



Monday, 23 October 1950, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its second session (A/1316) .....	91

Chairman: Mr. V. OUTRATA (Czechoslovakia).

### Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its second session (A/1316)

[Item 52]\*

1. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom), dealing with the first part of the report of the International Law Commission (A/1316), made some general comments on the Commission's status and future. His government, he said, attached great importance to the Commission's work on the codification of international law, which was so vital to the future of the international community, and therefore his government considered it essential that the International Law Commission should be enabled to carry out its work under the best possible circumstances. For that reason the Government of the United Kingdom strongly wished the constitution of the Commission and its method of work to be improved. The difficulties in that field did not arise from the International Law Commission itself, but from extraneous factors which it was the business of the General Assembly to put right.

2. Although the codification of international law and its progressive development were the Commission's primary task, it had made little progress in that direction since it was first appointed in 1948. In his opinion, that deficiency was not due to any lack of zeal on the part of the members of the International Law Commission, but, among other reasons, to the fact that the Commission had had to devote two-thirds of its time to special tasks assigned to it by the Assembly. In the following year, the term of office of the members of the International Law Commission would expire, and the Commission would not then be able to produce any draft code on the subjects selected for that purpose. For those reasons, the United Kingdom delegation had already deprecated the sending to the International Law Commission of any further special tasks which would distract it from its work of codification. However, as was indicated in paragraph 19 of the International Law Commission's report, in July 1950 the Economic and Social Council had asked it to draft a convention on the nationality of married women. Ac-

ording to paragraph 20 of its report, the International Law Commission had decided that it was appropriate to accede to the proposal and to "initiate that work as soon as possible", perhaps at its session in 1951. He was surprised that the International Law Commission had made that decision, or, more exactly, that the Economic and Social Council had been able to make such a request without first referring it to the General Assembly, seeing that the International Law Commission's programme was already so overloaded in other directions. He would like the Secretariat to inquire whether the request of the Economic and Social Council was justified. He considered that if the International Law Commission was to be so overloaded with new tasks, it could not devote itself to its essential work.

3. The members of the International Law Commission were appointed for only three years, and the Commission only met for two or three months a year. Its members received only an inadequate *per diem* allowance and could not afford to devote more time to the work of the Commission or to preparatory work. He suggested several remedies for that state of affairs. First, the financial arrangements for the members of the International Law Commission could be improved. The Sixth Committee had already requested the Fifth Committee to do so, without result, at the fourth session of the General Assembly. Paragraph 21 of the International Law Commission's report urged that the matter should be reconsidered, and he supported that request. The term of office of members of the International Law Commission could also be extended from three years to five. Otherwise, as the preparation of a code involved lengthy research, the work might well be left incomplete. On the question whether the members of the International Law Commission should devote more time to the Commission, he considered that it was essential that they should retain their independence *vis à vis* their own governments and not lose touch with legal practice and opinion. He suggested that to appoint some of the members of the International Law Commission on a full-time basis would greatly speed up its work. It might also be possible to employ, as rapporteurs or technical experts on individual subjects, jurists who were not members of the Commission.

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

4. In conclusion, he said that he would be glad to hear the comments and suggestions of the members of the Sixth Committee on that matter. He was afraid that if the state of affairs were not improved, the prestige and usefulness of the International Law Commission would suffer. He recalled that the members of the Commission acted in their personal capacity as legal experts. He therefore regretted the withdrawal of Mr. Koretsky as described in paragraphs 4 to 7 of the Commission's report. He considered that if, for one reason or another, certain members of the Commission were no longer able to serve on it, they would be difficult to replace and the Commission's work would inevitably deteriorate. According to the Charter, the codification of international law was an essential task and the General Assembly was bound to see that it was carried out successfully.

5. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department), in answer to a question from the representative of the United Kingdom, read paragraph 1 and part of paragraph 2 of article 17 of the Statute of the International Law Commission regarding the consideration by the Commission of proposals and draft multilateral conventions.

6. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom) thanked the Assistant Secretary-General for his reply.

7. Mr. HSU (China) asked whether the United Kingdom representative had any specific proposals to make regarding the problem he had just been considering.

8. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom) said that he was anxious to hear the views of the members of the Sixth Committee on that question, and that before making any proposal he would like to consult the members of his delegation.

9. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that he had been greatly interested in the suggestions of the United Kingdom representative. He hoped that article 13 of the Statute of the International Law Commission would be revised during the current session of the General Assembly, so that the Commission's work could be made less of a burden on its members. He hoped that the Fifth Committee would take steps in that direction and suggested a *per diem* allowance up to thirty-five dollars. The eminence of the members of the International Law Commission called, he considered, for such a decision.

10. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) said that he had prepared a draft resolution on the subject of the allowance paid to members of the International Law Commission. He regretted that the Fifth Committee had not been able to take into consideration the proposals made by the Sixth Committee during the fourth regular session of the General Assembly. The eminence of the members of the Commission and the inconvenience to which they were put fully justified amendment of the Commission's Statute on that point, and he stated categorically that the daily allowance of twenty dollars was quite insufficient. He supported the remarks made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States, and added that it was desirable to amend article 13 of the Statute and that he had submitted his draft resolution to that end.

11. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) referred to paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 of the Report of the International Law Commission. The resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council seemed to him inopportune. While article 17 of the Commission's Statute did authorize other organs to submit proposals to it, paragraphs (c) and (d) of that article gave the General Assembly an opportunity to consider whether a proposal should be proceeded with. In that case, the proposal in question did not deserve the priority it had received.

12. At the fourth regular session of the General Assembly, the Fifth and Sixth Committees and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, after full consideration of the question of the allowances of members of the Commission, had decided not to re-open the matter. The 1951 budget made provision for a *per diem* allowance of twenty-five dollars to members if the session took place in New York, and the same honoraria for the Chairman and Rapporteurs as for 1950. The Fifth Committee had just approved the relevant section of the Budget.

13. Finally, he thought that subsidiary organs should as a general rule meet in New York. If the Secretary-General were consulted pursuant to article 12 of the Statute, he should bear in mind that meetings convened away from Headquarters should be held in soft currency areas.

14. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt) proposed that the meeting should be suspended for half an hour in order to permit informal consultation among the members of the Commission.

*The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.*

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Commission to examine the joint draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Cuba, Egypt, France, Iran, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (A/C.6/L.128).

16. Mr. ABDOH (Iran) indicated that he had consulted his colleagues during the recess and that agreement had been reached on the draft resolution.

17. The preamble of the document contained a reference to paragraph 21 of the report of the International Law Commission, and drew attention to the inadequacy of the emoluments paid to the members of the Commission, in view of the importance of its work, the eminence of its members and the method of their election. The operative part of the draft resolution set forth a decision to modify article 13 of the Statute of the Commission as follows: "Members of the Commission shall be paid travel expenses, and shall also receive a special allowance, the amount of which shall be determined by the General Assembly."

18. Mr. AbdoH recalled the present text of article 13: "Members of the Commission shall be paid travel expenses and shall also receive a *per diem* allowance at the same rate as the allowance paid to members of commissions of experts of the Economic and Social Council."

19. The amended wording would empower the General Assembly to increase the allowance paid to members of the International Law Commission, for the

reasons set forth in the preamble of the draft resolution. Mr. Abdoh indicated that, after examining the proposal of the United States representative, his delegation might perhaps submit a draft resolution providing that the amount of the allowance should be fixed at a minimum of thirty-five dollars daily.

20. He thanked his colleagues of the delegations of Cuba, Egypt, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America for their collaboration, and expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be acceptable to the members of the Sixth Committee and of the International Law Commission.

21. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) drew attention to the difficulty of the work of the International Law Commission. The progressive development of international law was a tremendous task, both technical and political. The codification of international law was an even more difficult task and a very slow one, for codification constituted the last stage of the juridical process, coming after the establishment of rules of law. In order to carry out their task successfully, the jurists of the International Law Commission must study all existing legal systems.

22. The final objective was to ensure the progressive development of international law in such a way that all the principles governing it could be set down in the form of a code. To that end it was necessary that the International Law Commission should be a permanent body, since the experts charged with that task needed to devote their entire time to its accomplishment. Those experts should receive the unqualified support of the United Nations, since they were eminent jurists and deserved proper respect for their qualifications as well as suitable living conditions.

23. The commissions of experts of the Economic and Social Council were provisional bodies, composed of technicians with specific and limited duties. The International Law Commission, on the other hand, was a permanent body whose members had to devote several years' work to their task. The results of their work were important not only for the future of the United Nations but for the progress of humanity in general. For those reasons, Mr. Maúrtua supported the joint draft resolution to amend article 13 of the Statute of the International Law Commission.

24. Sir Frank SOSKICE (United Kingdom) stated that his delegation, having approved the draft resolution, had associated itself with the authors of that document in submitting it to the Committee.

25. Recalling his earlier statement, he considered it desirable that the members of the International Law Commission should be invited to analyse the conditions under which their work was accomplished, and to study the wording of recommendations for submission to the General Assembly at its sixth regular session.

26. The United Kingdom delegation felt that a draft resolution couched in approximately the following terms might be presented: "*The General Assembly invites the International Law Commission to re-examine its Statute and to submit to the General Assembly at its sixth regular session recommendations for the amendment of that Statute in the light of experience*".

27. On the question of prolonging the terms of reference of the International Law Commission, he said that they had been established for three years and should be extended to five. For the moment, he said, he expressed only the views of his own delegation on that question, though they were shared by various other delegations which he had consulted. In view, however, of certain difficulties which had been pointed out to him, the United Kingdom delegation wished to study the question more carefully before presenting a concrete proposal at the next meeting of the Sixth Committee.

28. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt) supported the statements of the representative of Iran. He pointed out that when the General Assembly determined the amount of the special allowance to be paid to members of the International Law Commission, it could fix either a lump sum or a *per diem* allowance. In the latter case, the allowance should not be less than thirty-five dollars.

29. He also supported the suggestion of the United Kingdom representative to ask the International Law Commission to submit recommendations to the General Assembly for amendments to its Statute.

30. Mr. GARCIA AMADOR (Cuba), a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution, recalled that the previous year the Cuban delegation had taken the initiative in submitting a similar draft resolution. He regretted that, owing to the unfortunate procedure adopted at that time, the Sixth Committee's draft, in spite of the almost unanimous approval of its members, had not been accepted. He hoped that the present draft resolution would not meet the same difficulties. He nevertheless drew the attention of the Committee to difficulties which might arise in the Fifth Committee, and expressed the hope that the Chairman and the Secretariat would take the necessary steps to follow the appropriate procedure which would lead to success.

31. With reference to paragraph 22 of the report of the International Law Commission, which determined the place of its third session, and to which certain objections had been raised, he recalled article 12 of the Statute of the International Law Commission which gave that Commission the right to choose the place of its meetings after consultation with the Secretary-General. He thought that the Commission had taken that decision with a knowledge of the facts and after duly consulting the Secretary-General; there was therefore no need to question that decision any further.

32. He supported the views expressed by the United Kingdom representative regarding possible amendments to the Statute of the International Law Commission, and said that a period of at least five years was necessary to enable the Commission to fulfil the great task which it had to perform. He suggested that the General Assembly should take a decision, not at its sixth session when the terms of reference of the International Law Commission would expire, but at the current session. He was willing to support a draft resolution which would enable members of the International Law Commission to organize the work of their third session.

33. Mr. KURAL (Turkey), Rapporteur, pointed out a difficulty which would arise in drawing up the report. If the Sixth Committee merely asked the General



Assembly to determine the amount of the allowance to be paid to members of the International Law Commission, that would be too general a statement; it would be useful to suggest a definite sum. The figure mentioned by the Egyptian representative, namely thirty-five dollars a day, could be used as a basis.

34. Mr. ROLING (Netherlands) said that it was necessary to take account of two aspects of the joint draft resolution. On the one hand, the report of the International Law Commission implied that the terms of article 13 of the Statute should be revised in the interest of the future effectiveness of the Commission's work. If the Sixth Committee approved that paragraph of the report, it would state thereby that the effectiveness of the Commission's work was threatened and that the financial provision necessary to avert that danger must be made. On the other hand, it must be recognized that to do so would raise a general financial problem, as the committees of experts would ask for the revision of their own financial status; and the likelihood of obtaining such a general revision was nil, or very small indeed.

35. The Netherlands delegation would therefore be inclined, if the Sixth Committee accepted paragraph 21 of the report of the International Law Commission, to refer the question to the Fifth Committee with emphasis on the importance of the work of the International Law Commission, the danger which threatened that work, and the means of averting that danger. The Fifth Committee would reconcile that particular situation with the situation as a whole, and prepare a report. After considering that report, the Sixth Committee could make concrete financial proposals.

36. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) read rule 152 of the rules of procedure. That rule provided for a procedure in two steps. The first step was that "no resolution involving expenditure shall be recommended by a committee for approval by the General Assembly unless it is accompanied by an estimate of expenditures prepared by the Secretary-General"; the second was that "no resolution in respect of which expenditures are anticipated by the Secretary-General shall be voted by the General Assembly until the Administrative and Budgetary Committee has had an opportunity of stating the effect of the proposal upon the budget estimates of the United Nations".

37. In practice the procedure was as follows: on the basis of the proposals of the Sixth Committee, therefore, the Secretary-General would prepare an estimate of the expenditure involved in the amendment of article 13 of the Statute of the International Law Commission. The Fifth Committee would then ask the opinion of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. It would therefore suffice if the Sixth Committee were to adopt the draft resolution, and were to ask the Chairman to decide, in consultation with the Secretariat, upon the best procedure to follow.

38. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt) thanked the Assistant Secretary-General and agreed that the Chairman and the Secretariat should consult together and take the action which had been outlined.

39. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) said he spoke as representative of Greece and not as a member of the

International Law Commission. He agreed with the observations made by previous speakers, but pointed out that, if the same method as that used in the previous year were adopted, the same result would follow. The Fifth Committee would decide that an exception could not be made in favour of the members of the International Law Commission, who must be assimilated to the other members of the committees of experts. If the Sixth Committee wished to perform useful work, it should therefore adopt a specific proposal providing, for example, that the members of the Commission should receive a daily allowance of thirty dollars in Europe and thirty-five dollars in the United States. The Fifth Committee would then give its opinion. If that opinion were favourable, the proposal would be submitted to the General Assembly for adoption. If the opinion of the Fifth Committee were unfavourable, the question would come before the General Assembly, which would then take a decision. That, he thought, was the only procedure that could yield a useful result.

40. Mr. AMADO (Brazil) said he spoke as the representative of Brazil on the Sixth Committee and not as a member of the International Law Commission. He wished to present to the Sixth Committee evidence that would allow some members of the Committee, who had not been present at previous meetings when the question had been debated, better to understand the problems.

41. It had been stated in the Sixth Committee and in the International Law Commission during the previous year that the interpretation given by the Fifth Committee to the word "expert" was not always accurate.

42. The representative of Peru had pointed out the difference between an expert appointed to suggest an immediate solution to a specific problem, and a member of the International Law Commission appointed by the General Assembly to perform work of an enduring kind. He cited the example of Professor Brierley, whom the International Law Commission had charged with the study of the law of treaties. Professor Brierley had been obliged to interrupt his courses at Edinburgh University, and had prepared a comprehensive study, embodying some daring novel ideas. After the International Law Commission had examined his work, Professor Brierley had had to re-cast the study in accordance with their observations.

43. The work was thus substantial, and was to be further increased by the study of the question of reservations, which the Sixth Committee had decided to refer to the International Law Commission. The same applied to Mr. Spiropoulos who had been instructed to formulate the Nürnberg principles and prepare a draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind; or to Mr. Scelle, who was studying arbitration procedure, or to Mr. François, who was studying the regime of the high seas. Such eminent persons — among whom must also be included Mr. Hudson — of world-wide repute as masters of law, were not experts as the word was understood by the Fifth Committee. The allowance to be paid them must therefore be proportionate to their high qualifications and the long and exacting tasks they were undertaking.

44. He pointed out also that those jurists must be enabled, either through re-election by the General

Assembly or extension of the mandate of the International Law Commission, to finish the task they had begun. It was unthinkable that new rapporteurs should start again from the beginning to study questions on which a considerable volume of work had already been done.

45. In conclusion, he said he would support the joint draft resolution and hoped the Sixth Committee would specify the total amount of the daily allowance to be paid to members of the International Law Commission. His delegation would also vote for a proposal, should one be made, to extend the mandate of the International Law Commission.

46. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) stated that his delegation would support the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.128).

47. He also favoured the suggestion just made by the representative of Greece pointing out that a similar procedure had already been followed when certain Commissions, such as the United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans, the United Nations Truce Commission for Palestine, the Conciliation Committee for the Balkans and the United Nations Commission on Korea, had been set up by a resolution adopted by the First Committee and submitted to the General Assembly. Only after the First Committee had taken its decision, had financial estimates been considered, as provided for in the rules of procedure.

48. Hence, in the case now under consideration, the Sixth Committee could adopt the joint draft resolution. It would be transmitted, together with a further resolution specifying an inclusive figure, to the Secretary-General, who would proceed to draw up the financial estimates. The General Assembly would then decide on the Sixth Committee's proposal and on that submitted by the Fifth Committee. He pointed out that, in coming to a decision, the special qualifications of the members of the International Law Commission should be borne in mind, as had been stressed by the representative of Brazil.

49. He had no intention of commenting at length, at the present stage of the debate, on the suggestions of the United Kingdom representative. He could say at once, however, that his delegation approved the first of those suggestions, namely the proposal to extend the mandate of the International Law Commission from three to five years.

50. Mr. GARCIA AMADOR (Cuba) apologized for speaking again, but feared from the trend of the discussion that the Committee might encounter difficulties similar to those of the previous year and might make similar mistakes.

51. During the discussions in the Sixth Committee in the previous year, he had stressed that it was for the Committee to decide upon any amendments to be made in the statute of the International Law Commission; the duty of the Fifth Committee was to study only the strictly administrative side of the problem. Accordingly, and in order to avoid falling into the mistakes of the previous year, he suggested that the wording of the operative part of the joint draft resolution should be amended to specify the approximate amount of the allowance to be received by the members of the Inter-

national Law Commission. The last paragraph of the joint draft resolution would read as follows: "The members of the Commission shall receive . . . a special allowance of thirty-five dollars a day". The Fifth Committee would be helped in its decision by such a definite statement.

52. He favoured the proposal to extend the mandate of the members of the International Law Commission by two years. He would himself present a written draft resolution to that effect at the following meeting.

53. Mr. HSU (China) felt that, as had been pointed out by Mr. Amado, the universally recognized ability of the members of the International Law Commission entitled them to special treatment.

54. Moreover, the International Law Commission did not work under the same conditions as did other committees of experts. Whereas the majority of the latter met for two to four weeks a year, the members of the International Law Commission worked continuously for two to three months a year, not counting the considerable amount of work they had to do between sessions. Furthermore, many members of the International Law Commission were not paid by their governments.

55. He pointed out that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, although composed mostly of members supported by their governments and residing in New York itself, was in a more or less similar position to that of the International Law Commission, and that consequently any analogous request which it decided to submit should be taken into consideration.

56. Mr. SPIROPOULOS (Greece) wondered whether the current general feeling would favour extension of the mandate of the International Law Commission. Moreover, most of the reports, in particular those on arbitration procedure, the regime of the high seas, and the draft code of offences against the peace and security of mankind, would apparently not be ready within three years.

57. If, however, the Committee was obliged to recommend such a measure, it should do so during the present session of the General Assembly. Indeed, in the following year it would be difficult to prevent new elections in which not only the present members of the International Law Commission but also persons put forward by their governments would be candidates.

58. Mr. TOLENTINO (Philippines) recognized that the special qualifications of the members of the International Law Commission and the great value of the work in which they were engaged placed them in a special category. Nevertheless he wondered whether it might not be preferable, instead of granting them a *per diem* allowance, to give them an honorarium or at least an inclusive allowance which would correspond more closely to the nature of their work and their terms of reference. He suggested that the joint draft resolution should be amended to that effect.

59. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) stated that, contrary to what had been said, his delegation had not proposed that the term of office of the members of the International Law Commission should be extended. Nevertheless, since the Cuban delegation intended to

present a formal proposal to that effect, the United Kingdom delegation would support that proposal.

60. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that, before indicating the position of his delegation, he would like some clarification of the questions now under study. That information was particularly necessary because the Committee, which had started from the simple question of the emoluments of members of the International Law Commission, was now considering an important proposal to invite the International Law Commission to revise its Statute. He reserved the right to comment on the substance of that proposal.

61. At the current stage of debate and in the light of the remarks of the representative of the Philippines, Mr. Morozov asked the representative of the Secretary-General whether it would not be possible to pay emoluments to members of the International Law Commission for special work which represented additional efforts made between sessions of the Commission. Those payments would be made from the appropriation provided for that purpose in the budget. Thus, the Sixth Committee would not have to take a special decision in the matter.

62. Referring to the United Kingdom proposal to invite the International Law Commission to revise its Statute, he said he would wait until that proposal had been presented in writing before discussing it in greater detail. Nevertheless, he wondered what provisions of the Statute of the International Law Commission were, in the opinion of the United Kingdom representative, unsatisfactory and therefore in need of change.

63. From the discussions which had just taken place, it seemed that there were three such provisions.

64. The first related to emoluments of members. In that connexion the Sixth Committee contemplated a special decision.

65. The second related to the term of office of the members of the International Law Commission. In that connexion, he wondered whether an invitation to the members of the Commission themselves to study that question would not place them in a somewhat delicate position. There again he reserved the right to consider the substance of the question.

66. The third provision in question was article 17 of the Statute of the International Law Commission, which was said to have the disadvantage of enabling the programme of work of the Commission to be overloaded by adding to it, without recourse to the General Assembly, the study of supplementary questions. In his opinion that was a misinterpretation of article 17. Actually paragraph (d) of that article allowed the General Assembly to invite the International Law Commission to continue its work in accordance with the

procedure which it had proposed; but the same article gave the General Assembly full power to propose that the Commission should not follow its plan and to ask it to remove questions from its agenda. Accordingly, there seemed to be no need to amend article 17.

67. In the light of all those considerations, he did not believe that there was any necessity for a revision of the Statute of the International Law Commission. Moreover, such a vast proposal would oblige the Commission to undertake a long study which would retard its work and thereby achieve precisely the opposite effects from those intended by the representative of the United Kingdom in formulating his suggestion.

68. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) replied to the question of the representative of the Soviet Union, that the budget of the International Law Commission for 1950 contained a sum of \$9,000 at the disposal of the Secretary-General to be paid to members of the Commission who were doing special work.

69. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt) supported the amendment of the Cuban delegation to the joint draft resolution under which members of the International Law Commission would receive a special allowance of thirty-five dollars a day.

70. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, if the joint draft resolution were adopted, its operative part would replace existing article 13 of the Statute of the International Law Commission. It therefore would be preferable to indicate in a special resolution the exact amount of the allowance to be granted to members.

71. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) concurred in the view of the Chairman.

72. Moreover, in view of the large number of proposals presented, he proposed that the vote should be postponed to prevent probable confusion.

73. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt) asked the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department whether the statute of the committees of experts serving the Economic and Social Council mentioned the amount of the allowance payable to experts. If so, he saw no reason why the amendment proposed by the Cuban delegation should not be accepted.

74. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) replied that neither the statute of the committees of experts serving the Economic and Social Council, nor the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal which had recently been set up, mentioned an exact figure for the allowance to be paid to members. He therefore thought that the Sixth Committee would be well advised to indicate a definite figure in a special resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.