



C O N T E N T S

	<i>Page</i>
Organization of a United Nations postal administration (A/1394/Rev.1, A/1453)	129
Expenses of the Permanent Central Opium Board. Assessment of non-members of the United Nations, signatories of the Convention of 19 February 1925 relating to narcotic drugs (A/1418, A/1461)	133
Budget estimates for the financial year 1951: (c) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1312 and Corr.1 and Add.1)	133

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

Organization of a United Nations postal administration (A/1394/Rev.1, A/1453)

[Item 46]*

1. The CHAIRMAN called attention to the relevant documents and noted that the General Assembly had already approved in principle (resolution 232 (III)) the establishment of a United Nations postal administration. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in its eighth report of 1950 (A/1453), recommended the adoption of the draft resolution on the subject submitted by the Secretary-General (A/1394/Rev.1, para. 12).

2. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) asked for clarification on several points.

3. Arrangements were already in existence at Geneva and The Hague, whereby the respective postal authorities in those two places issued special stamps for the use of the International Labour Organisation and the International Court of Justice, respectively. He wished to know whether the new arrangement would also apply to those two organizations and to other subsidiary organs of the United Nations. He requested information, too, in regard to the present arrangement between the International Court of Justice and the postal authorities at The Hague.

4. In past years, there had been a considerable net surplus resulting from the special arrangement in Geneva, amounting in one instance to 250,000 Swiss francs a year. It would therefore seem that the amount of estimated revenue from the sale of stamps for philatelic

purposes might not be excessive. He would, however, like to know: (a) the average expenditure of the Administration at the present time on postage and how that expenditure would figure in the budget in future years; (b) the calculated income from the sale of stamps to delegations, to the United Nations and visitors. It would seem that the real budgetary benefit must be much larger than the figure mentioned, if the ordinary revenue derived from the sale of stamps for mailing purposes were taken into account.

5. Reference was made in the Secretary-General's report (A/1394/Rev.1, para. 3) to Liechtenstein. In his view, that was not a happy comparison and he expressed the hope that it was not contemplated that the United Nations would develop a sort of philatelic industry, similar to what was practised in Liechtenstein.

6. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that, the previous year, the Committee had had before it a more far-reaching plan (A/988¹). To put it briefly the estimated cost of the 1949 plan had been \$280,480, minus offsetting revenue amounting to \$60,000, leaving a net estimated cost of \$220,480, as against the estimated expenditure of \$241,480 for the existing service (A/988, annex I).

7. The net figure of some \$220,000 had made no allowance for revenue from philatelic sales, which would be the sole source of revenue under the proposed new plan. Furthermore, no provision would have been necessary, under the 1949 plan, for postal expenses in

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Fifth Committee, Annex, Vol. I.*

respect of the official mail of the United Nations, amounting to some \$170,000 to \$180,000.

8. A precise budgetary comparison between the two plans was not therefore possible. The plan under consideration showed an estimated revenue from philatelic sales of \$300,000, against which must be set expenses estimated at \$83,000 for the first year (A/1394/Rev.1, para. 7). Postal services would still have to be provided for under section 18 of the budget estimates, to an amount of \$180,000 (A/1267, p. 190).

9. The estimate in respect of revenue from philatelic sales was considered by some experts to be unduly conservative, but since it was necessarily a speculative figure, the Advisory Committee had preferred to base its consideration upon the most conservative of the estimates submitted.

10. The Advisory Committee endorsed the plan for three reasons: (a) it offered substantial advantage in terms of publicity for the United Nations; (b) it had the advantage of administrative simplicity, since the actual postal services would be entrusted to those most competent to carry them out, the officials of the United States Post Office Department; (c) some revenue would accrue to the Organization.

11. In conclusion, he stated that, at the moment, the plan applied solely to the United Nations Headquarters. It was hoped to extend it, in time, to the specialized agencies, after some experience of its working had been gained.

12. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) confirmed Mr. Aghnides' last observation, and also said that the plan would not affect the present arrangements between the International Labour Organisation and the International Court of Justice with the respective postal authorities in Geneva and The Hague. The estimated cost of postal services was \$180,000. That figure would not be affected, since it was obvious that the cost of carrying mail would still have to be borne.

13. It was considered that revenue for the first year had been estimated at a reasonable figure: naturally, it was hoped that that estimate would be exceeded.

14. The reference to Liechtenstein in the Secretary-General's report was purely incidental; the term "Liechtenstein-type of agreement" was commonly used in philatelic-agreement nomenclature. It should not be taken to imply that the United Nations intended to embark upon any type of philatelic commercialism.

15. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) asked, in respect of sales of United Nations stamps through philatelic agencies, whether such stamps would be cancelled or unused ones. He also inquired whether United States postal authorities would accept United Nations stamps on letters not posted in the Headquarters area. It was his understanding that the stamps issued specially for the International Labour Organisation and the International Court of Justice could be used only for official mail.

16. From his own experience, he knew that unused stamps issued for the International Court of Justice could be bought en bloc in any stamp shop. He did not think it was consonant with the dignity of the United Nations that United Nations stamps should be available

for sale in such a manner or that they might be used for advertising purposes. He inquired whether any arrangement was contemplated to prevent such abuses.

17. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) said it would be difficult, if not impossible to control the use by individuals of stamps after they had been purchased, and the uncanceled stamp might possibly be used on mail anywhere in the United States. United Nations stamps would certainly be sold by commercial concerns in the same way as those of the International Court of Justice, because it was from that source that the principal revenue under the plan would be derived. Eighty-five to 90 per cent of all philatelic sales were made through agencies; it was intended that the normal practice of circularizing such agencies, notifying them of stamp issues and expressing willingness to accept orders, should be followed. The plan would be entirely unprofitable if sales of stamps in the Headquarters area were to be relied upon as the sole source of revenue.

18. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) warned the Committee that the result of flooding the market with United Nations stamps might be a considerable drop in their face value, with a consequent loss of revenue to the Organization. That had already happened in the case of International Labour Organisation stamps. It would be well to proceed very carefully in the matter, and nothing should be done that was not in keeping with the dignity of the United Nations.

19. The CHAIRMAN assured Mr. Hambro that the matter would be very carefully watched.

20. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) observed that the intentions and hopes when the question of a United Nations postal administration had first been raised in 1947², had been slightly different from those aroused by the proposal now before the Committee. The present plan would result in substantial advantages to the United Nations, both in terms of publicity and revenue. It should be noted, however, that the latter consideration was not the deciding factor. His delegation was prepared to accept the plan and hoped that, in time, it would be extended to all the specialized agencies.

21. He qualified his approval, however, by stating that he did not consider it the best plan that might have been produced. Whether or not such an arrangement was entered into, the United States Post Office Department would no doubt, as a normal public service, maintain a branch post office in the new Headquarters area. Under the plan proposed, the United States Post Office Department would maintain the post office, selling stamps printed and provided by the United Nations. The revenue therefrom would go to that Department, thus partially covering the cost of the services provided. On the other hand, the United Nations could maintain a separate agency for the sale of United Nations stamps for philatelic purposes, the revenue from which would be retained by the United Nations.

22. It would seem from the text of the draft agreement (A/1394/Rev.1, annex article 3 (ii)) that United Nations stamps might only be sold for philatelic purposes in response to orders received by mail. In other words, no direct sales of stamps for philatelic purposes could be made to the public. He requested Mr. Vaughan

² *Ibid.*, Second Session, 91st plenary meeting.

to comment on the point, as it was obvious that if direct sales could be made—to visitors, for instance—the revenue accruing would be substantially increased.

23. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) replied that the only postal activity on the new Headquarters site would be known as the United Nations Postal Administration, and would be under United Nations jurisdiction in accordance with the draft agreement. The only stamps sold there would be United Nations stamps.

24. It had been thought that, and the United States Government agreed, it should still be possible for the United Nations to establish a philatelic agency for the sale of stamps by mail, because, after careful inquiry, it had been established that 85 to 90 per cent of stamp sales for philatelic purposes were made by mail. Any person wishing to make a bulk purchase of stamps at the post office would be referred to the philatelic agency. In most cases, visitors to the Headquarters would primarily want to have a stamp with the United Nations cancellation upon it.

25. As it was difficult, without some basis of actual experience, to arrive at an exact formula for division of revenue as between the two types of sales, the draft agreement (article 8 (ii)) provided for a revision of some of its terms at the end of one year.

26. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) maintained that it was highly probable that many people would wish to make purchases of stamps for philatelic purposes from the post office in the Headquarters area, and that hence the United States Post Office Department would derive some of the revenue which, according to the draft agreement, should accrue solely to the United Nations. He therefore considered that the United Nations should have the right to sell its stamps for philatelic purposes either direct to the public or by mail.

27. Mr. CRISTOBAL (Philippines) stated that, unlike the position that had obtained the previous year, his delegation would have no hesitation in endorsing the plan submitted by the Secretary-General. It had the double advantage of offering publicity for the United Nations, together with administrative simplicity.

28. Mr. GANEM (France) stated that his delegation would strongly support the draft agreement and resolution submitted by the Secretary-General. He particularly welcomed the provision in the agreement for amendment at the end of one year, should experience prove that to be necessary.

29. When the question had first been raised by the Argentine delegation, some three years ago, much hesitation had been evinced both on the part of delegations and the Administration. The United States Congress, in accepting that United Nations Headquarters should be on American soil, had also provided that the United Nations had the right to maintain its own postal administration. Despite that provision, the United States Post Office Department had not been over-enthusiastic in the matter. It was therefore gratifying that the exercise of some pressure had brought about a satisfactory conclusion in the matter.

30. It was to be hoped that the Administration would be inspired by success in the present instance to press negotiations in other directions, such as, for example, in regard to exemption from income tax on salaries of United States staff members.

31. Lord CROOK (United Kingdom) observed that the United Kingdom delegation was glad that the idea of establishing a fully independent United Nations postal administration had been discarded. The proposed agreement appeared to be a satisfactory instrument from the viewpoint of the United Nations.

32. The United Kingdom delegation was anxious that nothing on undignified lines should be embarked upon by the United Nations in connexion with the proposed plan. He was glad to learn that there would be careful control in regard to a possible large-scale overproduction of stamps, such as had been referred to by the Norwegian representative.

33. Referring to the point raised by the representative of Brazil, he took the view that, under the agreement, the United States Post Office Department showed some generosity in respect of the machinery it undertook to set up. It was on the whole a fairly balanced agreement, which achieved the United Nations purposes in the best possible way.

34. The United Kingdom delegation was in complete agreement with the plan submitted by the Secretary-General and endorsed the Advisory Committee's views thereon.

35. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that the General Assembly had committed itself, in principle, at the 1948 session, to the establishment of a United Nations postal administration. Nevertheless, in concert with other delegations, the Canadian delegation had urged caution upon the Fifth Committee the previous year,³ because of serious doubts as to the practicability of the plan then submitted by the Secretary-General. It had supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation that further investigations should be made with a view to arriving at a plan which would provide satisfactory solutions to all the technical problems involved and which would be simple to administer and financially sound.

36. The Canadian delegation was satisfied that the proposal under consideration met those prerequisites in as large a measure as could be reasonably expected at such an early stage. The administrative responsibility for all United Nations external postal needs and relations would be in the hands of the United States Post Office Department, thus ensuring the efficiency of the system from the outset. And the United Nations would be relieved of the numerous administrative problems arising from the establishment of a self-operated postal administration.

37. The financial advantages of the plan did not seem to be appreciably greater than those which would have accrued under the plan proposed the previous year, if due account was taken of the cost of postal expenses of the Organization. The extent to which the additional expenditure resulting from the initiation of the plan would be offset would depend exclusively on the success of stamp-vending for philatelic purposes. Whereas the figure of \$300,000 might prove to be a fair estimate of revenue for the first year, it was difficult to foresee to what extent and for how long demands of philatelists would be maintained; the Norwegian representative's remarks in that connexion were very pertinent. Without

³ *Ibid*, Fourth Session, Fifth Committee, 187th meeting, paras. 11-13.

actual experience, it was impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the net income which would be derived over a period of years. Nevertheless, the Canadian delegation believed that the present plan offered sufficient guarantees of being at least self-sustaining over a period of time.

38. In regard to the point raised by the representative of Brazil, he could well understand the difficulties envisaged, but with co-operation and accommodation on both sides, the problem would eventually be solved amicably and satisfactorily. It would be appropriate, however, to make reference to the point in the Rapporteur's report. The representative of Norway had also raised a number of points which should not be ignored.

39. The Canadian delegation wished to associate itself, too, with the general remarks of the Advisory Committee concerning the plan. He disagreed on one point of detail with Mr. Vaughan; it was his understanding that the special stamps would be sold and used only by the United Nations post office to be located in the Headquarters of the United Nations. The stamps would be valid only for items mailed within the New York Headquarters area and there was no intention at present to extend their use to outlying offices or to the specialized agencies. On that understanding, the Canadian delegation was prepared to vote for the adoption of the plan.

40. Mr. DUSSAUT (Argentina) expressed his pleasure that the proposal under consideration, which had originated with his delegation, was reaching fruition. He would have liked to see the plan follow the original lines proposed, but nevertheless believed that, as submitted, it would serve the purposes of the Organization.

41. He was glad to note, too, that the draft agreement was subject to revision at the end of one year, if experience should prove that to be necessary. In that connexion, useful points had been raised by the representatives of Norway and Brazil.

42. The Argentine delegation would support the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

43. Mr. AGUILAR MONTEVERDE (Mexico) raised a legal point in connexion with the proposed agreement. He inquired whether the agreement was to be regarded as a treaty and hence would have to be ratified by the United States Senate, or whether it would be classified as an executive agreement, which did not require approval by the Senate. The latter type did not have equal legal validity in United States courts.

44. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretary) stated that there was provision in the Headquarters Agreement for the United States postal authorities to enter into an agreement with the United Nations in connexion with the establishment of a United Nations postal administration (resolution 169 (II), annex, article II, section 6). No further legislation would be called for on the part of the United States Government.

45. Mr. HALL (United States of America) expressed appreciation on behalf of the United States postal authorities for the approval of the proposed arrangements that had been expressed by so many delegations.

46. The United States postal authorities had attempted to develop a relationship with the United Nations postal administration that would be practical administratively and at the same time result in publicity and revenue for the United Nations. The agreement achieved both those objectives.

47. He wished to correct one of Mr. Vaughan's statements: United Nations postal stamps would be valid only for mailings from the Headquarters post office and not at regular United States post offices.

48. In regard to the point made by the representative of Brazil, he felt that the proposed agreement embodied the best solution that could be reached at the present stage. The problem of separating the two types of sale was very great, but the agreement provided for the most practical solution to this problem. Revision of this arrangement at the end of the first year was possible, should that be necessary.

49. As to the point raised by the representative of Mexico, he said that it was the intention of the United States Government that the agreement should be regarded as an executive agreement. It was their view that the President had sufficient authority under the existing Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations to sign it as a supplement to that Agreement.

50. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said he was not satisfied with the explanations given by Mr. Vaughan. He had no objections to article 3 (ii) of the United States-United Nations draft postal agreement but he wished to know whether or not it would be possible for the United Nations to sell stamps directly to the public, or whether it could only do so by mail.

51. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) said there was nothing in the Agreement which would prevent any person from purchasing stamps at the United Nations post office which would be operated by the United States Government. The proposed philatelic agency would be operated by an expert group in a separate part of the Headquarters building.

52. It had been finally agreed with the United States Government that it would not be practicable to have a United Nations office selling stamps directly to the public when such stamps could be obtained from the post office in the Headquarters building.

53. Mr. NASS (Venezuela) said that it was evident that if any person wished to buy a large quantity of United Nations stamps he would have to do so by mail. Such a system would make large sales of stamps much more difficult, and that would be inadvisable from a financial point of view.

54. In connexion with the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General (A/1394/Rev.1), he wished to know whether sales of United Nations stamps would take place in 1951.

55. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) said that it would take approximately six months to complete the final technical arrangements with the United States postal authorities, to hold an international competition for a stamp design, and to choose a design.

56. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the question raised by the Brazilian representative, said that stamps would

be sold at Headquarters direct to the public by the United Nations postal administration which was to be operated by the United States postal authorities. Any requests by philatelic agencies for stamps would be dealt with by the United Nations postal administration. He emphasized that in the United States of America about 90 per cent of the sale of stamps to philatelists was carried out by philatelic agencies, and therefore it would be advisable for the Fifth Committee to wait and see how the suggested arrangements worked. The matter could be considered further at the sixth session of the General Assembly if the arrangements being made proved unsatisfactory.

57. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thanked the Chairman for his explanation but felt that it should have been given by the representative of the Secretary-General. It was evident that the so-called "United Nations postal administration" would in reality be the United States Post Office and any money earned by the sale of stamps direct to the public would go to the United States Treasury and not to the United Nations.

58. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) said the Netherlands delegation considered that on the whole a happy solution had been found to the problem, and would therefore support the United States-United Nations draft postal agreement.

59. Referring to the statement of the United States representative that uncancelled official United Nations stamps could be used for private mail if posted at Headquarters, she doubted whether that would be altogether desirable. If she was not mistaken, the stamps issued by the International Court of Justice at The Hague could not be so used.

60. Mr. VAUGHAN (Secretariat) said he believed that it was possible for the stamps of the International Court of Justice to be used on private correspondence if the letters were mailed at the Peace Palace at The Hague, but he did not have information on that point.

61. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote paragraph by paragraph the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General on the organization of a United Nations postal administration.

Each of the paragraphs of the draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Expenses of the Permanent Central Opium Board. Assessment of non-members of the United Nations, signatories of the Convention of 19 February 1925 relating to narcotic drugs (A/1418, A/1461)

[Item 45]

62. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the Secretary-General's report (A/1418) and to the ninth report of 1950 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1461). He pointed out that the Advisory Committee concurred in the recommendations made by the Secretary-General in his report, and recommended that the resolution contained in paragraph 12 of that document should be adopted.

63. He then read out the various paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted by the Secretary-General and put each paragraph to the vote separately.

Each of the paragraphs of the draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted unanimously.

Budget estimates for the financial year 1951: (c) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1312 and Corr.1 and Add.1)

[Item 39]

SECOND REPORT OF 1950, PART THREE

64. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that part three of the second report of 1950 of the Advisory Committee dealt with three general administrative questions on two of which the Advisory Committee had been requested to submit reports by the Fifth Committee at the fourth session of the General Assembly, namely, the question of subsistence allowances for members of commissions, committees and other subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations (A/1232,⁴ para. 65), and possible economies in the registration, translation and publication of treaties and international agreements (A/1232, para. 107). In addition, the Advisory Committee had submitted a series of recommendations to the General Assembly on the subject of compensation to members of commissions, committees or similar bodies in case of injury or death.

65. Referring to the question of subsistence allowance, he drew the attention of members of the Committee to paragraphs 322 to 328 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1312), and to a draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee in connexion with emoluments paid to members of the International Law Commission (A/C.5/394).

66. Mr. KOBUSHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that as the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee had only very recently been brought to the notice of the members of the Fifth Committee, no decision on it should be taken at the present meeting.

67. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) supported the proposal made by the USSR representative. In view of the fact that the Sixth Committee, in addition to suggesting that members of the International Law Commission should be paid travel expenses and should receive a special allowance, had also approved a *vœu* to the effect that the special allowance provided for in the draft resolution adopted by it on 28 October 1950 should be \$35 a day, he considered that no decision should be taken by the Fifth Committee until it had received a report from the Advisory Committee and also the comments of the Secretary-General.

It was so decided.

68. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to paragraphs 322 to 328 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1312), briefly reviewed

⁴ *Ibid.*, Fourth Session, Plenary Meetings, Annex.

the recommendations made in paragraphs 325, 326 and 327, and pointed out that members of the Administrative Tribunal and of the Advisory Committee came within the purview of the suggestion made in paragraph 328.

69. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations in relation to subsistence allowance generally.

70. Referring to the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee in connexion with the emoluments paid to the International Law Commission (A/C.5/394), he emphasized that the Australian delegation had voted against that draft resolution and would do so in the Fifth Committee.

71. If his understanding of the suggestions made by the Sixth Committee was correct, members of the International Law Commission would receive a total of \$60 per day. That was an important departure from the recognized principles governing subsistence allowance.

72. Briefly reviewing the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee, he pointed out that many members of various General Assembly commissions were eminent men who devoted a considerable amount of their time to United Nations work and yet received no remuneration from that Organization apart from the reimbursement of their travel expenses. He cited in that connexion the experts who would be attached to the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and would have to devote all their time to problems of the greatest importance. He emphasized that those experts would be reimbursed only their out-of-pocket expenses, and suggested that the same principle should apply to members of the International Law Commission.

73. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to the draft resolution adopted by the Sixth Committee, said that it appeared that the Australian representative's assumption was correct that the Sixth Committee had suggested that members of the International Law Commission should be paid \$60 *per diem*. The Advisory Committee would study the Sixth Committee's proposal very carefully.

74. Mr. HALL (United States of America) said it was the understanding of the United States delegation that the special allowance referred to in the fifth paragraph of the Sixth Committee's draft resolution was in fact a subsistence allowance but would be outside the general provisions which applied to other expert bodies of the United Nations. He felt it would be helpful if the Committee had before it a definite interpretation of the Sixth Committee's proposal.

75. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) said the United States representative was correct in his assumption. He (Mr. Castañeda) had been present at the discussions in the Sixth Committee and the proposal which had been adopted was that a special allowance of \$35 per day should be paid to members of the International Law Commission instead of the sum provided in article 13 of the Statute of that Commission. It had also been suggested that an honorarium should be paid in addition to the \$35 *per diem*. That, however, had been rejected. Another proposal that members of that Commission

should receive remuneration in addition to the \$35 *per diem* has also been rejected.

76. Quoting article 13 of the Statute of the International Law Commission, he pointed out that the only amendment proposed by the Sixth Committee was that the General Assembly should determine the amount to be paid to the members by way of a special allowance. There was no question of the payment of \$60 *per diem*.

77. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) felt that the misunderstanding which had arisen showed that it was very undesirable that Committees of the General Assembly other than the Fifth Committee should discuss the administrative and budgetary consequences of the adoption of a draft resolution without the advice of the Advisory Committee. The latter Committee should have been consulted before the Sixth Committee's resolution was submitted to the Fifth Committee.

78. The explanations given by the Mexican representative had not altered the Australian delegation's stand regarding the emoluments to be paid to the members of the International Law Commission. It saw no reason why one commission should be singled out for treatment different from that accorded to other United Nations bodies.

79. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the remark of the Australian representative that Committees of the General Assembly other than the Fifth Committee should not make such proposals as those contained in the Sixth Committee's resolution without proper advice.

80. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) considered that, in accordance with rule 152 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, a statement showing the financial implications of the proposals made by the Sixth Committee should be submitted by the Secretary-General to the Fifth Committee before the latter took any decision on the matter. He suggested that such an estimate should be submitted at the same time as the Advisory Committee's report on the question.

81. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said his delegation supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the payment of subsistence allowance, and suggested that the Fifth Committee should not decide on the merits of the proposals made by the Sixth Committee until it had reached a decision on the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding normal subsistence allowance.

82. Mr. HALL (United States of America), referring to the Australian representative's suggestion that all bodies of the United Nations should be treated alike as regards the payment of subsistence allowance, pointed out that two of the groups of commissions, committees and other subsidiary bodies referred to in the Advisory Committee's report, were expert bodies to which individuals were elected, and the third group comprised commissions of inquiry and investigations to which governments were elected and on which individual members served as government representatives. Two sub-groups, namely, government employees and experts who served in a private capacity, were included in the first two groups. A distinction should also be drawn between those groups which met at Headquarters and those which met in Geneva or in other parts of the world. The Advisory Committee's report drew a distinction between

the expenses of the expert and governmental representative groups, and that distinction had been reflected in the Sixth Committee's resolution.

83. The United States delegation felt that it was very important to maintain consistency of treatment between the expert groups mentioned in part three, A, of the Advisory Committee's second report of 1950 (A/1312), but also had a great deal of sympathy for the factors which had led the Sixth Committee to make its proposals regarding the members of the International Law Commission. The fact that the Sixth Committee had made such proposals did not imply that its members wished the International Law Commission to be treated differently from other expert bodies.

84. Experts who were not in receipt of an income from other sources and who had to maintain themselves at Headquarters or in Geneva for considerable periods of time, were faced with a difficult problem. His delegation felt, therefore, that the *per diem* recommended by the Advisory Committee might not be entirely adequate and would submit a proposal in writing that *per diem* paid at Headquarters should be increased to \$35 in accordance with the recommendations of the Sixth Committee, and that the *per diem* paid to members of commis-

sions and committees meeting away from Headquarters should also be increased. His delegation would be opposed to any exception to the general rules regarding the payment of subsistence allowance, and considered that it was very important that experts should be equitably treated. Any effort to distinguish between the groups would involve the Fifth Committee in great difficulties with other General Assembly Committees and considerable criticism on the part of various professional groups.

85. He felt it would be useful if the members of the Fifth Committee could receive before their next meeting a list of the expert bodies and commissions of inquiry and investigation, the members of which received subsistence allowance, and also a paper showing the effect of the United States proposal and of the Advisory Committee's recommendations on those allowances. He would like the list to indicate where the various bodies were at present stationed.

86. The CHAIRMAN said that the United States proposal would be circulated to the members of the Fifth Committee in time for it to be considered at the Committee's meeting on 3 November 1950.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.