



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Consolidation and stabilization of the regular economic and social programmes of the United Nations: Australian draft resolution (A/C.5/L.96) (<i>concluded</i>)	291
Financial implications of draft resolution A on agenda item 32 (a), proposed by the Third Committee (A/1687, A/C.5/443).....	292
Financial implications of the draft resolution on agenda item 67, proposed by the Third Committee (A/1686, A/C.5/444).....	294
Budget estimates for the financial year 1951 (A/1312 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.5/445, A/C.5/445/Add.1, A/C.5/L.103, A/C.5/L.104) (<i>second reading, concluded</i>)	295
Financial implications of the draft resolution on agenda item 20 (a), proposed by the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee.....	297
Permanent staff regulations of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/1360)	297

Chairman: The Maharaja Jam Saheb of NAWANAGAR (India).

Consolidation and stabilization of the regular economic and social programmes of the United Nations: Australian draft resolution (A/C.5/L.96) (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to continue discussion of the draft resolution submitted by the Australian representative (A/C.5/L.96).
2. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) congratulated the representative of Australia on the important statement he had made at the previous meeting. His delegation approved the purpose of the Australian draft resolution, as it was concerned at the constant increase in the activities and expenditures of the United Nations, particularly in the economic and social field.
3. In that regard he recalled the statement he had made during the general discussion on the budget estimates (238th meeting, paras. 41-55). The United Kingdom was prominent among the countries which contributed to the expenses of the United Nations in a currency other than their own and it therefore wished to ensure that the funds of the Organization were spent to good purpose. Unfortunately, it had been noticeable in recent months that the expenditure of the United

Nations had steadily mounted, while being devoted to increasingly long-term projects.

4. His delegation was always prepared to approve any proposal, such as that submitted by the Australian representative, designed to halt that increase in expenditure which, in the last analysis, could only be harmful to the United Nations.
5. The total disbursements of the Organization were continually increasing, thus creating ever greater difficulties for the Member States. At the current session his delegation had supported every proposal designed to effect reasonable economies and to prohibit any expenditures on unnecessary commissions or committees.
6. To that end, the governments of the Member States should ensure a degree of co-ordination between their representatives in the various committees, since it was quite useless for a country's representative in a given committee to help to draw up ambitious programmes, if that country's representative in the Fifth Committee later found that the effect of those programmes was to increase unduly the expenditure of the United Nations.
7. Although agreeing in principle with the Australian draft resolution, he nevertheless wondered whether that

proposal would enable the Australian representative to achieve his aim, which was to draw up an order of priority for the various projects. To achieve that end, the Economic and Social Council should accordingly be invited to scrutinize carefully all the projects submitted to it. In particular, the Secretariat should provide the Council with all necessary information as to the nature of each project, its advantages and disadvantages, and the cost involved. The Secretariat was able to obtain an accurate idea of the relative importance and urgency of the various projects proposed for implementation: it was necessary to adopt the projects which were of obvious value, to defer those of doubtful value and, lastly, to know exactly the financial implications of them all. The effect which certain proposals might have upon the taxpayers of the various Member States should not be neglected.

8. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that in the Fifth Committee, the Economic and Social Council and other organs of the United Nations, his delegation had consistently supported most of the ideas contained in the Australian draft resolution. It was desirable to establish an order of priority for the various activities of the United Nations, but without fixing a ceiling for the expenditures involved. When submitting a proposal, a delegation should always bear in mind the relative importance and urgency of the programmes which the United Nations was required to carry out.

9. His delegation, like the United Kingdom delegation, approved the underlying purpose of the Australian draft resolution; it would, however, find it very difficult to vote in favour of the various paragraphs of that draft resolution as they stood. His delegation hoped that the Australian representative would follow the suggestion made at the previous meeting by the representative of Brazil and that the Australian delegation would bring the matter to the attention of the Economic and Social Council and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

10. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) thanked the Australian representative for having raised so important a question by submitting his draft resolution. By bringing that draft to the attention of the General Assembly the Fifth Committee would be performing a useful task. She wondered, however, whether, instead of submitting a draft resolution to the General Assembly, it might not be better to include the substance of the Australian draft resolution in the Rapporteur's report on the budget estimates, together with the favourable comments which had been made concerning it.

11. Mr. DE COMMINES (France) recalled that at the previous meeting the French representative had expressed the view that the Australian draft resolution should not have been submitted to the Fifth Committee, but to the joint meeting of the Joint Second and Third Committee and the Fifth Committee. Though it fully appreciated the purpose which the Australian representative sought to achieve, the French delegation would vote against the draft resolution because it felt that the draft did not attack the essential causes of the evil, but merely dealt with its consequences. Those causes included, in particular, the proliferation of programmes, the lack of co-ordination between the international agencies, and the lack of co-ordination within the delegations themselves. As the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Social Affairs had

stated at the previous meeting, the responsibility for that state of affairs lay not with the Secretariat, but with the organ which proposed a project for implementation. Lastly, to fix a limit for the expenditure to be incurred on the regular economic and social programmes of the United Nations would be an arbitrary procedure.

12. In conclusion, while thanking the Australian delegation for having raised the question, he wished to ask that delegation whether, in a spirit of compromise, it could not withdraw its draft resolution.

13. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) thanked the various delegations which had supported in principle the draft resolution he had submitted. He particularly appreciated the Peruvian representative's tribute to the Australian delegation's work in the Economic and Social Council.

14. Several delegations had supported the aims pursued in the draft resolution but had opposed the methods it suggested. Most delegations, it appeared, would be unable to vote in favour of the draft unless it were amended.

15. The suggestion which the Brazilian representative had made at the previous meeting presented numerous advantages, but he was unable to accept it because of the short time available. He would therefore withdraw his draft resolution, but reserved the right to submit it again at the next session of the General Assembly. He asked that in his report the Rapporteur should make appropriate reference to the discussion on the Australian draft resolution, for the guidance of members of the Economic and Social Council and of the Advisory Committee.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the Australian representative's request would be complied with.

Financial implications of draft resolution A on agenda item 32 (a), proposed by the Third Committee (A/1687, A/C.5/443)

17. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the United Nations High Commissioners in Libya and Eritrea both had a rank comparable to that of an Assistant Secretary-General. That was why the Advisory Committee had made the comments which appeared in paragraph 3 of its forty-first report of 1950 (A/1687).

18. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that in 1946 the General Assembly had adopted, at the first part of its first session, resolution 8 (I), stating that the main task concerning displaced persons and refugees was to encourage their return to their countries of origin. During the second part of the first session, the Assembly had confirmed that decision and the International Refugee Organization had been asked to carry out that task (resolution 62 (I)). That resolution had unfortunately not been implemented and his delegation had recalled during the Assembly's fourth session that the only possible way of solving the problem was to ensure the full and complete implementation of that resolution.

19. Before the Committee was a draft resolution (A/1682, draft resolution A) proposed by the Third Committee, entrusting to a high official the task of solving the problem of refugees; if that draft resolution

were implemented, it would raise numerous difficulties and prevent the refugees and displaced persons from returning to their countries of origin. In those conditions it would be impossible to put into effect the resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly.

20. For all those reasons, he proposed that the Committee should reject the appropriations relating to the functioning of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

21. Mr. GANEM (France) recalled that, because of its geographical position, France had always afforded shelter to political refugees. The Polish refugees who had escaped from the oppressions of the Czars, the Russian revolutionaries, the victims of the fascist and nazi regimes had all been made welcome in France. His country had always been interested in the problem of refugees and he did not, therefore, agree with the point of view of the USSR representative.

22. He drew attention to paragraph 3 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1687). According to the Secretary-General's proposal (A/C.5/443, para. 6 (a)), the High Commissioner was to hold the rank of a principal director. While the Advisory Committee had merely expressed some doubts in that respect, the French delegation for its part was extremely surprised at the Secretary-General's proposal and wondered how it could possibly be justified. Not only the United Nations Commissioners in Libya and Eritrea but also the Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration had been assimilated to the rank of Assistant Secretary-General. Thus the same status should be given to the High Commissioner for Refugees. It would not be necessary to increase the appropriations for that purpose, as he felt sure that the Secretary-General could take the necessary steps within the budget of \$300,000 provided for the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

23. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said he would not vote against the estimate relating to the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. He wished, however, to recall that, during its previous session, the General Assembly had adopted resolution 319 (IV) providing that no expenditure other than administrative expenditures relating to the functioning of the High Commissioner's Office should be borne on the budget of the United Nations. That meant the expenditure involved in recruiting and paying the staff working directly under the orders of the High Commissioner. It seemed now, however, that it was proposed to finance expenditure of a totally different character on the budget of the Organization. The number of officials the High Commissioner could recruit should be kept to the minimum.

24. Mr. KAHANY (Israel) pointed out that the High Commissioner would not only be serving the interests of certain Member States but also those of States which were not members of the Organization. It would therefore be natural for such non-member States to bear a part of the expenditure. In that respect he recalled that Switzerland and Liechtenstein bore part of the expenditure of the International Court of Justice. Similarly, when the Third Committee had proposed the establishment of an international bureau for declarations of death, it had specified that if non-member States adhered to the Convention on the

Declaration of Death of Missing Persons they would have to share in the expenses of the bureau.

25. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) recalled that, during the discussion in the Third Committee, the representative of Australia had expressed some doubts on the number of staff proposed for the High Commissioner's Office. With that reservation, he would vote in favour of the appropriations requested under the item under discussion.

26. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services), replying to remarks made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and the representative of France, pointed out that the draft resolution proposed by the Third Committee provided that the terms of appointment of the High Commissioner should be proposed by the Secretary-General and approved by the General Assembly (A/1682, resolution A, annex, chapter III). The Secretary-General had proposed that the High Commissioner should be given a grade equivalent to that of principal director. He would then receive not only a salary of \$12,000-12,500 net, but also a representation allowance of up to \$3,500 as well as the other ordinary allowances. In making that proposal, the Secretary-General had considered that such a salary would be appropriate, and he had at the same time taken into account the status which the High Commissioner would then have in comparison with the high-ranking officials of the United Nations Office at Geneva. Nevertheless, if the Fifth Committee decided that the High Commissioner should have the rank of Assistant Secretary-General, the Secretary-General would not raise any objections.

27. The Secretary-General had not prepared a final manning table so that the High Commissioner would be able to recruit the staff he considered necessary.

28. In reply to the representative of Brazil, he pointed out that the total of the expenditure to be financed by the United Nations budget was mentioned in the Advisory Committee's report (A/1687, para. 2). That sum would not be exceeded. It was important to avoid constant increases in the expenditure of the Organization, otherwise the small Powers might find themselves unable to pay a constantly increasing contribution.

29. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) asked whether, when proposing that the High Commissioner should be given a grade comparable to that of a principal director, the Secretary-General had borne in mind the fact that the High Commissioner would have to enter into negotiations with various governments.

30. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) replied that that point had been borne in mind. Moreover, he pointed out that, under the draft resolution submitted by the Third Committee, it was for the General Assembly to take the final decision on the rank of the High Commissioner.

31. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) endorsed the statement made by the representative of France. He made a formal proposal that the High Commissioner should be assimilated to the rank of Assistant Secretary-General and not to that of principal director.

32. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the budget estimates for the financial year 1951 should not include the appropriation of \$300,000 proposed for the functioning of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 22 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

33. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would not take part in the vote on the United Kingdom proposal because he was opposed for reasons of principle to the establishment of a High Commissioner's Office for Refugees.

The United Kingdom proposal was adopted by 18 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

34. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation that a total appropriation of \$300,000 should be made for the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

The recommendation was approved by 24 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

35. Mr. KAHANY (Israel) requested that the Rapporteur's report should mention his suggestion that non-member States concerned should share in the expenses of the High Commissioner's Office.

Financial implications of the draft resolution on agenda item 67, proposed by the Third Committee (A/1686, A/C.5/444)

36. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the Advisory Committee's fortieth report of 1950 (A/1686) on the Secretary-General's request (A/C.5/444, para. 2) that \$45,000 be appropriated for the expenses of the *ad hoc* commission proposed in connexion with the complaint of failure on the part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to repatriate or otherwise account for prisoners of war detained in Soviet territory. The Advisory Committee recommended a reduction of \$10,000 in the estimate. He emphasized the comments made on the payment of fees to members of the proposed commission (A/1686, para. 3).

37. Mr. HALL (United States of America) pointed out, in connexion with the payment of fees to experts, that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 1 December 1950 (A/1596) on subsistence allowances for members of commissions, committees and other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations, as well as the decision taken on the subject by the Fifth Committee (A/1538), had been annulled the previous day by new decisions taken by the General Assembly with respect to the payment of a special allowance to members of the International Law Commission, and by the Fifth Committee with respect to the revised estimates for sections 10 and 11 of the budget, which made provision for payment of fees to experts.

38. His delegation had originally supported the proposal that fees should not be paid to experts. However, after the decisions recently taken it felt obliged to approve the Secretary-General's recommendation, otherwise some sort of discrimination might occur against the proposed *ad hoc* commission.

39. Mr. GANEM (France) favoured the Advisory

Committee's recommendations. As a result of the contradictory decisions taken by the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly, the United Nations was now paying the experts it recruited at rates varying between \$25 and \$62.50 a day. He wondered, therefore, if it would not be advisable to ask the Secretary-General to submit a report on the problem of fees for experts to the Advisory Committee, which would in its turn report to the Assembly. It was essential that some light should be thrown on a situation which was administratively unsound and should not be allowed to continue for more than a year.

40. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) considered that the problem presented to the Committee in the course of its previous meeting was totally different from the one it must now resolve. At the previous meeting, it had been proposed that the Committee should authorize the Secretary-General to remunerate experts charged with a very specific task; the Canadian delegation had then considered that it would be appropriate to remunerate such experts.

41. The position of the members of the proposed *ad hoc* commission charged with the question of prisoners of war was entirely different, because that commission would act on behalf of the United Nations. For that reason, the Canadian representative would vote for the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

42. Finally, he wholeheartedly supported the proposal just made by the French representative that a study of the whole question of the remuneration of experts in the service of the United Nations should be undertaken.

43. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) supported both the Advisory Committee's recommendations and the French representative's proposal. He considered that the Committee must take measures to put some order into a situation which was becoming chaotic and to strengthen its own position.

44. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) held that the members of the new *ad hoc* commission need not necessarily be "experts". To consider them as such would be a fundamental misconception which might result in the nomination of persons of possessing the requisite qualifications. The United Kingdom representative felt that, even in the present day world, there might still exist persons willing to give their services for a humanitarian cause without remuneration.

45. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had stated its views on the question in the Third Committee. He explicitly protested against any appropriation of funds which would enable the *ad hoc* commission proposed by the Third Committee to be set up.

46. It was his view that the item, complaint of failure on the part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to repatriate or otherwise account for prisoners of war detained in Soviet territory, had been placed on the Assembly's agenda purely for propaganda purposes. He cited Article 107 of the Charter in proof that the question was entirely outside the Assembly's competence. Furthermore, he stated that the prisoners of war detained by the USSR had already been repatriated long ago, whereas those governments which had requested that the question should be placed on the agenda had not fulfilled their obligations in that respect.

47. In those circumstances, the USSR representative proposed that all appropriations under the item should be deleted.

48. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) indicated his agreement with the Canadian and United Kingdom representatives and said he would vote for the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He agreed with that Committee that no difficulty need be anticipated in securing the services of qualified and impartial persons willing to serve, as a matter of honour and obligation, on the *ad hoc* commission on the normal terms approved by the General Assembly for expert bodies of the United Nations.

49. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said he also would vote for the Advisory Committee's recommendations. At the previous meeting he had voted for the necessary appropriations to pay fees to economic experts, because then it had been a question of genuine experts. In the present case, he was in complete agreement with the United Kingdom representative.

50. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) said she also would support the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

51. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) reminded the French and Brazilian representatives that the Advisory Committee had already carried out a study of the question of the remuneration of experts employed by the United Nations. He wondered whether, in view of the slight impression made by the first one (A/1312, part three), it was worth while for the Advisory Committee to undertake a new study.

52. Mr. GANEM (France) asked the Secretary-General to include an annex to the budget estimates for 1952, giving a complete statement of the fees paid to all categories of experts. The Fifth Committee would thus be able to take a decision in full knowledge of the facts. He wished to have his request recorded in the Committee's report.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the French representative's request would be met.

54. Mr. HALL (United States of America) noted that his proposal had received no support and withdrew it, although he did not entirely agree with the United Kingdom representative's view.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 25 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/1686, para. 4) for an appropriation of \$35,000 was adopted by 24 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1951
(A/1312 and Corr.1 and Add.1, A/C.5/445,
A/C.5/445/Add.1, A/C.5/L.103, A/C.5/L.104)
(second reading, concluded)**

[Item 39]*

**SECTION 1. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, COMMISSIONS
AND COMMITTEES**

55. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that the General Assembly had rejected the Fifth Committee's recommendation regarding the *per diem* allowance to be paid to members of the International Law Commis-

sion. The expenditures necessitated by the General Assembly's decision would exceed the expenditure recommended by the Fifth Committee by \$13,500. He wished to know how the Secretary-General intended to cover that additional expenditure.

56. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the additional expenditure of \$13,500 for the payment of a higher *per diem* allowance to members of the International Law Commission could be met by savings on other sections of the budget. For reasons of principle, however, he would like a supplementary appropriation in that amount to be included in section 1 of the budget estimates.

57. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the Fifth Committee's decisions on the second reading of the budget would be final. He wondered whether the Committee was legally entitled to make appropriations necessary to cover the expenditure arising from proposals which the General Assembly had not yet adopted; the financial implications of such proposals would only become effective after the General Assembly had adopted them.

58. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Fifth Committee made recommendations, and that the final decision was taken by the General Assembly. The Fifth Committee merely approved the budget estimates. The estimates became appropriations only after the General Assembly had adopted the substantive proposals and decided to appropriate the necessary funds.

59. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that his delegation had always supported the proposal to pay a *per diem* allowance of \$35 to members of the International Law Commission, and had voted accordingly. If, however, a vote was now to be taken on supplementary appropriations to cover the daily allowance, he would vote against them, as he objected to the procedure the General Assembly had followed in dealing with the question.

60. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) proposed that the estimates in section 1 should be reduced by \$1,750,000, the cost of holding the sixth session of the General Assembly in Europe. The General Assembly had not yet decided on the question, and the Fifth Committee should refuse to appropriate funds for that purpose.

61. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had endorsed the budget estimates which the Advisory Committee had submitted on the question (A/1644), and that it had not approved the above appropriations.

62. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thought that the USSR representative was justified in opposing the inclusion of certain appropriations in the budget so long as the General Assembly had not yet taken decisions calling for such appropriations.

63. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the Secretariat had included in documents A/C.5/445 and A/C.5/445/Add.1 all the estimates which the Fifth Committee had approved in first reading, merely in order to facilitate representatives' work. Obviously, should the General Assembly decide not to hold its sixth session in Europe, for example, the total of the budget estimates would automatically be reduced by the amounts which the Fifth Committee had set aside for that purpose.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

64. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) remarked that it was not a question of procedure. The Committee had deviated from its ordinary procedure for reasons of expediency. In view of the short time left, he would not object to including the estimates for the financial implications of resolutions which the General Assembly had not yet adopted in the budget estimates for 1951, provided it was understood that such estimates were purely provisional and that they would be deleted if the General Assembly did not adopt the relevant resolutions. Ordinarily, he would oppose such a procedure, which he considered very dangerous, but in view of the exceptional circumstances he was obliged to agree to it.

65. Mr. TURNER (Secretary of the Committee) observed that the General Assembly would only examine the budget after it had decided on all the substantive questions on its agenda. It was clear that, if the General Assembly rejected certain proposals for which the Fifth Committee had made budgetary provisions, the provisions would then be appropriately adjusted.

66. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) explained that his proposal to reduce the budget estimates in section 1 by \$1,750,000 was not a procedural motion. He was opposed to the sixth session of the General Assembly being held in Europe, and he therefore asked the Fifth Committee to reduce the appropriations in section 1; in that way the Committee would express its view, giving all the administrative and budgetary reasons why the sixth session of the General Assembly should be held in New York.

67. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thought that the Australian proposal as presented could not be considered, as the Fifth Committee was not competent to deal with the question of selecting the place of meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly. He asked the Chairman to give a ruling on the point. Since the Fifth Committee had transmitted all the information it was required to provide under rule 152 of the rules of procedure to the General Assembly, the question was no longer on its agenda.

68. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) thought that it must first be decided, whether the Committee would approve a gross budget, including the estimates based on the financial implications of proposals which the General Assembly had not yet adopted; or a net budget, without those estimates. For his part, he was in favour of the first course.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that any proposals to increase or reduce the estimates submitted to the Committee could be made on the second reading of the budget. The Australian proposal was in one of those categories, and could therefore be considered.

70. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked how the General Assembly could examine the question of the place of meeting of its sixth session if the Fifth Committee adopted the Australian proposal. He thought that the budget estimates mentioned in the Australian proposal should be included among those to be considered on second reading.

71. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the General Assembly was not bound by the Fifth Committee's recommendations.

72. Mr. CRISTOBAL (Philippines) remarked that the General Assembly had decided the day before to disregard the Fifth Committee's recommendations, and there was therefore nothing to prevent it from doing so again.

73. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the Brazilian representative that the Australian proposal was unacceptable. In that connexion, he pointed out that, when the Fifth Committee had examined the estimates relating to the proposal made by Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, it had been recognized that the General Assembly itself would decide on the substance of the question.

74. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) withdrew his proposal.

75. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) remarked that even when the General Assembly had decided on the substance of a question, it was still for the Fifth Committee to recommend the necessary appropriations to carry that decision into effect.

76. The CHAIRMAN proposed, in accordance with the United Kingdom representative's suggestion, that the Committee should approve a gross budget including the appropriations which would become necessary if the General Assembly approved the proposals which were still before it.

It was so decided.

77. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the following appropriations in section 1 should be deleted: \$30,000 for the *Ad Hoc* Commission on Prisoners of War, and \$12,100 for the implementation of the resolution on uniting for peace.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 25 votes to 4, with 2 abstentions.

Section 1 was adopted at \$2,538,750 by 25 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

SECTION 20. UNITED NATIONS OFFICE AT GENEVA

78. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the appropriations in section 20 should be reduced by \$40,000. His purpose was to abolish the appropriations for the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 26 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

Section 20 was adopted at \$4,383,600 by 28 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

SECTION 20a. OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

79. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the total sum appropriated under that section should be deleted.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 26 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

Section 20a was adopted at \$254,000 by 26 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

SECTION 25. OFFICIAL RECORDS

80. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the total appropriation under section 25 should be reduced by the amounts allocated

for printing the reports of the United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the Office of the United Nations Commissioner in Libya, the *Ad Hoc* Commission on Prisoners of War, and the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 28 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

Section 25 was adopted at \$883,000 by 29 votes to none with 4 abstentions.

SECTION 26. PUBLICATIONS

Section 26 was adopted unanimously at \$962,000.

81. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) said that she had abstained from voting on several questions because the Committee was voting on a gross budget in accordance with its previous decision.

ESTIMATES OF MISCELLANEOUS INCOME

82. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should adopt the estimates of miscellaneous income contained in document A/C.5/445/Add.1.

The estimates of miscellaneous income were adopted at \$6,504,000.

DRAFT APPROPRIATION RESOLUTION FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 1951

83. The CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption of paragraph 2, as amended, and paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/1312 and Corr.1, appendix I).

It was so decided.

DRAFT RESOLUTION RELATING TO UNFORESEEN AND EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES

84. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/1312, appendix II), together with the Secretary-General's proposal adding certain provisions to that draft resolution (A/C.5/L.104).

85. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would abstain from voting on the proposal in view of the objections his delegation had made to certain appropriations which were the subject of the draft resolution and the Secretary-General's proposal.

The Advisory Committee's draft resolution and the Secretary-General's proposal were adopted.

DRAFT RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND

86. The CHAIRMAN proposed the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/1312, appendix III), together with the Secretary-General's proposal adding certain provisions to the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.103).

The Advisory Committee's draft resolution and the Secretary-General's proposal were adopted.

87. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa), Rapporteur, stated that certain drafting changes were neces-

sary in the resolution the Committee had adopted on the salary, allowance and leave system at the 269th meeting, in order to give effect to the Committee's decisions with respect to the age-limit of children for whom staff members would receive the dependency allowance and education allowance. He requested the Committee's authorization to make any changes in the text.

It was so decided.

Financial implications of the draft resolution on agenda item 20 (a), proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee

88. The CHAIRMAN said that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had just adopted a draft resolution on the question of an international regime for the Jerusalem area and protection for the Holy Places (A/AC.38/L.71) and he read out the budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General.

89. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) proposed that the budget estimates should be approved without further formalities.

90. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that members of the Committee had received no documents on the subject. He proposed that the Committee should follow its normal procedure and refer the question to the Advisory Committee. Afterwards it would be able to take a decision in full knowledge of the facts.

91. Mr. KAHANY (Israel) and Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) supported the USSR proposal.

92. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) withdrew his proposal.

The USSR proposal was adopted.

Permanent staff regulations of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/1360)

[Item 42]*

93. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee had to settle the question of the staff regulations. It obviously no longer had time to consider it in detail, but it should nevertheless adopt a draft resolution postponing consideration of the item. He therefore proposed the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly,

"Taking note of the administrative problems arising out of the changes proposed in the allowance and leave systems of the United Nations for 1951,

"Decides to postpone the consideration of the permanent staff regulations until the sixth regular session of the General Assembly".

94. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) proposed that a further paragraph should be added to that draft resolution specifying that, in the meantime, the Advisory Committee would study the draft regulations prepared by the Secretary-General and report on the subject to the General Assembly.

95. The CHAIRMAN accepted the amendment submitted by the Netherlands representative.

The Chairman's proposal, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.