

question of promotions as a whole. The additional expenses resulting from a favourable decision of the Committee in regard to interpreters amounted only to 5,000 dollars, and the representative of Brazil, so far as he was concerned, was prepared to approve them. In general, the classification of interpreters within the framework of the new plan must be different from that of the other members of the Secretariat. The Secretary-General might classify them according to the number of languages they knew.

94. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee could rest assured that the Secretary-General

would take all the measures possible to benefit the staff.

95. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) reminded the Committee that it was considering section 15 of the budget estimates. It could not, therefore, consider in connexion with that subject a paragraph of the report of the Advisory Committee which dealt with a question that was entirely general and the exact financial implications of which should first be known. Under section 15, the Committee could consider only paragraph 122 of the Advisory Committee's report.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 2 December 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1950 (*second reading continued*)

SECTION 15 (*continued*)

1. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that at the previous meeting the representative of Poland had raised the question whether the deferment of classifications referred to in paragraphs 21 and 122 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/934) would be affected by the postponement of the examination of the Committee of Experts' report.

2. It was obvious that the Committee's decision on that report introduced a new factor which must affect the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee considered that it would be unjust to insist that all reclassifications should be deferred until the General Assembly had taken a decision on the report of the Committee of Experts.

3. The Polish representative had mentioned specifically paragraph 122 of the report of the Advisory Committee, in which the Committee recommended a reduction of 5,000 dollars in the sum provided for certain reclassifications in the Interpretation Division. The Secretary-General had proposed the reclassification of eighteen interpreter posts, ten of them from grade 13 to grade 15 and the remaining eight from grade 13 to grade 14.

4. The Advisory Committee's recommendation in that connexion in no way related to the report of the Committee of Experts. The Advisory Committee considered that it might be unduly liberal to reclassify eighteen posts, and that was its only reason for recommending the reduction of 5,000 dollars. Such a recommendation was not unique; the Committee had made similar recommendations with regard to other sections of the budget, for example, in paragraph 128 of its report.

5. A distinction should consequently be made between the reclassifications approved in principle by the Advisory Committee and those which did not seem to be justified, irrespective of the decision taken on the report of the Committee of Experts.

6. Mr. TARN (Poland) proposed the restoration of the sum of 5,000 dollars, which it had been decided to eliminate at the first reading. He also wished to ask the Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services whether he would agree that the question of the dismissal or retention of the staff members engaged upon maintenance and guard duties should be discussed with the Advisory Committee before any decision was taken on the subject.

7. Mr. PELT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services) stated that that question would be considered by the Administration with the Advisory Committee; that would be essential, since the decision that would be taken would influence the budget.

8. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the estimates for section 15 were of great importance. He therefore considered that it would be useless to approve a further sum of 5,000 dollars, since it should be possible to find such a small sum.

9. Mr. PELT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services) stated that he would do what he could in that respect, but could give no guarantee. If he was unable to save that sum, the staff members entitled to the reclassification concerned would not obtain it.

10. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) supported the Polish proposal on grounds of principle; the Committee had approved a considerable number of reclassifications in other Departments of the Secretariat and it could not, therefore, adopt a discriminatory measure in the case of the Interpretation Division.

11. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) considered that it would be absurd to add 5,000 dollars to the estimates for section 15, since those estimates exceeded the sum of 8,500,000 dollars. He proposed that the Committee should state that no discrimination would be exercised against the interpreters, and that the Committee should go on record to the effect that the sum required could be found within the estimates for section 15.

12. Mr. TARN (Poland) accepted the United Kingdom representative's proposal.

Section 15, amounting to 8,731,200 dollars, was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

SECTION 16

Section 16, Department of Administrative and Financial Services, was adopted unanimously at 720,000 dollars.

SECTION 17

Section 17, Common Staff Costs, was adopted unanimously at 3,888,000 dollars.

SECTION 18

3. Mr. TARN (Poland) believed he was right in saying that a radio-technician or an electrician could not belong to the Secretariat unless he was a member of the American Federation of Labor. He thought that a regrettable fact and hoped that the question would be settled when the whole contracts plan was revised.

4. The CHAIRMAN stated that that would be done.

Section 18, Common Services, was adopted unanimously at 2,110,300 dollars.

SECTION 19

Section 19, Permanent Equipment, was adopted unanimously at 241,800 dollars.

SECTION 20

Section 20, United Nations Office at Geneva, was adopted unanimously at 4,195,400 dollars.

SECTION 21

5. Mr. TARN (Poland) urged his previous proposal that the total estimates relating to information centres should be reduced by 20,290 dollars, which was the estimate adopted by the Committee or the establishment of an information centre in Liberia. He pointed out in that connexion that certain information centres were staffed by more than six persons, as in the case of the information centres in Paris and London. Moreover, the Advisory Committee considered that the Washington information centre was absolutely useless. In those circumstances, the Department of Public Information might easily save the sum necessary for the establishment of an information centre in Liberia.

16. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the Polish proposal.

The Polish proposal was adopted by 15 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.

Section 21, as amended, was adopted by 31 votes to none, with 2 abstentions, the total estimates being 839,550 dollars.

SECTIONS 22, 23, 24, 25 and 25a

Section 22, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, amounting to 686,850 dollars; section 23, Economic Commission for Latin America, amounting to 525,500 dollars; section 24, Hospitality, amounting to 20,000 dollars; section 25, Advisory Social Welfare Services, amounting to 635,900 dollars; and section 25a, Technical Assistance for Economic Development, amounting to 539,000 dollars, were adopted unanimously.

SECTION 25b

Section 25b, International Centre for Training in Public Administration, amounting to 149,500

dollars, was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

SECTION 26

Section 26, Transfer of the assets of the League of Nations to the United Nations, was adopted unanimously at 533,768 dollars.

SECTION 27

17. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/1087, paragraph 4), and agreed that the salaries and allowances of the Judges and the Registrar of the International Court of Justice could not be modified before the fifth session of the General Assembly.

18. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) could not understand the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/363), the terms of which were too indefinite. He presumed that it was proposed to retain the appropriations in dollars already approved for section 27, but wondered whether the whole of that sum would be disbursed, so that the salaries in florins would in fact be increased, or whether economies would be effected.

19. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that the budget estimates for the International Court of Justice had already been approved in the first reading. Were they to be modified? Furthermore, the Secretary-General was proposing that the question of the salaries and allowances of the Judges and the Registrar of the International Court of Justice should be settled in 1950. Was it now proposed to settle the question in 1949?

20. Mr. LEVONTIN (Israel) asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to explain the meaning of the second paragraph of point 4 of the Secretary-General's note. He did not think that the General Assembly could request reimbursement from the persons concerned. Consequently, it might not be possible to make the Assembly's decision retroactive.

21. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) read the memorandum addressed to the Secretary-General by the Advisory Committee (AC/254) and pointed out that point 4 of the Secretary-General's note summarized the views of the President of the International Court of Justice, of the Secretary-General and of the Advisory Committee. It meant that the General Assembly would have to take a decision at its fifth session and that, whatever that decision was, it would be retroactive.

22. The Brazilian representative was right in stressing the fact that there were two questions under discussion, namely, the total of the budget estimates in section 27, and also the rate of the salaries and allowances of the Judges and the Registrar of the International Court of Justice. Mr. Aghnides pointed out to the representative of Israel that the penultimate paragraph restated a principle on which no disagreement existed. Whatever the Assembly's decision, it would be retroactive.

23. Mr. LEVONTIN (Israel) concluded that either the Judges and Registrar would make a reimbursement or some reduction would be made in their salaries in future, which would be contrary to the Court's Statute. He thought that under those con-

ditions it would be preferable not to approve any modification before 1950.

24. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) noted that apparently the question would be studied and a decision taken on it at the General Assembly's fifth session. It was proposed at present to maintain the budget estimates as approved in the first reading, and also to maintain the salaries at their present rate in florins. In 1950, therefore, economies would be effected at the judges' expense. Mr. Lebeau was opposed to such a procedure.

25. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thought that the question to be decided was whether the budget estimates for the International Court of Justice, as approved at the first reading, should be reduced. If the appropriations were maintained at their present rate in dollars, the salaries in florins would be increased. In short, a decision should be taken as to who should profit from the devaluation of the florin. The judges whose place of residence was not The Hague would be out of pocket if their salaries were maintained at the same level, as the salaries would be equivalent to a lesser sum in dollars than previously.

26. Mr. HSIA (China) asked whether the Secretary-General had taken into account in section 29 the savings which could be effected in section 27.

27. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) replied in the negative. If the appropriations in dollars were maintained at their present level and the salaries in florins likewise, an additional saving of some 97,000 dollars would result.

28. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) pointed out that whatever decision the General Assembly took at its fifth session, it would establish the basis on which the salaries and allowances of the Judges and the Registrar of the International Court of Justice would be paid. Once the decision were taken, the necessary appropriations would have to be approved, but he could not understand why provisions should be made now to implement a decision which had not yet been taken. Whatever decision the Assembly would take, the Canadian delegation would not let itself be influenced with regard to the appropriations approved for the financial year 1950.

29. Mr. Pollock would ask the members of the International Court of Justice to bear in mind that the Fifth Committee would only take a decision after thorough consideration and one which was as equitable as possible.

30. Mr. GARNIER-COIGNET (Deputy Registrar of the International Court of Justice) declared that the statement of the opinion by the President of the International Court of Justice, contained in the second paragraph of point 4 of the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/363) indicated the Court's complete confidence in the wisdom of the General Assembly and of its organs. If Mr. Basdevant had mentioned retroactivity, it had been precisely to indicate that it was for the General Assembly to decide on that point.

31. The question was to determine whether the appropriations in dollars, which had stood for years in the budget of the United Nations, should be reduced. The President of the Court considered that they should be maintained, and he had stated that that would not create any obstacle to the retroactive effect envisaged by the Secretary-General.

32. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) was somewhat surprised that the Secretary-General should propose that the same appropriations in dollars should be maintained for section 27 but that he should not contemplate using the entire sum. That was equivalent to asking the Committee to approve appropriations which it knew for certain were too high. Mr. Lebeau believed that if the salaries were maintained at their present level in florins, the appropriations in dollars should be reduced. Mr. Andersen had said that the Secretary-General had not taken into account in section 29 the economies foreseen with regard to section 27.

33. In the circumstances, the Belgian representative thought the Committee should decide to maintain the appropriations voted in the first reading for section 27, and should instruct the Secretary-General to use those appropriations for the payment of salaries and allowances to the Judges and the Registrar of the International Court of Justice up to the same amount in dollars as if the florin had not been devalued. Such a decision would not in any way prejudice the decision the General Assembly would take in 1950.

34. Mr. GANEM (France) was guided by the respect he felt for the International Court of Justice and by the interests of the United Nations. He recalled that the Court had undertaken to implement the retroactive decision of the General Assembly, even if that decision was not in its favour. Under those conditions, the Committee could not compromise with its duty.

35. He agreed with Mr. Lebeau's statement and believed that it was in that spirit that the Secretary-General's note should be interpreted.

36. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) proposed that the credit of 634,765 dollars for section 27 should be maintained. Thus, if no changes were made in the salaries and allowances of the Judges and Registrar of the International Court of Justice, a saving of about 97,000 dollars would be effected.

37. Mr. GARNIER-COIGNET (Deputy Registrar of the International Court of Justice) explained that in the view of the President of the International Court of Justice the customary appropriations should be maintained in dollars at their present level, and that the salaries should be paid on the basis of those dollar appropriations, until the General Assembly's decision in 1950.

38. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) believed that the Assembly could just as well take a decision in 1949 as in 1950. The President of the International Court of Justice believed that the real value of the salaries and allowances of the Judges and the Registrar had been reduced. If the Fifth Committee did not share that view, it should consequently reduce the appropriations in section 27 by 97,000 dollars: either the appropriations should be maintained at their present level and the salaries in florins consequently increased, or the salaries in florins should be maintained at their present level and the appropriations in dollars reduced.

39. Mr. TARN (Poland) recalled that, under the Statute, the salaries and allowances of the Judges of the International Court of Justice could not be modified during their term of office. It would not therefore be possible to take a decision of that nature until 1950.

40. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) stated that anything which impaired the prestige of the International Court of Justice would also impair the prestige of the United Nations itself. He took the penultimate paragraph of point 4 of the Secretary-General's note to mean that the appropriations relating to the salaries of members of the Court, approved at the first reading of the budget, would be maintained. To do so would in no way prejudice the solution of the problem by the General Assembly at its next session. Any decision which the General Assembly would then take would be retroactive and it was possible that all the appropriations might be required. Mr. Agnides urged the necessity of not coming to a hasty decision on the substance of the problem.

41. The CHAIRMAN thought the Committee should take a decision on the United Kingdom proposal, which was supported by the representatives of Poland and China. According to that proposal, the appropriations for section 27 would remain as they were, on the understanding that if the General Assembly decided not to change the salaries of the judges payable in florins, the result would be a saving of 97,000 dollars.

42. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thought it strange that appropriations should be included in the budget if there was no intention of using them. The President of the International Court of Justice had considered that the judges' salaries had suffered a decrease by reason of the devaluation of the florin. It was that assertion which had led to the present discussion. If, therefore, the 97,000 dollars in question were included in the budget, they should be used in 1950.

43. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) had understood that, according to the United Kingdom proposal, the amount appropriated for the International Court of Justice would be maintained at the figure of 634,765 dollars; if, furthermore, the 97,000 dollars were to be included in section 29 of the budget, there would seem to be no reason for the Brazilian representative's objection. Mr. Roschin suggested that if the General Assembly was to decide at its next session that in 1950 judges' salaries payable in florins should be increased, the Secretary-General might then draw upon the Working Capital Fund for the additional sum necessary. Mr. Roschin could not agree to appropriations being made if there was no intention of using them.

44. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) proposed that the Fifth Committee should decide that the appropriations approved at the first reading for the Judges' and Registrar's salaries should be retained in the 1950 budget. That would imply that the Secretary-General would allocate that whole sum for the salaries of the Judges and of the Registrar.

45. Mr. HSIA (China) thought that at that stage of the discussion, the Committee should decide what sums should be appropriated for the budget of the International Court of Justice and not deal with the question of increasing the judges' salaries, which was to be decided by the General Assembly at the following session.

46. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) reminded the Committee that at the first reading of the budget, his delegation had asked for the discussion on section 27 to be postponed. The

proposal now submitted by the United Kingdom would mean that the salaries payable in florins would not be changed. The Secretary-General had proposed that the question whether or not any change should be made in the emoluments of the judges should be referred to the fifth session of the General Assembly. If the General Assembly should decide not to increase the emoluments payable in florins, there would be a saving of 97,000 dollars. If, on the other hand, it decided to increase them, the appropriation should be used retroactively. Mr. Cooper was therefore in favour of the United Kingdom proposal.

47. Mr. GARNIER-COIGNET (Deputy-Registrar of the International Court of Justice) repeated that the President of the International Court of Justice was asking for the usual appropriations to be maintained, so that he could proceed to pay the normal salaries calculated on a dollar basis, on the understanding that if those salaries were changed by the General Assembly at the following session, such a change should be made retroactive.

48. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) proposed that the second sentence of the United Kingdom proposal should be amended to read as follows:

"This decision assumed that the Secretary-General will assign the whole of the appropriations in chapter I, articles (i) and (ii), and chapter II, article (i), of section 27 to the salaries of the Judges and the Registrar of the Court."

49. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) did not press the suggestion he had made.

50. Mr. VANER (Turkey) said that he favoured the United Kingdom proposal.

The first sentence of the United Kingdom proposal, ending with the words "be maintained", was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

51. In reply to a question by Mr. VANER (Turkey), Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said that the result of the amendment he had submitted would be that the total dollar appropriation in section 27 would be used, and each judge would receive a larger sum in florins. It would be a provisional budgetary decision which would not prejudice the substance of the question. It might happen that the judges would have to reimburse the excess payment they will have received in 1950.

The Belgian amendment was rejected by 24 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

52. In reply to a question by Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), the CHAIRMAN said that salaries of judges would not be included in the review of salaries of United Nations personnel.

The second sentence of the United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 31 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

The United Kingdom proposal as a whole was adopted by 31 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

Section 27, amounting to 634,765 dollars, was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

53. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) explained that he had abstained from voting on section 27 as a protest against pressure having been put upon the Committee to take a hasty and premature decision on the possible consequences of devaluation.

54. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the appropriations adopted for the International Court of Justice included the sum required for the custody of the Nürnberg Tribunal archives.

55. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the budget of the International Court of Justice did not include any specific appropriations for the custody of the archives in question. That custody, however, would not entail very great expenditure. The Secretary-General would try to meet such expenditure from the appropriations already adopted. If he was unable to do so, he would ask the Advisory Committee for permission to effect a transfer between sections of the budget.

56. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) thanked the USSR representative for raising a question of particular importance. He thought that the Secretary-General would take the necessary steps if the custody of the archives proved to involve additional expense.

57. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) was glad to hear that the International Court of Justice had accepted the custody of the Nürnberg Tribunal archives.

58. Mr. GARNIER-COIGNET (Deputy Registrar of the International Court of Justice) said that the Court had given its agreement in principle on the matter.

59. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked that mention should be made of that decision in the Committee's report, so as to avoid future complications.

60. The CHAIRMAN stated that the USSR representative's request would be complied with.

SECTION 28

Section 28, Global reduction on provision for contractual printing, was unanimously adopted at the figure of 210,770 dollars.

SECTION 29

Section 29, Global reduction on account of devaluation of currencies (500,000 dollars), was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

61. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) stated that according to document A/C.5/354/Corr.1, the budgetary estimates for 1950 amounted to 42,352,563 dollars. In the course of the second reading of the budget the Fifth Committee had made the following modifications: it had reduced the estimates under section 1 by 6,500 dollars as a result of the decision reached regarding the *per diem* allowance to be paid to members of the Administrative Tribunal. It had increased the estimates in section 4 by 10,000 dollars in connexion with the session of the Trusteeship Council in Geneva. It had reduced the credits under section 9 relating to the Military Staff Committee secretariat, by 53,000 dollars. The credits under section 21, Information Centres, had been reduced by 20,290 dollars. The Committee had thus reduced by 69,790 dollars the total budgetary estimates as set forth in document A/C.5/354/Corr.1, making the total of those estimates 42,282,773 dollars.

62. Mr. TARN (Poland) asked whether, as a result of the votes previously taken in the Committee, it was understood that the expatriation allowance would be retained in 1950 on the same

basis as in 1949, and as provided for on page 164 of the budget estimates for the financial year 1950 (A/903).

63. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) replied that according to the vote taken by the Committee on section 17, the credits necessary for the payment of expatriation allowance had been approved.

64. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) stated that Mr. Andersen had only partly replied to the question put to him. He wished to know whether the expatriation allowance would definitely be paid to members of the staff of the Secretariat in 1950.

65. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) replied in the affirmative.

66. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the total budget estimates for 1950, amounting to 42,282,773 dollars, it being understood that the Committee would reach a decision on the estimates appearing under section 6 when it had been informed of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's decision.

The total budget estimates for 1950 were adopted by 31 votes to none, with 6 abstentions, the estimates appearing under section 6 being considered as provisional.

67. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he had abstained from voting on the budgetary estimates as a whole as he considered that those estimates contained appropriations for purposes which the USSR delegation regarded as contrary to the Charter, in particular the appropriations for the Interim Committee and the United Nations Field Service. He reserved the right to express his opinion at a later date on the expenses incurred in connexion with the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, the United Nations Commission on Korea, and the former Italian colonies.

ESTIMATES OF MISCELLANEOUS INCOME

68. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) pointed out that since the distribution of document A/C.5/354, annex B of which contained estimates of miscellaneous income in 1950, the Committee had approved the appropriations for the United Nations Commission for Indonesia. The income received from the Staff Assessment Plan in connexion with that Commission amounted to 7,000 dollars, which brought the total income received under that Plan to 111,300 dollars. It was expected that the income derived from the application of the Plan to the personnel of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine would amount to 38,700 dollars.

69. Replying to a question asked by Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) Mr. Andersen (Secretariat) stated that the figure of 5,091,740 dollars, which represented the total of miscellaneous income in 1950 could be regarded as a definite figure. Possible changes as a result of the vote on the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine should be borne in mind, however.

70. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) said that as the original estimates for the Staff Assessment Plan under section 6 amounted to 150,000 dollars and as, owing to the decisions reached, the income envisaged in that connexion amounted at present to 111,300 dollars, the total sum of 150,000 dollars could be approved, since that sum included the 38,700 dollars estimated under the

same heading for the staff of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

It was so decided.

71. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sum of 5,091,740 dollars, which represented the total amount of miscellaneous income estimated for 1950.

That sum was unanimously adopted.

72. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) stated that the sum of 42,282,773 dollars adopted by the Committee under the heading of budget estimates for 1950 was a gross sum from which the 5,091,740 dollars for miscellaneous income should be deducted, which would leave a net sum of 37,191,033 dollars. Finally, the sum of 2,351,365 dollars, representing the total of economies effected in 1948, as shown in document A/C.5/354, should be deducted.

73. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the Brazilian representative's statement and asked the Committee to give its decision on the amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft appropriation resolution for the financial year 1950 as submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/934, page 8). The figure of 4,946,490 dollars should be replaced by the figure of 5,091,740 dollars.

That amendment, and paragraph 2, thus amended, were unanimously adopted.

Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 were unanimously adopted.

74. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee would have to wait until it received information regarding the estimated expenses of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine before it could reach a decision on the draft appro-

priation resolution in the Advisory Committee's report (A/934, page 7).

Draft resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses

75. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) stated that that draft resolution had been amended as shown in Conference-Room Paper No. 5. The amendments, which were of little importance, had been made at the request of the International Court of Justice.

The Advisory Committee's draft resolution regarding unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (A/934, page 9), as amended in Conference-Room Paper No. 5, was unanimously adopted.

76. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked if the Secretary-General could prepare a brief summary of the decisions reached by the Committee at the current meeting. That summary should show the gross figure for the 1950 budgetary estimates, the 1950 income estimates, economies effected and the exact total of income envisaged under the Staff Assessment Plan.

77. Mr. GANEM (France) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal, but pointed out that the Secretary-General should emphasize the provisional nature of such figures. The decision reached regarding the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine might in fact have important financial implications and it would be advisable not to give the various Governments a false impression of the exact total of the budgetary estimates.

78. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) withdrew his proposal.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 7 December 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).

Establishment of an administrative tribunal

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the members of the Fifth Committee that under article 3, paragraph 2 of the statute of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, the members of the Tribunal should be appointed by the General Assembly for three years and might be reappointed; provided, however, that of the members initially appointed, the terms of two members should expire at the end of one year and the terms of two members should expire at the end of two years.

2. He drew attention to document A/C.5/L.45 containing a list of nominations which had been presented for membership of the Administrative Tribunal, and suggested that, in order that due account might be taken of the principle of geographical distribution, members of the Fifth Committee should first vote for the seven members to be appointed, and then should vote for the three members to be appointed for a period of three years, and afterwards for the members to be appointed for two years and one year respectively.

3. Mr. TARN (Poland) suggested that the nominees receiving the highest number of votes should be appointed for a period of three years.

4. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium), referring to the list of nominations for appointment as members of the Administrative Tribunal, requested the deletion of his name from that list as he had been recalled by his Government to occupy a post at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brussels. His duties in his new post would be too onerous to allow him to accept a position on the Administrative Tribunal. He thanked the delegations which had nominated him and asked them to vote for the French and Netherlands candidates.

5. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) felt that it would be wrong to elect the majority of members of the Administrative Tribunal from among those Member States which occupied permanent seats on the Security Council. The voting procedure followed in the United Nations was primitive and was not based on an arithmetical conception of an absolute majority.

6. The CHAIRMAN stressed the fact that the Fifth Committee was asked simply to recommend