

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
SEVENTH SESSION



FIFTH COMMITTEE, 371st

MEETING

Tuesday, 9 December 1952, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Headquarters, New York

C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Budget estimates for the financial year 1953: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2125 and Add.1, A/C.5/498 and Add.1, A/C.5/500, A/C.5/526, A/C.5/L.185); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2157, A/2245, A/2290, A/C.5/499) (<i>continued</i>)	
First reading (<i>continued</i>)	195
Committee's programme of work	196
Administration of the United Nations (A/2214, A/2290, A/C.5/L.212, A/C.5/L.213)	197

Chairman: Brigadier-General Carlos P. ROMULO (Philippines).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1953:

(a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2125 and Add.1, A/C.5/498 and Add.1, A/C.5/500, A/C.5/526, A/C.5/L.185); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2157, A/2245, A/2290, A/C.5/499) (*continued*)

[Item 42]*

First reading (*continued*)

**SECTION 10. DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS;
SECTION 11. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS**

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that its 354th meeting the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the budget estimates for sections 10 and 11 and the relevant USSR proposals (A/C.5/L.185) until the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had submitted its observations concerning both part I of the Secretary-General's memorandum on the administration of the United Nations (A/2214) and the USSR proposals. The Advisory Committee's twenty-sixth report (A/2290) was now before the Committee.

2. In the interests of orderly procedure, he thought that the Fifth Committee should deal with sections 10 and 11 separately. He suggested therefore that if there were no general comments on the budget estimates for

sections 10 and 11 as a whole the Committee should proceed to the discussion of section 10.

It was so decided.

3. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Advisory Committee's recommendation for section 10 (A/2245) and the USSR proposal on the subject (A/C.5/L.185). The Advisory Committee recommended an appropriation of \$2,304,000 for section 10, or a total reduction of \$51,100 in the estimates, including supplementaries (A/C.5/498 and Add.1), submitted by the Secretary-General.

4. The USSR delegation proposed that the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee should be reduced by \$400,000 on the basis of a merger of the Departments of Economic and Social Affairs. In that connexion he drew attention to the Advisory Committee's report (A/2290) stating that, having regard to the administrative measures contemplated and the proposals submitted by the Secretary-General in response to the United Kingdom request for over-all budgetary savings, it was unable to make a recommendation on the further reductions proposed by the USSR delegation.

5. There being no discussion on section 10, the CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal (A/C.5/L.185) that the appropriations under section 10 recommended by the Advisory Committee should be reduced by \$400,000, such reduction to be carried out at the discretion of the Secretary-General.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 30 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

6. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation that an appropriation of \$2,304,000 under section 10 should be approved.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 33 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

7. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to two proposals relating to section 11, namely the recommendations of the Advisory Committee (A/2245) and the USSR proposal (A/C.5/L.185). The Advisory Committee had recommended an appropriation of \$1,748,500 for section 11, or a cut of \$28,000 in the estimates submitted, the reduction to be a global reduction and to be applied mainly against consultants, temporary assistance and official travel. Supplementary estimates of \$12,600 arising out of resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its fourteenth session had also been submitted (A/C.5/498). Of that amount \$7,000 related to estimated additional expenditure for the World Population Conference and \$5,600 for travel and fees of experts on the definition of standards of living. The Advisory Committee, which was recommending the approval of \$1,000 only in respect of the World Population Conference, saw no justification for the engagement of outside experts for the standards of living study. Consequently the revised total appropriation for section 11 recommended by the Advisory Committee amounted to \$1,749,500.

8. The USSR delegation had proposed that as a result of the amalgamation of the Departments of Economic and Social Affairs, the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee under section 11 should be reduced by \$300,000. As in the case of section 10 the Advisory Committee felt unable to make any recommendations concerning the proposed further reduction.

9. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal that the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee under section 11 should be reduced by \$300,000, such reduction to be carried out at the discretion of the Secretary-General.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 30 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

10. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$1,749,500 for section 11.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 35 votes to 5.

REDUCTIONS IN THE TOTAL 1953 APPROPRIATIONS

11. The CHAIRMAN invited the Fifth Committee to take up the question of reductions in the total 1953 appropriations. At its 355th meeting the Fifth Committee had adopted a United Kingdom proposal (A/C.5/L.184), amended by the United States, welcoming the Secretary-General's assurance that he would submit proposals to reduce the total 1953 appropriations to \$48,700,000 gross.

12. He wondered whether, in view of the short time available to the Fifth Committee, it wished to begin consideration of the Secretary-General's proposals under that heading (A/C.5/526) forthwith or whether it thought they should be examined first by the Advisory Committee. If the Fifth Committee wished to proceed with the consideration of the item, it must take a

decision on three points. Firstly, there was the Secretary-General's suggestion that the total sum of \$431,850 representing additional reductions should be accepted as a global reduction to be achieved on various sections of the budget and that it should appear under a new section 33. Secondly, the Secretary-General suggested that a sub-paragraph should be added to the draft appropriation resolution authorizing him to apply the global reduction under section 33 to the various sections of the budget. Thirdly, the Secretary-General suggested that in order to give effect to the proposed global reduction of \$25,000 in the various Headquarters provisions for official travel, a further sub-paragraph should be added to the appropriation resolution authorizing him to administer as a unit the appropriation provided under the various sections of part III of the budget for travel on official business.

13. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), speaking on a point of order, thought that the Fifth Committee had decided at its 355th meeting that any proposals made by the Secretary-General to reduce the total United Nations budget for 1953 to \$48,700,000 gross should first be referred to the Advisory Committee for its consideration.

14. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested the Chairman to explain how he intended to deal with the basic point in the USSR proposal (A/C.5/L.185) relating to the proposed amalgamation of the Departments of Economic and Social Affairs.

15. The CHAIRMAN suggested that that portion of the USSR proposal should be dealt with in conjunction with the discussion on the administration of the United Nations.

It was so decided.

16. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) proposed that the Secretary-General's proposals for reductions in the total 1953 appropriations (A/C.5/526) should be considered by the Advisory Committee before the Fifth Committee took them up.

It was so decided.

Committee's programme of work

17. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) expressed concern at the suggestion which had been made that there should be only a few more meetings of the Fifth Committee at the present session. It was impossible for the Fifth Committee to decide on the many vital issues before it under such a schedule. He was opposed to rushing hastily through the debate on the budget as a whole. It might help the Fifth Committee, however, to decide on the proper procedure if it knew the position with regard to prolonging the current session of the General Assembly.

18. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the General Committee would take up that question on 15 December 1952 and make recommendations on the future programme of work in the light of the progress made by the various committees by that time.

19. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) inquired whether the Committee would be given an opportunity of considering the matters dealt with in the opinion recently submitted to the Secretary-General by the Commission of

Jurists to advise the Secretary-General on certain issues in connexion with the United States Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

20. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) emphasized that the matter raised by the Egyptian representative was very serious. The opinion of the Commission of Jurists had far-reaching implications, and delegations should be given time to consult with their governments on the matter. He emphasized that the question did not concern merely the United States and the Secretary-General but vitally affected every Member State. The Chairman should bring the matter to delegates' attention in good time if it was to be discussed at a subsequent meeting.

Administration of the United Nations (A/2214, A/2290, A/C.5/L.212, A/C.5/L.213)

[Item 69]*

21. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the memorandum by the Secretary-General on the administration of the United Nations (A/2214) and the comments of the Advisory Committee thereon (A/2290) as well as the two draft resolutions on the subject sponsored by various delegations (A/C.5/L.212, A/C.5/L.213). The Advisory Committee thought that the General Assembly should express its views on the general lines of the plan proposed by the Secretary-General after which he should be requested to work out further details and to prepare the 1954 budget estimates accordingly.

22. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that while he had not come with any prepared statement concerning his memorandum on the administration of the United Nations (A/2214), he welcomed the opportunity of making a few general comments on the subject as a whole. The explanatory memorandum was unique in two respects. In the first place, it was one of the last papers which the late Mr. Feller had helped to draft. In the second place, it had been issued on 7 October 1952, by which date the Secretary-General had already decided to submit his resignation. Before doing so, however, he had wished to present to the General Assembly a paper summarizing his views on certain very important and difficult problems which had crystallized in his mind in the course of the preceding seven years of his administration. Moreover, he had given careful thought for several months past to the specific form in which his proposals should be presented.

23. Throughout his administration the United Nations and the Secretary-General had been served faithfully and well by eight Assistant Secretaries-General and by the Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration, and the suggestions he had put forward for reorganization of the Secretariat should not be construed as reflecting in any manner whatsoever on the value of the service which those officers had rendered. Shortly after he had entered upon his responsibilities as Secretary-General of the United Nations, he had nevertheless become aware that the administrative structure of the Organization was unduly cumbersome. He had been constrained, however, to follow the administrative pattern proposed by the Preparatory Commission and approved by the General Assembly at its first session. He had a little less than a month in which to recruit persons to head the eight departments recommended by the Preparatory Commission, and only a

few short months in which to engage more than two thousand members of the Secretariat.

24. It would be readily appreciated that the effective streamlining of an organization which, from its inception, had been developed on the basis of eight principal departments, later expanded to nine, necessarily presented many complex problems which did not lend themselves to quick or easy solution. Previously, he had hesitated to take definite action, partly out of consideration for the loyal and faithful servants who had assisted him so capably from the beginning. Having reached the decision to resign, however, he thought it would be wrong if he failed to give the General Assembly his ideas on how the administration of the United Nations might be reorganized in the interests of increased efficiency and effectiveness, having in mind at the same time the possibility of achieving further substantial economies.

25. He had attempted to consider certain changes in the structure of the Secretariat when entering upon his extended term of office. At that time he had carefully reviewed the administration and structure of the Secretariat to see what could be done. In so doing he had approached approximately twelve ambassadors or persons of comparable status from various parts of the world including Latin America, Asia and Europe, to ascertain whether they would be willing to accept service in the United Nations. All of them, however, had indicated their inability to accept United Nations posts, largely on the grounds that the emoluments of ambassadors stationed at New York were in general, a good deal more favourable than the remuneration which he was in a position to offer. His efforts to secure new persons of the necessary calibre to fill some of the top posts in his administration had therefore been unsuccessful.

26. He had urged the existing Assistant Secretaries-General to remain in their posts until 1 February 1954 and had extended their contracts accordingly. He felt that they would be of invaluable assistance to the new Secretary-General. It was with those considerations in mind that, in submitting his resignation on 10 November 1952, he had pointed out that the incoming Secretary-General would require almost a year to study proposals for reorganization of the administration before making specific and detailed recommendations for submission to the Advisory Committee for its consideration.

27. After mature reflection he had concluded that three deputy Secretaries-General to head three departments would be sufficient, but their remuneration would, of necessity, need to be higher than was at present paid to Assistant Secretaries-General if the United Nations wished to obtain the services of individuals who, by virtue of their personal prestige and authority, would command, as United Nations officials, the confidence and respect of the governments, the specialized agencies and the other United Nations organs with which they would come into contact. The actual details of any broad re-organization would have to be worked out carefully by daily conferences between the Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretaries-General, and in close co-operation with the Advisory Committee. He had already informed the Advisory Committee that the

matter in hand was one which most urgently required the closest possible collaboration.

28. He would welcome the Fifth Committee's views on his proposals on the understanding, of course, that Members would not, at that juncture, be in any sense finally committed. It would be helpful, however, to the Secretariat to hear any suggestions on the amalgamation of the Departments of Economic and Social Affairs, and their relationship with the Technical Assistance Administration, and on the general question of the number of deputy Secretaries-General for which provision should be made. While he was not absolutely certain that three deputy Secretaries-General was necessarily the ideal number, nine was unquestionably too many.

29. He would say nothing further, for the time being, on the possibility of achieving a more efficient and economical organization, but expressed his firm conviction that some reductions in staff could be made, and that the quality and effectiveness of the Secretariat's performance could be further improved, through the eventual adoption of measures along the lines of those he had proposed.

30. In viewing the over-all problem of the administration of the Secretariat, however, related questions concerning other organs could not be ignored.

31. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions was an organ of the General Assembly which had been created to assist the Fifth Committee in its work, and which was responsible to the General Assembly. He had no criticism to offer of the Advisory Committee, which had always been most helpful to him. He was particularly indebted to its Chairman for the assistance and co-operation which he had unfailingly extended. He could not, of course, in all honesty imply that he had always been fully satisfied with the Advisory Committee's actions. Equally, he felt sure that the Advisory Committee, for its part, was sometimes far from satisfied with the actions of the Secretary-General. Excellent relationships had, however, been maintained, and he was most conscious of the vital contribution which the Chairman and members of that Committee had made to the building up of an efficient administration over the past seven years.

32. In performing his functions as Secretary-General he had nevertheless been obliged to consider certain constitutional aspects of the status of the members of the Advisory Committee. He seriously doubted whether, in drafting the rules of procedure which related to the Advisory Committee, the intention had been that individuals appointed to the Advisory Committee in their personal capacity as experts should at the same time act as representatives of governments on the Fifth Committee or in the General Assembly itself. On the contrary he had always interpreted the rules of procedure in quite another sense. The Secretary-General then quoted the relevant rules of procedure:

"Rule 154

"The General Assembly shall appoint an Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (hereinafter called the 'Advisory Committee'), with a membership of nine, including at least two financial experts of recognized standing.

"Rule 155

"The members of the Advisory Committee, no two of whom shall be nationals of the same State, shall be selected on the basis of broad geographical representation, personal qualifications and experience, and shall serve for three years corresponding to three financial years, as defined in the regulations for the financial administration of the United Nations. Members shall retire by rotation and shall be eligible for reappointment. The two financial experts shall not retire simultaneously. The General Assembly shall appoint the members of the Advisory Committee at the regular session immediately preceding the expiration of the term of office of the members, or, in the case of vacancies, at the next session.

"Rule 156

"The Advisory Committee shall be responsible for expert examination of the budget of the United Nations, and shall assist the Administrative and Budgetary Committee of the General Assembly . . ."

33. Those rules, and particularly rule 156, seemed to him to lend very clear support to the point of view he was expressing. The Advisory Committee had been appointed to assist the Fifth Committee. In the present wording of the rules of procedure the members of the Advisory Committee were experts and therefore should not, in his opinion, sit on the Fifth Committee as representatives of their governments. He could recall several instances when the Advisory Committee had forwarded certain recommendations to the General Assembly which some of the members of that body had failed to support when acting on the Fifth Committee as representatives of their governments. It was unsound to permit a situation to arise in which any doubt could develop concerning the opinions of a body as important as the Advisory Committee, and the Fifth Committee would not expect a member of the Advisory Committee to hold one opinion in his capacity as a member of that body and a different opinion while acting as a representative of a Member State. It was understandable if confidence in the Advisory Committee might occasionally have been weakened as a result of important questions having been dealt with by some of the members in this dual fashion.

34. The Secretary-General stressed that he did not intend to criticize any particular member of the Advisory Committee, and certainly not the Chairman who had always been most consistent in his position. As Secretary-General he had hesitated to raise the issue earlier; he had always considered that it was not for the Secretary-General to ensure proper application of the rules of procedure, but before leaving his post he felt he could do no other than bring such a vital matter before the General Assembly and inform the Fifth Committee of his views concerning it.

35. Turning to the Administrative Tribunal, the Secretary-General stated that he considered this body to be the organ which was perhaps most closely related to the Secretariat. In making his comments he intended no criticism of the members of the Tribunal; their decisions had been handed down in the best judicial tradition, and he was convinced that the members had always felt their decisions to be right and just. He felt bound, however, to say that the Tribunal's actions had often placed him as Secretary-General in a very diffi-

cult position, for he had been at times confronted, in effect, with two sets of instructions, those given him by the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly and those implied in the decisions of the Administrative Tribunal. The whole question was too important for the existing situation to continue, and it should be clarified as soon as possible.

36. The Secretary-General had exercised his functions under the staff regulations approved by the General Assembly as recommended by the Fifth Committee, but it seemed to the Secretary-General that the Administrative Tribunal had frequently interpreted these regulations in a way other than the authors had intended.

37. In particular, in 1951, the Fifth Committee had drafted and the General Assembly had approved certain staff regulations, including regulation 9.1 relating to the termination of contracts. He had previously been in no doubt that the duration of a fixed-term contract was clearly determined by the terms of the contract itself. For example, if a person was appointed to the staff for a specific period of six months, a year, or two years, that in his mind meant that the person was engaged just for the period so specified. At the expiration of such a contract, therefore, the Secretary-General did not feel he was required to give any reason for not renewing the person's appointment. Whether or not his services should be continued under a new contract was, in the Secretary-General's opinion, a matter which came entirely within his administrative discretion. The Administrative Tribunal, however, in one decision, had introduced the concept of "expectancy" with regard to the renewal of fixed-term contracts. In another instance the Secretary-General was criticized for having failed to give reasons for not renewing a fixed-term contract which had expired. Consequently, the position with respect to such contracts was no longer at all clear.

38. Regulation 9.1 (c) relating to the termination of temporary appointments had been very specifically endorsed by the Fifth Committee. It had been made abundantly clear that in adopting this particular regulation, the Secretary-General had been given the discretionary right to terminate such staff members if, in his opinion, such action would be "in the interest of the United Nations". He had repeatedly stated his view in the Fifth Committee that the Secretary-General had such discretionary power, adding that normally reasons for such action would be given. There were times, however, when governments supplied the Secretary-General with confidential information which obviously could not be disclosed. The possibility that that might occur was envisaged at the very outset of the United Nations. For example, after the Preparatory Commission had discussed the functions of the Secretary-General, it stated in its report that:

"Because a Secretary-General is a confidant of many governments, it is desirable that no Member should offer him, at any rate immediately on retirement, any governmental position in which his confidential information might be a source of embarrassment . . ." (PC/20, page 87, para. 19).

39. In conformity with that text it followed that the Secretary-General would receive confidential information, not only on questions of substance, but on matters concerning the staff as well. In fact, almost every

government had at one time or another given him confidential information of that nature. In reviewing the temporary contracts of staff members, he studied all the available information and took his decision on all the evidence available. It was his responsibility as Secretary-General to weigh the evidence and reach a decision, a decision which he considered should be binding on all United Nations organs.

40. But the future of the United Nations administration in such matters was not clear, and indeed the administration would be seriously weakened unless the problems to which he had drawn the Committee's attention were soon clarified.

41. He was not urging the Fifth Committee to act forthwith on the questions relating to the Administrative Tribunal, but in the interests of the United Nations he thought a committee should be appointed to review the situation in all its aspects, including possible and necessary revisions of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal.

42. He expressed his appreciation of the action of the five delegations concerned in presenting the two draft resolutions before the Committee (A/C.5/L.212, A/C.5/L.213) and hoped that they would be adopted.

43. Mr. KYROU (Greece), introducing the joint draft resolution on the administration of the United Nations submitted by the delegations of Chile, the Dominican Republic, Greece, Norway and the Philippines (A/C.5/L.212), said that his delegation had studied the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2214) very carefully. It was the Secretary-General's duty under Articles 97 and 101 of the Charter to make such suggestions regarding administration, and as he had been in office for nearly seven years he was the person best fitted to do so.

44. The Greek delegation could not agree with all the conclusions reached by the Secretary-General, but that did not mean that it criticized the functioning of the Secretariat. On the contrary, his delegation considered that the members of the Secretariat were as a whole working very efficiently. Nothing was perfect, however, there was always ground for improvement and increased efficiency, and that must be everyone's aim.

45. The Greek delegation had also read the report of the Advisory Committee (A/2290) very carefully. The joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.212) was based on the suggestions made in paragraph 6 and the first sentence of paragraph 7 of that report, as would be seen from paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution.

46. His delegation hoped that when the report called for in the joint draft resolution was being prepared, the Secretary-General would keep in close touch with Member States.

47. Mr. OYARZUN (Chile) said that his delegation had always been ready to assist in the task of improving the efficiency of the United Nations and for that reason had joined in submitting the draft resolutions before the Committee (A/C.5/L.212 and A/C.5/L.213). Paragraphs 38 to 45 of the Secretary-General's memorandum mentioned in document A/C.5/L.212 were too clear to need comment.

48. As the session was drawing to a close, delegations had no time to go thoroughly into the Secretary-

General's proposals, but the work of the bodies mentioned in the two joint draft resolutions would clarify those proposals. Those resolutions, if adopted, would lead to the solution of a very complicated problem.

49. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said that it had been his privilege to discuss many questions connected with the activities of the United Nations with the Secretary-General, and he had therefore listened with great interest to the latter's statement.

50. The Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2214) should be studied in detail, but such a study could not be made by the Fifth Committee in the time left at its disposal. It should therefore be carried out by the bodies referred to in the joint draft resolutions before the Committee. After summarizing the various points of those resolutions, he said that he was awaiting instructions from his Government as to what action he should take on them.

51. Reviewing briefly the strict administrative law applied in Uruguay, he emphasized that no arbitrary decisions should be taken by the head of an organization as regards members of his staff, and was not surprised, in view of the Secretary-General's statement regarding contracts, that the Administrative Tribunal received many appeals.

52. He thought the question whether members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions could also act as representatives of their governments on the Fifth Committee, and whether members of the Fifth Committee could serve on the Administrative Tribunal, should also be studied.

53. Every effort should be made to improve the administration of the United Nations, and members of the Latin-American delegations would shortly contact the Secretary-General in that connexion. His delegation wished every aspect of that problem to be studied very thoroughly and hoped that the existing situation, which was unsatisfactory, especially as regards the Selection Committee for the review of staff members on temporary appointments, would be remedied.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal that the Department of Economic Affairs and the Department of Social Affairs should for 1953 be amalgamated into one single Department of Economic and Social Affairs in accordance with the decision of the Fifth Committee, as approved by the General Assembly at its sixth session (A/2022, para. 15), requesting the Secretariat to review the whole structure and functions of the Department of Economic Affairs, the Department of Social Affairs and the Technical Assistance Administration, as well as the system of co-ordination between them, and also in accordance with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 9 votes to 5, with 21 abstentions.

55. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that as a result of the voting on the USSR draft resolution, the decision taken by the Fifth Committee at the General Assembly's sixth session regarding the amalgamation of the Department of Economic Affairs and the Department of Social Affairs had been reversed.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that the USSR representative's interpretation of the vote was not correct, as the Fifth Committee's decision had merely been postponed; if the joint draft resolution submitted by Chile, the Dominican Republic, Greece, Norway and the Philippines (A/C.5/L.212) was adopted, it would be postponed for another year.

57. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) said that she had wished to speak on a point of order before the vote was taken. As she had not had an opportunity of doing so, she had had to vote against the USSR proposal. Her action was, however, without prejudice to what her delegation might feel about the future amalgamation of the two Departments concerned. No significance could therefore be attached to her vote in that matter.

58. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) thought that the Netherlands representative had expressed the feelings of many members of the Committee. The vote had been very uncertain, owing to the fact that many delegations had not been ready to deal with that question.

59. He was fully satisfied with the interpretation of the vote on the USSR proposal and felt that the problem should be left open until the next year.

60. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) associated himself with the views expressed by the Netherlands and Belgian representatives.

61. Mr. ISNOR (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation had abstained from voting on the USSR proposal for the simple reason that it was not prepared at that moment to vote for or against it, owing to the other two draft resolutions which were also before the Committee.

62. He had been much impressed by the USSR representative's statement in introducing his draft resolution at the 354th meeting, and thought that it would lead to definite economies.

63. He agreed with the Chairman's interpretation that the Fifth Committee's decision on the amalgamation of the two Departments in question was merely being postponed for a year.

64. Mr. WILEY (United States of America) remarked that the Belgian, Canadian and the United Kingdom representatives, together with the Chairman, had already clearly stated the position. For his part, he had found a great deal of merit in the USSR proposal but his vote had been cast on the understanding that the matter was to be the subject of later consideration.

65. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that the Danish delegation's position was the same as that of Canada. It had taken note with satisfaction of the various administrative measures already adopted or planned by the Secretary-General, as outlined in the Advisory Committee's report (A/2290, para. 11).

66. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) stated that the point of order he had unsuccessfully tried to make immediately before the vote on the USSR proposal had been to ask for a postponement of that vote. He therefore asked whether the proposal could be reconsidered and the vote taken deleted from the Committee's report.

67. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia), Rapporteur, asked for further clarification of the Egyptian representative's proposal. The Australian delegation had found no difficulty in voting against the USSR proposal because the broader question of over-all reorganization of the Secretariat was to come up before the Committee later.

68. The CHAIRMAN asked whether it would satisfy the Egyptian representative if the Rapporteur were to include in his report a reference to the construction to be placed upon the vote on the USSR proposal.

69. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) agreed to withdraw his motion on that understanding.

70. Mr. LIVERAN (Israel) stated that the Israel delegation had voted against the USSR proposal, not because of its substance but because of the timing. The contemplated study of the organization of the Secretariat as a whole would cover the proposal which, if accepted separately, might have prejudicial repercussions on the over-all question. The USSR delegation's views, as expressed in the proposal, could, he assumed, be taken into account in the broader study.

71. The CHAIRMAN agreed on the latter point.

72. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the USSR delegation did not object to discussion of the two joint draft resolutions (A/C.5/L.212, A/C.5/L.213) now before the Committee. As, however, they referred to a memorandum of the Secretary-General's which, in the opinion of the USSR delegation, raised a number of issues of principle directly related to the Charter (Article 1), he would ask for postponement of the vote upon them to allow further time for consideration of all the implications. Furthermore, there would seem to be a certain inconsistency between the two draft resolutions, for in the case of one of them (A/C.5/L.213) the Advisory Committee was virtually excluded from consideration of the problems involved, since its Chairman could not be regarded as representing the Advisory Committee as a whole.

73. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) endorsed the view expressed by the USSR representative. The Belgian delegation assumed that the decision about to be taken related to a question of procedure, since obviously the Committee was unable to reach any judgment on the substance of the matter. He had listened with great interest to the Secretary-General's statement, and the Belgian delegation was grateful to him for the initial work done in the matter. The memorandum that he had submitted could, however, only serve as a basis for future work.

74. He had two suggestions to make for amendment of the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.212) which he hoped the sponsors would be able to accept in the interests of unanimity: first, to replace the words "Having considered", in the first introductory paragraph, by the words "Having received"; secondly, in the third introductory paragraph, to say frankly that the whole problem of the reorganization of the Secretariat required further study rather than to confine the reference to the reorganization proposed by the Secretary-General. The second suggestion was not a formal amendment:

it had been inspired by the Advisory Committee's comment in its report (A/2290, para. 6) that no detailed and exhaustive study on methods to give effect to administrative and structural changes had so far been made.

75. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) would also like to have time to study the two draft resolutions before stating her delegation's views on them. She had a further suggestion to make for the amendment of the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.212), consequential upon the Belgian representative's tentative proposal: to insert at the end of the first line of operative paragraph 2 the words "question of the reorganization of the Secretariat and its", and to delete the words "of the proposed reorganization" in the second line.

76. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) also advocated postponement of the vote on the two draft resolutions. In the meantime he would suggest for the consideration of the sponsors that the membership of the committee proposed in document A/C.5/L.213 should be increased from six to nine. A six-member committee was rather small to deal with matters of such importance.

77. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) also favoured deferment of the voting and suggested a further addition to the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.212, to follow the Netherlands representative's amendment: "including the relationship of the Department of Economic Affairs, the Department of Social Affairs and the Technical Assistance Administration". The addition would, he thought, serve to round out the proposal.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that, in deference to the requests that had been made, he would not put the two draft resolutions before the Committee to the vote at the present meeting.

79. In response to a request from Mr. ISNOR (Canada) for publication of the Secretary-General's statement, he gave an assurance that the fullest possible report would be given in the summary record.

80. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) wished to ask the Chairman of the Advisory Committee whether he would feel able to act as a member of the committee contemplated by the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.213.

81. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) observed that the proposal in document A/C.5/L.212 was orthodox in the sense that the Advisory Committee was asked to make recommendations. In the other draft resolution (A/C.5/L.213), the departure from normal practice in appointing the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to serve on the proposed committee would place him in an invidious position *vis-à-vis* his colleagues on the Advisory Committee, since two of its recently elected members were also representatives of their governments in the Fifth Committee.

82. Mr. KYROU (Greece) observed in the first place that it had never been the intention of his delegation to ask for the vote to be taken on the two draft resolutions at the present meeting. Secondly, in keeping with the Chairman's instructions, he had confined himself to the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.212. Concerning the USSR representative's remarks, he was

unable to agree that there was any inconsistency between the two draft resolutions. Both proposals were based on the need to arrive at very close co-operation between Member States on the one hand and the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee on the other.

83. On the issue raised by Mr. Aghnides, his delegation, he said, had agreed to the proposal in question only on the clear understanding that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would be aware of the views of his colleagues on the question of dual capacity of its members prior to any meeting of the proposed committee.

84. Speaking for his own delegation alone, he was quite ready to accept the Belgian representative's suggestion for amendment of the third introductory paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.212, and the Netherlands amendment to operative paragraph 2. The Belgian representative's first amendment, however, seemed somewhat inappropriate and that of the United Kingdom might tend to narrow the scope of the proposed study.

85. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) thanked the Greek representative for accepting his second suggestion. He apologized for the oversight in omitting the consequential amendment put forward by the Netherlands representative. Regarding his first amendment, the term used was rather strong in French and he accordingly urged acceptance of some weaker expression.

86. As regards the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.213, he fully appreciated the possible embarrassment to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, and wondered whether the proposal could not be brought into line with normal practice by saying "in consultation with the Advisory Committee".

87. Mr. BARTOL (Argentina) wished to introduce an amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.212. In view of the lengthy period that had been devoted to the preparation of the Secretary-General's memorandum on the organization of the Secretariat, and in view of the contents of that memorandum, the Argentine delegation regarded it as a basic document, which had been referred to the Fifth Committee so that it might note the general principles that would have to be followed in the definitive reorganization of the Secretariat. In the draft resolution as it stood, no fixed basis was set for the proposed study; he accordingly proposed the insertion of a specific statement that the study of the reorganization was to be carried out on the basis of the suggestions contained in the Secretary-General's memorandum (A/2214).

88. The SECRETARY-GENERAL remarked that he had been consulted in advance by the sponsors of the two draft resolutions, and he agreed as to the correctness of the proposed action in each case in so far as it concerned the Advisory Committee. The procedure laid down in document A/C.5/L.212 was merely the normal practice followed, and that in document A/C.5/L.213 had, to the best of his recollection, a precedent in the Committee that had been set up to study the establishment of the Administrative Tribunal, the Chairman of which had been the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

89. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) believed that the Committee under the Chairmanship of Mr. Aghnides which had prepared the original draft statute of the Administrative Tribunal had made its first report in September 1946, whereas the Advisory Committee had been appointed only in November of that year.

90. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) corroborated Miss Witteveen's account. He was strongly of the opinion that the advisory Committee should not take part in the original work on the matters to be referred to the proposed committee; its observations could be obtained at a later stage.

Mr. Friis (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, took the chair.

91. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) regretted that his efforts to be brief had given rise to a mistaken impression of his proposed amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.212. He had been moved by a desire to restore a position that many of the delegations abstaining on the USSR proposal had regarded as lost, and the inclusion of a specific reference to the question of the merger would not limit the operative part of the draft resolution, it would merely emphasize that aspect of the matter.

92. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the sponsors of the two draft resolutions and delegations submitting amendments should meet at the close of the meeting with a view to reaching agreement on a revised text.

93. Replying to the point raised by the Egyptian representative earlier in the meeting, he had been asked to remind the Committee that the question of the opinion of the Commission of Jurists appointed by the Secretary-General had not been placed on the agenda of the Fifth Committee. It was the intention of General Rómulo to discuss the matter of procedure involved with the President of the General Assembly and to report at a later stage.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.