

I would like if I may to quote from a statement made by the Canadian representative on the Ad Hoc Committee of 14 on this subject of rate of growth. On June 13, 1966, our representative said to the Ad Hoc Committee: "The limits of future growth of UN economic and social activities will depend on the merits of the plans put forward and on the reaction of member states to those plans. We do not think these limits should be determined in advance. Good planning arrangements can give us a much better idea of where we are going and therefore a much better basis for supporting and for increasing support of worth-while endeavours by the UN and its agencies. Long-term planning must mean that you judge proposals on their merits--that you judge them in terms of the usefulness or worthiness of the job which is set out to be done. If there are many important jobs to be done--as there are--jobs which appeal to the national priorities of Member States then the appropriate funds are likely to be made available provided they are clearly presented and planned well ahead."

My delegation, therefore, commends the approach of long-term planning to the Secretary-General and member states as the most effective way of resolving the question of rate of growth. Long-term planning would also make it easier for the Advisory Committee and all member states to review the annual budgetary estimates of the United Nations, since the Secretary-General's requirements would be directly related to approved long-term programmes. In the absence of programme planning, however, it is difficult for this Committee to determine whether new budgetary requests reflect in all instances real and immediate needs. We have reservations, **this year**, for example--particularly in the light of the vacancy situation in the Secretariat, which the Advisory Committee has described in its report on the on the 1968 budget estimates (A/6707)--as to whether existing staff resources are being fully utilized and as to whether the Secretary-General's request for 524 new posts for 1968 is, therefore, fully justified. We feel that the Advisory Committee's recommended cuts in staff are reasonable, as well as its cuts under other section and that they deserve the support of member states.

We wish to emphasize, however, that we support these cuts not because we wish to restrict unduly the expenditures of the Organization, but because we feel that before we can support any sizeable increase we need to know that these increased expenditures are the result of carefully considered programme needs. Well conceived planning might indeed result in a higher level of United Nations expenditures than would otherwise be the case.