

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
SIXTH SESSION



FIFTH COMMITTEE 320th

MEETING

Wednesday, 19 December 1951, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee on item 65 of the Agenda (A/C.5/476).....	213
Approval of the Rapporteur's draft reports (A/C.5/L.150, A/C.5/L.151)....	214

Chairman: Mr. T. A. STONE (Canada).

Financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on item 65 of the agenda (A/C.5/476)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had at its 26th meeting adopted a draft resolution (A/AC.53/L.11/Rev.2) on the appointment of an impartial international commission under United Nations supervision to carry out a simultaneous investigation in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Berlin, and in the Soviet Zone of Germany in order to determine whether existing conditions there make it possible to hold genuinely free elections throughout these areas. He read out a letter which he had received from the President of the General Assembly requesting the Fifth Committee, under rule 152 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to consider the financial implications of this draft resolution. It would be desirable for that to be done at the current meeting. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had first to consider the matter and report back to the Committee. He accordingly proposed that the meeting should be suspended for an hour for that purpose.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 3.20 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.

2. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/476) on the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

3. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) referred to the penultimate paragraph of his mimeographed statement on the financial implications of the resolution in question (Conference Room Paper No 9)¹ and drew attention to the reasons why the Advisory Committee had recommended that the sum proposed by the Secretary-General should be reduced to \$45,000.

4. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that the Fifth Committee was not being asked to approve an appropriate

tion but merely to inform the General Assembly of the financial implications of the adoption of that draft resolution by the General Assembly.

5. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the discussions which had taken place in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, said the USSR delegation would vote against the draft resolution now before the Fifth Committee as it regarded the setting up of such a commission as undue interference in the domestic affairs of Germany and as a violation of the principles of the Charter.

6. Mr. LEVI (Yugoslavia) said that, although he quite understood that the Fifth Committee was merely considering the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, he would have to abstain from voting on the paper before the Committee as he had abstained in the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

7. Mr. ALGHOUSSEIN (Yemen) said that, for the reasons given by his delegation in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, he also would have to abstain from voting.

8. Mr. ADARKAR (India) pointed out that although his delegation had abstained from voting on the question in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, he could not abstain from voting in the Fifth Committee if it was merely a question of informing the General Assembly as to the financial implications of the adoption of the resolution in question.

9. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 152 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and emphasized that all the Fifth Committee was asked to do was to state whether it approved the Secretary-General's estimate or the sum recommended by the Advisory Committee.

10. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that he would vote against the proposal before the Committee and drew the attention of members to the statement made in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee by the Czechoslovak representative. The three Powers which had suggested that a commission should be set up to investigate the possibility of holding free elections in Germany had signed the Potsdam Agreement with the Union of Soviet

¹ Document published later as A/2029.

Socialist Republics and under that Agreement and the Charter of the United Nations, Germany was responsible to the four occupying Powers and not to the United Nations. The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution therefore violated the Potsdam Agreement and the Charter of the United Nations.

11. Mr. DONOSO (Chile) suggested that the Fifth Committee should adopt the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the sum of \$45,000 is sufficient.

12. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question by Mr. KYIN (Burma), said that if the General Assembly adopted the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's draft resolution the question of appropriating the necessary funds would be considered later by the Fifth Committee.

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the financial implications of the adoption of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's report by the General Assembly would amount approximately to \$45,000.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 27 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

Approval of the Rapporteur's draft reports (A/C.5/L.150, A/C.5/L.151)

14. Mr. GANEM (France) lodged a protest because the French text of the two draft reports before the Committee had not yet been distributed. In order not to delay the work of the Committee, he would consent to discussion of the reports at the present meeting, but he must insist that the rules of procedure be fully met in respect of the report on the 1952 budget to be considered before the forthcoming recess.

15. The CHAIRMAN expressed his sympathy with the French representative's observations and thanked him for his co-operation. The serious difficulties caused by the heavy volume of documentation handed in for processing the previous evening accounted for the unfortunate omission.

16. Mr. GANEM (France) was unable to accept the explanation. He recognized the physical limitations of the Secretariat but the preparation in the working languages of reports for submission to the General Assembly should be given first priority.

17. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the form in which the draft resolution relating to supplementary estimates for the financial year 1951 (A/C.5/L.150) had been prepared in the Rapporteur's draft report, gave a distorted picture of the 1951 budget situation. The figure of total expenditure thus arrived at was quite artificial. The true situation would be revealed by adding the total additional requirements for the year, amounting to \$2,638,000, less the savings, amounting to \$851,500, to the sum appropriated under resolution 471 (V), making a total of approximately \$50,300,000. He agreed that the statement in paragraph 2 of the draft report explained the position, but a proper presentation on the lines he had outlined was much to be preferred.

18. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) fully agreed with the USSR representative. Moreover, the fact that the savings accruing as a result of the transfer to the 1952 budget of part of the expenses for the Assembly session and the costs of Korea medals and ribbons respectively had been treated differently had led to a certain amount

of confusion as different figures of net additional requirements had been obtained in the body of the report and in the draft resolution.

19. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Secretariat would take note of the suggestions for future use.

20. Mr. HALL (United States of America) considered the present form of the draft resolution quite appropriate and correct. Perhaps the points raised might be met in future by including an additional table in the Committee's report.

21. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) observed that, if it was a continuation of previous practice, he would be prepared in future to accept the presentation in the draft resolution now before the Committee.

Mr. Albornoz (Ecuador) took the chair.

The Rapporteur's draft report (A/C.5/L.150) was approved with minor drafting changes.

22. Mr. ASHA (Syria), Rapporteur, introduced the draft report on the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (A/C.5/L.151), at the same time noting some minor drafting amendments.

23. Mr. HALL (United States of America) asked for two additions to be included so as to convey more fully his delegation's views: (1) the insertion of the following sentence in paragraph 12, between the third and fourth sentences: "No nation would submit overlong to under-representation and over-taxation in an international organization"; (2) amendment of the penultimate sentence in paragraph 34 (b) to read: "The United States representative stated that he understood the Chairman of the Contributions Committee to have said that the question was of a predominantly political character rather than a technical question; he urged the Committee to apply the ceiling immediately."

24. Lord WAKEHURST (United Kingdom) said that he would be very glad if several sentences could be inserted in paragraph 14, in order to bring out the points made by his delegation on the matter in question. The paragraph would then read: "Several delegations its introduction at the present time, as the adjustments entailed would be too abrupt. The United Kingdom delegation stressed the importance of upholding the authority of the Committee on Contributions. There could be no better substitute for dealing with the delicate as well as highly technical problems of assessing contributions. The United Kingdom favoured the early realization of the one-third ceiling. The view was also expressed".

25. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the views expressed by the French representative. To have to consider such an important document in a language other than Russian caused him considerable difficulty.

26. He thought that the second paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution, concerning the 33 ⅓ per cent ceiling, was unnecessary and inappropriate. The question to which it referred had not been formally discussed in the Fifth Committee and in any case it was superfluous to include a mere point of view in a resolution.

27. He also thought the amendment proposed by the United States representative to paragraph 34 (b),

attributing a statement to the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions, inappropriate.

28. Finally, some points had been omitted from the report, such as his delegation's references to the USSR's difficulty in securing dollars, the extent of its war damage and its views concerning the 10 per cent rule.

29. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was not opposed to the amendments so far suggested but felt that the report should be based on the summary records, which constituted the official report of delegation's views.

30. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that every Rapporteur did his best to give a faithful summary of a Committee's views but the records remained as the permanent source of reference.

31. Mr. ADARKAR (India) complimented the Rapporteur on his excellent work. He suggested that, as the first part of the report appeared to consist of general comments as distinct from individual delegation's views, it might be wise for the United Kingdom amendment to paragraph 14 to be worded in more general terms. He was grateful to the Rapporteur for having stressed, in paragraph 4, the question of comparative income per head of population. He proposed that a statement should also be included in that paragraph to the effect that the formula which was to guide the Committee on Contributions in assessing national incomes should be approved by the General Assembly. Such a formula should not be left to the Contributions Committee's own responsibility but should be a General Assembly decision.

32. The CHAIRMAN stated that, in accordance with rule 58 of the rules of procedure, the Rapporteur's report was being translated into all the official languages.

33. Mr. HALL (United States of America) said that, in view of the fact that some criticisms had been made, he wished to associate himself with the Indian representative in complimenting the Rapporteur on his work, having omitted to do so in his previous statement.

34. He disagreed with the USSR representative's proposal to delete paragraph 2 of the draft resolution: it would be incorrect to delete anything from a text already approved by the Committee. Concerning his amendment to paragraph 34 (b) he pointed out the reservation contained in the words "he understood".

35. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) considered that the report represented an excellent attempt to give the General Assembly a brief and clear exposition of the nature of the discussion on the matter in question. In order to make his delegation's views clearer he suggested that the end of paragraph 18, after the words "capacity to pay of these countries", should read ".... as reported in statements made by their own spokesmen. He urged that the remaining maladjustments should be removed during 1952, bearing in mind the need for arriving as quickly as possible at a fully equitable scale which would be true to the principles approved in the 1948 resolution".

36. He also supported the United States view that it would be incorrect to delete a paragraph from a resolution already approved and pointed out that the Rapporteur had stated that the reference in paragraph 2 of the preamble to the resolution carried no more weight than other references to members' views. The

summary records contained the fuller views of delegations and should be considered in relation to the resolution.

37. Mr. ASHA (Syria), Rapporteur, regretted that the Russian text of his report was not available in time. In answer to the criticism concerning paragraph 2 of the preamble to the resolution he referred to his statement in paragraph 34 (b) of the report. He would always be very willing, however, to consider any amendments delegates might put forward.

38. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) suggested an amendment to paragraph 14 which he believed would express a thought that had also been voiced by the South African representative. He proposed that a sentence be added to the paragraph reading as follows: "The view was also expressed that the expression 'normal times' should be taken as referring to the time when a permanent scale would have been established".

39. He agreed with the comment of the Indian representative on the United Kingdom amendment concerning the importance of upholding the authority of the Committee on Contributions, as he believed that the amendment expressed a view held by a number of delegations.

40. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) again stressed the importance of consistency between the Rapporteur's report and the summary records and therefore felt that the Rapporteur, basing his opinion of the summary records, should state whether or not he was prepared to accept delegates' amendments.

41. Referring to the comments by the USSR representative, he felt it was important for the Committee to remember that at the present meeting its task was to adopt the Rapporteur's report rather than to discuss the substance of the questions dealt with therein.

42. Mr. ASHA (Syria), Rapporteur, assured the Brazilian representative that the summary records, together with other notes taken by the Secretariat, had served as the basis for the report. He intended to check all proposed amendments with the summary records in order to ensure consistency.

43. Lord WAKEHURST (United Kingdom) did not wish to insist on the insertion in the Rapporteur's report of the exact words he had read out in his amendments. He wished only to assist the Rapporteur and to make sure that all the points raised by the United Kingdom delegation were included in the report. He agreed with the Australian representative that if other delegations had made the same point as the United Kingdom delegation the latter's amendments should be included in a general form.

44. Mr. ADARKAR (India) said representatives were confident that the Rapporteur had based his report on the summary records and his own notes. The report could, however, be amended by members before it was drafted in final form.

45. Mr. LIVRAN (Israel) suggested that the last sentence of paragraph 25 of the Rapporteur's draft report should be amended to read as follows: "His delegation felt that the increase for Israel was unjustified as the principle of capacity to pay should be the main criterion".

46. Mr. ASHA (Syria), Rapporteur, referring to the statement of the United Kingdom representative, said that he remembered the latter's exact words on the

question of contributions and therefore had no objection to the amendments he had suggested. He would, however, check every amendment with the summary records.

47. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thought that his previous statement had been misunderstood. He did not challenge the Rapporteur's report, but wished merely to point out that the Committee should abide by its summary records.

48. Mr. DONOSO (Chile) felt that he was interpreting the feelings of the Spanish-speaking members of the Fifth Committee in congratulating the Rapporteur on the work he had done in preparing the report before the Committee.

49. Mr. ASHA (Syria), Rapporteur, referring to one of the amendments suggested by the United States representative, read out paragraph 17 of the summary records of the 306th meeting which, in his opinion, quite justified the amendment suggested.

Mr. STONE (Canada) resumed the chair.

50. The CHAIRMAN said the various amendments suggested would be included in the redrafted text of the Fifth Committee's draft report (A/C.5/L.151) and assumed that, in view of the limited time available, members would agree to the revised report being submitted direct to the General Assembly.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.