

HUNDRED AND NINETY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 13 October 1949, at 10.45 a.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

Chapters I, II and III

1. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should begin with the consideration of section 4 of the budget, in order to take advantage of the presence of the President of the Trusteeship Council, who was prepared, if members of the Committee so desired, to give information on the visiting mission which the Trusteeship Council had decided to send to the Trust Territories in 1950.

2. He pointed out that the relevant paragraphs of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions were paragraphs 51 to 53. In addition, he drew the attention of representatives to document A/C.5/317, which contained supplementary information.

3. Moreover, in view of the fact that the Trusteeship Council had decided to hold its first 1950 session in Geneva, he proposed that the Committee should adopt the same procedure as for the Economic and Social Council and should postpone the discussion of chapter I of section 4 until a later date.

4. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was prepared to accept the Chairman's proposal. He pointed out that judicious use should be made of the services of the Geneva office of the United Nations, and suggested that the Committee should request the Department of Conference and General Services to supply the necessary information on the sessions which were to be held in Geneva in 1950. The Committee would then be in a position to take the necessary decisions to prevent the staff of the Geneva office from being left idle for certain periods.

5. The CHAIRMAN stated that he would request the Department of Conference and General Services to supply all the necessary information. He then called on the President of the Trusteeship Council to speak.

6. Mr. GARREAU (President of the Trusteeship Council) said that he was glad to be present at the consideration of the budget estimates for the visiting mission of the Trusteeship Council, which would take place in 1950.

7. He reminded the members of the Committee that the sending of visiting missions to the Trust Territories was a function which was expressly provided for in Article 87 of the Charter of the United Nations. The General Assembly, at its second session, had approved the request of the Trusteeship Council that budget estimates for one visiting mission each year should constitute a permanent item of the annual budgets of the United Nations.

8. In 1948, a mission had visited the Trust Territories of East Africa. A second mission would leave during the current year for the Trust Territories of West Africa.

9. On 19 July 1949 the Trusteeship Council had decided to send a visiting mission in 1950 to the four Trust Territories of the Pacific: the Pacific Islands under the trusteeship of the United States, New Guinea, Western Samoa and the island of Nauru. The Council had decided that the mission would spend 110 days in those Territories and would be composed of representatives of China, France, the Philippines and the United Kingdom; it had also decided that only six members of the Secretariat would accompany the mission.

10. In its second report of 1949 to the General Assembly, the Advisory Committee recommended that the original estimate of 75,000 dollars for the 1950 mission should be reduced to 50,000 dollars. That recommendation had been made before the decision taken by the Trusteeship Council on 19 July 1949. Taking into consideration the various factors of that decision and the itinerary adopted, the Secretary-General had prepared supplementary budget estimates which amounted to 78,880 dollars. Mr. Garreau pointed out that in making its recommendation the Advisory Committee had based its decision solely on the total expenses of the 1948 mission. That mission, however, had had to visit only two countries, one close to the other, while the four Territories in the Pacific which were to be visited in 1950 were separated from each other by considerable distances. Moreover, the duration of the 1948 mission had been only 75 days, while 110 days would be necessary for the 1950 mission. The increase in expense was therefore due, not only to the fact that four Territories would be visited instead of two and that the distances to be covered would be much greater, but also to the fact that the Council had thought that a longer period should be devoted to the Territories of the Pacific. He pointed out, for the information of the Committee, that the 1948 mission had covered a total distance of 18,000 miles, whereas the 1950 mission would have to cover a distance of at least 30,000 miles.

11. He felt it his duty to stress the importance of the role which visiting missions had to play in the work of the Trusteeship Council, and he asked the Committee to recommend that sufficient appropriations should be made to enable the Trusteeship Council to carry on, in a satisfactory manner, one of its activities which was expressly provided for in the Charter.

12. Mr. SHANN (Australia) admitted that the situation had changed since the time when the Advisory Committee had made its recommendations. It was obvious that the visiting mission which was to be sent to the four Trust Territories in the Pacific could not be compared to the preceding mission and that it must have the necessary time at its disposal. He himself was in favour of the new proposal of the Secretary-General. He asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee if he had any other proposals to make in view of the new factors which had just been explained by the President of the Trusteeship Council.

13. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that he agreed with the representative of Australia. In order, however, to facilitate the work of the Fifth Committee and to save time, he proposed that in future all supplementary budget estimates should automatically be submitted to the Advisory Committee before they were sent to the Committee. In the case under consideration, however, he did not think that it was necessary to postpone the discussion.

14. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying first to the representative of Canada, admitted that it would be preferable if the Advisory Committee could have before it, in good time, all the data necessary for the preparation of its report. The report under consideration had already been completed when the Trusteeship Council had taken its decision on 19 July 1949. The Advisory Committee had therefore been able to indicate, in its report, only a token figure fixed on the basis of the preceding mission. In view of the fact that, as the President of the Trusteeship Council had just said, the 1950 mission would entail greater expenditure than the 1948 mission, it would be advisable to examine the budget estimates again. He left it to the Chairman of the Committee to decide what would be the best procedure.

15. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) stated that, in principle, he shared the opinion of the representative of Canada: all budget estimates should be examined by the Advisory Committee before they were sent to the Committee, so that the latter could take its decisions in full knowledge of the facts. He proposed that the discussion should be adjourned until the Advisory Committee had been able to give its opinion.

16. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that he approved in principle of the general procedure proposed by the representative of Canada. In view, however, of the fact that the President of the Trusteeship Council was present and that it was only a question of a difference of approximately 4,000 dollars, the original appropriation being 75,000 dollars and the supplementary budget estimate 78,880 dollars, he thought that the Committee could take a decision immediately.

17. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the difference was not 4,000 dollars, but much greater, since the Advisory Committee had recommended an allocation of 50,000 dollars for the 1950 mission. Moreover, the Secretary-General had accepted that recommendation—a fact which must also be taken into consideration. The decision rested, however, with the Fifth Committee.

18. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the decision should be postponed until the Advisory Committee had been able to make specific budgetary estimates, taking into account the new factors in the question. The members of the Committee could, however, take advantage of the presence of the President of the Trusteeship Council to ask him for any information they wanted.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

19. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) asked if it was necessary to include an accountant in the secretariat of the mission to be sent to the Trust Territories of West Africa.

20. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) replied that the fact that the last visiting mission had not been accompanied by an accountant had caused much additional work in the auditing of the accounts of the mission. It would therefore seem necessary to take an accountant, who would supervise expenditure and the application of the financial regulations. That would not give rise to any great additional expense, since the accountant would not have a very high grade.

21. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked for some further explanation of chapter III of section 4.

22. Mr. GARREAU (President of the Trusteeship Council) explained that the visiting mission which was going to West Africa would depart towards the end of October 1949 and would return some time in January 1950. The mission would visit the Trust Territories of Togoland and the Cameroons under British and French administrations—four Territories which were all very close together. It was not the same in the case of the visiting mission to the Trust Territories in the Pacific, for they were very far apart. The Territory under United States administration was made up of any number of islands and there was often no direct means of communication between them. Thus the members of the mission would have to obtain means of transport from the local authorities on a reimbursable basis, or charter special aircraft. That was why the expenditure would be much higher than it had been for the missions sent to Africa, and it was for that reason that the Trusteeship Council had requested that the mission should be given a minimum period of 110 days.

23. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that he understood from section 4, chapter III, that the Secretary-General had proposed that an allocation of 50,000 dollars should be included in the 1950 budget, to be deducted from the 1949 allocations. He wished to make quite sure that it was really a transfer and that there would not be any increase in allocations.

24. Mr. GARREAU (President of the Trusteeship Council) explained that the budget estimates were prepared by the Secretary-General and discussed by the Trusteeship Council. The Council had examined and approved the Secretary-General's proposals for all the previous missions, as well as for the two future ones.

25. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that, for the few days the mission would spend in Africa in January 1950, the sum of 50,000 dollars was far too large. In his opinion the allocation for 1949 should suffice.

26. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) agreed that there was justification for the USSR representative's remark. The allocation for 1949 should be sufficient, but most of the mission's expenses would be settled only after its return, which would be in January 1950. That was why the Secretary-General had proposed a transfer of 50,000 dollars from the 1949 budget to the 1950 budget.

27. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) said that he was not satisfied with the reply Mr. Price had given to his question concerning the need for an accountant.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that the whole question was to be referred to the Advisory Committee, so that body would have an opportunity to consider the point raised by the New Zealand representative.

SECTION 3A

Section 3a was approved.

SECTION 3B

29. Mr. TARN (Poland) observed that documents issued in the field by the regional economic commissions sometimes showed errors in quotation and other deficiencies, apparently because documentation prepared at headquarters was not always available on the spot. The documents were then reproduced at headquarters with the same errors and deficiencies. He therefore suggested that the documents of the regional economic commissions should be issued in a provisional form in the field, and that the Secretariat should afterwards make the necessary corrections and revisions.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General would reply to the question raised by the representative of Poland when the Committee took up the discussion of part VI of the budget estimates for 1950.

31. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that the Economic Commission for Latin America was to hold its next session at Montevideo. When inviting the Commission, the Uruguayan Government had announced that it would itself meet any additional expenditure that might be involved. He was not in any way opposed to the decision taken by the Commission, but he did not think that the Economic and Social Council should be encouraged to decide that its Commissions should meet in different parts of the world, simply because one Government, when inviting a Commission to meet in its country, had agreed to cover all the additional expenditure. In his opinion, the meetings of the various organs should as far as possible be held at the temporary headquarters.

32. Mr. GARCÍA (Guatemala) said that the representative of Brazil had raised a very important question of principle. Some representatives had held that the Committee had the right to cancel a decision taken by another United Nations organ, on the basis of financial considerations. It had, however, been understood at the San Francisco Conference that all the organs would be free to hold their meetings in any part of the world. In the case in question, it would be a good thing for the Economic Commission for Latin America to hold its sessions in the countries most directly concerned in its work.

33. He reserved the right to submit a proposal at a later stage to the effect that the Sixth Committee should be asked whether the Fifth Committee was entitled to overrule a decision taken by another organ of the United Nations, solely on the basis of financial considerations. The Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee should have some sort of "financial rules of procedure", setting forth clearly the extent of their competence in that field.

34. Mr. LARRAÍN (Chile) fully agreed with the representative of Guatemala. In his opinion, such a proposal would be useful, and he suggested that either the Sixth Committee or the Legal Department of the Secretariat should be consulted on the point, so that the question of competence,

which arose within the Fifth Committee at every session of the General Assembly, should be finally settled. He recalled that, when the Economic Commission for Latin America had been set up, it had been understood that it would hold its sessions in the various capitals of Latin America. The cost of those sessions was always about the same, no matter where they were held.

35. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) also thought that some co-ordination was needed between the various organs of the United Nations so that a decision taken by one should not be cancelled by another.

36. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that the Committee had already discussed the question of competence during the previous session of the General Assembly, and had settled it in a way that was satisfactory to everyone.¹ The Fifth Committee was the only body which had an overall view of the Organization's work, while the other organs took decisions only within their own particular field of action. It was therefore essential to establish some co-ordination between the Committee and the various organs.

37. He did not agree with the Guatemalan representative's idea of submitting a proposal. In his opinion, it would be best to refer to the summary records of the meetings held by the Committee at the previous session, where the solution it had adopted would be found.

38. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) agreed with the representative of Canada. The Committee had settled the problem the previous year and its Chairman had made a statement on the subject at a plenary meeting of the Assembly.² It was therefore unnecessary to discuss the question again.

Section 3b was approved.

SECTION 5

Section 5 was approved.

SECTION 6

39. The CHAIRMAN recalled the statement on section 6 made in the previous meeting by Mr. Price, Assistant Secretary-General. In view of that statement, the Committee should postpone its decision on the section until it had received the reports of the various Commissions concerned.

It was so decided.

PART III, SECTION 7

40. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) was pleased to note that the Executive Office of the Secretary-General had been re-organized, as the Secretary-General had promised it would be during the previous session. He congratulated the members of the Executive Office as well as the staff of the Protocol Section for the way in which they were carrying out their work. Finally, he asked what was the purpose of the allocation of 3,000 dollars for consultants mentioned in chapter I, article (ii) (A/903, page 51).

41. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) said that article (ii) was a

¹ See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I*, Fifth Committee, 127th, 166th, 167th, 168th and 175th meetings.

² See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I*, 170th plenary meeting.

general provision which was made for all the Departments of the Secretariat. The Secretary-General might well need the services of a consultant in certain circumstances, especially where political questions were concerned.

42. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) proposed that the Committee should consider all the allocations for consultants at one and the same time.

43. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he would like to have some time to consider that proposal.

Section 7 was approved.

SECTION 7A

44. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) recalled that, during the previous sessions,¹ his delegation had been opposed to the programmes and decisions taken regarding the organization of the Library. He was very glad, therefore, to note that the library services had been transferred from the Department of Public Information to the Executive Office of the Secretary-General. That, at least, was how he interpreted the final paragraph of document A/C.5/298, which said that the budget estimates for 1950 showed that the Library had been attached to the Executive Office of the Secretary-General as an independent service. That was, indeed, the correct thing to do and he hoped that it was a permanent arrangement.

45. Nevertheless, the Netherlands delegation did not think that the system of Departmental libraries should be developed. Such a system would entail the virtual disintegration of the Library as an administrative unit; it would lead to an unjustified increase in the number of officials attached to that service and to duplication in the purchase of books and would thus involve unnecessary expense. The Library should be organized in such a way that it could lend books to the Departments, while at the same time retaining complete control over those books. Finally, expenses for contractual printing services should be kept as low as possible.

46. The Netherlands delegation would vote for the recommendations submitted by the Advisory Committee; it reserved the right to make observations on the Geneva Library.

47. In reply to a question by Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa), Mr. MILAM (Director of the Library) said that delegations had free access to the Library and could borrow books for a period of two weeks.

Section 7a was approved.

SECTION 8

48. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee) pointed out that the only recommendation the Advisory Committee had made with regard to the Department of Security Council Affairs was the same reduction of 5 per cent of the estimate for the expenses for travel on home leave, as it had recommended for all other Departments.

49. He drew the Committee's attention to the decrease of the volume of work in that Depart-

ment, but stated that the Advisory Committee was not recommending any reduction of staff, since the volume of work was likely to increase considerably in a way that it was impossible to foresee.

50. Mr. SHANN (Australia) supported the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. He thought that the requests for appropriations for the establishment of new posts in the Department were not justified in view of the decrease in the volume of work and he therefore proposed an allocation of 800,000 dollars which ought to be sufficient in the circumstances. Furthermore, an attempt ought to be made to cover the expenses of bibliographic services with regard to atomic energy by reducing the existing free services.

51. Mr. ZINCHENKO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Security Council Affairs) wanted to emphasize that, in connexion with the information concerning the meetings served by the Department of Security Council Affairs, as mentioned by the Advisory Committee in its report, and supplemented by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, besides the servicing of the subsidiary organs mentioned, the Department has the important duty of performing work for the First Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and their subsidiary organs.

52. He cited the number of meetings held by those bodies.

53. Finally, he observed that the creation of a bibliography on Atomic Energy did not involve any great additional expense because, with the exception of the printing, the expense was carried within the Department.

54. Mr. SHANN (Australia) withdrew his proposal.

Section 8 was approved.

SECTION 9

55. Mr. TARN (Poland) was surprised at the size of the staff attached to that Secretariat and quoted the statement in chapter I, article (i) (A/903, page 63): ". . . arrangements have been made with the Department of Conference and General Services with a view to using the staff fully . . .". He thought that the number of interpreters attached to the Military Staff Committee was disproportionate to the volume of work and that their work might very well be taken over by the Interpretation Division.

56. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) asked how many meetings the Military Staff Committee had held in 1948 and 1949.

57. Mr. SHANN (Australia) thought that substantial savings might be effected by incorporating the secretariat of the Military Staff Committee with the Department of Security Council Affairs.

58. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) said that the Polish representative's suggestion had been the subject of previous study, but the Military Staff Committee had consistently and categorically opposed it. He did not know how many meetings the Committee had held.

59. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) noted that the Military Staff Committee had at the moment reached a deadlock. The existence of a symbolic secretariat might be intelligible, but not that of the secretariat proposed for 1950. He would therefore welcome

¹ See *Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly, Fifth Committee, 94th meeting*, and *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Fifth Committee, 136th meeting*.

further information on the current work of that secretariat and an idea of what was expected in 1950.

60. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) asked that information should be supplied not only on the number of meetings held by the Committee but also on their length. The section of the budget under discussion was extremely debatable. He therefore suggested that its examination should be deferred until the Secretary-General was able to supply all the information requested.

It was so decided.

SECTION 10

61. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the fact that section 10 was one of those about which the Advisory Committee and the Secretary-General were not in agreement.

62. Mr. ASHA (Syria) drew attention to the existence of private offices which the Advisory Committee had noted in paragraph 87 of its report on the Department of Economic Affairs. He requested the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of that Department to be kind enough to explain the actual situation.

63. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) thought that criticism of his Department arose chiefly through a lack of knowledge of the exact circumstances in which it operated.

64. The Office of the Assistant Secretary-General comprised, in the first place, a small technical group of five persons (three professional officers and two secretaries) who made up the secretariat of the Interim Co-ordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements. It would, of course, be possible to transfer that group to another section of the Department, but, wherever it was, the staff carrying out that work would remain. The work of central planning, co-ordination and administration, which was the particular task of the Office of the Assistant Secretary-General, was carried out by a very small "private office" and by the Executive Office. The Executive Office, which comprised seven persons, was responsible for the internal administration of the Department and for the supervision of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and the Economic Commission for Latin America. In view of such heavy responsibilities, he did not think that the staff of that Office could be reduced.

65. The "private office" comprised five officials who assisted the Assistant Secretary-General and the top-ranking Director. That was certainly not an unduly large staff for carrying out, from the technical point of view, the extremely heavy and difficult work of co-ordinating the policy and administration of that important Department and its regional activities. During 1948, the Secretary-General had authorized the establishment of two posts of top-ranking Director in the Department of Economic Affairs. Up to the present, however, the Department had managed to function with only one of those Directors.

66. With regard to the "private offices" of the Directors, Mr. Owen thought that the only problem arose in the case of the Office of the Director of the Division of Economic Stability and Development. That Office existed only as the result of transfers of staff taken from the same Division. The staff of that Office had not in fact been increased in proportion to its regular functions;

only two new posts had been provided for. Owing to the fact that the Division had found it impossible to recruit an assistant director for the Geographical Area Units Section, two officials responsible for liaison with the regional economic commissions were temporarily attached to the Director. They would be transferred as soon as an assistant director for the Geographical Area Units Section was appointed.

67. Furthermore, the increase in the number of posts in the Office of the Director was explained by the establishment of a group responsible for reports, which had been attached to the Office of the Director. That group was a separate unit and took no part in the over-all supervision of the Division.

68. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was a difference of 156,000 dollars between the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and the revised budget of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/307).

69. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) recalled that mention was made below table 10-1 of the budget estimates (A/903, page 65) that the Executive Office of the Assistant Secretary-General was "also responsible for over-all supervision of the internal administration of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and of the Economic Commission for Latin America." He would like to know what office dealt with the over-all supervision of the internal administration of the Economic Commission for Europe.

70. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) explained that that function was assumed by the administrative and financial services of the Geneva Office, to which the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe was attached.

71. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) drew attention to the fact that the budget estimates were prepared in April or May each year. He wondered, therefore, whether the Secretary-General had taken into account in his revised budget estimates the decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council at its ninth session.

72. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) said that the decisions taken by the Council at its ninth session would involve a considerable increase of work for his Department, but that that work could be carried out by the staff requested in the 1950 budget estimates with the addition of two junior officials, the establishment of posts for whom would be requested.

73. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked Mr. Owen for details on his Department's various programmes of work, and what stage they had reached. The Committee would be in a better position to decide what justification there was for requests for allocations if it knew exactly what questions were before the Department, which of them had been completely settled and which were in course of completion.

74. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) asked permission to defer that question until the Committee's next meeting.

It was so decided.

75. Mr. SHANN (Australia) did not agree with the recommendation contained in paragraph 89 of

the Advisory Committee's report that credits for contractual printing should be reduced. The Australian delegation attached great importance to the interim reports published by the Department of Economic Affairs.

76. He was opposed to any reduction of staff in the Statistical Office and, unlike the Advisory Committee, he thought that it was better to call upon consultants than to engage additional staff. As far as the suggestion of condensing statistical publications and reducing the length of reports was concerned, great care should, he thought, be exercised, in view of the increasing importance which Member States attached to those reports.

77. The expenses of the twenty-two posts created by the programme for technical assistance should be paid for out of the funds set aside for that programme. Recruiting should be deferred until the Technical Assistance Committee of the Economic and Social Council had met, and should then be carried out slowly.

78. Finally, he wished to know the exact meaning of the following phrase contained in para-

graph 86 of the Advisory Committee's report: "the new tasks laid on the Secretariat in 1949 are offset to a large extent by the completion of projects assigned in earlier years".

79. As a compromise, his delegation proposed that the appropriations shown in section 10 should amount to 2,400,000 dollars.

80. Mr. OWEN (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Economic Affairs) pointed out that technical assistance had been organized in conformity with General Assembly resolution 200 (III) and that the twenty-two posts provided for the Technical Assistance Section were intended for the administration of the technical assistance furnished by the United Nations under resolution 200 (III). With regard to the expanded programme, which was to be financed in a different manner, it was possible that the Australian representative's suggestion would be workable.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 14 October 1949, at 10.45 a.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 III, SECTION 10 (*continued*)

1. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) drew the attention of the Assistant Secretary-General to the fact that certain decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council at its ninth session appeared to be in conflict with decisions taken by one of its own Commissions. In paragraph 92 of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/972), it was stated that the Council "also invited the Secretary-General to appoint a small group of experts to prepare, in the light of the current world economic situation, a report on national and international measures required to achieve full employment". The language used there was almost identical with the terms of reference of the Sub-Commission on Employment and Economic Stability. Hence the Economic and Social Council would apparently receive two reports on the same question, one submitted by a group of experts and the other by the Sub-Commission, thus making a duplication of work. He also enquired what would be the financial implications of the decision taken by the Economic and Social Council.

2. Mr. TARN (Poland) pointed out that the Secretary-General's estimates gave nine posts as unfilled in the Department of Economic Affairs. He wondered whether the Advisory Committee had taken that fact into account when it had rec-

ommended the creation of twenty-two new posts. Among those nine unfilled posts there was one post of principal officer in the Economic Development Section (table 10-2-2), one post of principal officer in the Geographic Area Units Section (table 10-2-5), one post of director in the Fiscal Division (table 10-3), one post of director in the Office of the Director, Statistical Office (table 10-5-1), one post of professional officer in the section for the Research and Promotion of International Comparability of Statistics (table 10-5-3), and two or three posts, one of which was grade 18, in the section for the Co-ordination of Statistical Activities of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies (table 10-5-5).

3. What struck him was that, if the Department of Economic Affairs had been able to do without the services of nine officials, mostly in high grades, for a whole year, it should be able to deal with the additional work required of it without asking for new posts. He was surprised that some services had been able to function without either a principal officer or a director and emphasized that, generally speaking, it did not seem necessary to have so many high-grade officials in each section.

4. Furthermore, he drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, according to the budget estimates, certain members of the secretariat of the Economic and Social Council were responsible for liaison with non-governmental organizations (A/903, page 80), while a section of the Department of Social Affairs (A/903, page 83) and nine officials of the Department of Public Information (A/903, page 108) had the same function. There again, there appeared to be duplication of work.

5. In the circumstances he did not see how the twenty-two new posts could possibly be justified.