

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FIFTH COMMITTEE

MEETING

Friday, 23 November 1951, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

## CONTENTS

Page

Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1812 and Add. 1, A/C.5/448, A/C.5/451, A/C.5/L.110, A/C.5/L.111, A/C.5/L.113); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853)

First reading (continued)..... 57

Chairman: Mr. T. A. STONE (Canada).

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/1812 and Add. 1, A/C.5/448, A/C.5/451, A/C.5/L.110, A/C.5/L.111, A/C.5/L.113); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853)**

[Item 41]\*

### First reading (continued)

PART III, SECTION 9; PART IX, SECTIONS 27, 28 AND 29

1. Mr. HALL (United States of America) thanked the representative of Egypt for his proposal (A/C.5/L.110), which furnished an excellent basis for discussion. He had also been greatly interested by the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/L.111), and hoped the advantages of both proposals could be combined.

2. The United States delegation was concerned at the high administrative expenditure required to carry out the technical assistance programme and hoped it could be considerably reduced in future. He suggested that the Rapporteur's report should indicate that those administrative expenditures of the Technical Assistance Administration which were covered by voluntary contributions should also be reviewed by the General Assembly. That suggestion would, moreover, conform to the recommendation made by the Fifth Committee in 1950 asking the specialized agencies to provide the Assembly with information on technical assistance expenditure and to submit their audit reports relating to such expenditure to the Assembly for approval (resolution 411 (V)). He hoped that the Secretary-General would not object to it.

3. He found it difficult to apply unreservedly the principle of geographical distribution to posts in TAA,

since the holders of those posts generally had to be technical experts. The chief aim should be to recruit the best-qualified person for each post.

4. He observed that any reduction in expenditure on administering technical assistance would proportionally increase the funds available for carrying out the programmes. He understood, as had the representative of China, that the Committee was to receive more precise information in 1952 on programmes, fellowships, areas served, etc.

5. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) asked the Egyptian representative whether he was prepared to accept the revised text of his draft resolution given in document A/C.5/L.113.

6. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) accepted the text suggested by Mr. Agnides.

7. The CHAIRMAN noted that the title of document A/C.5/L.113 should be corrected to read: "Revised text of the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Egypt".

8. Mr. LIVRAN (Israel), after paying tribute to the work of TAA and its staff, stated that all questions relating to technical assistance should be considered in terms of the benefits to be derived by the receiving countries. He did not think that a change in the administrative structure of the technical assistance services would necessarily simplify its operation or save money. The experience of countries which had received technical assistance, such as Israel, showed that the complexity arose, not from the administrative structure, but from the extent and variety of the technical assistance which had to be rendered in so many parts of the world. The countries benefiting from technical assistance generally had not the required administrative apparatus to organize it and had to use the United Nations administrative services. Consequently the difference between administration and operation had meaning only at the United Nations end; from the point of view of the receiving country

\* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

the administrative work was itself a form of direct assistance.

9. Israel had found no administrative overlapping, and its delegation was not inclined to support a draft resolution declaring the administrative services of technical assistance to be unduly complex. It would not, however, oppose the adoption of a request to the Secretary-General to make a thorough study of the question, and would support any proposal to increase credits for the technical assistance services.

10. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that the Committee should consider two distinct questions: first, the structure of the various services of technical assistance; secondly, the financial supervision of the whole of the expenditure on technical assistance, whether covered by credits in the Organization's regular budget or by voluntary contributions. Neither the original Egyptian draft resolution nor the revised wording took into account the second aspect of the problem, the supervision of expenditure amounting to \$7,000,000.

11. He could not support the revised wording unless the Egyptian representative or the Chairman of the Advisory Committee assured him that the second aspect of the question would be considered in due course.

12. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) felt that the administrative structure was a constitutional question. He agreed with the Brazilian representative that financial supervision should be exercised over all technical assistance expenditure, but he thought it would be better to deal with the question of extra-budgetary expenditure separately later and to adopt immediately the motion concerning the administrative structure (A/C.5/L.113), which took account of the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/L.111).

13. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) reiterated that the General Assembly must be able to examine the total expenditure attributable to technical assistance. The Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly must exercise financial supervision over all expenditure incurred on behalf of the United Nations, whether included in the Organization's regular budget or contributed voluntarily by Member States.

14. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia), like the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, considered that it would be better to deal separately with co-ordination between TAA, the Department of Economic Affairs and the Department of Social Affairs, and with the supervision of expenditure on programmes affecting other services besides those of technical assistance. Moreover, the question of co-ordination had been made much wider by the Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/L.111).

15. The CHAIRMAN agreed that consideration of that wider question should be deferred until the Committee had completed its examination of the budget estimates for the financial year 1952.

16. Mr. ADARKAR (India), while fully aware that co-ordination was essential, pointed out that it was already part of the duty of a number of United Nations bodies. Furthermore, items 26 and 28 of the General Assembly's agenda both related to co-ordination. He thought that the method envisaged in the Secretary-General's statement would lead the Committee to examine questions of ever-widening scope, which was

at present not desirable. He therefore suggested that the Committee should continue to debate the original Egyptian proposal (A/C.5/L.110) concerning co-ordination between TAA, the Department of Social Affairs and the Department of Economic Affairs, and urged the Egyptian representative to revert to that proposal. He also suggested that the Committee should request the Secretary-General to study only the co-ordination of those three services.

17. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) was in sympathy with the view expressed by the representative of Brazil, but agreed also with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. On the other hand, if the Egyptian proposal were adopted, that would in no way prevent the Committee from considering wider proposals such as he himself had suggested in the general debate.

18. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the Secretary-General's proposal in his statement was not related to the problems arising from the budget estimates for 1952. He therefore thought it reasonable to adopt the procedure proposed by the representative of Norway and to examine the structure of the Secretariat later, having regard to any comments that might be made during the debate on the budget and at the meetings of the Fifth Committee with the Joint Second and Third Committee.

19. If the Secretary-General undertook a general reorganization of the Secretariat, he thought that the Committee should give the Secretary-General detailed directives on the purpose of such reorganization, such as improved efficiency, co-ordination of work, or financial control.

20. He requested the Chairmen of the Advisory Committee and of the Fifth Committee to study the question in the light of all relevant comments made both by the Fifth Committee and by the other Main Committees dealing with co-ordination.

21. The CHAIRMAN agreed that the debate had strayed slightly outside the limits originally established for it. The adoption of the revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.113) would not, however, preclude a more extensive debate later on. He therefore asked the Committee if it was prepared, in the circumstances, to adopt the revised Egyptian draft resolution.

22. Mr. VOUGT (Sweden) asked the Chairman to postpone the vote on the Egyptian draft resolution.

*It was so decided.*

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee for sections 9 (Technical Assistance Administration), 27 (Advisory Social Welfare Services), 28 (Technical Assistance for Economic Development) and 29 (Programme for Training in Public Administration).

*The estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee for section 9 was approved unanimously at the figure of \$300,000.*

*The estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee for section 27 was approved unanimously at the figure of \$768,500.*

*The estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee for section 28 was approved unanimously at the figure of \$479,400.*

*The estimate recommended by the Advisory Committee for section 29 was approved unanimously at the figure of \$145,000.*

PART III, SECTION 12. DEPARTMENT OF TRUSTEESHIP  
AND INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING  
TERRITORIES

24. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Advisory Committee had recommended a decrease of \$34,300 for the section, reducing the Secretary-General's estimate from \$909,300 to \$875,000. He remarked that the Secretary-General had not contested that reduction.

25. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) proposed, in connexion with the two posts mentioned in paragraphs 155 and 156 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1853), that two officials should be transferred from the Department of Public Information.

26. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that he wished to recruit the two most highly qualified persons for those posts, but it would be necessary for that purpose that appropriations should be included in the budget. He noted the suggestion made by the Egyptian representative, but pointed out that the qualities required of officials in his Department were not necessarily identical with those required of officials in the Department of Public Information.

27. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) pointed out that although the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee seemed relatively small, it would nevertheless substantially affect one of the most useful departments of the Secretariat.

28. He recalled that in a paper submitted by the Secretariat to the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter (A/AC.35/L.71) the Secretary-General had said that the funds earmarked for the secretariat of the Special Committee were based on the financial calculations for 1952 for the Trusteeship Department and that any reduction in the appropriations for the Department would necessitate a reduction in the work programme of the secretariat of the Special Committee.

29. In the same document the Secretary-General had also made a reservation regarding the extra funds which would be necessary for the detailed maps showing the distribution of medical services in Non-Self-Governing Territories.

30. Those statements showed that the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee might cause the Special Committee serious difficulties. He reminded the Committee in that connexion that the representative of the World Health Organization had told the Special Committee that the secretariat had assumed tasks which the World Health Organization was not yet ready to carry out.

31. The two posts referred to in paragraphs 155 and 156 of the Advisory Committee's report were at present occupied by persons temporarily engaged or paid out of funds allotted for posts temporarily vacant. The Secretary-General's request for funds was therefore simply intended to regularize an existing situation. If the General Assembly refused the request and adopted the reduction proposed by the Advisory Committee, the secretariat of the Department would have to carry out the studies for the Special Committee with two fewer staff members than at present.

32. He therefore proposed that the Committee should authorize the whole of the appropriations requested

by the Secretary-General, and reserved the right to raise the question again at a later stage in the discussion.

33. Mr. CHHATARI (Pakistan) pointed out that the reduction of \$34,300 in the appropriations requested for the Department corresponded to five posts and would entail the interruption of certain work, in particular on racial discrimination, human rights and the organization of public health services. The Secretary-General's proposal was simply intended to regularize the existing position.

34. He urged the Committee to adopt the Secretary-General's estimates without reduction.

35. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said he would be glad if the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department would provide some explanation, since, according to the Chairman, the Secretariat had accepted the Advisory Committee's recommendations without indicating that these would force the Department to cease certain activities. The Committee had now learnt that the Department would be unable to carry out certain of its tasks if the appropriations requested were refused.

36. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) associated himself with the Brazilian representative's point of view. He had thought that there was no difference of opinion between the Assistant Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee and that the matter was going to be speedily settled. He would like a clear statement of the Secretary-General's position.

37. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) said that the reason why the Secretary-General had not commented in his statement (A/C.5/448) on the Department's budget was that he had had to concentrate his attention on the more important recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The reduction recommended by that Committee might affect the work of the Department.

38. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter had sat in Geneva in October, four months after the budget estimates had been presented. The Special Committee had assigned new tasks to the Department, but the Secretary-General seemed to have thought that the Department would be able to perform them without obtaining additional appropriations. Mr. Agnides thought that the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee for the Department would enable it to undertake the additional assignments.

39. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) said he could not object to the Advisory Committee's recommendations, since the Secretary-General himself had not done so. With regard to the two posts mentioned in paragraphs 155 and 156 of the Advisory Committee's report, the Fifth Committee might propose that the Assistant Secretary-General should fill them by transferring competent officials from another department.

40. Mr. ADARKAR (India) suggested that if additional tasks were assigned to the Department the amounts allocated to it might reasonably be increased. The appropriation recommended by the Advisory Com-

mittee ought, according to its Chairman, to be adequate for current assignments and for the new assignments also. The Assistant Secretary-General should accept the existing recommendation for current assignments and submit supplementary estimates for the new assignments. Mr. Adarkar proposed that the Committee should adopt the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

41. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) supported the Indian representative's proposal, which he said was based on a principle of logic and might be applied to all the other chapters of the budget.

42. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) urged the Committee to reject the Advisory Committee's recommendation. The members of the Special Committee and of the Fourth Committee feared that the Department might not be able to fulfil its important task. The Department had merely asked that the existing situation should be regularized, and the Committee was not entitled to refuse. His delegation would, if necessary, ask for a roll-call vote on the question.

43. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked the Assistant Secretary-General to explain the matter to the Committee in greater detail. He would vote for the Cuban proposal that all the appropriations requested by the Secretary-General should be approved if he were convinced that the Department could not undertake all the tasks assigned to it on the reduced appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee. The Secretary-General, however, appeared to have accepted by implication the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee.

44. Mr. ADARKAR (India) repeated his proposal and asked that it be put to the vote.

45. Mr. HOO (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories) stated that any increase of the work entrusted to the Department might impair its efficiency. That work seemed likely to increase in the near future. The Secretary-General's statement (A/C.5/448) had been published on 8 October, and the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter had made its recommendations on the new programmes of work at a later date. The Secretary-General had therefore been unable to allow in his statement for the Special Committee's decisions. Moreover, at the Fifth Committee's opening meeting the Secretary-General had made only a very short statement without going into the detail of the reductions that he would wish to be restored.

46. Again, on 7 February 1951 the Trusteeship Council had adopted a resolution (311 (VIII)) on information concerning the United Nations to be brought to the notice of the peoples of Trust Territories. Under that resolution the mission that had visited East Africa in 1951 would include, in a report shortly to be published, recommendations that would entail an increase in the work of the Department.

47. Mr. HALL (United States of America) felt that the Committee's decision should not be based only on verbal statements of the representative of the Secretary-General. In the circumstances it would be proper to adopt the Indian proposal.

48. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) agreed with the United States representative. In view of the

statements made to the Committee, it would in his opinion be proper for the Secretary-General to submit supplementary estimates for the Department of Trusteeship.

49. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should vote first on the Cuban proposal and then on the Indian proposal.

50. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) considered that, as the Indian proposal was one of procedure, it should be taken first.

51. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that under the general rule the proposal furthest removed from the Advisory Committee's recommendations should be voted on first. However, the Chair had ruled when sections 10 and 11 were under discussion that a motion to request supplementaries was procedural and should be voted on first. He had no objection personally to the adoption of the solution proposed by the Egyptian representative, but felt that the Committee should not go into such detail. He thought it better to leave it to the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to decide how adjustments should be made within the appropriations for each section of the budget.

52. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the adoption of the Egyptian proposal would have the effect of reducing the appropriations made in respect of section 13 (Department of Public Information). It was true that the statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/448) had been issued on 8 October, but the fact remained that the Secretary-General had made a verbal statement approximately one month later, i.e., after the Special Committee had concluded its work. If the Fifth Committee requested the Secretary-General to submit supplementary estimates, it would be departing from its customary procedure and violating one of the principles which it had previously followed. In any event the Secretary-General was always entitled to submit supplementary estimates when he deemed it necessary.

53. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala) shared the Cuban representative's opinion. He attached great importance to the work of the Trusteeship Department and would therefore approve the Cuban proposal.

54. Mr. ADARKAR (India) stated that the object of his proposal was not to ask the Secretary-General to submit supplementary estimates. It was in fact identical with the proposals which the Netherlands representative had put forward during the study of the estimates for the Department of Economic Affairs and for the Department of Social Affairs. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee had at that time recognized the soundness of those proposals.

55. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) agreed that the procedure proposed by the Indian representative was orthodox.

56. Mr. PEREZ CISNEROS (Cuba) noted that the effect of adopting the Indian proposal would be to postpone examination of the problem presented by the increase in the assignments allotted to the Trusteeship Department, in order to permit the Committee to obtain more exact and detailed information. In the circumstances he would withdraw his proposal and support that of the Indian representative.

57. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve, on the first reading, the Advisory Committee's recommendations entailing a reduction of \$ 34,300 in the appropriation which the Secretary-General had requested for section 12, which would thus bring the total amount of that appropriation to \$ 875,000. It was, however, understood that the Secretary-General was invited to submit, if he considered it necessary, supplementary estimates to cover the execution of the new assignments allotted to the Department. The term "new assignments" meant those allocated to the Department after the middle of November.

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation for an*

*appropriation of \$ 875,000 for section 12 was approved, unanimously.*

58. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) explained that his last statement referred only to procedure. A ruling should have been given on whether the Indian proposal went to the substance of the matter or was procedural; the distinction affected the order of voting and had proved to be of great importance when sections 10 and 11 had been under discussion.

59. The CHAIRMAN stated that, if he had had to rule on the point, he would have decided that the Indian representative's proposal was procedural.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.