

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

NINTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 442nd
MEETING**

Thursday, 21 October 1954,
at 10.30 a.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 53: Organization of the Secretariat (<i>continued</i>)	} 71
Agenda item 38: Budget estimates for the financial year 1955 (<i>continued</i>)	
Agenda item 47: Systems of allowances to members of commissions, committees and other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly or other organs of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (<i>continued</i>)	74

Chairman: Mr. Pote SARASIN (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEMS 53 AND 38

Organization of the Secretariat (A/2731, A/2745; A/C.5/580, A/C.5/581, A/C.5/583; A/C.5/L.282) (*continued*)

Budget estimates for the financial year 1955 (A/2647 and Add.1, A/2688; A/C.5/577) (*continued*)

General discussion (*continued*)

1. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) said that the reorganization plan laid before the Committee (A/2731) marked a great step forward, on which the Secretary-General should be congratulated. Members of the Committee would note with satisfaction that the estimates for 1955 (A/2647) were lower than those for the previous year and that further economies could be expected when the reorganization was completed.
2. The Secretary-General had adopted the excellent principle that the Secretariat should be able to carry out its current work and to undertake with the necessary flexibility the new tasks that might be entrusted to it. Economy should not dominate the reorganization but result from it.
3. In the past, Member States had often been inclined to load new tasks on the Secretariat without considering the financial and administrative consequences. In future the organs of the United Nations would have to look more closely into the consequences of their decisions. If further economies were desired, it would be necessary to keep current programmes under continuous review.
4. It had been definitely established that when new programmes were discussed by the organs of the United Nations the Secretary-General's opinion should be given full weight. It was the right and the duty of the Secretary-General to provide Governments with all the data necessary to enable them to judge whether

particular programmes should be eliminated or continued on a limited scale.

5. His delegation was generally in favour of the proposals the Secretary-General had submitted to the Economic and Social Council,¹ but might wish to comment on them when the Committee discussed the economic and social sections of the estimates. In that connexion, his delegation welcomed the action taken to ensure more effective documents control and to eliminate certain periodical publications of doubtful value.

6. He noted with satisfaction that under the reorganization plan the structure of many services, including that of the secretariat of the Military Staff Committee, was to be simplified. He welcomed the simplification of the structure of the Department of Political and Security Council Affairs. It was a difficult matter for delegations which did not possess expert staff and had not had an opportunity to follow the Secretariat's work very closely, to express an opinion on the internal administrative arrangements proposed by the Secretary-General.

7. After paying a tribute to the Advisory Committee and its Chairman, he stated that his delegation, while favourably disposed towards further economies, would be unable to support the representatives who proposed reductions of as much as \$5 million in the amounts recommended by the Advisory Committee (A/2688). The Fifth Committee had no right, by votes on certain estimates, to annul decisions taken by the Assembly on political and humanitarian programmes, some of which had been in operation for many years.

8. The Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee differed on three points, the composition of the Survey Group, the speed of reorganization and the structure of the top echelon.

9. With regard to the first point, it was useless to speculate on whether anything would have been gained by including one or two persons from outside the Secretariat in the Survey Group. So far as the remainder of the inquiry was concerned, i.e., the survey of activities away from New York, it might still be useful to supplement the Survey Group with outside advisers having special experience in a particular region. His delegation also supported the United States proposal (437th meeting) that the Survey Group should cover the activities of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNWRA).

10. His delegation was inclined to agree with the Secretary-General's views regarding the speed of reorganization, although it might have favoured the methods proposed by the Advisory Committee had it

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Eighteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 29, document E/2598.

not been for the number of terminations carried out in 1952 and 1953. His delegation had been glad to note that the Secretary-General now believed that the adjustments in the Secretariat could be completed sooner than previously expected. It also welcomed the Secretary-General's efforts to introduce some flexibility in the application of the very low age-limit in force in the Secretariat. It might be of advantage in certain cases to retain on an annual basis the services of some particularly valuable officials who reached the retirement age, although such a policy might be difficult during the reorganization period.

11. So far as the top echelon was concerned, he was still unable to visualize the consequences of the arrangements contemplated by the Secretary-General. In the past the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee had commented unfavourably on the unduly large number of assistants attached to certain high officials (personal assistants and private secretaries). He would like to have a clear picture of the consequences of the reorganization in that respect.

12. His delegation would state its views on the Secretary-General's proposal to transfer the Narcotics Division and the main services of the Transport and Communications Division to Geneva when the Committee discussed the relevant sections of the estimates. He would like to know whether the transfer could be effected without involving extra expenditure or enlargement of the premises at Geneva or any serious lowering of the standard of office accommodation of the Geneva staff, at a time when the reduction of staff would release office space in New York.

13. The Secretary-General also proposed to review the salary scale for professional staff and differentials. A review of the differentials was certainly overdue. In some areas, the differentials applied by the various agencies were not the same.

14. The Argentine and other delegations had pointed out (436th meeting) that the expenditure of the specialized agencies was continuing to rise. It should be recognized that that was chiefly the case in recently established agencies like the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Health Organization (WHO). The expenditure of older agencies like the International Labour Organisation (ILO) was more or less stabilized.

15. In any case it was difficult to see what the Fifth Committee could do, given the constitutional position, except call attention to the matter in its report, and to comment upon the services which an experienced and semi-permanent body such as the Advisory Committee might render to an international organization. The steady increase in expenditure could only be halted by the concerted action of the States Members of the agencies concerned. His delegation would nevertheless consider any concrete proposals that might be presented.

16. In conclusion, he pointed out that the Assembly could not work properly if Governments could not make adequate preparations for their participation. The delegations must receive the necessary documentation in good time. At the present session, many documents had not been distributed in time, and the work of various committees had been delayed or disorganized because of lack of documentation. He hoped that it would be possible to improve the situation.

17. Mr. LIVERAN (Israel) said that the scheme for the reorganization of the Secretariat was a compromise between the actual and the ideal. It represented what was possible rather than what was desirable. The Secretary-General's proposals must be adopted or rejected as a whole; any change in detail might throw them out of balance. While not denying the relevance of the criticism several delegations had offered, he felt that the Secretary-General's proposals were workable and would support them.

18. With regard to the tempo of reorganization he considered that a policy of large-scale dismissals would have disastrous effects on staff morale and should therefore be discarded. He accordingly approved the position which the Secretary-General had taken. His delegation would not criticize the Secretary-General if he later found it necessary to slow down the reorganization because of regard for the human aspect involved.

19. The purpose of the various reforms was to increase the efficiency of the Secretariat, but in the last analysis the quality of the Secretariat depended on that of the individuals who made it up. The reorganization made it even more necessary that staff members should possess the efficiency, competence and integrity stipulated by the Charter. It was equally necessary that no considerations extraneous to those enumerated in the Charter should be allowed to affect the careers and advancement of staff members. That rule was not inconsistent with the necessity of ensuring a fair distribution of posts among the different Member States. He was certain that people with the qualities required by Secretariat members were to be found in every country. It might be desirable to recruit staff by means of competitive examinations as was done in most national civil service systems.

20. With regard to the estimates for 1955, he pointed out the budget was now becoming stabilized. He wondered whether it was really necessary for the estimates to undergo threefold examination by the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee and the Fifth Committee in all their details or whether a more thorough study of certain crucial problems might not be a preferable alternative method.

21. Mr. CONCHA (Ecuador) observed that the main consideration in the Secretary-General's reorganization scheme had been the need to increase the flexibility and efficiency of the Secretariat. The plan entailed a reduction in the manning table which was bound to arouse some anxiety among the staff. It was important, therefore, that the reorganization period should not be unduly prolonged. He accordingly welcomed the Secretary-General's assurance that the reorganization of the Secretariat would be completed by 1956 and that the necessary adjustments would be attainable through normal staff turnover. In that connexion it would be interesting to know whether the Secretary-General had already received complaints from staff members arising from the reorganization.

22. The titles of "Under-Secretary" and "Deputy Under-Secretary" had been criticized. The titles should correspond to the important duties discharged by the Secretariat's top-level officials. Since there was a Secretary-General there was no reason why his immediate subordinates should not have the title of "Under-Secretaries-General" and their assistants that of "Under-Secretaries" or "Deputy Under-Secretaries".

23. With regard to the establishment of three posts of Deputy Under-Secretary it would be remembered that the Secretary-General had stated his intention not to fill the third post until he considered it necessary to do so. With regard to the composition of the Survey Group the Secretary-General had also stated that he would follow the Advisory Committee's recommendation if that became necessary.

24. His delegation would oppose any reduction in the budget of the Department of Public Information, whose work was, it believed, of vital importance. It also considered that technical assistance was one of the most useful and fruitful activities of the United Nations. Funds devoted to the development of technical assistance would not be wasted. Lastly, his delegation approved of the merger of the Departments of Economic Affairs and Social Affairs, which had already resulted in budgetary economies and should greatly simplify the administrative structure.

25. Mr. CHERNYSHCHENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that he would deal with the estimates for 1955 and the reorganization of the Secretariat together. The two questions were rightly linked in General Assembly resolution 784 (VIII) since the rational use of Secretariat staff would undoubtedly permit a reduction of the budget.

26. The total appropriation for 1954 was \$46,700,000, \$100,000 less than the 1955 estimates, a fact which suggested that the absolute minimum had not been reached. In that connexion he drew attention to paragraph 25 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/2745).

27. The Secretary-General had predicted that implementation of the reorganization plan for Headquarters would take two years and would make possible a reduction, as compared with the budget level for 1954, of an amount estimated at \$2 million gross. He agreed with the Polish representative (437th meeting) that it should be fully in effect by the end of 1955.

28. With regard to personnel policy the Byelorussian delegation wished to draw attention to the observations in paragraph 13 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/2745), and welcomed the assurances given by the Secretary-General in his statement to the 435th meeting (A/C.5/580). He shared the Advisory Committee's concern about the high proportion of posts carrying the highest rank and feared that the reorganization had been effected mainly at the expense of the staff at other levels. The merger of the former Departments of Economic Affairs and Social Affairs, which would have to be completed by the amalgamation of the Technical Assistance Administration (TAA) with the new unified department, should be approved, but it was a matter for regret that the Advisory Committee had felt it necessary to point out that the number of senior posts still remaining in the unified department was too high (A/2688, paragraph 96). The same comment applied to the Department of Public Information and the Department of Trusteeship.

29. It had frequently been pointed out at previous sessions of the General Assembly that the staff at Geneva was too large and the expenditure of the European Office too high, but year after year the budget for services external to Headquarters steadily rose. There should accordingly be a detailed review of the activities in offices away from Headquarters, including the European Office, as a result of which it was to be hoped

that the Secretary-General would be able to effect some savings.

30. The 1955 budget still contained sizable appropriations for such organs as the United Nations Military Observers in Greece, the United Nations Tribunal in Libya and the United Nations Field Service which, having been established in violation of the Charter, were illegal. The organs in question had moreover been found useless in practice. Sections 5 and 5a of the budget estimates should therefore be deleted.

31. In conclusion the Byelorussian delegation felt that the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee were inadequate and that the budget for 1955 could be reduced to \$35 million dollars net as the Polish delegation had proposed at the 437th meeting. The adoption of that proposal would make it possible to ease the financial burden on Member States; furthermore, the more accurate the estimate of an administration's financial needs, the greater the compulsion upon it to become more efficient and to put its resources to better use. Lastly, the Byelorussian delegation would support any proposal calculated to make the structure of the Secretariat more flexible and better integrated.

32. Mr. BUNCHOEM (Thailand) thanked the Secretary-General and Advisory Committee for their reports to the Fifth Committee and congratulated them on the way they had discharged their task. The organization of the Secretariat had been under discussion for many years; at the present session the Fifth Committee was at last called upon to pass judgment on proposals which, although they were not complete and did not cover TAA, the United Nations Children's Fund or the services situated away from New York, nevertheless merited the approval of the General Assembly.

33. The Thai delegation had voted in favour of resolution 784 (VIII) at the eighth session and was in general agreement with the Secretary-General's reorganization plan but had a number of comments to make on points of detail.

34. With regard to personnel administration, although the Advisory Committee's arguments in support of its recommendation that the reorganization should be speeded up had considerable weight, he would support the Secretary-General's proposal, in view of the Secretary-General's statement at the 435th meeting (A/C.5/580).

35. The Thai delegation also approved of the Secretary-General's proposals concerning the structure of the various Headquarters departments and services, on the understanding that the General Assembly would be able to review the administrative, financial and legal services at the end of a two-year period.

36. He shared the Advisory Committee's views regarding the status of Deputy Under-Secretaries (A/2745, paragraph 21) but thought that the problem was within the jurisdiction of the chief administrative office of the Organization. In any case the Secretary-General was bound to take into account the misgivings of many delegations and would no doubt wish to reconsider the matter with a view to submitting a compromise solution.

37. It was gratifying to note that there was a reduction of one million dollars in budget estimates which had previously tended to rise steadily. The budgetary reductions were the more important because they related only to part III of the budget and additional

economies might be expected in other sections. The reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee were justified in most cases; he was glad that the Secretary-General had raised few objections to them and had left the final decision to the Fifth Committee. He reserved the right to speak again later during the detailed examination of the budget and would support any proposal to strengthen the working of the Organization.

38. Mr. TEKLE (Ethiopia) agreed with the main features of the Secretary-General's reorganization plan and shared his concern about the possible consequences of large-scale dismissals. He had not, however, been convinced by the Secretary-General's arguments regarding the status of Deputy Under-Secretaries.

39. The Ethiopian delegation was glad to note that substantial savings would be achieved in 1955 and hoped that the specialized agencies would follow the example of the United Nations. However, it felt that the efficient working of the Secretariat and the competence of its officials were more important than any economies that might be made.

AGENDA ITEM 47

System of allowances to members of commissions, committees and other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly or other organs of the United Nations: reports of the Secretary-General and of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2687 and Add.1, A/2688, Part II; A/C.5/L.274) (continued)

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had still to take a decision on question 6 (b) in document A/C.5/L.274 which was concerned with the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Sir Harry Greenfield, President of the Permanent Central Opium Board, took a place at the Committee table.

41. Sir Harry GREENFIELD (President of the Permanent Central Opium Board) thanked the members of the Committee for interrupting their consideration of the item they had been discussing to hear him express the views of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body.

42. The Second Opium Conference, which had resulted in the signing of the 1925 Convention,² had examined the question of the recruitment of members of the Permanent Central Board. The Conference's conclusions were set out in the second paragraph of article 19 of the 1925 Convention; they included several of the criteria which should govern the choice of members, such as technical competence and impartiality. The need for both was self-evident. As the Board had sometimes to make decisions which might not be to the liking of Governments, the impartiality or disinterestedness of its members was of primary importance. The Conference had also felt that it would be impossible to obtain the services of highly qualified persons if they were not remunerated. The Conference had considered that the members of the Board need not devote all, or even the greater part, of their time

to their duties. In the early years, especially after the formation of its secretariat, the Board had not been overloaded with work, but its responsibilities had been extended by the 1931 Convention,³ which had also set up the Drug Supervisory Body, by the 1948 Protocol⁴ and by the 1953 Protocol,⁵ which was to enter into force at the end of 1955.

43. It was difficult to say why the 1924-1925 Conference had not taken a decision on the remuneration of Board members. It had perhaps felt that it was desirable to find out first what was in fact the amount of work required. It had probably taken a similar view when the Board's task had been considerably increased after 1935. It should be added that, while the Conference's recommendations concerning the remuneration of Board members were very clear, the majority of the members had not, at any rate before the Second World War, experienced any financial difficulty. Many of them had had independent means. Since 1945, however, the cost of living had risen considerably, taxation had become heavier and persons with private means and suitable qualifications were becoming increasingly hard to find. At the same time, the scope and importance of the Board's work and, since the invention of synthetic drugs, its complexity had steadily increased. For all those reasons, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had, of its own accord, brought the question before the Economic and Social Council. The Council had adopted resolutions 505 F III (XIV) and 548 B IV (XVIII) in which it stated that a positive solution should be found.

44. Originally the Board had held four long sessions every year. After its secretariat had been established, it had met only twice a year for sessions of two weeks. Later it had had to hold three sessions during some years and, especially since 1953, had had to hold longer sessions. The Drug Supervisory Body and the Board held their sessions simultaneously and often met in joint session. Between sessions, the Board had to analyse estimates of consumption as they were received and often to settle questions arising from the revised estimates by air mail. It was frequently necessary to set up sub-committees. The President and Vice-President drew up the agenda for each session and supervised the implementation of decisions taken during sessions. They had to draw up budget estimates and were in continual correspondence with States, the United Nations and their own secretariat. The Permanent Central Board had to arrange for a representative to attend the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly and had to send one of its members to the Advisory Committee and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, whose sessions often lasted four weeks, as well as to special conferences, such as those held in 1950 and 1953. The Board and the Drug Supervisory Body

² See *Conference for the Limitation of the Manufacture of Narcotic Drugs, Geneva, 27 May-13 July 1931, Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, Protocol of Signature and Final Act, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946*, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1947.XI.6.

³ See *Protocol bringing under international control Drugs outside the scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for limiting the manufacture, and regulating the distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success of 11 December 1946*, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1949.XI.6.

⁵ See *United Nations Opium Conference Protocol and Final Act signed at New York, 23 June 1953*, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1953.XI.6.

² See *Second Opium Conference, Convention, Protocol, Final Act, amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, 11 December 1946*, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1947.XI.4.

had sometimes to submit reports on specific questions; Economic and Social Council resolution 548 C (XVIII) requested a report of that kind. The missions sent to certain countries to study questions relating to narcotic drugs included a member of the Board. Finally, under article 24 of the 1925 Convention, the Permanent Central Opium Board was responsible for watching continuously the course of the international opium trade.

45. Mr. ROUSSOS (Greece) said that he would support the Secretary-General's proposals, especially after hearing the statement of the President of the Permanent Central Opium Board.

46. Mr. HALL (United States) asked whether members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body, like the Chairman and rapporteurs of the International Law Commission, personally drafted reports for the Board and Drug Supervisory Body.

47. Sir Harry GREENFIELD (President of the Permanent Central Opium Board) said that the Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body published an annual report with annexes. From time to time, members wrote memoranda for the use of their colleagues and reports for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

48. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) felt that the United Nations could not ask the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body to work between sessions without remuneration. It had become almost impossible to find suitably qualified and impartial persons who also had private means. He was accordingly in favour, in principle, of the payment of honoraria to the members of the Board and Drug Supervisory Body. However, he would like to have details on the way in which the principle would be applied. The Advisory Committee might be able to submit satisfactory proposals to the Committee.

49. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) explained that the Advisory Committee had based its recommendation that honoraria should not be paid to the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body on General Assembly resolution 677 (VII), in which the Assembly had laid down a principle which applied to the members of organs like the Administrative Tribunal, the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body, as well as to special rapporteurs. In the circumstances, the Advisory Committee was bound to recommend that the principle should be respected; only the Committee could decide otherwise.

50. The Secretary-General's report (A/2687) contained the background information necessary to enable the Committee to come to a decision, although the Advisory Committee would, of course, submit further proposals to the Committee, if the Committee so desired. In conclusion, he pointed out that the adoption of the Secretary-General's proposals would involve an annual expenditure of \$7,300; the Secretary-General had submitted his proposals to the President and members of the Permanent Central Opium Board, who had approved them.

51. Mr. ASECIO WUNDERLICH (Guatemala) pointed out that the Committee had approved the pay-

ment of honoraria to the Chairman and rapporteurs of the International Law Commission and that the question of principle had therefore been decided.

52. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that the Secretary-General discussed certain special characteristics of work of the Drug Supervisory Body and the Permanent Central Opium Board in his report (A/2687). Both bodies did extremely useful work in a specialized field, and as the Norwegian representative had rightly pointed out, could not make use of the services of experts without remunerating them.

53. It was clear from the preamble of General Assembly resolution 677 (VII) that the members of the organs to which the resolution applied might normally expect to be remunerated by their Governments. However, the President of the Permanent Central Opium Board had said that the members of the Permanent Central Board and Drug Supervisory Body should be independent. The Committee should bear that consideration in mind.

54. Mr. M. I. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) thought that the Committee should first decide the question of principle. He asked the President of the Permanent Central Opium Board whether the difference between the honoraria suggested for the President and Vice-President and for the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body was justified.

55. Sir Harry GREENFIELD (President of the Permanent Central Opium Board) explained that the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body had not formally approved the Secretary-General's proposals. They felt that it was not for them to raise the delicate question of honoraria. However, the Secretary-General's proposals had seemed satisfactory and they had raised no objections.

56. Replying to the representative of the Union of South Africa, he stated that the President and Vice-President did most of the work and that the difference in scale between their honoraria and those of the members would be justified.

57. Mr. SAPRU (India) shared the Belgian representative's views. The members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body should not receive any remuneration from their Governments. He thought that the Advisory Committee should make new proposals, taking into account the views expressed in the course of the debate.

58. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee was willing to submit proposals to the Committee, provided that the Committee would first take a decision on the principle of paying honoraria to the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body.

59. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) also agreed with the Belgian representative. In his opinion, General Assembly resolution 677 (VII) did not apply either to the Permanent Central Opium Board or to the Drug Supervisory Body, whose members should not receive any remuneration from their Governments. The Legal Department should be asked to give the Committee an

interpretation of the provisions of that resolution; the Committee would have to determine how far it was bound by those provisions.

60. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) thought that, on the whole, the provisions of General Assembly resolution 677 (VII) did apply to the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body. However, the arguments of the President of the Permanent Central Board were, he thought, convincing.

61. The Committee had recently decided at the 434th meeting not to pay honoraria to the members of the Administrative Tribunal although his delegation had always considered that the members of the Tribunal should be remunerated. If the Committee decided to pay honoraria to the members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body, it should reverse its decision with regard to the Administrative Tribunal. As was suggested by the Norwegian representative, the Advisory Committee should submit proposals as to the best means of remunerating the members of the bodies concerned.

62. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take a decision on the principle of paying honoraria to members of the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body, and then refer the question to the Advisory Committee for detailed study.

63. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) supported that suggestion.

64. Mr. ASHA (Syria) thought that the Committee should be logical. After deciding not to pay honoraria to the members of the Administrative Tribunal, it now had before it a proposal to pay honoraria to members of other bodies. It was a thorny question on which many delegations were probably not yet able to state their position. He accordingly moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The motion was adopted by 34 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.