

HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 18 November 1949, at 11.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. LACHS (Poland).

Comments on the time-table of meetings

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of members to the fact that the meeting had started very late. He requested them once again to do all they could to be present at the time the meetings were scheduled to open.

2. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) explained that some delegations, basing themselves on the probable date when the session would close, had made arrangements to leave Lake Success at the end of November. In the circumstances, since a considerable amount of the Committee's work still remained to be accomplished, it might be necessary, if some delegations were unable to keep punctually to the time-table of meetings, to consider the possibility of holding night meetings from now on.

3. The CHAIRMAN again urged members to arrive at the time fixed for the Committee's meetings. It would be most regrettable if the Committee were forced to extend its work beyond the agreed time simply because some members were not punctual.

Draft rules for the calling of international conferences: report of the Secretary-General (A/943) (*continued*)

DRAFT RULE 4 (*concluded*)

4. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume consideration of rule 4 of the draft rules for the calling of international conferences (A/943). The Netherlands amendment (A/C.6/L.75), as modified by the proposal of the Cuban representa-

tive, had been adopted during the 194th meeting,¹ but the Committee still had to consider the amendment submitted by Israel which proposed adding to draft rule 4 a second paragraph couched in the following terms (A/C.6/L.67):

"The Secretary-General and the Economic and Social Council, when fixing the date and place of the conference, must be fully satisfied that all delegations and information personnel will have free access to the conference and enjoy equal treatment without discrimination of any kind."

5. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) pointed out that the draft rules included no provision that participants should have free access to and equal treatment at international conferences. Under draft rule 3, as approved, it was for the Economic and Social Council to decide which States were to be invited to a conference. The Council thus had the right not to invite all Member States of the United Nations, having in view regional conferences whose work would affect directly only the States belonging to a particular geographic area. The Council would presumably respect the principle of the sovereign equality of States and would not fail to invite all interested Governments. As for States to which no invitation had been sent, they would be free to send observers if they wished to do so. Nevertheless, in their present form, the draft rules would not ensure the effective participation of all States, whether or not invited to the conference, on a basis of equality. It might happen that a State would accept an invitation and wish to attend the conference, and yet be prevented because of discriminatory measures taken by the

¹ See the summary record of the 194th meeting, paragraph 118.

authorities in the locality where the conference was to convene.

6. The draft rules contained no provision requiring the Government of a country where a conference was to be held to ensure equally to all representatives invited the right of access to its territory and freedom of action in connexion with their participation in the work of the conference.

7. The question of effective participation had already caused regrettable difficulties, particularly in connexion with the World Health Organization's Regional Committee for the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Food and Agriculture conference which were to have been held respectively in Alexandria and Beirut. In each case, the Government of the Member State whose territory had been selected as the location of the conference had refused the Israeli delegation authorization to travel to the seat of the conference in conditions similar to those granted to other delegations. The respective organizations had consequently been obliged to find another meeting-place where all the participants would be protected from such discriminatory treatment.

8. On 21 October 1949, the General Assembly adopted resolution 314 (IV) based on a report of the Third Committee, and designed to put an end to a practice in the field of information which was no less reprehensible and which clearly violated the aims of the Charter; that resolution, relating to freedom of access for news personnel to meetings of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, requested Member States to grant such personnel free access to countries where meetings of the United Nations and specialized agencies, or conferences convened by them, took place.

9. If the General Assembly had considered it necessary to guarantee free access to conferences for news personnel, such a measure was much more necessary on behalf of the delegations themselves. That was why the delegation of Israel had proposed its amendment (A/C.6/L.67) providing for free access and equal treatment for all delegations and information personnel. Mr. Robinson pointed out that, under draft rule 7, specialized agencies and non-governmental organizations would be entitled to the same rights and privileges at international conferences as at sessions of the Council itself. It would therefore be paradoxical if the States which had been invited could be excluded from conferences to which those agencies and organizations had been guaranteed free access. The proposed amendment was intended to make such a situation impossible.

10. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, as a result of the decision¹ taken at the 194th meeting relative to draft rule 4, the Economic and Social Council would be responsible for fixing the date and place of the conference, in consultation with the Secretary-General only. The text of the Israeli amendment (A/C.6/L.67) should be amended, therefore, so that the Secretary-General would play an auxiliary part only; and the responsibility would be placed entirely on the Council for ensuring that delegations and information personnel had free access to, and enjoyed equal treatment at, the conference.

¹ See the summary record of the 194th meeting, paragraph 118.

11. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) agreed that the first part of that amendment, which had accorded with the original text of draft rule 4, should be changed either by the omission of the reference to the Secretary-General, or by the provision that he should only be consulted on the question by the Council.

12. Mr. LOUTFI (Egypt) wished to give an explanation in connexion with the reference made by the representative of Israel to the meeting of the World Health Organization's Regional Committee for the Eastern Mediterranean which was to have been held at Alexandria. As his Government has not recognized Israel, it was difficult for his Government to admit an Israeli delegation to its territory. It had been for that reason of a political nature, directly connected with public order in the country, that the Egyptian delegation had thought it advisable for the meeting to be held elsewhere. Geneva had finally been chosen. It should be remembered that the Egyptian Government had made no agreement with the World Health Organization concerning the headquarters of the Regional Committee at Alexandria, nor had it ratified the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. The Government of Egypt was therefore under no legal obligation to receive an Israeli delegation on its territory. The purely objective attitude which the situation had imposed on the Egyptian Government could not be interpreted as a refusal to co-operate with the United Nations or with the World Health Organization. Moreover, that attitude had resulted in no discrimination or annoyance to anyone, since the proposed meeting had been held at Geneva, as a result of an agreement between the Government of Egypt and the World Health Organization; and all participants had been treated on a basis of complete equality.

13. With respect to the Israeli amendment, Mr. Loutfi pointed out that article IV of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations already provided² for the privileges and immunities to be enjoyed by representatives of Members to the principal and subsidiary organs of the United Nations and to conferences convened by the United Nations, while exercising their functions and during their journey to and from meeting-places. That article therefore covered the Israeli amendment; it was consequently superfluous.

14. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) wished to emphasize that he had not intended to dispute Egypt's right to refuse an entry visa to the Israeli delegation. The point was that when a Government found itself in a situation of that kind, it should forego having conferences held in its territory. That was indeed the course which Egypt had followed.

15. Article IV of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, to which the Egyptian representative had referred, did not offer sufficient guarantees, because first of all, not all Member States had subscribed to that Convention, and also because that article dealt with the status of delegations after they had reached the place where the conference was being held but did not ensure their access to the territory of the seat of the conference.

² See *Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during the first part of its first session*, page 25.

16. Mr. MATTAR (Lebanon), in his turn, gave some clarification on the subject of Mr. Robinson's statement concerning Lebanon. The Lebanese Government had not wished to give Israel entry visas for observers to the regional conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization which was to have been held at Beirut, because Israel had not been a member of that agency. Mr. Mattar stressed the fact that, in any case, the matter should not have been raised in the Sixth Committee.

17. The Lebanese delegation would vote against the Israeli amendment since it did not see how it would be possible to carry out in practice the obligations which it was proposed to place on the Economic and Social Council. By refusing to adopt the minimum time-limit of sixty days proposed by the USSR delegation¹ (A/C.6/L.72) in its amendment to the original draft rule 8, the Committee had shown that it had wished to allow the Council to fix the date of a conference closer to the time when the invitations were to be sent out. It was difficult to see, in that case, how the Council would have time to communicate with the State concerned and to ascertain its views on the question of the authorizations to be granted to the delegations taking part.

18. Mr. MAÚRTUA (Peru) said that all delegations undoubtedly enjoyed the right of free access to the conferences to which they had been invited. However, observers had a different status from that of delegations, as had already been pointed out in the course of the discussion.

19. Moreover, delegations attending a conference were subject to the conference protocol; and the rules of protocol although they did not contain any real discrimination, did not always specify full equality of treatment for the various delegations. The amendment should therefore cover only information personnel, and leave the responsibility for establishing equality among delegations to the protocol officers of the conference.

20. Mr. MAKTOS (United States of America) regretted that he was unable to support the Israeli amendment as the General Assembly's resolution of 21 October 1949 seemed to him adequate to ensure freedom of access and equal treatment of information personnel. Moreover, the amendment dealt with a matter which did not have to be included in the rules; its inclusion would make for additional work for the Secretary-General, whose task was already sufficiently vast and complicated. Lastly, a Government which agreed to serve as the host of a conference would, presumably, ensure that the elementary rules of courtesy would be observed towards those taking part in that conference.

21. In any case, the rules which would be adopted would not be irrevocable and could always be modified in the light of the suggestion made by the representative of Israel if that were to prove necessary in the light of experience.

22. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) gave the Committee some factual information which he thought it might need in order to reach a decision, based on a full knowledge of the facts, on the problem raised by the Israeli amendment (A/C.6/L.67).

¹ See the summary record of the 193rd meeting, paragraph 1.

23. In the first place, it was true that thus far only thirty-three States had acceded to the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. That item appeared every year on the agenda of the General Assembly and of the Sixth Committee, and every year the opportunity therefore arose to appeal once again to those States which had not yet done so to accede to the Convention.

24. Apart from that Convention, there existed, between the United Nations and the United States, a Headquarters Agreement containing an article dealing with freedom of access of delegations and information personnel.

25. An exchange of letters between the United Nations and Switzerland had taken place on the same subject with respect to the Geneva buildings.

26. Finally, for the third session of the General Assembly, an arrangement had also been made with France, by means of an exchange of letters, in accordance with which the principles of the Headquarters Agreement had been enforced for the duration of part I of that session in Paris.

27. Mr. ROBINSON (Israel) thought that the Geneva and Paris arrangements, cited by the Assistant Secretary-General, to which could be added that of The Hague with respect to the International Court of Justice, set precedents which it would be well to follow in connexion with international conferences.

28. The United States representative had emphasized the fact that the way in which delegations were treated depended on the courtesy of the State acting as host. However, since that courtesy was not always observed, it would be wise to take steps in advance so that the sovereign equality of States proclaimed in the Charter should be respected in that field.

29. Mr. MATTAR (Lebanon) pointed out that it could be concluded from the information given by the Assistant Secretary-General that the question raised by Israel was connected with the general question of privileges and immunities, and should therefore be dealt with at the same time as the latter. Consequently, the Lebanese delegation believed that the text proposed by Israel (A/C.6/L.67) could not appear in the special rules on the calling of international conferences.

30. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) favoured the Israeli amendment. In his opinion, it was desirable that the Economic and Social Council or the Secretary-General should ascertain in advance that all delegations would be guaranteed free access and equal treatment. Such a precaution would avoid any future complications and, in particular, the repetition of incidents such as those to which the representative of Israel had referred. Mr. Bartos wished to stress the fact that his vote in favour of that amendment should not be taken as implying any criticism whatsoever towards any country and particularly towards Egypt, whose attitude had been so clearly justified by its representative.

31. Mr. CAICEDO (Colombia) stated that his delegation would oppose the adoption of the Israeli amendment for the following reasons.

32. In the first place, as the Peruvian representative had pointed out, the rights of delegations and information personnel were dealt with on the same level in that amendment, whereas separate provisions should be made for them.

33. If the amendment were to refer only to technical information personnel, it would merely be repeating the General Assembly's resolution of 21 October 1949; at the same time, however, it would make of what was now only a recommendation, an obligation for the Economic and Social Council and thereby for all States, even for those which might not have expressed approval of the rules.

34. However, the Israeli amendment also referred to the status of delegations, which was rather a problem of a moral nature arising out of the rules of courtesy and hospitality. In that field, the most important rules were not generally laid down in writing; the suggestion made by Israel fell within a category which could not be covered by specific rules.

35. Mr. STABELL (Norway), although he considered the Israeli delegation's intentions to be praiseworthy, would vote against its amendment for the following reasons: (1) observers were not mentioned amongst those to whom free access to conferences should be guaranteed; (2) the admission of "information personnel"—a vague expression which might give rise to differences of interpretation—constituted a general problem which could not be dealt with by a rule of the kind that was being considered; and (3) as the Colombian representative had so rightly emphasized, the most important part of the amendment did not need to be formulated, since it was obvious that the host States should grant free access to the place of meeting to all the delegations which had been invited.

36. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the rules being drawn up were intended to apply in the future to the calling of any international conferences decided upon by the Economic and Social Council. In his opinion, it would not be appropriate to take a stand on some particular situation that had arisen in the past; in special circumstances, the question was whether it was advisable to insert in the draft rules (A/943) a provision such as that proposed by the delegation of Israel.

37. The French delegation favoured the substance of the Israeli amendment. No one, in fact, could oppose the idea, since the amendment was based on the principle of the sovereign equality of States laid down in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter. Considering the question from the higher plane of principles, without being influenced by considerations of expediency, one had to admit that, in international conferences, States should be accorded complete equality of treatment.

38. The French delegation found it difficult, however, to acknowledge that a provision such as that proposed by the delegation of Israel was appropriate in the draft rules. To insert a provision of that kind in those rules would be tantamount to saying that the Council foresaw the possibility that certain States participating in an international conference would be the object of discrimination. Such a situation could only be exceptional, and it would not be fitting to incorporate special provisions in the rules.

39. In the circumstances, Mr. Chaumont wondered whether the delegation of Israel would not agree to withdraw its amendment and ask the Committee either to adopt a separate resolution or recommendation—to the effect that it was

understood that, when the Council convened an international conference, the sovereign States participating should, under Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter, receive equal treatment in all respects, particularly in respect of the privileges and immunities granted to them—or to insert a provision to that effect in the Committee's report to the General Assembly. If the delegation of Israel did not comply with that suggestion and maintained its amendment, the French delegation would be obliged to abstain from voting on it.

40. Mr. RENOUE (Australia) said he would also abstain from voting on the Israeli amendment, for reasons similar to those just stated by the French representative.

41. He added that his delegation's attitude should not be interpreted as indicating that Australia was opposed to the principle embodied in that amendment. The Australian delegation would abstain because it had doubts as to the possible consequences of the drafting of the Israeli amendment (A/C.6/L.67), which contained such expressions as "information personnel" and "free access", the meaning of which was not clear, and also because his delegation did not think it appropriate that the General Assembly should proclaim the principle championed by the delegation of Israel while drafting rules for the calling of international conferences.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the delegation of Israel (A/C.6/L.67) to draft rule 4.

The Israeli amendment was rejected by 16 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the whole of draft rule 4, worded as follows:

"The Council shall, after consultation with the Secretary-General, fix the date and place of the conference or request the Secretary-General to do so."

That text for draft rule 4 was approved by 38 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

DRAFT RULE 5

44. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee to consider rule 5 of the draft rules (A/943), together with the amendments to it submitted by the delegations of the United States (A/C.6/L.63) and the USSR (A/C.6/L.72).

The United States amendment called for the text of draft rule 5 to read as follows (A/C.6/L.63):

"The Council may make arrangements for financing the conference, except that any arrangements involving the appropriation of funds of the United Nations shall be subject to approval by the General Assembly".

The USSR amendment would modify draft rule 5 to read as follows (A/C.6/L.72):

"The expenses connected with the holding of the conference shall be paid by the States participating therein in accordance with the scale of contributions to the United Nations as approved by the General Assembly. States which participate in the conference but are not Members of the United Nations shall pay the expenses according to their 'capacity to pay' (see rule 149, rules of procedure of the General Assembly) as determined by the Secretary-General of the United Nations upon the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions.

"The United Nations may make a loan for the holding of the conference. Such loan shall be repaid, by the contributions of States participating in the conference, not later than one year after the calling of the conference."

45. Mr. MAKTOŠ (United States of America) was afraid that draft rule 5 in its present form was ambiguous. It might, in fact, be interpreted as meaning that the Economic and Social Council could, on its own initiative, allocate to international conferences funds belonging to the United Nations. Under article 17 of the Charter, however, the General Assembly alone was entitled to approve budget estimates and authorize the charging of expenses.

46. The United States delegation thought that the Council's powers with respect to the financing of the international conferences it convened should be more clearly specified. For that reason, it had submitted an amendment to draft rule 5 that would give the Council the possibility, rather than impose the obligation, of making arrangements for such financing, and would safeguard the prerogatives of the General Assembly. If that amendment were rejected, the United States delegation would propose that the text of draft rule 5 be referred to the Fifth Committee for its decision as to how that text should be interpreted. The Fifth Committee might itself draw up a draft rule 5 if it considered that the existing text did not adequately safeguard the General Assembly's rights in the matter.

47. Mr. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the amendment submitted by his delegation reflected its desire to find a satisfactory solution to the question relating to who should bear the expenses of the international conferences called by the Economic and Social Council. Everyone was aware that such conferences generally involved considerable expenditure; to give one example, the Havana Conference had cost the United Nations nearly 1.5 million dollars, which was a not negligible fraction of the United Nations budget. It was therefore important that the problem of financing international conferences should be settled, especially since the Committee had decided that the Council might call regional conferences—that was, conferences attended by only a small number of States—and it seemed, on the face of it, unfair that States which did not participate in those conferences should contribute to the payment of the expenses involved.

48. Two solutions were possible: the expenses of international conferences should either be borne by the United Nations, or should be distributed among the participating countries. Considering that the latter solution was more equitable, that it offered the advantage of not burdening the United Nations budget which was in the interest of Member States, the USSR delegation had submitted an amendment providing for the adoption of that solution instead of the one recommended in draft rule 5.

49. Since the problem of the financing of international conferences raised a series of administrative and budgetary questions which the Sixth Committee might have difficulty in deciding, Mr. Koretsky proposed that the Fifth Committee be consulted on the matter. For that Committee to express an opinion on the principle of the financing of international conferences would be preferable to

having to consult it—as the United States amendment implicitly provided—about each conference convened by the Council.

50. Mr. RENOUF (Australia) supported the USSR representative's suggestion that the Fifth Committee be consulted on the financial and budgetary aspect of the problem raised by draft rule 5 and the amendments to it. That procedure, which was in conformity with the current practice in the United Nations, would not fail greatly to facilitate the work of the Sixth Committee.

51. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, under rule 142 of the rules of procedure, any proposal involving expenditure had to be submitted to the Fifth Committee, which would state its effect on the budget estimates of the United Nations.

52. The original text of draft rule 5 stated that the Council should make arrangements for financing the conferences it convened, subject to any relevant principle adopted by the General Assembly. By the terms of the United States amendment (A/C.6/L.63) the Council might make such arrangements, but any involving the appropriation of funds of the United Nations would be subject to General Assembly approval. The USSR amendment (A/C.6/L.72) would require the States participating in international conferences to pay the expenses involved, in accordance with the scale of their contributions to the United Nations. The problem was one of undeniable importance. The Chairman therefore asked the Committee to take a decision first on the prior question of consulting the Fifth Committee.

53. Mr. MAKTOŠ (United States of America) explained that his delegation's amendment in no way precluded the possibility of attributing the expenses of an international conference to the participants. The Council could take whatever decision it deemed most appropriate in each case, subject to the approval of the General Assembly if the arrangements made involved the charging of expenses to the United Nations budget. It was highly probable that the General Assembly might decide in one case that the expenses should be paid out of United Nations funds, and in another that they should be allocated among the participating States.

54. In his opinion, rule 142 of the rules of procedure was not applicable in that particular case, since none of the proposals before the Committee involved the Organization in any expenditure. Only when the Council's arrangements for financing an international conference, which it had convened, affected the budget of the United Nations should the General Assembly consult the Fifth Committee before approving those arrangements.

55. The United States delegation had three objections to the USSR amendment. In the first place, that amendment excluded any possibility of charging the United Nations with the expenses of an international conference. In some cases, however, the Organization might well consider it desirable to sustain the expenses of an international conference itself, even if the conference was only a regional one. It would appear that, in such cases, States Members should not be permitted to refuse to contribute to the expenses of such a conference on the grounds that the question dealt with was not of any interest to them.

56. In the second place, a distinction should be made between, on the one hand, the travelling expenses and subsistence allowances of representa-

tives of the States invited to an international conference, and, on the other hand, the general expenses of the conference, which should in all cases, unless the General Assembly decided otherwise, be charged to the United Nations.

57. Lastly, it did not seem fitting to make the Secretary-General responsible for assessing, on the recommendation of the Committee on Contributions, the "capacity to pay" of non-member States participating in an international conference convened by the Economic and Social Council. A State's capacity to pay was not easy to determine; numerous factors had to be taken into consideration. Unless there were imperative reasons for doing so, no such additional burden of work should be imposed on the Secretary-General and the Committee on Contributions.

58. Mr. Maktos emphasized that, in his opinion, there was no need whatsoever to consult the Fifth Committee if his delegation's amendment were adopted. That amendment only enabled the General Assembly to decide in each specific case whether the United Nations or the participating States should pay the expenses of an international conference. The Fifth Committee would have to be consulted only if the United States amendment were rejected.

59. Mr. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought it was important to know the opinion of the Fifth Committee on that matter, for the fact was that it was hardly within the Sixth Committee's technical competence. Moreover, reference to the Fifth Committee was necessary under the rules of procedure.

60. In his first statement, the United States representative himself had seemed to propose such reference. He now insisted that the Sixth Committee should adopt his amendment without previously consulting the Fifth Committee. It clearly followed from the United States amendment that the Council should take into account the principles adopted by the General Assembly and obtain the approval of the latter, which alone was empowered to authorize expenditure. The amendment introduced no new element into the present set of rules. What it amounted to was the re-submission of the proposed rule 5 in a different form. The amendment was therefore useless.

61. On the other hand, the amendment was likely to complicate the Council's task, since it provided that the financing of conferences should be approved by the General Assembly. At the 193rd meeting, the Committee had rejected a proposal suggesting an interval of sixty days between the calling and opening of conferences. In those circumstances, would they have to wait for the next regular session of the General Assembly or convene the Assembly in special session in order to obtain a decision on the financing of a conference?

62. Article 62, paragraph 4, of the Charter gave the Economic and Social Council some freedom. The Council would have its hands tied if the Committee decided that it could not convene a conference until it had obtained the approval of the General Assembly.

63. One must not forget, either, the sometimes considerable expenditure for Secretariat services in which international conferences like the Havana Conference involved the Organization.

64. The USSR delegation was of the opinion that the Council should know in advance that it had the right to convene international conferences, not at the expense of Members of the Organization, but at the expense of the participants. In calculating the contribution of non-member States to the expenses of the conferences, they might use the scale in force in the United Nations, as had been done in the case of the International Court of Justice.

65. What did the United States representative propose in that respect? He considered that an international conference was an organ of the United Nations. There were, however, international questions of a special kind which did not concern all the States Members and which the Organization could not deal with itself. In such cases, therefore, it was necessary to go outside the framework of the United Nations; and it was to deal with such questions that the Economic and Social Council would be authorized to convene international conferences. Mr. Koretsky thought that the Organization would have, as it were, to arrange for a referendum among States in the same way as Governments did among their subjects.

66. The USSR delegation had not submitted its amendment because it objected to contributing to the costs. On the contrary, it was asking that all States Members should participate in the conferences, and that economic questions, for example, should be resolved by all States, whether or not they were Members of the United Nations. That was the principle of the USSR amendment. There were, however, questions of an exceptional nature, outside the normal scope of the Organization. In such cases, the latter merely took the initiative of calling conferences, and the States participating in such conferences were in charge of them and should bear the expense.

67. The Council's task should be facilitated, but the Organization's expenses should be reduced, as the USSR amendment proposed. In that respect, the amendment was in the spirit of the "tendency to reduction" which had been manifested in the Fifth Committee.

68. The United States representative was mistaken in claiming that the Council's task would be facilitated if the Organization made a partial contribution to the expenses of conferences, since it would be necessary to wait for a session of the General Assembly before the contribution could be authorized.

69. In conclusion, Mr. Koretsky asked the Committee to adopt the USSR amendment. It was simple, reasonable from the Organization's point of view, and designed effectively to facilitate the Council's task. The Sixth Committee should not decide on the matter before consulting the Fifth Committee.

70. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General), referring to the USSR representative's mention of the Havana Conference, thought it might be useful to point out to the Committee that the expenses of that conference had amounted to 137,000 dollars for the Organization and 362,000 dollars for the Cuban Government, making a total of 449,000 dollars. If to that sum were added the expenses of delegations and the cost of the preparatory work carried out in Geneva, the figure

reached would be that of 1,500,000 dollars mentioned by the representative of the USSR.

71. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) pointed out that, should the matter be referred to the Fifth Committee, that Committee could not be addressed in general terms. He therefore asked the USSR representative to be more specific and to say how he considered the question should be worded for reference to the Fifth Committee.

72. Mr. KORETSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that it would not be difficult to find a wording in view of the preliminary question raised by the Chairman. He recalled, however, that in referring the question of the draft convention for the suppression of the traffic in persons and the prostitution of others to the Sixth Committee (A/C.6/329 and A/C.6/329/Add.1), the Third Committee had merely submitted the text of the draft together with the relevant amendments. In the present case, the Sixth Committee might proceed in the same way and refer to the Fifth Committee the text of draft rule 5 with the proposed amendments.

73. The Fifth Committee should consider the three principles proposed. Those were as follows: (1) the expenses of international conferences should be borne by the Organization; (2) the expenses should be borne by the participating States; (3) there should be no rule laid down in advance, the decision being left to the General Assembly, which might decide on either of the first two principles or on a combination of both.

74. One could no doubt draw up in written form the terms in which the matter should be referred to the Fifth Committee, but it would be simpler to proceed in the way just indicated.

75. Reference of matters from one Committee to another was a current practice which might prove very useful in the present case, the more so since the Fifth Committee might very well propose a solution different both from draft rule 5 and the amendments proposed to it.

76. Mr. CHAUMONT (France) remarked that he was satisfied with the USSR representative's explanations. He noted, however, that one of the principles Mr. Koretsky had mentioned, namely that whereby the Organization would bear the expenses of international conferences, was not embodied in any of the texts under discussion. On the other hand, the United States representative had just said that any expenditure proposed in the Organization's budget should be the subject of a decision by the General Assembly, which amounted to no more than an application of Article 17 of the Charter. Thus, the principle of the financing of international conferences was raised only when the expense had to be borne by the United Nations.

77. The representative of France therefore saw no incompatibility between the United States and USSR amendments. The latter related to a supposition not contemplated in the former, which sought to safeguard the prerogatives of the General Assembly, an objective to which no delegation could be opposed. He therefore asked the representatives of the USSR and the United States of America to consult together with a view to the possible production of a single text. Such a course would in any case provide the possibility of correcting any vagueness in the two amendments under consideration.

78. The French delegation had no objection in principle to referring the matter to another Committee, but it thought the practice was not to be encouraged, in view of the example of delay provided by the Sixth Committee in its consideration of the matter referred to it by the Third Committee. Besides, reference was not indispensable in the present case. He stressed the need for adopting a text of a general nature, and therefore thought it would be superfluous to burden that text with details relating to the financial aspect of the matter, consideration of which could only retard the Committee's work.

79. Mr. FITZMAURICE (United Kingdom) did not understand why the United States delegation wished to make the Council's arrangements for financing conferences optional. If the Council was to be empowered to convene such conferences, he thought the expression "shall make arrangements" in the present text of draft rule 5 (A/943) should be retained instead of the expression "may make arrangements" proposed in the United States amendment (A/C.6/L.63). On the other hand, he could not agree to the expression "subject to approval by the General Assembly" in that amendment, for the reasons already adduced by the representative of the USSR. Suppose, for example, that the Council, meeting at the beginning of the year, wished to convene an international conference for the following summer; it would be able to do so only after the autumn session of the General Assembly. For that reason, the delegation of the United Kingdom proposed that the expression "subject to approval by the General Assembly" in the United States amendment should be replaced by the expression "subject to such general rules and principles as the General Assembly may lay down".

80. As for the amendment submitted by the USSR delegation, he would criticize it firstly on the grounds that it was too rigid, for it eliminated the possibility of a financial arrangement whereby the expenses of a conference could be charged to the Organization's budget. There were many cases in which it might be useful for a conference to be financed by the United Nations, and it would be inadvisable to exclude that possibility.

81. Secondly, the USSR amendment was just as rigid in respect of Members' contributions. It would be unjust if the various States Members contributed to the expenses of conferences in a constant proportion, regardless of the extent to which their interests were affected. He pointed out, for example, that the United States of America, whose contribution to the expenses of the Organization was 37 per cent, should not unjustly bear financial charges disproportionate to its interests in participation in a conference.

82. The United Kingdom delegation would, therefore, vote against the USSR amendment.

83. Mr. MAKROS (United States of America) thanked the United Kingdom representative for his suggestions. He explained the purpose of his amendment, stating that the Council would not need to wait for the session of the General Assembly in order to convene a conference. It would not be necessary to obtain the prior approval of the Assembly; it would suffice if the Assembly ratified the Council's arrangements subsequently.

84. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the United States representative's remark, explained that he had invoked rule 142 because that rule stipulated that in all cases of decisions involving expenditure for the Organization, the Fifth Committee had to be consulted. The United States amendment

provided for the contribution of both participants and the Organization to the expenses of conferences. Consequently, that rule had to be invoked for the purpose of referring the proposed rule to the Fifth Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

¹ See the summary record of the 189th meeting, paragraph 46.