report and felt that his delegation could safely approve the reduction of \$25,000 recommended by the Advisory Committee.

33. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that judging from the budget estimates, the work of the High Commissioner's Office which served a desperate humanitarian need, was being very efficiently administered and executed. He only wished to query two points in the Advisory Committee's report. First, he did not quite understand the implications of the suggestion contained in paragraph 304 of the report that savings might be made by replacing some of the representatives in Europe and the Americas by correspondents, and would like further clarification of that statement from the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. Secondly, he would like to know what grounds the Advisory Committee had for believing that the savings due to staff turnover might exceed the estimated 3 per cent for Professional staff in existing posts and 10 per cent for all new posts. Although \$25,000 was a relatively small reduction, his delegation nevertheless felt that it would be an advantage to the Fifth Committee to have more detailed information in order to understand the reasons for the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

34. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention, in response to the first question, of the representative of Trinidad and Tobago, to table 18-4 in the budget estimates for 1970. Many of the offices listed there had been established by the High Commissioner at a time when refugee problems were at their worst in Europe. Since then the emphasis had shifted to other areas of the world, and although the High Commissioner still attached importance to the European offices, he believed that in most cases the

staff could and should be replaced by local officials known as correspondents. The Advisory Committee had felt that it would be appropriate to make a token reduction in staff in order to accelerate the process of change. In answer to the second question, he said that the adjustment for staff turnover in the office of the High Commissioner was 3 per cent, rather than 5 or 6 per cent as in other United Nations offices, because posts in the office of the High Commissioner were relatively easy to fill; but the Advisory Committee still considered 3 per cent to be too low. That had been a minor consideration, however, in recommending the reduction.

35. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that the High Commissioner recognized the reasonableness of the Advisory Committee's recommendation concerning the replacement of some of his representatives in Europe and the Americas by correspondents. The High Commissioner viewed it as a suggestion and not an instruction, and would explore the matter carefully, although he could not promise that the changes would be feasible and that they would result in savings. Regarding the deduction for turnover, the Advisory Committee had tended to be optimistic about what could be achieved and had fortunately proved right in the past. The situation might well change, but there was no way of predicting when and to what extent. The High Commissioner did not propose to prejudice essential service or programme activities in order to reach a higher adjustment figure, but was prepared to do his best to achieve the modest saving envisaged by the Advisory Committee.

36. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that in view of the shifting emphasis of the High Commissioner's work, his delegation could accept the suggestion that the existing establishment in Europe should be reviewed. It would have thought, however, that the proper course would have been first to suggest such a review and to take budgetary action a year later. It should be noted in that connexion that the High Commissioner was already engaged in reorganizing staffing arrangements in two Latin American countries (see A/7606, para. 18.42). Thus it should be recognized that the High Commissioner was attempting to ensure that his budget requests reflected current needs rather than past arrangements. From the explanations just given, however, he gathered that the High Commissioner could accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations as a working hypothesis, and his delegation was prepared to support them.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/7608, para. 305) for an appropriation of \$4,145,100 under section 18 was approved on first reading by 69 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

SECTION 3. SALARIES AND WAGES (*continued*)*
(A/7606, A/7608, A/7710, A/C.5/1231 AND CORR.1 AND 2)

37. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) observed that of the 74 new established posts requested for 1970, 30 were requested under section 3 for two areas: the Library at Headquarters (12 posts) and the Languages Division at the United Nations Office at Geneva (18 posts). The Library

* Resumed from the 1313th meeting.

posts were required to continue the work of converting the existing indexing system to a computerized operation and were unlikely to be affected by the current manpower survey. The posts in the Languages Division had been requested in order to restore a more workable ratio between permanent and temporary conference servicing staff employed at Geneva. His delegation accordingly had no difficulty in supporting the request.

38. Only 17 provisional posts were foreseen for ECA in 1970. In considering the question of the staff of the Commission, his delegation had kept in mind the report of ECA on its ninth session² and the report on ECA by the Joint Inspection Unit.³ In several parts of its report, that unit referred to the inadequacy of staff resources of ECA, and drew attention specifically to paragraphs 15, 16 and 18. His delegation therefore wondered whether the proposed 17 provisional posts were sufficient in the light of the functions ECA was expected to fulfil and the hopes placed in it by African countries. He hoped that everything would be done to enable ECA, in the course of the coming decade, to implement the important resolutions adopted at its ninth session.

39. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the general discussion (1300th meeting) his delegation had drawn attention to the steady rise in United Nations expenditure and the heavy burden it placed on Member States. Many delegations had expressed the same concern and had pointed specifically to the growth of expenditure on United Nations personnel. The combined estimate under sections 3 and 4 had risen from \$68.9 million for 1966 to \$93.7 million for 1970, representing an increase of 36 per cent. No Government budget showed so high a rate of increase for the same period.

40. The only way to introduce order into United Nations staffing arrangements was, in his delegation's view, to exert firm control over expenditure and the establishment of new posts. His delegation, like many others, had repeatedly stressed the need to streamline the Secretariat, abolish superfluous and duplicative units, redeploy staff members whose responsibilities had diminished and adopt other steps leading to reduced expenditure. No practical measures of that kind had yet been taken, however. Rather, more and more new requests were being put forward, even though it was generally accepted that no expansion of staff should be permitted pending the completion of the manpower utilization and deployment survey. Almost a year had elapsed since the Administrative Management Service had been set up to conduct the survey, but its work was so far progressing slowly.

41. His delegation strongly opposed an increase in the staff of the United Nations, UNCTAD and UNIDO above the 1969 level. It was also opposed to the granting of additional credits to the Secretary-General to engage staff on a provisional basis in 1970. Nevertheless, considering the statements made in the general discussion by the represent-

atives of many developing countries linking the requests for new posts with the implementation of approved programmes in the economic and social fields for 1970, his delegation would support the proposal submitted by the Ukrainian delegation (see A/C.5/L.993), even though it did not close the door to staff expansion. His delegation regarded the proposal as the minimum limitation which the Fifth Committee should impose. It was ready to consider any further proposals which might be placed before the Committee.

42. Mr. NÁTHON (Hungary) said that the growth rate of section 3 tended to exceed the growth rate of the total budget and observed that expenditure connected with the human resources of the Secretariat amounted to more than three-quarters of the total estimates for 1970.

43. The expansion of the Secretariat had been uneven and had not been co-ordinated. One of the main reasons for the uncertainty in the planning and use of financial resources for staffing was the lack of any direct contact between the legislative bodies and the respective departments of the Secretariat. The legislative body responsible for the planning and evaluation of a given work programme was not always aware of the actual financial implications of the programme's implementation. Moreover, the Fifth Committee often approved appropriations without having the data and justifications necessary for the thorough evaluation of the requests for additional staff. As a result, staff expansion had been controlled by the Secretariat itself.

44. It was difficult for delegations to assess the actual workloads and outputs of individual Secretariat units, especially as there was no unified and acceptable yardstick of manpower and related requirements. His delegation shared the Advisory Committee's view that "more attention should be given to evaluating completed and existing programmes and projects and the staff resources which are and will become available for redeployment" (A/7608, para. 34). The mechanical, uncritical description of work done in the economic social and human rights fields by Headquarters units and the regional economic commissions, as presented in the annual budget performance reports, did not promote an understanding of the Secretariat's activities.

45. His delegation could not support the new method by which the Secretary-General sought to expand the staff by 160 provisional posts under section 3. It was not satisfied with the justification given for the posts and shared the doubts expressed by the Advisory Committee. It could not approve the expansion in the form requested by the Secretary-General. Neither could it agree with the request for 30 additional established posts under section 3.

46. His delegation proposed that the 1969 establishment should be adjusted to meet the requirements of the 1970 work programme, except in the areas cited by the Ukrainian delegation (see A/C.5/L.993). The Ukrainian proposal, if approved, would reduce the requested 160 provisional posts by 71, resulting in a reduction of some \$410,000 under section 3, as compared with the \$120,000 cut recommended by the Advisory Committee. His delegation could not support the Advisory Committee's recommendation in its current form.

² *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-seventh Session*, document E/4651.

³ See document E/4733, sect. I.

AGENDA ITEM 81**Implementation of the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies: Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/7728, A/7738, A/C.5/1241, A/C.5/1242)**

47. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Secretary-General's note in document A/C.5/1241 and the corresponding report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/7728) dealt with the report by the Joint Inspection Unit on its activities during the period 1 January 1968 to 30 June 1969. The Secretary-General's note in document A/C.5/1242 and the corresponding report of the Advisory Committee (A/7738) dealt with the question of supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Unit as proposed in Economic and Social Council resolution 1457 (XLVII) of 8 August 1969.

48. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that in its report in document (A/7728), the Advisory Committee indicated the action it had taken so far on the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit which it had formally received from the Secretary-General and expressed its appreciation of the contribution made by the Unit to the work of the United Nations. At a recent informal meeting of the Advisory Committee with 6 of the 8 inspectors, it had been agreed that in order to ensure effective co-ordination of activities, continuous contact would be maintained between the Executive Secretaries of the Advisory Committee and the Unit and that further informal consultations between members of the Advisory Committee and the Unit would be held when convenient.

49. The Fifth Committee might wish to suggest that the General Assembly adopt a resolution taking note with appreciation of the report and the contribution made by the Joint Inspection Unit to the work of the Organization.

50. With regard to the supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Unit, he said that the Advisory Committee had stated in its report on that subject (A/7738) that it fully appreciated the desire of the Economic and Social Council to receive reports concerning activities under its general responsibility as soon as possible, together with the observations of the Secretary-General. The Advisory Committee would accordingly ensure that such reports and observations were transmitted to the Council, through the Committee on Programme and Co-ordination, as soon as they were received by the Advisory Committee. The latter would deal as expeditiously as possible with the reports and observations; the Secretary-General had also indicated that he would take into account the time-limits set out in resolution 1457 (XLVII) of the Council and endeavour to meet them within the limits of the staff resources available to him.

51. The supplementary arrangements were closely related to the arrangements for making the reports available to Member States. While maintaining its view that the reports should normally be made available to Member States, the Advisory Committee felt that it might be uneconomical and

inefficient to circulate all reports of a highly technical and complex nature in all the official languages and with full distribution. In some cases the authors of the reports might prepare summaries for general distribution in all languages, with the full texts in the original language being made available on requests; alternatively, if such technical reports did not lend themselves to meaningful summary, a limited initial distribution could be made of the full report and additional copies made available on request. The Advisory Committee would give particular attention, on a case-by-case basis, to the distribution of the Unit's reports, bearing in mind the essential principle that the reports should be circulated to Member States.

52. Mr. GONSALVES (India) said that his delegation had persistently drawn attention to the growing proliferation of co-ordination machinery, which resulted in duplication and tended to obscure the basic question of the proper planning and management of United Nations activities. It welcomed the efforts which had been made to clarify issues and delineate responsibilities and recognized the fundamental role which the Advisory Committee had to play in offering constructive solutions in matters of administrative, budgetary and management co-ordination. Nevertheless, his delegation had misgivings about the proposal that the Advisory Committee should assume full and final responsibility for co-ordinating in advance the plans of the Joint Inspection Unit, the Board of Auditors, its own work and that of other administrative units. The proposal would appear to entail both constitutional and practical difficulties. It had been clearly envisaged that the Joint Inspection Unit and the Board of Auditors should enjoy complete independence in the discharge of their responsibilities. A co-ordination effort restricting that independence would not only run counter to the spirit of the decisions establishing those two bodies but would destroy the validity of the investigating work they were expected to undertake. He pointed out that although the Advisory Committee's proposal was before the Fifth Committee, the views of the Joint Inspection Unit and of the Board of Auditors were not.

53. In his delegation's opinion, co-ordination of the activities of different investigating units could be brought about more effectively by regular exchanges between the Advisory Committee, the Joint Inspection Unit, the Board of Auditors and other administrative bodies, on the basis of which each of the organs concerned could develop a better understanding of priority fields for investigation. He hoped that the Advisory Committee would present a more precise statement of the co-ordinating functions it wished to assume so that the Fifth Committee could give its views concerning what it believed to be the optimum arrangement for the co-ordination of the work of investigating units.

54. With regard to the supplementary arrangements for handling the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit, he said that his delegation awaited with interest the implementation of the procedures outlined by the Advisory Committee (A/7738) in order to satisfy itself that the requirements mentioned by a number of delegations for the proper and prompt handling of Joint Inspection Unit reports were fully met.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.