

Swiss radio authorities. They were thus able to broadcast from Geneva and also to relay broadcasts from Lake Success.

91. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) inquired whether the restoration of 25,000 dollars requested in document A/C.5/310 was intended to cover the Geneva information services' function as distributor of information regarding meetings held at the Geneva office, or regarding merely its more general functions.

92. Mr. COHEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Public Information) said that it was difficult to separate the two functions; the restoration was intended to keep the Geneva information services at the peak of efficiency they had reached in 1949, a position more satisfactory than that of previous years.

93. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The General Assembly, at its second session, had by resolution 166 (II) limited the staff in the larger Information centres to six, whereas the estimates under consideration specified seventeen for Geneva. He considered the sum of 99,850 dollars, as recommended by the Advisory Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Questions quite adequate for the information services at Geneva, particularly in view of the large number of Information centres in Europe generally.

94. Mr. COHEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Public Information) drew the USSR representative's attention to the fact that the Geneva information services had never been included under section 21, Information Centres, but always under section 20, United Nations office at Geneva, since the Geneva information services differed from the others in that they not merely disseminated but also originated information.

95. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the 1950 budget estimates (A/903, page 189) stated that in future "emphasis would be devoted less to the coverage of meetings and the issue of press releases thereon, and more to the preparation of background and feature material".

96. The Advisory Committee, when originally trying to find a basis on which to decide the relative strengths of Information centres had been told by the Department of Public Information that there would be less work in Geneva if more centres were established; the Committee had taken that earlier statement into account when making its decision on the 1950 estimates.

97. Mr. COHEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Public Information) said that the staff of the Geneva information services could not issue press releases for all meetings; there had been over a thousand in the first six months of 1949. An understanding had therefore been reached, in particular with the Economic Commission for Europe, by which the releases were to be on a broader basis; that applied, however, only to the latter Commission and did not mean any decrease in the number of press releases required when special meetings were in progress.

98. Mr. HALL (United States of America) said that he would have difficulty in voting without knowing how many meetings the press and radio services might have to cover, in other words, whether the Trusteeship Council and the Economic and Social Council would be meeting in Geneva.

99. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) thought that, since it was known that 1,875 meetings could be serviced, it was immaterial what meetings they were; an immediate decision could be taken on the information services required to cover those meetings.

*The Secretary-General's proposal that the sum of 25,200 dollars should be restored to the Advisory Committee's recommendations for chapter II of section 20, was rejected by 25 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.*

*The Advisory Committee's recommendations for chapter II of section 20 were approved by 34 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

### Chapter III

*The Committee unanimously approved the Secretary-General's estimates for chapter III of section 20, Secretariat of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Narcotic Drugs Supervisory Body.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

## TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTH MEETING

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 26 October 1949, at 3 p.m.*

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

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1950: (a) budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/903); (b) reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/934) (first reading continued)**

### PART I SECTION 1 Chapter IV

1. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, since the Chairman of the International Law Commission was present and would be obliged to leave early, the

Committee should begin by considering section 1, chapter IV of the 1950 budget estimates, dealing with the International Law Commission.

*It was so agreed.*

*On the Chairman's invitation, Mr. Hudson, Chairman of the International Law Commission, took his place at the Committee table.*

2. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the Secretary-General's proposals (A/C.5/325), and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1051).

3. The Committee was called upon to decide whether honoraria should be paid to the Chair-

man and five rapporteurs of the International Law Commission, and also what should be the rate of subsistence allowance for members of the Commission.

4. Mr. HUDSON (Chairman of the International Law Commission), thanking the Committee for their invitation to state his case, said that he was at their disposal for any consultation or explanations required in connexion with the work of his Commission.

5. The issue before the meeting arose from paragraph 42 of the Commission's report, which expressed the opinion that "it would be in the interest of the work of the Commission, in order to enable the time of its members to be enlisted in that work, that method should be explored by which service in the Commission might be made less onerous financially". To that end it had been suggested that the General Assembly might reconsider article 13 of the Commission's statute.

6. The Sixth Committee had approved such a reconsideration but had referred the matter to the Fifth Committee for a decision as to its implementation. Article 13 of the Commission's statute provided that members should be paid travel expenses and also receive a *per diem* allowance at the same rate as that paid to members of commissions of experts of the Economic and Social Council. The category of "commission of experts" was somewhat difficult to define; it seemed, moreover, illogical that members of the International Law Commission, who were elected by the General Assembly and exercised responsibility on behalf of that body, should be placed in the same category as sub-commissions of the Economic and Social Council, since only the sub-commissions received a subsistence allowance.

7. An examination of the 1950 budget estimates revealed that, of the five Sub-Commissions of the Economic and Social Council, the Sub-Commissions on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and on Freedom of Information and of the Press, were to meet for a maximum period of three weeks, and the Sub-Commissions on Economic Development, on Employment and Economic Stability, and on Statistical Sampling, for two weeks. The preceding session of the International Law Commission, however, had lasted eight and a half weeks, and a maximum of ten weeks was envisaged for the coming session—a very long period for its members who, if they were to carry out their work properly, must also devote much time to it between sessions; in particular, rapporteurs had to spend many months in the necessary research. Mr. Hudson was grateful to the Advisory Committee for proposing a fixed sum as special compensation for rapporteurs, although he thought that in view of their distinction a larger amount might have been suggested.

8. As regards the members themselves, the Advisory Committee had felt bound by the provisions of article 13 of the Commission's statute—a statute which had been adopted by the General Assembly and could therefore be modified by it—and had not seen its way to meeting the Sixth Committee's desire to amend that article.

9. Mr. Hudson did not wish to suggest that the members of his Commission should be placed in a special category, but he felt that the one in which they were now placed was not appropriate; a

more natural category he thought, although he did not propose it as a guide, would be that of the *ad hoc* judges of the International Court of Justice. The latter received two allowances, one subsistence and one general, which, even after taking devaluation into account, gave them forty-eight dollars a day. Many members of the Law Commission found it impossible to live in New York on a subsistence allowance of twenty dollars a day. The Commission felt that a more adequate allowance would enable it to implement the provisions of the Charter and, by calling upon the time of its members both during and between sessions, to study the problems referred to the Commission by the General Assembly.

10. He trusted that the Fifth Committee would give sympathetic consideration to the desire of the Sixth Committee to amend article 13 of the International Law Commission's statute, and that, as far as the rapporteurs were concerned, it would be guided by the Advisory Committee's recommendations and the Secretary-General's proposal for a fixed fee.

11. Mr. TARN (Poland) asked how the emoluments of members of the International Law Commission compared with those of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, a body also elected by the General Assembly.

12. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that his Committee had been somewhat embarrassed by a question which they considered should be decided by the administration.

13. As regards the question of honoraria to rapporteurs, whose duty it was to prepare drafts and working papers to assist the International Law Commission in its work, the Advisory Committee was convinced that such delegation of work saved the Commission's time during the session, but that it demanded much time from the members to whom it was entrusted, being in addition work which required seasoned legal authorities. The Advisory Committee had felt able to recommend only a maximum honorarium of 1,500 dollars.

14. With regard to payments to members, the Advisory Committee had given special attention to the question of comparison with the Commissions and Sub-Commissions of the Economic and Social Council. Mr. Agnides quoted article 13 of the International Law Commission's statute, explaining that the latter was a principle adopted by the General Assembly and one which the Advisory Committee could not modify. He pointed out in that connexion, however, that neither the Advisory Committee nor the Fifth Committee had been informed of that statute before it was adopted, and that the position might have been more satisfactory if the matter had gone through the usual channels.

15. The Advisory Committee was of the opinion that the question of the adequacy of subsistence allowances to members of subsidiary bodies should be thoroughly reviewed by the Secretary-General, and that it would be inadvisable to come to a special decision on a special case; a comprehensive review, in the fourth year of the life of the United Nations, would ensure that the Fifth

Committee was presented with no more cases of the kind before it.

16. Although convinced of the importance of the International Law Commission and appreciative of the eminence of its members, he considered that the Fifth Committee, if it attempted to draw up a list of priorities for the commissions of the United Nations, would be entering upon dangerous ground.

17. In answer to the question of the Polish representative, Mr. Agnides stated that some members of the Advisory Committee received a subsistence allowance of ten dollars each day they worked, others of twenty-five. Moreover, the Advisory Committee's session was not one of six or eight weeks; during 1949 the members of the Committee would have been away from home for some nine months. The relevant point, however, was that neither the Advisory Committee itself, nor the General Assembly, had decided what that subsistence amount should be; that was a matter for the Secretary-General to decide.

18. Mr. JUTRAS (Canada) pointed out that the question of emoluments raised important and complex issues. It was clear that adequate provision should be made for the proper remuneration of members of the International Law Commission; but the latter was only one among many United Nations commissions, and any decision taken by the Fifth Committee must also take account of the general principles for reimbursement of members of United Nations commissions.

19. The International Law Commission had been constituted on a basis similar to that of other United Nations commissions. It was therefore clear that any decision to increase the emoluments of its members would have an effect on the basis on which experts of other commissions were remunerated. There were, however, certain differences which might justify special treatment of the members of the International Law Commission, in particular the fact that the latter's activities required several months annually, whereas sessions of other commissions were usually of two or three weeks' duration. To this it might, however, be objected that the forthcoming session of the Social Commission was expected to last eight weeks or more. The contention that absence from their private practices might result in members of the International Law Commission sustaining certain financial losses might be true in certain cases, but in many others those members were employed on an annual salary basis by their Governments or by academic institutions and sustained no financial loss.

20. Mr. Jutras stated that he was not raising such points with a view to supporting or opposing an increase in the emoluments of members of the International Law Commission, but rather to indicate the very wide range of problems which must be examined and resolved if a solution of the question were to be reached which would provide satisfactorily for the members of the Commission, without prejudicing the general principles on which United Nations experts were paid for their services.

21. The Canadian delegation, therefore, was of the opinion that before going into details, the Committee should have before it a full report from the Secretary-General setting out all essential informa-

tion for reaching sound conclusions, namely, the nature of the International Law Commission and its work, the basis on which members were appointed, any points of difference between it and other commissions of the United Nations, some indication of the type of appointments which its members held in their own countries, and particulars of any special activities of its rapporteurs.

22. The Canadian delegation therefore proposed that, after members of the Committee had indicated their general views, the question should be referred back to the Secretary-General for a report on the above-mentioned matters and any others which the Committee might deem relevant. Such a report, in addition to providing background and other appropriate data, should include recommendations from the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee, after consultation if possible with such members of the International Civil Service Advisory Board as might be available. The report in question would not take more than two weeks to prepare and could be dealt with by the Committee before the end of the session.

23. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) expressed approval of the statement of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. In reality the only problem was the payment of a honorarium to the rapporteurs. The principle of a subsistence allowance was not in dispute, although he agreed with the Advisory Committee that it was for the Secretary-General, under the powers granted to him, to revise the amount as required. The general question of a subsistence allowance had already been adequately studied. The allowance should, however, depend not on the person to whom it was paid but on the purposes for which it was intended.

24. The honorarium of 1,500 dollars recommended by the Advisory Committee was a minimum. In view of the calibre of the experts employed by the International Law Commission, the Brazilian delegation would propose 2,000 dollars. Although working for the United Nations was an honour, no one except Government officials, who knew in advance the implications of the work they were undertaking, should be called upon to give up three or four months annually without adequate remuneration.

25. As regards article 13 of the International Law Commission's statute, Mr. Machado thought that the Commission should have drawn attention to any anomalies when drafting the article. He agreed with the Advisory Committee that the article must be maintained, since otherwise the position of all other commissions would be brought into question.

26. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) associated himself with the Canadian statement that the problem raised in connexion with the International Law Commission was really only one aspect of the more general problem of whether, in certain circumstances, members of certain commissions set up by the General Assembly should receive remuneration over and above their travel expenses and subsistence allowance. That question might arise, for instance, in the case of members of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which met for months on end. The Belgian delegation therefore supported the recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 6 of document A/1051. It could not, however, vote on paragraph 5 of that

report without knowing something of the other commissions and to what extent a precedent was being created.

27. The Chairman of the International Law Commission had criticized the fact that in article 13 of the Commission's statute an analogy was drawn with the financial system in operation for members of the Commissions of the Economic and Social Council. That analogy did not, however, imply any appraisal of merit. It had merely been a question of citing a financial system in force at the time, whereby members were ensured the payment of their travel expenses and a subsistence allowance, and the Assembly had intended to apply that system independently to members of the International Law Commission. With regard to the rates of subsistence allowances, the Belgian delegation agreed with the Brazilian representative that that question came within the competence of the Secretary-General.

28. Mr. Lebeau supported the Canadian proposal that the Secretary-General should be asked to study the whole problem, comparing the status of the International Law Commission with other commissions, and to report on the matter of honoraria and additional subsistence allowances.

29. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) stated that the New Zealand representative in the Sixth Committee had, in consideration of the functions of the International Law Commission, opposed the payment of salaries but had recognized that some emoluments should be paid to rapporteurs, particularly when the latter were not Government employees. The Secretary-General had drawn attention to the amount of research the rapporteurs were called upon to carry out, and had suggested a fixed honorarium; the New Zealand delegation believed that, in that connexion, some difference should be made between those who were Government employees and those who were not; it fully realized, however, the difficulty of differentiating in practice.

30. His delegation was opposed to any remuneration of members which would differentiate them from the members of any other commission. The prestige of an international civil service and the honour of working for the United Nations should be borne in mind, and although members of the commissions ought not to lose by their participation, the New Zealand delegation considered the sum of twenty dollars a reasonable amount for *per diem*.

31. Mr. Webster emphasized the fact that *per diem* should not be different for the members of different commissions unless the material conditions under which they had to work also differed.

32. Mr. TRANOS (Greece) thought that the Canadian proposal was apposite, and that the question was one within the Secretary-General's jurisdiction. He agreed, however, with the representative of Brazil that 1,500 dollars should not be the maximum for the emoluments of rapporteurs; in view of the importance of their work — the codification of international law — he considered even 2,000 dollars insufficient; the scale of remuneration should be more in keeping with the importance of the work the rapporteurs were called upon to perform.

33. Mr. HUDSON (Chairman of the International Law Commission) thanked the Committee for its

appreciation of the character of the work of the International Law Commission. He assured the Brazilian representative that the members of his Commission were conscious of the honour of working for the United Nations and that their hearts were in that work, even though they might feel, in view of their family demands, that the financial sacrifice on their part should be lightened.

34. He pointed out that the International Law Commission's statute had been drafted by the General Assembly one year before the members of that Commission were elected. The Commission was well aware of the magnitude of the task with which the Assembly had entrusted it, and any views they expressed were in the interests of that work, which they wished to be of the highest possible standard.

35. He thanked the Committee for its reception of his Commission's proposals.

36. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) suggested that in view of the eight and a half week period mentioned, the sum of 1,500 dollars was more appropriate than 2,000 dollars.

37. The honorarium was a token payment given in recognition of services and was not remuneration; indeed, full remuneration would require far more than 2,000 dollars.

38. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) supported the Canadian proposal and paragraph 6 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1051). His delegation did not wish anyone who was working for the United Nations to be financially embarrassed as a result. He therefore favoured the principle of a honorarium. His delegation hoped, however, that the Secretary-General would take as his criterion the degree of financial loss sustained, that is, that a member in a Government service drawing a full-time salary and also serving as rapporteur would not qualify for a honorarium.

39. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked whether referring the matter back to the Secretary-General for clarification would mean that the problem would be dealt with as a general problem. If so, his delegation was not in agreement, and had indeed accepted the Advisory Committee's proposal for a honorarium as signifying that the problem was to be treated as an individual one. The time factor, also, should not be ignored.

40. Mr. JUTRAS (Canada) explained that his proposal was that the Secretary-General should submit a report during the present session, that being fully in keeping with the request of the Sixth Committee.

41. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that, since more than two weeks had already been spent in considering the budget, a decision to re-examine the question of the commissions would merely lead to repetition. He found the Advisory Committee's arguments on subsistence allowances convincing.

42. Mr. JUTRAS (Canada) said he had had in mind information regarding the other commissions only in so far as it affected the problem at issue.

43. Mr. TARN (Poland) said that the Secretary-General had stated in document A/C.5/325 that the following alternatives were possible regarding the remuneration of members of the International Law Commission: (1) to increase payments for

members of the Commission, thus establishing an exception for that group as compared with such other groups as Expert Commissions of the Economic and Social Council, and creating a precedent; (2) as suggested by the Chairman of the International Law Commission in his statement to the Sixth Committee, to compare, for purposes of remuneration and subsistence, the members of the International Law Commission to *ad hoc* judges of the International Court of Justice who received a fee and a subsistence allowance while exercising their functions. Mr. Tarn felt that the second alternative would also create a precedent, and therefore suggested that the Committee should immediately pass to a vote on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

44. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) considered that the Committee should not vote on any proposals regarding the remuneration and subsistence allowance of members of the International Law Commission until it knew what effect any special arrangements made in connexion with that Commission would have on other bodies of the United Nations. He suggested that the Secretary-General should draw up a table listing all the commissions and committees of the United Nations, the number of their members, the duration of sessions, the frequency of meetings and, if possible, information whether members of such bodies had to give up their governmental functions while working on commissions and committees of the United Nations.

45. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the Secretary-General could prepare the report that had been requested within two weeks.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Canadian representative's proposal that the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, should be asked to submit a report as soon as possible on the nature of the International Law Commission, its work, the basis on which its members were appointed and any factors which would make it different from other commissions of the United Nations, with an indication of the type of appointments which its members held in their own countries, and information concerning any special activities of its rapporteurs.

*The proposal was adopted by 21 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.*

47. The CHAIRMAN said that he would not get into touch with the Chairman of the Sixth Committee regarding the International Law Commission until the Fifth Committee had taken a definite decision on the question of remuneration of members of that Commission after having received the Secretary-General's report.

#### RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INTERIM COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

48. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to a letter dated 22 October 1949 from the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee regarding the Interim Committee of the General Assembly (A/C.5/326). The letter would be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions with a request that it should prepare a report on the financial implications of the re-establishment of the Interim Committee.

49. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. SMOLYAR (Byelo-

russian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. VOYNA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. TARN (Poland) stated that, having voted against the continuation of the Interim Committee, which had been set up in violation of the provisions of the Charter, he could not support the Chairman's proposal to send the letter of the President of the General Assembly to the Advisory Committee for report on budgetary appropriations for the continuation of the Interim Committee.

#### PART IV

#### SECTION 20

#### Chapter IV

50. The CHAIRMAN said paragraphs 173 to 180 inclusive of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/934) referred to the Economic Commission for Europe, and pointed out that that Committee had recommended that the Secretary-General's budget should be reduced by 110,250 dollars. The Secretary-General had requested that a sum of 98,250 dollars should be restored to the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee, and had stated his reasons therefore in document A/C.5/310.

51. Mr. SHANN (Australia) said it was the view of his delegation that the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) should be maintained and strengthened, and it would therefore support the Secretary-General's estimates.

52. Referring to his statement at the previous meeting of the Fifth Committee, he said his delegation was puzzled by the remarks in paragraph 177 of the Advisory Committee's report relating to the Research and Planning Division of the Economic Commission for Europe. His delegation doubted very much whether fourteen posts could be abolished without consequential and considerable reduction in the efficiency of the Commission.

53. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) said the United Kingdom delegation strongly supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations. As one of the main contributors to the budget of the United Nations, the United Kingdom Government felt that it was essential that there should not be any wasteful expenditure either by the Economic Commission for Europe or any other commission. At the recent debate on the Economic Commission for Europe in the Economic and Social Council, the head of the United Kingdom delegation had paid a tribute to the good work done by that Commission. It felt, however, that the Commission should confine its work to those subjects on which effective international action could be taken on the regional plane without duplicating the work of the functional commissions and specialized agencies.

54. The United Kingdom delegation had fully considered the remarks of the Advisory Committee regarding the Economic Commission for Europe, and agreed that the Commission should be reorganized not only for the sake of economy but also as a matter of efficiency.

55. He pointed out that on page 191 of the budget estimates (A/903) reference was made to a statistical section in the Research and Planning reference was made to another office which collected statistics, and again on page 196 there was

reference to still another office which collected statistical data for a statistical bulletin. It was the opinion of the United Kingdom delegation that all statistics should be centralized in the Statistics Section of the Director's office. The duties carried out by the Research and Planning Division were also duplicated in part by the Industry and Materials Division. The number of the divisions should be reduced and such divisions as the Electric Power Division, Industry and Materials Division, and Steel Division should be amalgamated.

56. The United Kingdom Government would continue to support those activities of the Economic Committee for Europe which were likely to contribute to the economic rehabilitation of Europe, but was anxious to avoid all extravagant expenditure.

57. Mr. MONTEL (France) felt that the reduction of 110,250 dollars recommended by the Advisory Committee in the budget of the Economic Commission for Europe was too severe. During the general discussion on the budget estimates of the United Nations, the French delegation had paid a tribute to the work of the Advisory Committee and had approved in principle the savings recommended by that Committee. Although it approved such recommendations in general, it wished to draw the attention of the Committee to certain specific questions in connexion with the budget which it felt had not been sufficiently studied. The budget of the Economic Commission for Europe came under that heading.

58. If the credits put at the disposal of the Economic Commission for Europe were insufficient, that Commission could not, like other bodies of the United Nations, request additional appropriations. Regional commissions enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy and the Executive Secretary of each of the Commissions, in collaboration with the representative of the Governments concerned, had to determine the field in which action would be most useful and effective.

59. He quoted sub-paragraphs 1 (a), (b) and (c) and paragraphs 4 and 5 of Economic and Social resolution 36 (IV), establishing the Economic Commission for Europe, in order to emphasize that the efficiency of the Commission was at stake when its budget was discussed. If the credits granted to it were restricted it could only carry out routine duties which might prove useless. If, on the other hand, it received adequate funds it could carry out investigations, furnish technical assistance, organize the necessary liaison with Governments and thus fulfil its mission.

60. His delegation could not agree with the restrictive nature of the remarks in paragraph 175 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/934). Mr. Montel emphasized that most of the European countries had reached, in some cases surpassed, the pre-war level of production. The Economic Commission for Europe should not be restricted to offsetting the effects of war devastation; the Commission had other work to do. The French representative on the Economic and Social Council had pointed out that there was a threat of unemployment and that the problems arising from a decrease in the demand for goods were serious. Markets might be disorganized and producers tempted to group themselves into cartels which would be harmful to the interests of consumers and all concerned. He had stressed that

the committees of the Economic Commission for Europe should lay down the basis for inter-governmental agreements to facilitate the preparation of long-term production programmes, regulate markets and standardize prices.

61. Mr. Montel pointed out that the Steel Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe was studying the influence of discriminatory prices on the production costs of steel in Europe. Certain countries were selling metallurgical coke at prices higher than domestic prices and others were doing the same in the case of ores, which led to a rise in cost price and made competition on the world market difficult. That Committee was also studying the export markets and the possibilities of relating the export capacity of European countries to the absorption capacity of foreign markets.

62. The conclusions reached by the Economic Commission for Europe were of the greatest use to Governments which could, if they felt it necessary, change their investment policy in the industries concerned. In that field, the Commission was able to make recommendations to Governments with a view to the conclusion of inter-governmental agreements.

63. The new problems arising in European economy called for new methods and no other organization was better qualified to do that work than the Economic Commission for Europe.

64. He emphasized that many of the conclusions reached in a recent report of the Economic Commission for Europe were far-reaching.

65. In conclusion, the French delegation, for the reasons he had given, requested the Fifth Committee not to accept the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee and to agree to the Secretary-General's revised estimates for the Economic Commission for Europe.

66. Mr. TARN (Poland) supported the remarks of the French representative, especially in connexion with paragraph 175 of the Advisory Committee's report. His delegation would therefore vote for the Secretary-General's revised estimate.

67. Mr. HALL (United States of America) associated himself with the remarks of other delegations regarding the quality of the research work carried out by the staff of the Economic Commission for Europe. That work was very useful and the United States delegation would like it to continue.

68. He felt that certain of the Advisory Committee's criticisms regarding the Economic Commission for Europe were justified. Some of the directors' offices seemed to be overstaffed. He noted that the Secretary-General had agreed that certain additional work could be absorbed by the Commission without extra cost.

69. The United States delegation supported the Australian proposal. In view of the fact that the activities of the Economic Commission for Europe would be reviewed in 1951, he felt that the Fifth Committee could vote for the Secretary-General's revised estimates for 1950. He asked that the Economic and Social Council at the time of the review of regional economic commissions should have before it a statement on the costs of these regional commissions as well as a commentary by the Secretary-General on the administrative questions referred to in the Advisory Committee's report.

70. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in view of the important work carried out by the Economic Commission for Europe, his delegation supported the proposal that the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee in the Commission's budget should be restored, with the exception of the sum of 12,640 dollars for the Frankfurt office. German unity was undermined when such offices existed, and he therefore proposed that the Secretary-General's revised proposal of 98,250 dollars should be accepted minus the sum of 12,640 dollars.

71. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) paid a tribute to the excellent work carried out by the Research and Planning Division of the Economic Commission for Europe. The publications of that division were of a very high quality and the *Economic Survey of Europe* was one of the best publications issued by the United Nations. He wondered whether it would be possible, if the United Kingdom proposal regarding reorganization were accepted, to maintain the publications and the work of the Statistics Section at the same high level.

72. Mr. NASS (Venezuela) said that he would support the Secretary-General's revised estimate for the Economic Commission for Europe in view of the fact that the Economic and Social Council would make a special review of the work of the regional economic commissions in 1951. He could not altogether accept the views in paragraph 191 of the Advisory Committee's report that the preferable course would be to seek to achieve, meanwhile, stability of the budget at approximately the current level of costs.

73. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) thanked the various delegations for the tributes they had paid to the work of the Economic Commission for Europe.

74. In spite of an increase in work the Secretary-General's estimates for 1950 were a reduction on the amounts spent in 1949. In reviewing the supplementary work placed on the staff of the Economic Commission for Europe since the original budget estimates were prepared, it had been found possible to absorb the additional amount requested in the revised figure which the Secretary-General had submitted. The Secretary-General found it difficult to see how the saving of 110,250 dollars recommended by the Advisory Committee could be achieved.

75. The Secretary-General had considered the suggestion that the statistical work of the Economic Commission for Europe might be centralized. In the various specialized divisions such as the Coal Division, statistics were by-products of the general duties of the divisions and were highly specialized. There was no overlapping between the specialized statistical work and the central statistical work carried out in the Research and Planning Division. The situation was similar to that in many government offices. The secretariat had in fact devoted a great deal of time to considering the best way of organizing statistical work.

76. Referring to the United Kingdom representative's proposal that the work of the various divisions of the Economic Commission for Europe should be reorganized in order to reduce staff, he emphasized that the staff was highly technical and

there were limits to which transfer of staff from one division to another could be effectively applied.

77. A review was being made of the work carried out by the various working committees of the Economic Commission for Europe and on the basis of that review the future of that body and its secretariat would doubtless be based. It was premature to anticipate the result of that review by making reductions which would impair the efficiency of the Commission. Such reductions would involve the termination of the contracts of expert staff and it would be wasteful to dismiss members of the staff who were proving so useful and who had been recruited with difficulty and at some expense.

78. Referring to the United States representative's question, he said that a survey of the regional economic commissions on the lines suggested would be submitted by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council, when the review took place.

79. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General was requesting the restoration of 98,250 dollars of the 110,250 dollars reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee in the direct costs for the Economic Commission for Europe. On later consideration he had reduced that sum by 12,000 dollars in respect of savings on printing and travel expenses resulting from currency revaluations. He claimed in his report (A/C.5/310) that the Advisory Committee's reduction would be ill-timed as the committees of the Economic Commission for Europe were engaged in reviewing the work of the Commission. The Advisory Committee had not laid great store by the argument since it was rare for a substantive commission to declare its work finished and reduce its estimates accordingly. The Advisory Committee had made its recommendations on organizational and financial grounds; it was possible that further savings could result from the Committee's reviews. The eighteen posts which the Advisory Committee had suggested might be reduced would not, in its opinion, affect the efficiency of the Commission.

80. The Australian representative had suggested that the Advisory Committee's recommendations in paragraph 177 implied criticism of the Commission's efficiency; the Advisory Committee had, however, shared the opinion of the United Kingdom representative that the reorganization of the statistical activities and general organization would not only reduce expenses but make the Economic Commission for Europe a pattern for other regional economic commissions.

81. The representatives of France and Poland had criticized the last eight lines of paragraph 175 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/934). The Advisory Committee had nevertheless considered that there was a tendency to devote time to theoretical problems not directly related to economic reconstruction and rehabilitation. It was doubtful whether the sixty-two members of the Research and Planning Division were all engaged on work closely related to such problems.

82. The tendency for high officials to develop large office staffs had been generally deprecated and the Advisory Committee had considered the staff of sixteen in the central office of the Commis-

sion might justly be censured on those grounds. The special assignments which it handled might, in many cases, be dealt with by the Research and Planning Division. That recommendation was especially valid in view of the structure of the Commission, several of whose divisions had been inherited from the three earlier organizations.

83. The Secretary-General, opposing the Advisory Committee's recommended cut of 5,000 dollars for expert consultants, had pointed out the importance of the services rendered by such experts. The Advisory Committee did not dispute the point but considered an increase of 100 per cent over the 1948 actual expenditure to be excessive.

84. It was natural that, when a commission had done useful work, the Fifth Committee should incline towards generosity on its behalf. While sympathizing with that tendency and in no way criticizing the work of the Economic Commission for Europe, the Advisory Committee had recommended cuts to streamline the organization which, it was convinced, could absorb more work than the Secretary-General's budget allowed.

85. Mr. HALL (United States of America) felt that the USSR representative had moved the elimination of the appropriation for the Frankfurt office mainly on political grounds. He would not discuss the point beyond disagreeing with the USSR representative's view. Nevertheless he would be grateful for details regarding the work of that office.

86. Mr. VANER (Turkey) expressed the opinion that appropriations for the statistical services could be calculated on the basis of the average output per staff member per day in relation to the material to be prepared. He wondered whether savings could not be made by the use of mechanization.

87. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) replying to the United States representative, said that the Frankfurt office was a liaison office for the collection of material on conditions in Germany bearing on the general work of European reconstruction, which could be collected in Frankfurt more easily than from Geneva. The question had been examined with great care and the Executive Secretary had found the existence of that office abundantly justified in dealing with broad questions concerning the economic structure of Europe.

88. In reply to the Turkish representative, he said that mechanization apart from the usual machines used for statistical computation would not be practicable since the Commission did not deal with mass statistics. Recently it had considered an international trade project which would have involved the use of Hollerith machines, but had ultimately abandoned it.

89. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said it was important not to confuse the value and nature of the work produced by the Commission with the question of whether the work could be done with less expenditure. Regarding the latter he entirely endorsed the favourable comments of other representatives. He had, however, noted a tendency to perpetuate sections the work of which had been largely completed. It should be noticed that the heads of the Coal, Steel and Electric Power Divisions would be leaving the Economic Commission

for Europe in the near future. The presumption was that their work had been finished, but the Commission appeared to be embarking on new work, such as the joint ECE and FAO timber project. It appeared to be growing into a kind of regional specialized agency and to be trespassing on the provinces of the specialized agencies. In his view, therefore, its activities should be limited and he formally proposed that the Committee should restore only half the sum requested by the Secretary-General, namely 43,125 dollars.

90. Mr. VANER (Turkey) was satisfied with the explanation given by the Assistant Secretary-General and favoured restoring the entire sum requested by the Secretary-General.

91. Mr. TARN (Poland) asked why it was necessary to have the office in Frankfurt and whether it was not possible to obtain the information regarding the situation in Germany in the same way as it was obtained in other countries. He asked whether the information obtained related to the whole of Germany or only to part.

92. Mr. LEVONTIN (Israel) asked whether the Frankfurt office rendered any services to Germany.

93. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that the Frankfurt liaison office was the only one of its kind, as Germany was not represented on the ECE in the same way as other countries, but economic activity in that country was nevertheless a considerable factor in the European picture. The Executive Secretary had tried to reach agreement with the Control Authorities in Berlin for the establishment of an office there for the collection of information relating to the whole of Germany but, as his efforts had been unsuccessful, the Frankfurt office was the best arrangement possible.

94. In reply to the representative of Israel, he said that any service rendered to Germany by the office was incidental to its main duties relating to the collection of material.

95. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said that his instructions had been to support the Advisory Committee's recommendation, but the arguments of the Brazilian representative had convinced him to use the latitude allowed him and to support the Brazilian proposal.

96. Mr. MONTEL (France) suggested that the Committee should vote first on the proposal of the USSR representative for the elimination of the appropriation for the Frankfurt office.

97. The CHAIRMAN agreed to that procedure, which had been followed in the case of the Opinion Survey Section in the discussion of the estimates for the Department of Public Information. He therefore put to the vote the proposal that the sum of 12,640 dollars appropriated for the Frankfurt office of the ECE should be cut from the total appropriation for section 20, chapter IV.

*The proposal was rejected by 27 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.*

98. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) requested a separate vote on the Advisory Committee's recommendation for a reduction of 5,000 dollars in the estimates for consultants.

*The recommendation was rejected by 17 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.*



99. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Secretary-General's proposal that the Advisory Committee's estimate for section 20, chapter IV of the budget estimate should be increased by 98,250 dollars, making a total of 1,097,200 dollars.

*The proposal was approved by 23 votes to 16, with 2 abstentions.*

#### Chapter V

100. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the decision of the previous day to reduce the appropriation for the information services at Geneva had entailed a consequential reduction in the Secretary-General's estimate for common staff costs. He was therefore requesting a restoration of 12,600 dollars instead of 17,800 previously proposed, making a new total of 612,600 dollars.

101. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that the estimate for common staff costs was reached by an automatic calculation; he would not therefore oppose the Secretary-General's estimate.

*The Secretary-General's requested restoration of 12,600 dollars was approved by 30 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.*

#### Chapter VI

102. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General had also revised his estimates for common services in Geneva as a result of the reduction in the appropriation for the information services; instead of requesting the restoration of 29,300 dollars, he was asking for only 25,000 dollars to be added to the Advisory Committee's estimate, making a total of 345,000 dollars.

103. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that the estimates for common services were not affected by the reduction in the same way as the common staff costs, and that he would vote for the Advisory Committee's figure of 320,000 dollars.

104. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Brazilian representative. Whereas the common staff costs resulted from contractual obligations, common services included such items as the rental and maintenance of premises, and would not be perceptibly affected by a change in the staff employed in the information services. He would therefore support the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

105. Mr. HALL (United States of America) thought that such items as stationery supplies and telephones, which were also included under common services, would be radically affected by the change in staff numbers.

106. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that the Advisory Committee had made its recommendation before the reduction in the budget of the information services; the sum should therefore be more than sufficient after the reduction had been made.

107. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the expenditure on common services in 1948 had been higher than the 1950 estimate (A/903, page 199), though the number of staff had been lower than was proposed for 1950. It seemed, therefore, that there was no relation between staff numbers and expenditure on common services.

108. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and

Financial Services) agreed that the connexion between staff and expenditure was not so close in chapter VI relating to common services as in chapter V, yet such items as stationery supplies, maintenance of equipment and office equipment could be reduced as a result of the reduction in the information services.

109. He referred to the paragraph in document A/C.5/310 in which it was stated that the actual cost of these services in 1949 would exceed the original estimates and there was little possibility of saving on the original estimate.

110. With regard to the point made by the Brazilian representative, it should be remembered that the Advisory Committee had recommended a total appropriation of 320,000 dollars on the assumption that the reductions in staff which it had recommended would be implemented. However, the Fifth Committee had restored part of the reduction in established posts, so that a corresponding restoration was required to supplement the 320,000 dollars recommended by the Advisory Committee.

111. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) asked whether the Advisory Committee, in recommending that the Secretary-General's estimate for common services should be reduced by 29,000 dollars, had considered only the relevant recommendations for reductions in established posts, or had also believed the total cost to have been over-estimated.

112. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that his Committee's recommendation had been made on both grounds.

113. Mr. TARN (Poland) felt unable to vote on the estimate for chapter VI, since the Advisory Committee had not been able to revise its estimate as a result of the decision on the information services.

114. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the new item of 5,000 dollars for the cafeteria (article (xv)) which had not been included in the 1949 estimates and which would hardly be affected by a reduction of some fifteen posts. The supplies for internal reproduction (article (vii)), which were estimated at 18,000 dollars above the 1949 estimate, would likewise hardly be affected by slight changes in the staff. The same applied to article (iv) for rental and maintenance of premises. There was, therefore, no need to assume that the expenses of the Economic Commission for Europe under chapter VI would be higher as a result of a few posts in addition to those allowed for when the Advisory Committee had made its recommendation.

115. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) repeated that the Advisory Committee's recommended reduction in expenditure was far greater than would be justified by the elimination of the eighteen posts which it had proposed. Those posts might account for only about 9,000 dollars of the total recommended out of 29,000, so that the restoration of some of the established posts need not be assumed to affect the remaining 20,000 dollars, which the Advisory Committee had considered could be saved, presumably on grounds of over-estimation.

116. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Secretary-General's adjusted estimate, namely, that 25,000 dollars should be added to the Advisory Committee's recommendation of 320,000 dollars for chapter VI.

*The proposal was rejected by 16 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.*

117. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appro-

priation of 320,000 dollars for chapter VI.

*The proposal was approved by 33 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

118. The CHAIRMAN announced that the total for section 20 of the budget estimates, relating to the United Nations office at Geneva, amounted to 4,216,900 dollars.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

## TWO HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 27 October 1949, at 3 p.m.*

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

### **Budget estimates for the financial year 1950: (a) budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/903); (b) reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/934) (first reading continued)**

#### PART I

#### SECTION 4

1. At the invitation of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. GARREAU (President of the Trusteeship Council) explained the general reasons for which the Trusteeship Council had decided, subject to the approval of the General Assembly, to hold its next session in Geneva. He believed the Committee would find many advantages to justify the additional expense entailed. The principle that meetings of the United Nations organs should be held outside the headquarters had been approved by many delegations, and also by the President of the United States in the speech he had made, a few days before, on 24 October. Such a practice enabled public opinion in the areas in question to become more fully acquainted with the work of the United Nations. So far, of all the principal organs of the United Nations, only the Trusteeship Council had not received the valuable publicity which resulted from a meeting held outside headquarters. Not only would that publicity be ensured by a Geneva session, but some three hundred students from Trust Territories administered by France, and attending French universities, would be able to listen to the discussions affecting their own countries.

2. A further advantage would be ensured for the Administering Powers, whose annual reports on seven Trust Territories were to be discussed, as Geneva was sufficiently close to their capitals to allow easy and frequent reference to the Ministries concerned, and rapid travel when personal attendance was necessary.

3. The Council had considered holding a session in Paris or Geneva immediately after the first part of the General Assembly's third regular session, but the proposal had eventually been abandoned for technical reasons. The Council believed now that it was of the highest importance to the good functioning of the International Trusteeship System for the next session to be held in Geneva, and that the advantages amply justified the extra expenditure involved.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had heard the reasons which had led the Trusteeship

Council to propose that its next session should be held in Geneva, and was provided with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1040). In order to save time which might be wasted on unprofitable discussion, he hoped there would be no debate on the competence of the Fifth Committee to reverse a decision taken by another organ. The Fifth Committee was unquestionably competent to recommend that the General Assembly either grant or not grant the extra funds which would enable the Trusteeship Council to meet in Geneva. He proposed, therefore, that a vote should be taken, preferably without prior discussion, on the question of principle, namely, whether or not such funds were to be granted, and that the precise sum to be appropriated should be discussed only after that decision had been taken.

5. Mr. TARN (Poland) agreed that a vote should be taken without prior discussion. He deplored, however, that the Fifth Committee had been discussing the general policy relating to the meeting places of the two Councils and the various commissions concerned. Representatives of delegations who had not supported the establishment of such bodies as the United Nations Commission on Korea had refrained in the past from raising substantive issues when the relevant financial implications had been considered by the Fifth Committee, but if matters going beyond the question whether or not the appropriate funds should be granted to the two Councils were to be discussed, he would propose that all decisions taken by other bodies should be reviewed on substantive grounds by the Fifth Committee.

6. He pointed out, incidentally, the want of validity in the argument advanced by the representative of Venezuela at the 207th meeting, that there could be no comparison between the advisability of holding the session of the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information and of the Press in Uruguay and the advisability of holding the sessions of the two Councils in Geneva, because the former involved a negligible expenditure by the United Nations. Such decisions were made on broad social and political grounds, and not on a comparison of costs.

7. Having obtained the CHAIRMAN'S permission to speak on the budgetary matters involved, Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said it was clear from document A/C.5/322 that of the 112,000 dollars already appropriated for temporary assistance in the General Services of the Geneva office, 10,000 dollars were allocated for the Trusteeship Council.