FIFTH COMMITTEE 338th

MEETING

Thursday, 31 January 1952, at 3 p.m.



Dano

CONTENTS

1	uge
Adoption of the Rapporteur's draft report (A/C.5/L.170, A/C.5/L.171)	327
Questions concerning the liquidation of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (A/1893, A/C.5/494)	328
 Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/493, A/C.5/495, A/C.5/L.172); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2099, A/2102) 	
Part II, section 5, chapter IV: United Nations Tribunal in Eritrea	329
Part II, section 5, chapter VI: United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine	329
Report of Sub-Committee 8 of the Fifth Committee, set up to review the principles governing the work of the Department of Public Information	329

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

Adoption of the Rapporteur's draft reports (A/ C.5/L.170, A/C.5/L.171)

1. Mr. STANSFIELD (Canada) proposed two amendments to the Rapporteur's draft report on the permanent staff regulations of the United Nations (A/C.5/L.170). The first suggested that paragraph 5 (f) should be replaced by the following: "his intention to place as many of the staff on permanent appointments as could be done with prudence so reducing the number of uncertain cases to a minimum; to reserve temporary appointments for beginning periods of service, for such unavoidable cases as employment for sessions of the General Assembly and other requirements of short duration, and for a small number of staff members who may not be granted permanency because of formal restrictions". The second suggested a new sub-paragraph (g) reading as follows, to be inserted in paragraph 5: "his assurance that the review of status of staff members on temporary appointments would be conducted with scrupulous fairness towards the individuals concerned; that those who received termination notices would be able to utilize the machinery of the Appeals Board which advises the Secretary-General; and that within the broad standards of the interest of the United Nations' it would be the practice in most cases to require the Bureau of Personnel to inform staff members of the reasons for termination". The existing sub-paragraph (g) would become subparagraph (\check{h}) .

2. Mr. Stansfield said that the Rapporteur had accepted those amendments, and remarked that they merely reproduced parts of the Secretary-General's statement of 21 January (A/C.5/L.164). The Canadian delegation attached the greatest importance to the assurances given by the Secretary-General on that occasion. It was largely because of those assurances that Canada had voted for the draft regulations.

3. Mr. ASHA (Syria), Rapporteur, stated that the Netherlands delegation had asked him to include the following words before the sentence beginning "It then adopted" in paragraph 14 of his draft report (A/C.5/L.170): "Moreover, it was emphasized that the reference to increments should not be interpreted as meaning that increments would be automatically granted". At the Netherlands delegation's request, he also proposed to reverse the order of annexes II and IV.

4. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thanked the Rapporteur for the interpretation he had given of regulation 9.3.

5. In reply to a question by Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), the CHAIRMAN stated that, although the General Assembly could of course make any amendments it wished to the text proposed by the Fifth Committee, that text was nevertheless in principle definitive.

6. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked that the report should mention the reasons why the USSR had been unable to vote for the text proposed by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for regula-



Official Records

tion 9.1. Those reasons were explained in the summary record of the 335th meeting.

7. Mr. TRESERRA (Mexico) and Mr. DONOSO (Chile) observed that the Spanish text of the draft report contained a number of inaccuracies.

8. The CHAIRMAN stated that the French and Spanish texts of document A/C.5/L.170 would be revised.

The draft report of the Rapporteur on the permanent staff regulations of the United Nations (A/C.5/L.170), amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Canadian, Netherlands and USSR delegations, was adopted.

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Commission to consider the draft report of the Rapporteur on the Headquarters of the United Nations (A/C.5/L.171).

The draft report of the Rapporteur on the Headquarters of the United Nations (A/C.5/L.171) was adopted.

Questions concerning the liquidation of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation (A/1893, A/C.5/494)

[Item 61]*

10. Mr. GANEM (France) gave a brief account of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. In 1946 the rights of the League of Nations in the Institute had been transferred to the United Nations, and pursuant to resolution 71 (I), the United Nations had authorized UNESCO to utilize the Institute's assets, The final particularly furnishings and documents. liquidation of the Institute's assets had, however, not yet been effected. Mr. Ganem paid a tribute to Mr. Wilgress, a former member of the Canadian delegation and a former Chairman of the Fifth Committee, by whose efforts the position as regards the assets of the League of Nations had been cleared up; France was now submitting a draft resolution (A/C. 5/494) proposing that the General Assembly should transfer to UNESCO all the rights of the United Nations in respect of certain assets of the Institute, UNESCO to be responsible for clearing up all the Institute's accounts.

11. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom), seconded by Mr. ADARKAR (India), asked for details of the International Institute's liabilities.

12. Mr. GANEM (France) was unable to give exact figures for the Institute's liabilities, but, according to the latest estimates, it seemed that the assets exceeded the liabilities.

13. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) wished to know the Secretariat's opinion on the liquidation of the Institute.

14. Mr. FELLER (Secretariat) said that the Secretariat had been studying the question for a long time past and had maintained close contact with the French delegation and UNESCO. He pointed out that the United Nations had not assumed any legal liability for the Institute's debts. If UNESCO undertook the liquidation, it would probably be able to pay certain creditors out of the Institute's assets, which would appear adequate to the purpose, but in any case the United Nations could assume no legal responsibility in that connexion.

15. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) paid a tribute to the assistance given by the French Government and several prominent Frenchmen to the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. He would vote in favour of the French draft resolution (A/C.5/494); it had now been made clear that its adoption would not lay the United Nations under any financial obligation.

16. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) regretted that the Secretary-General had not submitted a report on the subject, and hoped that there would be no omissions of that kind in the future.

17. Mr. SABA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) recalled the circumstances in which the General Assembly had transferred to UNESCO the use of the furniture, archives and publications of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. In 1947, four former officials of the Institute had put forward claims which had been recognized as valid by the Administrative Tribunal of the League of Nations. Other claims had been submitted by printers. He pointed out that there was a mistaken belief among the public that UNESCO was the legal heir to the Institute.

18. From the financial point of view, the assets of the Institute included, over and above the furniture and documents in the possession of UNESCO, certain bank accounts totalling about one million French francs and claims amounting to about 1,500,000 francs. Furthermore, UNESCO did not expect to continue using free of charge the furnishings which the United Nations had placed at its disposal, and it was prepared to credit the assets of the Institute, against final ownership of the furniture and publications, with the value of such property minus depreciation. According to information available, the entire assets of the Institute were probably about 4,500,000 francs. The liabilities had been estimated at about 4 million francs. It would therefore appear that liquidation would make it possible to meet the legitimate claims of the Institute's creditors. Furthermore, a credit of \$18,000, which had been opened for the Institute by the Rockefeller Foundation for certain studies that had not been carried out, and which was therefore repayable to the Rockefeller Foundation, had been placed in a special account. The Rockefeller Foundation had announced that it was considering using that credit for an intellectual co-operation item on the programme of UNESCO.

19. He thought he might sav that, if the General Assembly approved the French draft resolution, the recommendation in it would be submitted to UNESCO's Executive Board, which would ultimately be responsible for accepting the assignment made to UNESCO by the General Assembly. It was in any event clearly understood that, under the terms of the agreement between the Institute and the League of Nations, UNESCO would not reimburse the creditors of the Institute beyond the amount of the existing assets as already specified.

20. In reply to Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), the CHAIRMAN explained that the statements by the representatives of France and UNESCO made it clear that adoption of the French

^{*} Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

craft resolution (A/C.5/494) would not involve any financial commitment for the United Nations.

21. Mr. PETREN (Sweden) drew attention to a document submitted by former staff members of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, stating that the Institute's accounts could not legally be liquidated without the assistance of the Institute's former Governing Body, represented at present by Mr. Herriot.

22. Mr. GANEM (France) explained that the Governing Body had ceased to exist along with the Institute itself and that it was at Mr. Herriot's own request that the French delegation had decided to submit the question to the General Assembly.

23. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said he would vote for the French draft resolution, but reserved his delegation's position on any action that might be taken by UNESCO for the liquidation of the Institute.

24. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether the claims of former staff members of the Institute would have priority and whether they represented a cash indemnity and not a pension. If the answer were in the affirmative, he would vote for the French draft resolution.

25. Mr. GANEM (France) replied to both questions in the affirmative.

26. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked whether the States members of UNESCO would be consulted.

27. The CHAIRMAN explained that the Executive Board of UNESCO would have to take a decision on the proposal that would be submitted to UNESCO if the French draft resolution were adopted.

28. Mr. ADARKAR (India) was glad to note that under the terms of the draft resolution the transfer of the Institute's assets to UNESCO was dependent upon the latter agreeing to carry out the liquidation of the Institute. He was, however, surprised that the United Nations could transfer those liabilities to UNESCO, as, according to statements made both by the representative of the Secretary-General and the French representative, the United Nations had not assumed responsibility for the Institute's liabilities. Adoption of the draft resolution might, he feared, have the effect of committing UNESCO to certain financial obligations and it might be better to transfer to UNESCO merely ownership of the assets actually in its possession, by deleting the second half of paragraph 4 of the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.5/494), beginning with the words "on condition that UNESCO".

29. Mr. SABA (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) explained that UNESCO did not consider itself bound to cover the Institute's deficit, if, contrary to expectations, the liquidation revealed a debit balance. UNESCO was acting from purely moral considerations.

30. Mr. FELLER (Secretariat) stated in reply to a further question by Mr. MACHADO (Brazil), that if, contrary to present estimates, the Institute's assets were insufficient to cover its liabilities, the Institute's creditors would have to suffer a loss, as the Organization could not assume any commitment in that connexion.

The French draft resolution (A/C.5/494) was adopted by 33 votes to none, with 5 abstentions. Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/493, A/C.5/495, A/C.5/L.172); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2099, A/2102)

[Item 41]*

Part II, section 5, chapter IV: United Nations Tribunal in Eritrea

31. The CHAIRMAN introduced the budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General for the United Nations Tribunal in Eritrea (A/C.5/493) and the seventeenth report of 1952 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2099); he opened discussion on the Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$28,900 for chapter IV of section 5, with a corresponding reduction in the appropriation provisionally approved under section 33.

32. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the USSR delegation had already stated its views on the matter in the Second Committee, where it had voted against the establishment of the Tribunal, which it considered could not serve the interests of the Eritrean population. He would therefore vote against the appropriation requested.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was adopted by 34 votes to 5.

Part II, section 5, chapter VI: United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine

33. The CHAIRMAN introduced the budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General for the United Nations Conciliation Commission and the Truce Supervision Organization (A/C.5/495) and the eighteenth report of 1952 of the Advisory Committee on this question (A/2102).

34. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already stated its views at the 336th meeting and would not repeat its reasons for voting against the appropriation recommended by the Advisory Committee. It would merely express its opinion by its vote.

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the recommendation of the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$545,000 under section 5, chapter VI and an appropriation of \$5,000 under section 25, chapter V, with a corresponding reduction in the appropriation already approved under section 33.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 34 votes to 5.

Report of Sub-Committee 8 of the Fifth Committee, set up to review the principles governing the work of the Department of Public Information

36. The CHAIRMAN said that in introducing the report of Sub-Committee 8 of the Fifth Committee, set up to review the principles governing the work of the

Department of Public Information (A/C.5/L.172), he wished to make a short statement in his capacity as Chairman *ex officio* of that Sub-Committee.

37. The Fifth Committee owed a debt of gratitude to the members of the Sub-Committee for the zeal with which they had undertaken their difficult task. Despite differences of opinion, each member had tried to contribute to the solution of the many problems with which the Department of Public Information had to cope, owing, *inter alia*, to the fact that ithad at all times to be ready to adapt its methods and media of information to the various tasks for which it was responsible.

38. The Sub-Committee had heard statements from witnesses representing the various media of information, as well as from the Secretary-General and his representative, the Assistant Secretary-General. During the discussion he had had occasion to express his view that there were two ways of making economies. The first was to reduce the budget; the General Assembly was always free to do so and, moreover, when approving the establishment of the Sub-Committee, it had asked that the Sub-Committee should consider ways and means of reducing the Department of Information's budget for 1953. The other way was to continue constantly to search for the best means of making the most of the funds appropriated for the Department and it was his impression that that was the method adopted by the Department. The members of the Sub-Committee had also been guided by that consideration.

39. In conclusion, he pointed out the essential factors in the problem which had been brought out in the course of the discussion: (a) the implementation of a world information programme raised problems which seemed to defy all definition and all possibility of solution; (b) it would always be necessary to take budget cuts into account when determining policy; and (c) it must be the special endeavour of the Department of Public Information to get the best return possible on the money it spent. To do so, it should be guided by its own experience and should at all times seek the advice of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the delegations.

40. After thanking all who had taken part in the Sub-Committee's work, he recommended that the Fifth Committee should approve the report before it.

41. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) said that the Sub-Committee had been faced with a dilemma, being asked, on the one hand, to make economies and, on the other, to introduce improvements. The United Nations could never spend too much money on making its purposes and activities known to the world. He had pointed out in the Sub-Committee that owing to insufficient publicity the Marshall Plan, which was helping to save the free world, was unknown to 90 per cent of the world's population. The explanatory statement by the Assistant Secretary-General had demonstrated the magnitude of the task of the Department of Public Information and had shown that despite all difficulties it was succeeding in its aim.

42. There was, however, one problem for which a solution had to be found—the discrimination against the French language. English was used to the extent of 80 per cent at meetings, and French only 15 per

cent. The first thing to be done to remedy the situation was to use French on the same footing as English, in conformity with the Charter. A number of publications were drafted in English only and the French edition of the United Nations Bulletin published by the Department of Public Information was merely a translation of the English Bulletin, thus accounting for the lack of interest taken in it by the French-speaking public. The programmes of meetings in the Palais de Chaillot were posted in English only, whereas the most elementary courtesy would require the use of French or at least both languages. Moreover, none of the Press releases were drafted by persons whose mother tongue was French.

43. That practice was particularly serious as it imperilled the very basis of the international character of the United Nations. French had been and must continue to be the connecting link in international relations. His delegation hoped that the Secretariat would satisfy its just demands concerning the use of French in the work of the Department of Public Information, and it considered that such funds as might be required for that purpose should be duly voted. He would not submit a resolution as he was sure that the necessary action would be taken. He would merely ask the Rapporteur to refer briefly to the matter in his report.

44. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in the English text of document A/C.5/L.172, the last paragraph should be numbered 13, and that in the French text, the first two paragraphs of the annex should be combined into a single paragraph.

45. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) appreciated the difficulties which the Sub-Committee had encountered in its work; while he regretted having received the text of the report only that morning, he had no intention of criticizing anyone on that account.

46. Nevertheless, he wondered how many representatives had really been able to study the document, which was of interest not only to representatives, but also to governments. It appeared impossible to dispose of the matter in the short time remaining. He therefore proposed that consideration be deferred until the General Assembly's next session. The Advisory Committee would perhaps wish to study the document in the interval and give its opinion on it.

47. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) supported the South African representative's proposal that the report be referred to the next session of the General Assembly.

48. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) stated that for several years past his delegation had been carefully following the trend of the work of the Department of Public Information and had found a number of cases in which Spanish, which was a working language of the General Assembly, had been treated unfairly. It would be easy to demonstrate from statistics the necessity for reorganizing the Department of Information in that respect. He wished, however, to express appreciation of the Secretary-General's and Assistant Secretary-General's efforts to put that situation to rights.

49. As Chairman of the United Nations Visiting Mission to Trust Territories in East Africa (1951), he had had opportunities for realizing that many difficulties were due to the lack of information and he supported the Sub-Committee's views in that respect. He also thought that the Department should determine and apply priorities in its work.

50. As regards the United Nations Bulletin, he felt that a change was needed in editorial methods so that the numbers appearing in each of the three working languages would form an entirely independent publication. Film publicity should also be reorganized along new lines.

51. If the Sub-Committee's report were put to the vote, the Dominican delegation would be ready to vote, but it would undoubtedly be preferable, as the South African and Egyptian representatives had suggested, to refrain from taking a decision at the present stage.

52. With reference to the last paragraph of the report, he thought some further information would be useful. He would therefore propose that consideration of that point be adjourned until the General Assembly's next session.

53. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had not received the Sub-Committee's report until the end of the morning. In view of the very heavy expenditure incurred for the Department of Public Information the conclusions contained in that report were extremely important. It appeared that the Sub-Committee had achieved a certain amount of work, but had not succeeded in completing its assignment, which was to investigate the possibility of effecting further economies on public information. He would therefore support the South African representative's proposal that consideration of the report be referred to the General Assembly's next ordinary session. The report might also be referred to the Advisory Committee so as to give the latter an opportunity to submit its findings to the General Assembly.

54. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) recalled that when considering the budgetary estimates for the financial year 1952, the Fifth Committee had decided it to be necessary to set up a smaller body to review the principles underlying the work of the Department of Public Information (302nd meeting). The Sub-Committee set up for that purpose had been instructed to reconsider the recommendations approved by the General Assembly on 13 February 1946 (resolution 13 (I), Annex I), to submit proposals for economies, and to report to the Fifth Committee at the present session so as to enable that Committee to formulate the principles by which the Secretary-General would be guided in framing the budget estimates for 1953.

55. The Sub-Committee had made a considerable effort to comply with the Fifth Committee's instructions. Certain members of the Fifth Committee now appeared, however, to prefer a procedure involving reference of the Sub-Committee's report to the Assembly's next session. Speaking personally, he did not agree that the Sub-Committee had failed to carry out its task.

56. He dissented very strongly from the United Kingdom representative's opinion that in drafting its

recommendations the Sub-Committee had failed to pay sufficient attention to the principles of economy. He read out, and briefly commented on, the following passages in the Sub-Committee's report, which, to his mind, showed the United Kingdom representative's opinion to be entirely wrong: the last sentence in paragraph 3, indicating the lines along which the Sub-Committee had worked, especially the words: "after the most detailed and thorough discussion of the issues involved"; the second and third sentences in paragraph 7, based on evidence given before the Committee by competent experts from outside the United Nations; also the last sentence in paragraph 7, all of which went to show that the Sub-Committee had not overlooked the budgetary considerations by which the Fifth Committee had been actuated in setting up the Sub-Committee; the four first sentences of paragraph 10, the first two sentences of paragraph 13, paragraph 15 (first sentence of sub-paragraph (iii), second and third sentence of sub-paragraph (iv) and the second sentence of sub-paragraph (v)) and the last sentence of paragraph 16.

57. It was, therefore, manifest that the Sub-Committee had made specific recommendations with a view to achieving economies. Besides, there would be nothing to prevent members from raising the problem again at the General Assembly's next ordinary session, nor would the Advisory Committee be precluded from putting forward its comments in the meantime. It would therefore be really regrettable to delay for a whole year, except for some urgent reason, the implementation of recommendations which were the result of careful and honest work. For that reason he would strongly resist the proposal for postponement of the Sub-Committee's report.

58. He realized the difficulties of delegations which had only received the report a short while ago, but he pointed out that the policy to be adopted for the Department of Public Information had already been discussed at length, that the subject-matter was therefore not new and that nobody could claim ignorance of it. Consequently, he would propose that the Committee should adopt the Sub-Committee's report.

59. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) recalled that his delegation had opposed the proposal to set up a Sub-Committee to review during the current session the principles by which the work of the Department of Information should be governed. As the Fifth Committee had decided, however, to set up the Sub-Committee on condition that its work was completed before the end of the present session, he thought that the Committee should now proceed to consider the report.

60. After a brief discussion on procedure during which Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) suggested that the discussion of the report should be postponed to the meeting on Friday afternoon, Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) moved the adjournment of the meeting.

The Pakistani representative's motion for adjournment was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.