



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Budget estimates for the financial year 1953: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2125 and Add.1, A/C.5/498 and Add.1, A/C.5/500, A/C.5/L.184); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2157, A/2245, A/C.5/499) (<i>continued</i>)	
First reading (<i>continued</i>)	81

Chairman: Brigadier-General Carlos P. ROMULO (Philippines).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1953:
(a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2125 and Add.1, A/C.5/498 and Add.1, A/C.5/500, A/C.5/L.184); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2157, A/2245, A/C.5/499) (*continued*)

[Item 42]*

First reading (*continued*)

UNITED KINGDOM PROPOSAL TO REDUCE THE TOTAL APPROPRIATION FOR 1953 (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to discuss the proposal submitted by the United Kingdom delegation at the 352nd meeting (A/C.5/L.184).

2. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that he had studied the United Kingdom proposal with the greatest interest, the principle of which he approved. He had, however, already carried out the task which the United Kingdom delegation wished him to undertake, and within a week would be in a position to submit his own suggestions which the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions could then examine.

3. Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom) was happy to note that the Secretary-General intended to make additional reductions, thus meeting the Committee's wishes. The United Kingdom delegation felt, however, that the Secretary-General's statement did not justify the withdrawal of the proposal it had submitted on 3 November, not because it thought that the Secretary-General would not try to make the most stringent reductions possible, but because that proposal

had already been supported by a large number of delegations.

4. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) said that his delegation was prepared to support the United Kingdom proposal provided that the Secretary-General informed the Advisory Committee about the suggestions which that proposal invited him to submit. The Fifth Committee did not at present possess sufficient data to enable it to decide what repercussions such a proposal would have on the Organization as a whole.

5. Mr. STRAUCH (Brazil) while paying a tribute to the spirit behind the United Kingdom proposal, thought that it had been submitted both too late and too soon. Too late because three-quarters of the budget estimates for 1953 had already been approved, and if the committee now adopted a proposal to make a global reduction in the appropriations requested, it would be necessary to begin the process all over again—the preparation of the budget estimates, their examination by the Advisory Committee and discussion by the Fifth Committee—or approve the reduction suggested without discussion. Too soon because the basic factors on which the stabilization of the budget depended in the last resort would enter into the picture only when the administrative reorganization of the Secretariat had been carried out.

6. The Brazilian delegation wished to know the meaning of "administrative expenses", and also whether the Advisory Committee could recommend larger reductions than those which the Secretary-General would shortly suggest and, lastly, whether the Fifth Committee would in the meantime continue the first reading of the budget estimates.

7. The Brazilian delegation wished to make a counter-proposal that a special paragraph should be included in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assem-

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

bly requesting the Secretary-General to do everything possible to ensure that 1953 expenditure did not exceed the sum of \$48,700,000, and to prepare the budget estimates for the 1954 financial year on the basis of that maximum figure.

8. Mr. ISNOR (Canada) thought that it was obvious that the United Kingdom should not withdraw its proposal. From the debate on that proposal the Fifth Committee could obtain a definite idea of the directives to be given to the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee and then note the result of their consultations.

9. The United Kingdom proposal was very important as it aimed at stabilizing the Organization's budget. The Canadian Government had always emphasized the need for allocating appropriations to the Organization's most important tasks. Furthermore, Member States were faced with ever-increasing difficulties in the payment of their contributions. The United Kingdom proposal was therefore very timely and was supported by the Canadian delegation because it aimed at fixing the budget at a figure only very slightly above that for 1952.

10. The Fifth Committee should try to effect the maximum economy consistent with the efficient working of the Organization and the accomplishment of its tasks. Unanimity had been reached on the goal to be achieved and it should therefore not be difficult to discover how it could be attained. While the Canadian delegation had felt obligated to oppose USSR proposals which would have resulted in arbitrary and harmful reductions, it considered that the United Kingdom proposal was precisely what the Committee was seeking. Supposing that the Secretary-General encountered some difficulty in distributing the reduction contemplated, he could at least submit to the Fifth Committee a certain number of solutions which the latter would study in the light of the United Kingdom proposal. It would be useful, in that connexion, if the Fifth Committee could hear the Advisory Committee's comments. It would then be in a position to achieve its objective. Should the United Kingdom proposal be rejected the Committee could always continue to reduce certain items of expenditure, but the Canadian delegation thought that the first method was better than the second. It thus hoped that all delegations, together with the Secretary-General, would combine their efforts and maintain the 1953 budget within the limits suggested by the United Kingdom delegation.

11. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) said that his delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal and would vote for it. He hoped, however, that the economies made as a result of that proposal would be distributed with the greatest care and would not in any way impair the work being done by the Organization, especially in the economic and social fields and in connexion with the Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Egyptian delegation believed it possible to make large economies without impairing the Organization's work. It would be sufficient to reduce administrative expenses and the expenditure incurred in connexion with certain items of secondary importance.

12. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway), referring to the United Kingdom proposal, asked whether the Chairman could follow the usual procedure, which was to request

the Secretary-General to examine that proposal with the Advisory Committee and then inform the Fifth Committee of the results of that study.

13. Mr. THORSING (Sweden) fully supported the Norwegian representative's suggestion.

14. Mr. CARRIZOSA (Colombia) thought it would be better if the Committee did not come to a decision on the United Kingdom proposal until it knew exactly how far the proposed economies would affect the Secretariat and the various projects undertaken by the United Nations.

15. Mr. NEHRU (India) thought, on the contrary, that the Committee should take a decision on the United Kingdom proposal without delay. The Indian delegation could not approve that proposal, which aimed at making an arbitrary reduction in the budget as a whole. It was not a question of effecting economies at any price, but of using the funds placed at the Organization's disposal in the most rational way possible. A global and arbitrary reduction might be an excellent method at a national level, but it was an unduly severe and dangerous method at an international level. The situation was not so serious that the United Nations budget had to be axed. It would be sufficient to prune it here and there, and the Committee had at its disposal an excellent instrument for doing so—the Advisory Committee. As the Fifth Committee had not yet taken a decision on the Advisory Committee's recommendations, it would be illogical to invite the Secretary-General to suggest additional reductions without telling him in what items of expenditure those reductions should be made. The Indian delegation regretted that the Fifth Committee had already thought fit to send two questions to the Advisory Committee in order that the latter and the Secretary-General might seek a compromise solution. Such a practice was a bad thing as it might turn the Advisory Committee into a negotiating—body, and make it lose its impartial character.

16. Referring to the USSR proposal that the Advisory Committee should review the working of the Geneva Office, he suggested that the Committee might follow that precedent by requesting the Advisory Committee to review each year a different part of the Secretariat. Such inquiries would lead to substantial and well-placed economies.

17. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) said that all measures taken so far had been ineffective in preventing a continual increase in the United Nations budget and the situation called for exceptional and more drastic measures. It was right to recognize that the increase in the budget was not due solely to administrative expenses. Member States were partly responsible for that situation as they often asked the Organization to undertake new work without due consideration of the expenses and the work involved. As the United Kingdom proposal would somewhat restrain the increase in the budget estimates, the Netherlands delegation welcomed it but, having some doubts on certain points, wished to have more information about it before reaching a decision. She therefore wished to know whether the Fifth Committee would continue the first reading of the budget while it was waiting for the Secretary-General's proposal to be submitted. Secondly, she thought that the reduction of \$735,000 suggested by the United

Kingdom delegation could not be applied solely to administrative expenses without a serious disorganization of the Secretariat's services. Such a reduction should probably be applied to some extent to non-priority projects. In that case, the Fifth Committee should inform the Secretary-General, perhaps at the end of the first reading, what items of expenditure apart from administrative expenses might be reduced. Lastly, the Netherlands delegation wondered whether it would not be useful for the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to have some discussion on those questions, before their reports reached the Fifth Committee at the beginning of the second reading of the budget estimates.

18. Moreover, the United Kingdom proposal was an exceptional measure which, although perhaps justified in view of the existing situation, might in the future not be the best solution to the problem of stabilizing the budget. The Fifth Committee should recognize that it was rather difficult for the Secretary-General to draw up budget estimates without knowing what amount the General Assembly was prepared to approve. It might perhaps be appropriate for the Assembly to establish for 1954, if not an absolute maximum figure, certain limits within which the Secretary-General would attempt to keep the budget estimates. That was a suggestion which the Fifth Committee could study later.

19. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) favoured neither an absolute maximum figure nor an arbitrary reduction as both were solutions which might prejudice the essential work of the United Nations and hamper other activities as well. The New Zealand delegation agreed with the Indian representative in saying that the Advisory Committee should at all costs avoid becoming a negotiating or, even worse, a bargaining committee. Like the Brazilian representative, he also thought if the United Kingdom proposal was adopted it would be very difficult to review the whole question of the budget estimates again from the beginning. Before deciding, therefore, he would like to know the effects of such a reduction.

20. Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) said his delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal, which met with the desire for economy consistently expressed by the Cuban Government. Like the Mexican representative, he thought it would be useful for the Fifth Committee to know on precisely which activities the proposed reductions would be made and to head the Secretary-General's proposals as well as the Advisory Committee's observations before taking a decision on the United Kingdom proposal. The Cuban delegation shared the Norwegian representative's view that the United Kingdom proposal should be transmitted to the Secretary-General and to the Advisory Committee.

21. The CHAIRMAN said he had just received a United States amendment to the United Kingdom proposal which suggested that the beginning of the proposal (A/C.5/L.184) should be replaced by the following: "The Fifth Committee welcomes the assurance of the Secretary-General that he will submit proposals . . .". He asked the United Kingdom representative whether he would accept the amendment.

22. Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom) said that he would accept the United States amendment, if

the delegations which favoured his proposal had no objections.

23. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would support the United Kingdom proposal, although it considered the proposed reduction inadequate. The USSR proposals would have permitted more substantial reductions to be made. His delegation was however, prepared to view favourably any proposal to reduce excess expenditure and to increase the efficiency of the Secretariat.

24. He could not accept the Canadian representative's statement that the USSR proposals would have led to arbitrary cuts. As a matter of fact, the USSR delegation always considered the solution to a problem very carefully before submitting any proposals and always took into account the views of the Advisory Committee and of the Fifth Committee.

25. If the Fifth Committee adopted the United Kingdom proposal, it should still ask the Secretary-General to submit the proposals he had in mind. He reserved the right to speak again when the Fifth Committee reviewed the Secretary-General's proposals.

26. The United States amendment duplicated the statement made by the Secretary-General at the opening of the meeting and the USSR delegation was not prepared, therefore, to accept it.

27. Mr. BARTOL (Argentina) remarked that in principle his delegation was in favour of economy and savings whatever their form, provided that the essential work of the United Nations did not suffer as a result. Accordingly, his delegation could not take a decision on the United Kingdom proposal until it knew on exactly what items the proposed reductions would be made. Agreeing as he did on that point with the Mexican and Cuban representatives, he asked that the United Kingdom proposal should be referred to the Advisory Committee which would consider it jointly with the Secretary-General. It was obvious that reductions could be made, if perhaps not to the extent proposed by the United Kingdom delegation.

28. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) thought that there was a certain relationship between the United Kingdom proposal and the other item on the agenda for that meeting, the adoption of Spanish by the Economic and Social Council. A balance must be achieved between income and expenditure without sacrificing any essential activity. It was doubtless not too much to say that saving of approximately \$750,000 could be made in a budget of over \$48,000,000, but it would be very helpful to discuss the proposals worked out by the Secretary-General in collaboration with the Advisory Committee before taking any decision on the United Kingdom proposal. The Fifth Committee could not adopt the proposal without knowing what sacrifices its decision would entail. The Uruguayan delegation therefore wholeheartedly endorsed the statements of the representatives of Argentina, Cuba and Mexico; although, in principle, it supported the United Kingdom proposal it felt the question could not be isolated from the other items of the agenda. He would withhold his decision until he had seen the examples and explanations to be submitted by the Secretary-General in his report.

29. The SECRETARY-GENERAL suggested that the Fifth Committee should follow its customary procedure. His report, which would be submitted to the Fifth Committee after the first and prior to the second reading, would be studied by the Advisory Committee, it being understood that the Fifth Committee was free to follow or not to follow the Advisory Committee's advice as it deemed fit.

30. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) pointed out that the United Kingdom proposal raised not only a question of procedure but also of method. Could the Fifth Committee continue its work in the usual way or should it change its approach? As the New Zealand and Indian representatives had said, the methods employed by a diplomatic conference did not necessarily coincide with those of national parliaments. The Belgian delegation was wary of radical reductions. A head of department could conceivably be ordered to distribute a reduction if he was also told exactly in what sections the cuts should be made; but it would be dangerous to give anyone complete freedom to slash the general budget of the United Nations at random, as that might entail the elimination of measures which had many ardent supporters. The Fifth Committee might be faced with a mass of proposals which it would be unable to examine in detail at the second reading without once again going over the ground covered at the first reading. As the Brazilian representative had said, the United Kingdom proposal had been submitted too late. It was to be feared that the second reading might develop into a series of bargainings. Before deciding, however, his delegation would like to hear the views of the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee on the new approach.

31. Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom) wished to give some additional explanations regarding the United Kingdom proposal. In the first place, it should be understood that inasmuch as the figures given were provisional the proposed total of \$48,700,000 was also subject to adjustment. Secondly, the proposed reduction of \$735,000 could be made on certain selected programmes which the Fifth Committee could decide to suppress; or it could take the form of marginal reductions in all sections of the budget whether those had been already approved or not. To the extent that the first type of economy was adopted, the Secretary-General would have no difficulty in following the Fifth Committee's decisions. But with respect to the other type of economy the Secretary-General would himself submit proposals to the Fifth Committee for reductions in general administrative expenses under all sections of the budget. By general administrative expenses he meant staff costs, temporary assistance, travel, printing costs and the like. Such cuts need not endanger the activities themselves.

32. In reply to questions to which his previous statements had given only partial satisfaction, he explained to the Netherlands representative, in the first place, that his delegation had no objection to the Fifth Committee's continuing its consideration of the Advisory Committee's recommendations. Secondly, it was the Fifth Committee's duty to specify clearly which items could be suppressed, if necessary, but it was to be hoped that a significant part of the economies aimed at would be through administrative reductions rather than through

the suppression of programmes. Thirdly, it would certainly be very useful for the Secretary-General to go through his proposals with the Advisory Committee before transmitting them to the Fifth Committee.

33. Despite the Brazilian representative's remarks, the United Kingdom delegation felt that its proposal did not come too late in the budget process. Any body dealing with a budget was entitled to call for a fresh presentation of the budget estimates. His delegation was making a proposal which was completely in order and one which did not prejudice the issue.

34. The Colombian representative could rest assured that the Secretary-General's proposals would not hamper the carrying out of projects including the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Economic and Social Council and its functional commissions. The proposals related mainly to administrative expenses. If the Fifth Committee adopted the United Kingdom proposal and achieved the purposes of that proposal, his delegation would not oppose the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Economic and Social Council.

35. The comments of the representatives of India and of New Zealand seemed to indicate that there had been a misunderstanding. It was not a matter of arbitrarily reducing allocations for activities or even for administrative expenses. The reductions might reach a maximum of 5 per cent of the allocation for certain sections but in most cases they would be much lower than that. Was there any reason to talk of drastic reductions when the total cuts would amount to less than 2 per cent of the entire budget?

36. The Cuban representative was concerned to know where the reductions would be made. In that connexion, it should be recalled that it was the Fifth Committee's duty to say where the cuts should be made and to take a decision on the Secretary-General's proposals.

37. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) supported the United Kingdom proposal as amended by the United States.

38. Mr. THORSING (Sweden) thought that the United Kingdom's proposal for economy might be deceptive for on the one hand there was a question of reducing the budget by \$735,000 and on the other hand of increasing it by \$361,400 for the adoption of Spanish as a working language of the Council. That did not appear to be a very consistent policy. His delegation would, however, support the United Kingdom proposal as it wished to show by its vote that it was particularly interested in any proposals for a practical reduction which the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee could suggest.

39. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) wished it to be clearly understood that he was wholly in agreement with the Secretary-General in his recommendation to follow the usual procedure. It was not for the Advisory Committee to seek a compromise; the Fifth Committee was the body to take decisions on the political level. In the particular situation arising from the United Kingdom proposal, the Secretary-General would prepare a report for examination by the Fifth Committee. During that examination, it would

issue certain directives (particularly in regard to projects) which would serve as a basis for the Advisory Committee's subsequent recommendations to the Committee on how best to attain the set objectives without impairing United Nations work.

40. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico) would like to allay the Swedish representative's fears regarding the adoption by the Economic and Social Council of Spanish as a working language. The Latin-American delegations were of the opinion that the figure indicated in the Secretary-General's estimates (A/C.5/501) could be substantially reduced. Furthermore, the Secretary-General, in drawing up the budget estimates, should seek to increase his income from certain sources, in particular that accruing from garage rentals, the rate for which could easily be raised by 50 per cent.

41. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) thanked the United Kingdom representative for his additional explanations in reply to Belgian objections, and the Chairman of the Advisory Committee for clarifying the procedure to be followed, thereby allaying the Belgian delegation's fears. As a result, he would support the United Kingdom proposal as amended by the United States.

42. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was sorry that the United Kingdom representative had accepted the United States amendment, as it weakened the original proposal. He took the same view as the Swedish representative regarding the adoption by the Economic and Social Council of Spanish as a working language and thought that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had correctly interpreted the Committee's role. Considering that the United Kingdom proposal represented an attempt to reduce by a definite proportion, however moderate, the administrative expenditure and that the Secretary-General would have to submit proposals to that end to the Committee, the USSR delegation would vote for the United Kingdom proposal.

The United Kingdom proposal (A/C.5/L.184), as amended by the United States, was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

43. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) explained that the Danish delegation had been obliged to abstain because, while approving the spirit of the United Kingdom proposal, it doubted whether the method chosen was the best. The total of \$48,700,000 might be too low or too high, depending on what decisions the Committee would take on questions of substance.

44. Mr. CALO (Philippines) held the same viewpoint as the Danish representative and had therefore abstained from voting.

SECTION 3. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

45. The CHAIRMAN invited the President of the Economic and Social Council to outline to the Committee the reasons which had led to the Council's decision to hold its sixteenth session in Geneva.

46. Mr. Amjad ALI (Pakistan), President of the Economic and Social Council, recalled that the Council at its 657th plenary meeting, had adopted by 8 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions the French proposal to designate Geneva as the venue for the sixteenth session of the

Council (E/L.423); he reviewed the chief arguments adduced for and against the proposal.

47. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that he would not linger over the juridical aspects of the matter. He recalled, however, the terms of Articles 60 and 66 of the Charter and stressed that the words "as required", in the second paragraph of Article 72, did, in fact, refer to the requirements of the Council. The General Assembly had certainly the right to grant or refuse budgetary provision for the execution of decisions taken by other United Nations bodies. Yet it was nevertheless true that the Council's decision to hold its sixteenth session in Geneva had been taken under the terms of its rules of procedure and with a full knowledge of its requirements. The Council had, among other things, had the advice of the directors of the specialized agencies and of the Secretariat services concerned.

48. The Australian representative had brought out a different aspect of the question of procedure by stressing at the previous meeting that the Committee could not go further than making a recommendation as to ways and means to the General Assembly. That might well be so in theory, but in practice the plenary Committee was empowered to decide on all aspects of any administrative and budgetary question. The Belgian delegation, for its part, had always found the repetition of debates undesirable, save where a matter going beyond the competence of a single Main Committee was in question or where the competent Committee's decision had been reached by a very small majority and hence was open to revision. It was better for the Committee to shoulder its responsibilities, feeling that the General Assembly would, as a matter of course, confirm its recommendation. Moreover, the second reading of the budget gave the Committee a chance to reconsider decisions taken during the first reading.

49. The United Kingdom representative had proposed that consideration of the matter of the Council's sixteenth session should be postponed until the Committee took up the more general question of the over-all calendar of conferences and their apportionment between Headquarters and the Geneva Office. That would not be a logical procedure: it would be wrong to consider a question of immediate interest and long-term projects at one and the same time.

50. The Committee was faced with a decision of the Council regarding its sixteenth session, with its unalterable consequences. The Council had taken a decision in full knowledge of the facts. No new factor had arisen since the fifteenth session to cause the Council to go back upon its decision: it had been aware of the budgetary situation. The Committee, before assuming the responsibility of opposing that decision, would have to weight the implications and dangers of its action.

51. A similar discussion had taken place in the Committee regarding the Council's eleventh session, when it had been decided not to grant the necessary provision for holding that session at Geneva.¹ The General Assembly, however, had set aside its recommendation on the ground that the Council was the sole judge of what should be done in the interests of its work.² Furthermore, any decision by the Committee designed to over-

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Fifth Committee*, 210th meeting.

² *Ibid.*, *Plenary Meetings*, 276th meeting.

rule the Council might lead the Council to think that it was to such a degree subject to budgetary tutelage that it was no longer at liberty to apply its own rules of procedure, whereby it had the right to decide the place of its meetings. Lately, there was a risk that the Committee would upset the established calendar of conferences, which would lead to additional expenditure and impede the smooth operation of the Council's work. From the administrative viewpoint, also, the schedule of staff leave would have to be completely revised, thus adding to expenditure. Moreover, the technical services of the Headquarters Secretariat would be overwhelmed with work resulting in delayed translations and publications. If the sixteenth session of the Council were to be held at Headquarters, the Secretariat would have more work than during the peak period of a General Assembly session and that at a season when staff output was affected by the summer heat and humidity of New York.

52. In those circumstances, he deemed it wiser to vote the necessary funds for holding the sessions of the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva.

53. Mr. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) cited the pertinent remarks of the Secretary-General in paragraphs 5 and 18 (b) of the Secretary-General's report on the programme of conferences at Headquarters and Geneva (A/2243) which the South African delegation endorsed. Moreover, it considered that all bodies usually located at Headquarters should hold their meetings there, particularly in 1953. It would accordingly vote against the granting of additional funds to enable the Economic and Social Council to hold its sixteenth session at Geneva.

54. Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom), recalling his proposal to postpone consideration of the matter under discussion, withdrew the proposal and suggested a vote at the present meeting.

55. Mr. CALO (Philippines) stated that he had not had the slightest intention in his earlier remarks (354th meeting) of casting aspersions on the facilities provided by the Geneva Office of the United Nations. He recognized that the Office formed part of the United Nations, but the General Assembly's express wish that bodies usually located at Headquarters should hold their meetings there should not be overlooked. Observance of that wish would not necessarily diminish the use to be made of the Geneva Office since the specialized agencies and other bodies usually located in Geneva would continue to meet there. His remarks, moreover, had applied exclusively to the year 1953, not to subsequent years.

56. Decisions taken by the Council were not necessarily binding upon the General Assembly. The Council merely noted the financial implications of its proposed action whereas the General Assembly was the sovereign body, more representative than the Council, whose function it was to give detailed examination to the budgetary implications of decisions taken by other United Nations agencies and to pronounce upon them.

57. The work of the Council for an improvement of the lot of the under-developed countries had been cited. He certainly acknowledged the value of such action but did not feel that the atmosphere in Geneva

was necessarily more conducive to its planning. It was in point of fact more a matter of the goodwill of States than of climate. Furthermore, he had at no time desired to qualify Council sessions at Geneva as picnic parties. He had thought that there would be a danger of hurting the Council's prestige in the under-developed countries by undertaking additional expenditure of more than \$200,000. The number of experts and scholarships and the amount of demonstration equipment that such a sum if devoted to other purposes, would make available for the under-developed countries could well be imagined. Lastly, he recalled that one State Member of the Council had been unable to meet the travel costs of its delegation and had been forced to resign from the Council on that account alone.

58. In those circumstances, the Philippine delegation would vote against the additional appropriations requested, and asked that the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the sessions of the Council and of the Commission on Human Rights (A/2245) should be put to the vote.

59. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) did not in principle object if organs that ordinarily met at Headquarters occasionally met at Geneva. The special reasons, however, that had been valid in former years no longer applied, because the Headquarters of the United Nations had been completed and should be fully utilized. If the Council was to hold its most important sessions at Geneva, it might well be asked why a special conference room had been provided for it at Headquarters.

60. His delegation would be prepared to admit of exceptions to the rule once the long-term programme of conferences had been completed, but in the instance at hand it would vote against the additional appropriations requested.

61. Mr. HALL (United States of America) said that his delegation attached very great importance to the Geneva Office of the United Nations. It did not, however, believe that the Council should meet elsewhere than at Headquarters in 1953 and would therefore vote against the additional appropriations requested for that purpose.

62. He said that he would be in favour of a well drafted plan for the most efficient use of the facilities available both at the Geneva Office and at Headquarters. He supported the views of the representatives of France and the Philippines on the authority of the Fifth Committee in budget matters.

63. Mr. CARRIZOSA (Colombia) thought that from the budgetary and administrative point of view it was inadvisable to vote appropriations enabling United Nations organs to meet elsewhere than at Headquarters. He recalled that the Committee was responsible for reducing expenses as far as possible. Neither the Economic and Social Council nor any other important organ of the United Nations should refuse the facilities which had been provided at Headquarters. The question was not, moreover, coming up for the first time. He recalled what had been said on the matter at the third regular session of the General Assembly³ and said he would vote against the additional appropriations

³ *Ibid.*, Third Session, Fifth Committee, 165th and 166th meetings.

requested for the sixteenth session of the Council at Geneva.

64. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) regretted, as did the representative of the United Kingdom, that the Committee had been unable to consider first the more general question of apportioning conferences between Headquarters and the Geneva Office. He hoped that the Committee's decision on the sixteenth session of the Economic and Social Council would not prejudice the results of its study of the general problem.

65. His delegation shared the Belgian delegation's views on the advantages of Geneva. It should not, moreover, be forgotten that the climate so often referred to during the debate was not to be interpreted as referring only to the weather. Although he recognized the authority of the Fifth Committee in budget matters, he preferred not to vote against the carrying out of a decision of the Council.

66. He said that one possible disadvantage of the presence of permanent delegations in New York was that by residing in New York and being in daily contact with officials of the United Nations Administration, the members of the permanent delegations might gradually become disposed to accept the views of the Administration more easily than the views of representatives coming from their own countries to take part in a session.

67. Without prejudice to the attitude that it would adopt when a general plan for the apportionment of conferences was considered, the Norwegian delegation would vote for the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee.

68. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) recalled that his delegation in the Economic and Social Council had abstained from voting on the French proposal for holding the sixteenth session of the Council at Geneva. He wished to explain his attitude on the important question before the Committee. His delegation did not share the view that the Fifth Committee could make recommendations likely to encourage or discourage the Economic and Social Council in its decisions on questions within the Council's jurisdiction. His delegation could not agree with the delegation which had said that the Committee could, by a decision on a budgetary matter, set aside a decision of the Economic and Social Council.

69. It was true that the Committee was acting on behalf of the General Assembly and that the Economic and Social Council was also subject to the Assembly. The Committee could thus make recommendations to the Assembly on Council decisions that had or might have financial implications. He believed, however, that the Committee's debate should not go beyond the financial implications. In other words, the Committee was acting on behalf of the General Assembly only in administrative and budgetary matters and was not qualified to concern itself with the substance of the Council's decisions. The Committee therefore clearly had no power to approve or disapprove decisions taken by the Council after a thorough study of technical matters within its jurisdiction. Only a plenary meeting of the General Assembly could take such a decision, and it had not delegated that power to the Fifth Committee.

70. He was convinced that when the Fifth Committee's terms of reference had been drawn up there had been no intention of empowering it to interfere in any way with the technical activities of the Economic and Social Council. It would, in fact, be very dangerous if the Fifth Committee were permitted to encroach upon areas which under the Charter fell within the jurisdiction of other United Nations bodies.

71. The Egyptian delegation accordingly believed that the budget estimates and the financial implications of decisions taken by other organs should be dealt with by the Fifth Committee in the form in which they were presented to it by the Secretary-General, consideration being given to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. In carrying out its functions, however, the Committee was not entitled to deal with the substance of the decisions communicated to it nor to oppose the carrying out of decisions taken by other organs in the exercise of their powers.

72. Mr. ISNOR (Canada) would not discuss the question of the Committee's jurisdiction. His delegation recognized the undeniable advantage of close relations between the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies, but it had always been in favour of having the principal organs of the United Nations meet at Headquarters. He understood perfectly the advantages that would result from the Council's going to Geneva. He pointed out, however, that the Council could accomplish just as much work if it met at Headquarters and he recalled the provisions of General Assembly resolution 534 (VI).

73. The more general question of apportioning conferences between Headquarters and the Geneva Office would be considered later by the Committee. From a budgetary point of view, however, 1953 would be a difficult year and the additional expenditure caused by the Council's going to Geneva would bring the 1953 budget up to a figure which could not easily be borne. His delegation would therefore vote against the appropriations requested. That vote would be without prejudice to the attitude which it would adopt when the more general question was considered. He realized that the special facilities available at Geneva for conferences should be used to the utmost, and he was prepared, for example, to support a proposal under which the Council would meet at Geneva every other year.

74. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) regretted the Council's decision, and would vote against the appropriations necessary to give effect to that decision. He believed that the Committee had the right and duty to consider the financial implications of decisions taken by all organs of the United Nations. The freedom of action of those organs was limited by the Committee's authority in budget matters. The representative of Belgium had spoken of budgetary tutelage. Mr. Pachachi believed that such tutelage did exist and that it was justified by the Charter. It had been said that setting aside a decision of the Council would constitute a dangerous precedent, but he, on the contrary, thought that such action would be very salutary. He pointed out further that the Council had taken its decision by a majority of only eight votes, while the committee consisted of sixty members.

75. Mr. CHENG (China) said that his delegation's attitude would be the same as in the Council and that

it would vote against the Council's going to Geneva. He pointed out, however, that if the sixteenth session of the Council were held at Headquarters, some changes in the programme of conferences would be required. He therefore wondered whether it might not be well to establish a sub-committee to consider an adjustment of that programme.

76. Mr. BARTOL (Argentina) said that he shared the opinion of the representative of Egypt on the substance of the question and would vote for the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee.

77. Mr. STRAUCH (Brazil) did not believe that the Committee could or should nullify the Council's decision. He also believed that the question where to hold the sixteenth session of the Council should be considered as part of the more general question of the apportionment of conferences between Headquarters and the Geneva Office. His delegation would abstain from voting on the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

78. Mr. LALL (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services) said that the programme of conferences would not have to be adjusted if the sixteenth session of the Council were held at Headquarters.

79. Mr. GANEM (France) would not return to the constitutional aspect of the question. He observed that by the spring of 1953 the Council would have held three consecutive sessions in New York and that in those circumstances it might be inadvisable to deny it the right to hold its sixteenth session away from Headquarters. He recalled the important fact that all the heads of specialized agencies had urged the holding of

the Council's session in Geneva. The Committee was constantly being asked to ensure closer co-operation between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Was the Committee going to nullify a decision which the Council had taken for the particular purpose of bringing about such closer co-operation? He thought that to do so would be very unwise and he would vote for the necessary appropriations.

80. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) would vote for the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee. He believed that as a rule the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations organs could and should occasionally meet away from Headquarters.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/2245, para. 6) for an appropriation of \$120,000 (sections 3 and 20), representing the estimated cost of holding the sixteenth session of the Council at Geneva instead of at Headquarters.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 17 votes to 14, with 11 abstentions.

82. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/2245, para. 7) for an appropriation of \$40,000 (sections 3 and 20), representing the estimated cost of holding the session of the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva instead of at Headquarters.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 18 votes to 13, with 11 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.