

considered an anonymous document on the financial implications of its proposed decisions. In spite of the remarks of certain representatives, who had rightly considered that the document should be considered by the Fifth Committee, the representative of the United States had signified his intention of supporting it. That had been the origin of the First Committee's recommendation of administrative and financial questions.

96. He considered that the expenditure involved by decisions on the disposal of the former Italian colonies should be borne by the Member States which had the honour of participating in the solution of that problem, or, in other words, the members of the organs to be established. It was inconceivable that the United Nations should have to bear all those expenses.

97. Mr. ASHA (Syria) proposed the addition of 52,000 dollars to the sum recommended by the Advisory Committee; that meant restoring the appropriations for the payment of the travelling expenses and subsistence allowances of the alternate members of the United Nations Commission on Eritrea, as well as those that the United States representative had already proposed to restore.

98. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) withdrew his proposal in favour of that of the Syrian representative.

99. Mr. SHANN (Australia) considered that the Syrian proposal was a logical one. He would support it for the same reasons as those which had led him to support the United States proposal.

100. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Polish

proposal to refer the resolution adopted by the First Committee to the Sixth Committee.

*The Polish proposal was rejected by 19 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.*

101. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR proposal that the United Nations should bear no expenses in connexion with the disposal of the former Italian colonies.

*The USSR proposal was rejected by 28 votes to 5, with no abstentions.*

*The Syrian proposal to restore 52,000 dollars to the sum recommended by the Advisory Committee was adopted by 18 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.*

102. In reply to a question asked by the Belgian representative, Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said the Secretary-General would negotiate with the Administering Authority on the reimbursement of expenditure incurred in respect of the services of the Secretariat and of the members of the Advisory Council for Italian Somaliland.

*The financial implications of the draft resolution proposed by the First Committee, amounting to 452,000 dollars, were approved by 24 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

103. Mr. VOYNA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said the First Committee had spurned the principle of geographical distribution in electing the members of the new organs; he hoped that that principle would be respected in the choice of the members of the Secretariat to be attached to those organs.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.

## TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 18 November 1949, at 3 p.m.*

*Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).*

### Budget estimates for the financial year 1950 (first reading continued)

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF TWO DRAFT RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED BY THE AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE

1. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) read paragraph 29 of the report of the Special Committee on a United Nations Guard (A/959). He recalled that during the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee several delegations had expressed their interest in paragraph 29. The delegation of the Union of South Africa had asked that the paragraph be included in the communication from the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to the President of the General Assembly.

2. The South African delegation was aware of the difficulties which the establishment of a United Nations Field Service would entail. It was probably too much to expect that, during the first year of such a Service, the expenditure contemplated would be entirely offset by savings on the mission budgets. The South African delegation nevertheless hoped that the terms of paragraph 29 would be applied in succeeding years. Mr. Fourie stated that if savings were not contemplated under that heading in the 1951 budget his delegation would raise the question again.

3. Mr. TARN (Poland) read section I (B) of document A/C.5/348 relative to the estimated savings to be achieved through the establishment of a United Nations Field Service, and pointed out that the expenses envisaged "would be partly compensated by savings to be achieved in the budgets of the various missions" as a result of "the deletion of the provisions made in those budgets for payment of salaries to the staff to be absorbed in the Field Service" and of "the reduction of the provisions made under the same budgets for subsistence allowances for that staff". Mr. Tarn finally referred to paragraph 4 of the twenty-third report of 1949 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1088), where it was stated that the expenditure budget of the Field Service reflected the savings likely to result from the recent devaluation of certain national currencies.

4. The Polish representative asked whether the contemplated savings were finally to result from the elimination or reduction of the appropriations mentioned in document A/C.5/348, or from the devaluation of currencies.

5. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Administrative and Financial Services) said that steps would be taken to effect economies by eliminating or reducing appropriations. As far as the results of devaluation were concerned, Mr.

Price reminded the Committee that it had decided at its 224th meeting to effect economies estimated at 500,000 dollars, to be spread over all the sections of the budget, with the exception of section 6. The Secretary-General was now submitting estimates of savings under section 6.

6. Mr. TARN (Poland) failed to see how savings could be achieved by replacing personnel with other personnel. The Secretary-General had not as yet the staff at his disposal to carry out all the functions listed in annex 1 of document A/959. As for the estimated savings to result from devaluation, Mr. Tarn doubted whether the figures submitted were correct.

7. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) reminded the meeting that estimated expenditure in connexion with the Field Service amounted to 337,000 dollars (A/C.5/348, section I (A)) but that such expenditure might be partly offset by savings in the various mission budgets.

8. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) declared himself in favour of the Advisory Committee's report and drew particular attention to paragraph 5 of that report. It would be seen from document A/959 that the Secretary-General had envisaged a far larger service than that which it had been decided to establish. In carrying out the decision, the Secretary-General should pursue a prudent and cautious policy, as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

9. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the USSR representative on the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had stated the position of his delegation regarding the establishment of a United Nations Field Service. Such a service would really be a military unit, as its name indicated. It would, moreover, be supplied with arms. The establishment of such a service was contrary to Articles 43 and 48 of the Charter, which provided that, whatever their weapons, any armed forces at the disposal of the United Nations should be under the control of the Security Council and not of the Secretary-General. Moreover, the use of such a service might give rise to conflicts with the authorities in the countries in which it would operate. For those reasons, the USSR delegation had been opposed to the establishment of such a service and it would oppose the granting of the appropriations required for that purpose.

10. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) read section I, sub-paragraph (d) (1) of document A/C.5/348 where it was stated that the salaries and allowances for personnel integrated in the United Nations Field Service, with the exception of subsistence and quarters in the field, would be shown in a Field Service budget. He then quoted section (B), sub-paragraph (b) in which a reduction of the provisions made in the budgets of the various missions for subsistence allowances of Field Service staff was proposed. The Netherlands representative considered those two passages of the same document to be contradictory.

11. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) stated that according to sub-paragraph (d) (1) of document A/C.5/348, the

costs of maintenance would not be shown under section 6. It had been felt, moreover, that it would be possible to reduce such costs in the budgets of the various missions.

12. Mr. STARY (Czechoslovakia) recalled that his delegation's position in regard to the setting up of a United Nations Field Service had been explained in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Such a measure was not only useless—it was also contrary to the provisions of the Charter. For that reason the Czechoslovak representative would vote against the appropriation of the sum necessary for the establishment of a United Nations Field Service.

13. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) stated that the United Nations Field Service would not be a military unit, but would help maintain peace in the same way as the United Nations Relief Rehabilitation Administration and the International Refugee Organization had done. He considered that the savings contemplated as a result of devaluation were fictitious. They would not be large, since there had already been a rise in prices in the countries which had devalued their currencies and that tendency would no doubt continue. The Norwegian delegation wished to avoid a deficit in the United Nations budget and felt, therefore, that it would be wiser to approve estimates which were realistic.

14. The Jam Saheb of NAWANAGAR (India) supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations and hoped that when the Secretary-General recruited personnel for the United Nations Field Service he would bear in mind the principle of geographical distribution.

15. Mr. VOYNA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions if he felt that the establishment of a United Nations Field Service would be a breach of the provisions of the Charter, especially of the provisions of Chapter XV. He also asked whether such a measure was compatible with the functions of the Secretariat as laid down by the Fifth Committee in 1946 and adopted by the General Assembly in resolutions 11 (I) and 13 (I).

16. He also wished to ask the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to explain the meaning of paragraph 5 of that Committee's report (A/1088).

17. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) stated that he was not competent to say whether the establishment of a United Nations Field Service was or was not contrary to the provisions of the Charter.

18. Paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report had been included in order to restrict the numerical strength of the Field Service. It was a new service, and in organizing it the Secretary-General should bear in mind the budgetary implications and should exercise caution.

19. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that the Canadian representative had explained the position of his delegation in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. He shared the opinion of the representative of the Union of South Africa as regards the establishment of the Field Service. He felt that the qualifications of the staff of a force which would represent the United Nations in various countries should be carefully scrutinized.

20. He hoped that the Secretary-General would study the possibility of amalgamating the guard unit at temporary headquarters with the United Nations Field Service. Some savings might thus be made.

21. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) felt some satisfaction in noting that a project which had had the proportions of a hippopotamus at the outset had now been reduced to the more familiar size of a domestic animal such as a dog or a cat. He stressed the importance of paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report and would vote in favour of that report.

22. Mr. TARN (Poland) said that he would vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendations for the reasons given by his delegation in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The military character of the United Nations Field Service was shown plainly in the Secretary-General's revised proposals. It might be asked what type of training the members of that service would receive if it were not military training.

23. He noted with surprise that a sum of 300 dollars had been estimated for each trainee for the purchase of a uniform (A/C.5/348). Did not such a large sum include the purchase of arms? Furthermore, it was proposed that certain trainees should be recruited outside the United States, but there did not seem to be any estimates of their travel expenses from their country of origin to Lake Success.

24. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) stated that the uniform for the members of the Field Service would be similar to those of the guards at headquarters. In connexion with the question of equipment he referred the Polish representative to document A/959, annex 1, paragraph on equipment.

25. He further explained that the equipment of the Field Service would comprise wireless equipment and it was in that field that recruits would be trained. Finally, the travel and removal expenses of the members of the Field Service recruited outside the United States would be shown in section 17 of the budget estimates.

26. Mr. SMOLYAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the Belgian representative was pleased that the hippopotamus had been reduced to the size of a cat or a dog. He feared, however, that the animal would shortly reach the size of a hippopotamus again. Whatever description was adopted, the substance remained the same; the establishment of an armed force was definitely contemplated. Such a decision was contrary to the Charter and for that reason the Byelorussian representative would vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

27. Mr. VOYNA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that the views of his delegation had been given in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The establishment of a United Nations Field Service was a violation of Chapter XV of the Charter, which laid down the functions of the Secretariat which the Fifth Committee itself had defined in 1946.

28. He considered that the guards which United Nations missions might need should be supplied at the request of the Secretary-General by the Governments of the territories in which those missions happened to be. The use of a United

Nations Field Service might give rise to undesirable incidents, even to violent clashes with local authorities. The neutrality of members of the Secretariat would thus be endangered and for that reason the Fifth Committee should seriously consider such a contingency.

29. For those reasons the Ukrainian delegation would vote against the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

30. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur, pointed out that the Fifth Committee had recently complained that one of the other Main Committees had encroached on its field of action. It should not in its turn lay itself open to the same criticism.

31. Mr. TARN (Poland) asked how members of the Field Service could be sent to all United Nations missions when only 9,000 dollars were allotted for their travelling expenses. He would also like to know how many of them would be locally recruited.

32. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked how and where the United Nations Field Service would be incorporated in the structure of the United Nations Secretariat.

33. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) explained that it had been proposed to recruit 25 trainees outside the United States. The average cost of their journey had been estimated at 360 dollars, hence the total of 9,000 dollars. The travelling expenses of members of the Field Service going on missions would be included in the budget of the mission in question.

34. In reply to the Brazilian representative, he said that the question he had raised would be settled later.

35. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, taking into account income under the staff assessment plan, the estimated net expenditure for the United Nations Field Service would amount to 71,000 dollars in 1950.

*The budget estimates for the United Nations Field Service were approved at a net figure of 71,000 dollars by 31 votes to 5.*

### Programme of Work

36. In reply to a question by Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), the CHAIRMAN said that the budget estimates relating to the question of refugees would shortly be submitted to the Committee.

37. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) added that those estimates would comprise both estimated expenditure in 1950, which would be greatly reduced because the General Assembly's decision would not come into effect before 1951, and estimates of the cost of operation in succeeding years.

38. The CHAIRMAN stated, finally, that the Committee would not begin the second reading of the budget estimates until it had completed all the supplementary expenditure estimates; it had still to consider the estimates for the United Nations Commission for Indonesia, the United Nations Commission for Palestine, the question of the Palestine refugees and, finally, the estimates of miscellaneous income.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.