

tary-General more money, when he had already signified his willingness to accept less.

81. As regards the twenty-four trade experts, he drew attention to paragraph 9 of the Advisory Committee's thirteenth report of 1949 (A/1056) where the Advisory Committee called attention to General Assembly resolution 231 (III) concerning the payment of travelling and subsistence expenses, and in particular to paragraph 5 (b) of that resolution, which said that neither travelling nor subsistence expenses should be paid in respect of representatives to organs or subsidiary organs, the members of which had a particular local interest in the region served.

82. The Advisory Committee had felt, moreover, that a body of twenty-four representatives would bear more resemblance to a diplomatic conference than to a group of experts. The question was whether a group of experts was required (in which case twenty-four was too many), or whether there should be no appropriations for the purpose, as the Advisory Committee recommended. If the Fifth Committee decided to pay costs that should be borne by the Governments concerned, all similar committees would be justified in asking to be paid.

83. He assured the representative of Chile that the Advisory Committee was not unsympathetic towards the Latin-American countries and he hoped that the Committee would subscribe to the United Kingdom proposal.

84. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) felt that the arguments advanced by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the Secretariat were not applicable, since the group in question was actually a group of experts, selected by the Executive Secretary and not delegated by the various Governments. He sensed, moreover, a discrepancy between the explanations given by the Department of Eco-

nomics and those contained in the Advisory Committee's report, and would therefore support the Secretary-General's original estimates.

85. Mr. LARRAÍN (Chile) signified his willingness to accept the South African proposal that the Secretary-General's original estimates should be reduced by 15,000 dollars; but he was unable to agree to the United Kingdom suggestion.

*The Secretary-General's revised estimates (686,850 dollars), involving an increase of 40,000 dollars over the Advisory Committee's recommendations for section 22 of the 1950 budget estimates, were approved by 34 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.*

*The Secretary-General's revised estimates (525,500 dollars), involving an increase of 42,000 dollars over the Advisory Committee's recommendations for section 23 of the 1950 budget estimates were approved by 41 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.*

86. Mr. ASHA (Syria) asked that the statement of the representative of Brazil be incorporated in the Committee's report.

### **Expenses of the Permanent Central Opium Board. Assessment of non-members of the United Nations, signatories of the Convention of 19 February 1925, relating to narcotic drugs (A/976)**

87. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to documents A/976, A/C.5/334, A/C.5/340, and the Secretary-General's proposed draft resolution given at the end of the latter document.

*The Committee unanimously approved the Secretary-General's draft resolution on that item.*

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

## **TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND MEETING**

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 11 November 1949, at 10.45 a.m.*

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

### **Commemoration of the Armistice of 11 November 1918**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that it was by continuing its work that the Committee could best pay homage to the heroes who had given their lives for liberty in the two world wars. By its labour the Committee was endeavouring to contribute towards the attainment of the goal for which so many had died.

#### **Draft reports of the Rapporteur**

2. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Rapporteur for the work she had accomplished and suggested to the Committee that draft reports A/C.5/L.30 to 36 inclusive should be submitted to the General Assembly in the course of the forthcoming plenary sessions.

*It was so decided.*

3. Mr. TARN (Poland) recalled that, following the election of various subsidiary organs, a discussion had taken place on whether a two-thirds majority was necessary in such a case. That discussion had occurred in connexion with elections to the Committee on Contributions. The Polish representative asked that the Rapporteur should mention that discussion in one of the reports as it involved a highly important question of principle in which many delegations were interested.

4. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur, stated that the Polish representative had put the question in a very general way during that discussion and that it would be difficult to include a reference to it in one or other of the reports. She therefore proposed that the Rapporteur should, in submitting the various reports to the General Assembly, make a statement on the problem raised by the Polish representative.

*It was so decided.*

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

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE

5. Mr. TARN (Poland) stated that, for the reasons he had frequently voiced in previous meetings, he would vote against the sum recommended for the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its seventeenth report of 1949 (A/1067).

6. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would not take part in the discussion on the proposed appropriations for the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans and that he would vote against any such appropriations. The USSR delegation had in fact always maintained that the very existence of that Committee was contrary to the provisions of the Charter. By its activities, the Committee was interfering in the internal affairs of the Balkan countries. For those reasons as well as for the reasons stated by the USSR representative in the First Committee, Mr. Roschin could not approve the continuation of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans.

7. Mr. SMOLYAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. UDOVICHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. STARY (Czechoslovakia) said that for the reasons stated by their respective representatives on the First Committee, they would vote against the appropriations for the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans.

8. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) stated that he would vote in favour of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He wished, however, to make one reservation: quoting the final paragraph of document A/C.5/343, he pointed out that the decision taken by the First Committee was based on purely political considerations and that in no case could it be considered as a precedent in connexion with social questions.

9. Mr. KACJAN (Yugoslavia) asked that the appropriations for the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans (A/C.5/343) and for the repatriation of Greek children should be voted upon separately (A/C.5/342).

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/1067) calling for an appropriation of 850,000 dollars for the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans was adopted by 35 votes to 6.*

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/1067) calling for an appropriation of 50,000 dollars for the repatriation of Greek children was adopted unanimously.*

### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF A DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE SIXTH COMMITTEE

*The procedure for the registration and publication of treaties and international agreements proposed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its sixteenth report of 1949 (A/1061) was approved.*

#### PART I, SECTION 1 CHAPTER IV (*concluded*)

10. Mr. TURNER (Committee Secretary) called attention to the fact that in the Secretary-General's report on the emoluments of members of the In-

ternational Law Commission, the paragraphs following paragraph 13 in the English text of document A/C.5/347, had been wrongly numbered and that paragraph 15 was in fact paragraph 14.

11. Mr. JUTRAS (Canada) recalled that he had asked for further information from the Secretary-General on the activities of the International Law Commission.<sup>1</sup> The Secretary-General had in reply submitted document A/C.5/347. The Canadian representative approved the Secretary-General's conclusions as set forth in paragraphs 18, 19 and 20 of that document.

12. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) and Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to have the Advisory Committee's opinion on the Secretary-General's conclusions.

13. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) stated that the Advisory Committee approved the Secretary-General's conclusions. At the time document A/C.5/347 had been prepared, the Advisory Committee had asked the Secretary-General to modify certain provisions embodied in that document. As the Secretary-General had agreed to do so, the Advisory Committee had deemed it superfluous to submit a report in addition to its eleventh report of 1949 (A/1051) on the same question.

14. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) approved the conclusions of document A/C.5/347. He considered that the emoluments payable to each rapporteur of the International Law Commission should be 2,000 dollars.

15. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said that, in paragraph 18 of document A/C.5/347, the Secretary-General had aptly summed up the three questions raised in connexion with allowances for the members of the International Law Commission. The Secretary-General had replied in the negative to question (b). That had no doubt been the opinion of the Advisory Committee. The Belgian representative wished to know whether, in adopting that point of view, the Advisory Committee had considered the particular case of the International Law Commission or the various commissions as a whole. The Belgian delegation had made it clear that it considered it desirable that the question should be dealt with as a whole.

16. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) stated that, in the case in point, the Advisory Committee had taken a decision on a particular case and had not wished to prejudice any solutions which might be adopted in the future. The International Law Commission enjoyed special status. When the problem arose in connexion with other commissions, the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee would then have the opportunity of taking a fresh decision.

17. In reply to a question by Mr. JUTRAS (Canada), Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the additional 5,000 dollars requested for the emoluments of the Commission's rapporteurs had been based on the figure of 2,000 dollars for each rapporteur (A/C.5/325).

<sup>1</sup> See the summary record of the 208th meeting.

18. Mr. TARN (Poland) said that it was impossible to find valid elements for comparison in document A/C.5/347. Annex A of that document did not in fact contain any information on the emoluments of the members of the various commissions; it had, moreover, never been decided that the members of the various commissions appointed by the General Assembly would receive the same salary.

19. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Secretary-General had proposed that each rapporteur should receive a salary amounting to 2,000 dollars (A/C.5/325). The Advisory Committee recommended that such salaries should be limited to a maximum of 1,500 dollars, thus making a total of 7,500 dollars for five rapporteurs (A/1051, paragraph 5). The total amount of the appropriations recommended had, however, not been reduced but had, on the contrary, been increased.

20. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) stated that the difference between the amounts was due to the fact that 5,000 dollars had already been included in the budget estimates for 1950 (A/903, page 31).

21. In answer to a question raised by the representative of Poland, he stated that the members of the various commissions all received a daily allowance of 20 dollars, with the exception of the members of the Advisory Committee whose allowance amounted to 25 dollars a day.

*The Secretary-General's conclusions contained in paragraphs 18, 19 and 20 of document A/C.5/347 were unanimously approved.*

22. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) pointed out that in section 1, chapter IV of the budget estimates (A/903) a sum of 6,000 dollars was earmarked for the salaries and travel of consultants. He recalled that he had made certain reservations with regard to the amounts earmarked for consultants in the budget for the Office of the Secretary-General.<sup>1</sup> The representative of the Secretary-General had stated that it was sometimes necessary to have the opinion of authorized persons on certain political questions. That reply had not entirely convinced the Belgian delegation, which was of the opinion that the Secretary-General could very well ask the advice of the appropriate officials of the Department of Security Council Affairs.

23. In the case of the International Law Commission, he was still less able to understand why it should be necessary to appeal to consultants. The Commission was composed of eminent jurists. Some of them drew up reports which served as the basis for the Commission's work. If the members of the Commission could not do all the necessary work, the best procedure would be to have recourse to the services of the Legal Department of the United Nations Secretariat.

24. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) recalled that when the International Law Commission was established some representatives had wondered whether it would not be advisable to establish not one but three commissions to deal with questions of public, private and penal international law. Eminent though the members of the International

Law Commission were, they were not specialists in all aspects of international law. It was, therefore, sometimes necessary to refer to specialists. The Commission's Statute moreover, provided for recourse to consultants. He was sure that the Commission would use the appropriations granted to it only to the best effect and only after asking the Secretary-General whether certain officials of the Legal Department were competent in the field concerned.

25. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) said that in the light of the explanations given by the Assistant Secretary-General, he understood that the consultants would not work on problems with which the members of the Commission could deal themselves.

26. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) stated that he was not, of course, authorized to speak on behalf of the Commission, but it was certain that the members of the Commission would have recourse to consultants only if they thought they could not complete a given piece of work themselves.

27. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that the International Law Commission was to hold a session at Geneva in 1950. He wondered whether, in voting the appropriations for that Commission, account was being taken also of the requirements of the Geneva Office.

28. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) stated that from the Secretary-General's report and the report of the Advisory Committee he had understood that the International Law Commission's budget would contain an additional appropriation of 9,000 dollars, including a sum of 1,500 dollars for each rapporteur and the Commission's Chairman. He wondered in that case under which section of the budget that appropriation should be placed. He also wondered whether that appropriation would cover the emoluments of rapporteurs who did work outside the Commission.

29. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) stated that the sum concerned was mentioned under article (ii) of the budget estimates (A/903, page 31, column 2). An amount of 5,000 dollars was earmarked for persons doing work for the Commission. An additional appropriation of 4,000 dollars was now being requested under the same section. The Advisory Committee had recommended an appropriation of 75,000 dollars, which, with the additional 4,000 dollars, would make a total of 79,000 dollars.

30. The CHAIRMAN, in reply to the question raised by the representative of Brazil, pointed out that on page 31 of the budget estimates, chapter IV, an appropriation of 9,750 dollars was included for travel of members of the Commission. That amount had been approved by the Advisory Committee. A sum of 13,000 dollars was also earmarked for travel and subsistence of staff. The Advisory Committee had fixed the amount of that appropriation at 10,000 dollars. Those two appropriations would cover the travelling expenses and subsistence of members and staff if the session was held at Geneva.

31. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that it was not merely a question of budget estimates, for the holding of the session at Geneva would have

<sup>1</sup> See the summary record of the 197th meeting.

important effects on the work programme of the Geneva office.

32. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shared the point of view of the Advisory Committee and of the Belgian representative on the question of consultants. Consultants were provided for almost every Department, and it seemed that those whom it was contemplated to engage for the exclusive use of the International Law Commission would be duplicating the work of those whom the Legal Department had been authorized to engage for its own use. He considered that it was excessive to engage consultants for the Legal Department, to engage others for the International Law Commission and at the same time to provide emoluments for that Commission's rapporteurs. In the circumstances, therefore, he proposed the removal of the 4,000 dollars for salaries and travel of the International Law Commission's consultants, as approved by the Advisory Committee (A/934, paragraph 40).

33. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) said he had already explained why provision was made in the Commission's Statute for recourse to consultants where necessary, and remarked that the sum involved was comparatively small.

34. With regard to the session of the Commission at Geneva, he remarked that the present circumstances of residence of the members of the Commission would make their travelling expenses less if they had to go to Geneva than if they came to New York, and thus the difference in cost of a session at Geneva and a session in New York was insignificant. Moreover, under its Statute the Commission was itself authorized to decide where it was to hold its session. The Assistant Secretary-General recalled that international law was essentially of European origin, and that was one of the reasons which had induced the Commission to decide on holding its next session in Geneva. Lastly, that decision would not have any repercussions on the budget of the Geneva Office since account had already been taken of that factor in drawing up the budget estimates.

35. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that the budget estimates for the Geneva office had been based on certain assumptions as to the number of meetings. It appeared that the number of meetings to be held in Geneva in the summer of 1950 was increasing in a disturbing way. Since the Committee had refused the Economic and Social Council the appropriations necessary to hold its summer session at Geneva, there were rumors to the effect that the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) was considering going there also. Could the ICAO hold a session at Geneva if the International Law Commission was to meet there also?

36. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) stated that it was very improbable that the ICAO would meet at Geneva. That was the reply which the Secretariat had received from the secretariat of that organization in answer to its question on the subject.

37. Mr. HSIA (China) was of the opinion that the Committee should approve the total appropriation of 79,000 dollars, which represented a considerable reduction on the initial estimates of

129,230 dollars (A/903, page 31). He considered that the allowance of 4,000 dollars for consultants was a reserve, upon which the International Law Commission would not necessarily draw.

38. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) read the provisions of the Statute of the International Law Commission relating to the engagement of consultants, and pointed out that under the actual terms of those provisions the Commission could engage consultants only within the limits of its budget. In view of the explanations provided to the Fifth Committee, he was of the opinion that that budgetary limit on the engagement of consultants might very well be reduced to zero. He would consequently support the USSR amendment.

39. Mr. GRAZIADIO (Argentina) also supported the USSR amendment, for he considered that the Secretariat should be in a position to satisfy all the needs of the International Law Commission.

40. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) asked whether there was not a danger that the removal of the 4,000 dollars for consultants would be detrimental to the work of the International Law Commission.

41. Mr. KERNO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department) said that the reply to the United States representative's question depended on the nature and the progress of the Commission's work. The International Law Commission itself had made it known that it would perhaps be obliged to have recourse to consultants. Mr. Kerno thought that the Commission might be trusted not to use the credits placed at its disposal except in cases of absolute necessity.

*The USSR amendment was adopted by 23 votes to 17, with 4 abstentions.*

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Secretary-General's revised estimates, thus amended, for section 1, chapter IV, amounting to 75,000 dollars.

*Section 1, chapter IV, was approved in the amount of 75,000 dollars, by 43 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

43. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that, throughout the budget, appropriations had been provided for temporary staff and for consultants, who were after all only temporary staff of a higher grade. He hoped the Secretary-General would exercise very strict control over the use of those appropriations. He himself did not think that the nature of the services rendered by such temporary staff and consultants justified such large credits. A permanent Secretariat comprising some 4,000 persons should be able to carry out all the duties entrusted to it.

## PART II

### SECTION 6

44. Mr. TARN (Poland) expressed his surprise that in its eighteenth report of 1949 (A/1070) the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had accepted such high budget estimates for the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.

45. He questioned the necessity to have "internationally recruited" staff as mentioned in document A/C.5/338. Why could not more staff be detailed from headquarters? And why was that internationally recruited staff granted a subsist-

ence allowance when it was recruited for a definite purpose at exceptionally high salaries?

46. Mr. Tarn did not see what savings could result for the Commission from the establishment of a United Nations field service, were it to be set up. Estimates of 4,800 dollars had been made for locally recruited staff, whereas the travelling expenses alone for members of the field service would be much higher.

47. Finally, Mr. Tarn did not see why the Principal Secretary of the Commission should have a Deputy Principal Secretary, whose grade was, moreover, not stated in the Secretary-General's report, in addition to the professional officers, one of whom would be detailed from headquarters (A/C.5/338, annex).

48. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the Security Council had considered the Secretary-General's budget estimates. The Commission's programme of work, mentioned in the Secretary-General's report, was the result of decisions taken by the Security Council. The latter might therefore express an opinion on the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/338).

49. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the procedure adopted in staffing the various missions was that headquarters staff members were always appointed if their services were not indispensable at Lake Success. It was not always possible to detail headquarters staff and that was why it was necessary to resort to special staff internationally recruited. Such staff came from various countries, and the members had obligations in their countries of residence. Moreover, they would have to travel continually in the course of their duties. That was why they had been granted a subsistence allowance.

50. The establishment of a United Nations Field Service would involve savings for the United Nations, for auxiliary staff now recruited for each mission received the same per diem allowance as the other staff members. Such would not be the case for the Field Service staff.

51. The post of Deputy Principal Secretary was normal, and was justified by the frequent absence of the Principal Secretary, who should be replaceable at the mission headquarters.

52. In reply to the USSR representative, Mr. Andersen said that the Secretary-General's report had not been submitted to the Security Council but that the latter would shortly receive a report by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan on its expenses.

53. The Secretary-General had also noted the considerable increase in the Commission's expenses from 1949 to 1950. Such an increase was mainly attributable to the establishment of observation groups and the appointment of alternate members; the expenses in 1949 had been covered by the Working Capital Fund.

54. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) approved the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee. He noted the fact that the Security Council would receive a report from the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, and that it would take a decision. In fact, the Secretary-General's budget estimates were based on the assumption that the Commission would carry out

the same activities in 1950 as in 1949. Mr. Machado took particular note of the observations contained in paragraph 2 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1070).

55. He thought there was a contradiction in the assumption that the Commission would function for twelve months and the assumption that a plebiscite would be held in 1950.

56. Finally, he thought that the observations in paragraph 5 of the Advisory Committee's report were particularly important, and he urged the members of the Fifth Committee to ponder the consequences of their decision.

57. Mr. TARN (Poland) was not entirely satisfied by the replies he had received. All the Secretary-General's reports on additional expenditure revealed a lack of flexibility in the staff, as the Secretary-General proposed to recruit additional staff for all new missions entrusted to the Secretariat. Mr. Tarn did not see why the Principal Secretary of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan should not be a high Secretariat official, nor why staff could not be detached from headquarters instead of new staff being recruited.

58. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) thought there was a contradiction in the following texts: the sixth paragraph of document A/C.5/338 ("... 4 persons to be temporarily employed at headquarters as replacement of staff assigned to the Mission..."), page 57 of the budget estimates (A/903), referring to the servicing of commissions of investigation and conciliation, and paragraph 77 of the second report of the Advisory Committee (A/934) ("the Department finds it necessary to maintain a panel of officials for service with commissions in the field"). It appeared, therefore, that although the Department of Security Council Affairs maintained officials for service with commissions in the field, it was obliged to replace them when they went on mission.

59. Mr. SMOLYAR (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) wished to know on what basis the Secretary-General had established his budget estimates, since there had been no consultation with the Security Council. He also wondered why provision had been made for fifty observers when it was possible that relations between India and Pakistan might improve.

60. The Jam Saheb of NAWANAGAR (India) said that, for his delegation, the question before the Fifth Committee was not only a budgetary question but also, and above all, a political matter. He had not had time to consult his Government on the subject of the Secretary-General's report, and he therefore reserved his right to speak again on the matter.

61. He pointed out, however, that the plebiscite would be held in Kashmir and not in India or Pakistan. The Advisory Committee, in paragraph 5 of its report (A/1070), left it to the General Assembly to settle the question of principle as to whether the United Nations should assume all or part of the costs of the plebiscite. The Indian delegation reserved the right to make a statement on the subject when the matter came before the General Assembly.

62. The Indian delegation had had no say in the matter when the number of observers and the

amount of the allowances had been decided. Those responsible for that decision, namely, the United Nations as a whole, should bear the financial consequences of their decision. In conclusion, the Indian representative pointed out that the area of Kashmir was equal to that of France. It was, moreover, a very mountainous country with few

roads, and the observers there would have a difficult mission. Those were facts which should be borne in mind when considering whether or not the number of observers provided for in the budget estimates was reasonable.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

## TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD MEETING

*Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 11 November 1949, at 3 p.m.*

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

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

#### PART II, SECTION 6 (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee was called upon to consider the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1070), and the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/338), both of which dealt with the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan.
2. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that, in considering appropriations for the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, the Fifth Committee was not following the correct procedure. The Fifth Committee was an administrative and budgetary Committee, whose task it was to consider the financial implications of decisions taken by other organs; it did not itself take substantive decisions on political questions. In the case of the Commission for India and Pakistan, there were many factors with which the Fifth Committee was unacquainted, such as the political and military situation and the possibility of a plebiscite in 1950. The Committee was, moreover, unaware as yet of the decisions taken by the Commission on India and Pakistan, then preparing its report in Geneva, or of what conclusions that Commission would submit to the Security Council. It did not know, in short, whether the appropriations proposed could justifiably be granted. The question was one which should be considered in the first place by the Security Council, which body, after analysing the political and military situations and possible measures to meet them, would take decisions which would then be referred to the Fifth Committee.
3. The USSR representative failed to see on what data the Secretary-General had based his figures. As it was impossible to estimate the required amount with any degree of accuracy, the Soviet proposal was that the Committee should grant the same appropriation as in 1949, namely 325,000 dollars, and should authorize the Secretary-General to draw any further money required from the Working Capital Fund, under the total set aside for expenditure in the cause of peace and security.
4. It might be thought that in submitting estimates without an adequate basis, the Secretariat was submitting to pressure from States interested in strengthening their position in certain parts of the world.
5. Moreover, the Advisory Committee had not considered the matter thoroughly nor given its conclusions; the opinion of the USSR representative on that Committee had not even been asked. The Advisory Committee had met and agreed to recommend an appropriation of 666,000 dollars, a figure different from the amount of 715,200 dollars which the Committee was now asked to discuss and which appeared to diverge arbitrarily from the Advisory Committee's recommendations.
6. The USSR delegation had always recognized the necessity for granting appropriations for activities designed to further the cause of peace and security; it had, at former sessions of the General Assembly, voted for such appropriations, but only when, in accordance with normal procedure, the responsible United Nations organ had taken the substantive decision and had transmitted to the Fifth Committee all the data which that Committee required to enable it to vote in full knowledge of the facts.
7. The USSR delegation was, therefore, unable to support the Secretary-General's proposals, in view of what it considered incorrect procedure, particularly undesirable when such a large sum was involved. It proposed that the same appropriations should be made as in 1949, with the understanding that the Secretary-General was authorized, in an emergency, to draw on the Working Capital Fund; a paragraph to that effect might be inserted in the Committee's report.
8. Mr. AGHINIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) thought that the USSR representative's statement regarding the discussion of the item in question in the Advisory Committee was based on a misunderstanding. The matter had, in fact, been fully discussed by that Committee, all members of which had taken part in the discussion, a fact that would be corroborated by those members of the Advisory Committee present at the meeting. He felt compelled to defend the Advisory Committee against the indirect accusations brought against it. The view put forward by that Committee was reached by a majority vote. A more justified accusation against the Advisory Committee, and against its Chairman, would be that of allowing discussion to be too long, and attaching too much importance to achieving unanimity, in an attempt to give all its members — including the USSR representative — the opportunity to state their case. He hoped that the other eight members of the Advisory Committee would confirm his statement.