

The USSR representative's proposal was rejected by 34 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

66. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Polish representative's proposal that the seven members of the Administrative Tribunal should each receive a *per diem* of 20 dollars plus 10 dollars special allowance.

The Polish proposal was adopted by 21 votes to 11, with 9 abstentions.

67. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said he did not understand the procedure being followed in the matter of voting. He was sure that there were a number of representatives who had voted for a *per diem* of 20 dollars plus an allowance of 10 dollars who would have been prepared to vote for a higher figure.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the fact that certain representatives had not understood the vote, he would put to the vote the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General for the Administrative Tribunal, namely 26,370 dollars, which had been agreed to by the Advisory Committee.

69. Mr. TARN (Poland) pointed out that as his proposal had been adopted it would be out of order to put another estimate to the vote.

70. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) supported the Chairman's proposal as those representatives who had been in favour of granting a

per diem of 50 dollars had not been able to express their opinion.

71. Mr. VANER (Turkey) agreed with the representative of the Netherlands and felt that the question of allowances to be granted to members of the Administrative Tribunal should be voted on as a whole.

72. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) supported the Chairman's suggestion.

73. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur, suggested that the Chairman should put the Polish amendment to the vote again.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the Polish representative to the Secretary-General's recommendation regarding the *per diem* to be paid to members of the Administrative Tribunal, namely that such members should receive a *per diem* of 20 dollars plus a special allowance of 10 dollars.

The Polish amendment was adopted by 17 votes to 14 with 10 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the total estimates for section 1 of the budget estimates for 1950, amounting to 1,326,960 dollars.

Section 1 of the budget estimates for 1950, amounting to 1,326,960 dollars, was adopted by 35 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 30 November 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1950 (second reading—continued)

SECTION 2

Section 2, the Security Council, Commissions and Committees, was unanimously adopted at 357,600 dollars.

SECTION 3

1. Mr. GANEM (France) recalled that at its ninth session the Economic and Social Council had decided to hold both its own eleventh session and the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights at Geneva. The Fifth Committee, on the first reading of the budget estimates for 1950, had decided not to appropriate the funds required to give effect to the Economic and Social Council's resolution.¹ Such a decision looked in some respects like a veto on the Economic and Social Council. He pointed out that Article 28 of the Charter laid down that the Security Council could hold its meetings where it thought fit. Article 22 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice contained a similar provision. Finally Article 12 of the International Law Commission's Statute provided that the Commission should sit at the headquarters of the United Nations, but should have the right to hold meetings at other places after consultation with the Secretary-General.

2. The French delegation, while not asking for a review of the decision taken by the Fifth Commit-

tee, thought nevertheless that the Economic and Social Council should not be given the impression that the decision it had taken at its ninth session had been absolutely vetoed by the Fifth Committee. It pointed out, moreover, that the Council, at its tenth session, might, despite the Committee's vote, uphold its own former decision and decide that its eleventh session and the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights would still be held in Geneva. In that case the Secretary-General might find himself in a difficult position, since the Fifth Committee would not have given him the means to apply a decision so confirmed by the Economic and Social Council.

3. To avoid the difficulty, the representative of France proposed the insertion in the Rapporteur's report of a passage saying that the Fifth Committee admitted that if, while impressed with the need for effecting as much saving as possible, the Economic and Social Council decided at its tenth session to confirm the decision it had taken with regard to its eleventh session and the sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights, it would be possible for the Secretary-General, with the concurrence of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, to make the necessary transfer between sections of the budget or, within reasonable limits, draw upon the Working Capital Fund.

4. Such a reasonable suggestion would supplement the decision taken by the Fifth Committee and allow the necessary steps to be taken in the

¹ See the Summary Record of the 210th meeting.

event of the Economic and Social Council's deciding to confirm its previous decision.

5. Mr. TARN (Poland) supported the French representative's proposal and added that at its coming session, in February 1950, the Economic and Social Council would indeed have the opportunity of confirming the decision taken with regard to its eleventh session.

6. The representative of Poland drew attention to the fact that the *Journal of the General Assembly* of Wednesday, 30 November 1949, gave an incorrect summary of the Committee's discussion of the Colombian draft resolution at its 230th meeting. The principle underlying the proposal had not, in fact, found "general support" with the Committee. Several representatives had opposed it.

7. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) thought the French proposal somewhat unusual. At its 230th meeting the Committee had approved the spirit of the Colombian draft resolution; yet the representative of France was submitting a proposal entirely at odds not only with the principles approved by the Committee but with the decision it had taken at the first reading of the budget estimates. The United Nations had a Secretariat which had been set up at great expense at Lake Success; the object of the French proposal was to enable the Economic and Social Council to hold a session in Geneva that involved an additional expenditure of about 100,000 dollars. The United Kingdom representative thought that since the question of substance had been settled, there was no point in reopening it.

8. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) entirely supported the French proposal. At its tenth session the Economic and Social Council would be able to decide where to hold its eleventh session in the light of political, economic and climatic considerations. If it decided to hold its eleventh session at Geneva, that decision would be subject to consideration by the Advisory Committee, and the Secretary-General would also have to assent, so that the requisite control was fully assured.

9. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) stated that he was against the French proposal.

The French proposal was rejected by 20 votes to 19, with 2 abstentions.

10. In reply to a question by Mr. TARN (Poland), the CHAIRMAN stated that if the Economic and Social Council at its tenth session confirmed the decision to hold its eleventh session at Geneva and asked the Secretary-General for the necessary appropriations for that purpose, the latter could refuse such appropriations if the decision just taken by the Fifth Committee was confirmed by the General Assembly.

Section 3 amounting to 325,390 dollars was adopted by 41 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

SECTION 3a

Section 3a, Permanent Central Opium Board and Narcotic Drugs Supervisory Body, was unanimously adopted at 39,900 dollars.

SECTION 3b

Section 3b, Regional Economic Commissions, was unanimously adopted at 53,560 dollars.

SECTION 4

11. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that following the statement made by his delegation, consideration of the Trusteeship Council, Commissions and Committees, had been postponed to a later date in the first reading of the budget.¹ The Brazilian delegation had submitted a proposal to reduce by 10,000 dollars the appropriations under the section. The Trusteeship Council's task, however, would be considerably increased during the coming year, in consequence of the resolutions recently adopted by the General Assembly. He felt that, as a first step, the explanations of the Secretary-General's representative on that point should be heard; he had no wish whatever to interfere with the activities of the Department in question and was prepared to propose the restoration of the 10,000 dollars, the deletion of which had been demanded.

12. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) stated that when the proposal had been made to reduce the estimate for the Trusteeship Council by 10,000 dollars, the Secretary-General had gone into the question thoroughly and had come to the conclusion that, if satisfactory services were to be provided for the Council's forthcoming session in Geneva, the sum fell short by 6,000 dollars. Moreover, Somaliland had been placed under trusteeship and the Council would have to consider that question, so that its session would last longer and additional expenditure would be incurred. If the amount of 10,000 dollars was not restored, the Secretary-General would have to apply to the Advisory Committee for authorization to make transfers between sections of the budget or to draw on the Working Capital Fund.

13. Mr. BUNCHE (Secretariat) recalled that since the first reading of the budget estimates, the General Assembly had adopted a certain number of resolutions which added to the workload of the Trusteeship Council at its session in Geneva. The Council would have to enter into negotiations with Italy in order to draw up a Trusteeship Agreement for Somaliland. The General Assembly had also adopted resolutions relating to political advancement in Trust Territories (A/1093), petitions and visiting missions (A/1094), economic advancement in Trust Territories (A/1095), social advancement in Trust Territories (A/1096), educational advancement in Trust Territories (A/1097), and the use of the flag of the United Nations in Trust Territories (A/1098). He hoped that not only would the sum of 10,000 dollars be restored but that the Committee would adopt the original estimates which had been reduced by 6,250 dollars on the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/1040, paragraph 5).

14. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) pointed out that if the session of the Trusteeship Council was held in Geneva, only a few delegations would be able to participate in the debate on Somaliland. For that reason, as well as for others previously stated, the New Zealand delegation proposed refusing the appropriations required for holding the Trusteeship Council session in Geneva.

15. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) said that whenever the Secretariat was given additional work, it asked for additional appropriations from the Fifth Committee without making any

¹ See the Summary Record of the 209th meeting.

attempt to cope with the work with the services at its disposal. He asked if all the Assembly decisions referred to by Mr. Bunche had been studied by the Advisory Committee; those decisions were being represented as justifying the request for restoring the appropriation of 10,000 dollars. He opposed such a proposal.

16. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) replied in the negative to the question put by the United Kingdom representative. The Advisory Committee, in making its recommendation, had not wished in any way to hamper the work of the Trusteeship Council.

17. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) agreed with the New Zealand representative. The same reasons which the Committee had admitted as valid when deciding that the Economic and Social Council would not hold its session in Geneva, were equally applicable to the Trusteeship Council.

18. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said the proposal to restore the appropriation of 10,000 dollars could not be considered since it had not been studied by the Advisory Committee.

19. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that he had asked whether the Trusteeship Council could cope with its work without the 10,000 dollars appropriation. The Secretariat's reply had been in the negative. Accordingly the Committee could give a considered decision.

20. Mr. TARN (Poland) said that apparently it was being settled that all United Nations organs should hold their sessions at the temporary headquarters as if it were not possible for them to hold such sessions elsewhere. He did not think that was a sound principle.

21. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) said that it should be possible for the Trusteeship Council to consider the new items on its agenda without asking for additional appropriations. In any case, the Secretary-General could apply to the Advisory Committee for authorization to transfer credits, should the costs originally contemplated be exceeded.

22. Replying to Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic), the CHAIRMAN stated that rule 112 of the rules of procedure was not applicable to the New Zealand proposal to deny the appropriations required for holding the Trusteeship Council's session in Geneva. He would put that proposal to the vote first, then, if it was rejected, he would take a vote on the Brazilian proposal to restore the appropriation of 10,000 dollars. The Brazilian proposal was admissible since the Committee had all the necessary information at its disposal to enable it to vote.

23. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) mentioned that the Committee did not have at its disposal the Advisory Committee's report on the Brazilian proposal.

The New Zealand proposal was rejected by 23 votes to 14, with 2 abstentions.

The Brazilian proposal was adopted by 19 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

Section 4 as a whole, amounting to 175,750 dollars, was adopted by 37 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

SECTION 5

Section 5, Special Conferences, was adopted unanimously at 53,600 dollars.

SECTION 6

24. The CHAIRMAN stated that voting on section 6, Investigations and Inquiries, would be postponed pending the decisions to be taken by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

SECTION 6a

25. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that for the reasons given by the USSR representative in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and by himself, he would vote against the estimates for the United Nations Field Service.

Section 6a, amounting to 337,000 dollars, was adopted by 35 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

SECTION 7

26. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that section 7, Executive Office of the Secretary-General, included an appropriation of 16,000 dollars for the Interim Committee. The establishment of such a committee was in conflict with the Charter. For the reasons given by the USSR representative in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and by himself, he would vote against the estimated appropriation of 16,000 dollars under that head.

27. Mr. TARN (Poland) said the Fifth Committee was voting not upon abstract figures but on the various posts in the Secretariat. It would be desirable to ascertain whether, if the Committee voted the same appropriations for one particular service as the previous year, the Secretary-General had or had not the right to abolish posts in the service concerned. That question was an important one since the future Administrative Tribunal would build up its case-law on the basis of the reply given. He felt that it was a matter for the General Assembly to establish or abolish posts. If, for administrative reasons, the Secretary-General abolished posts for some reason other than financial, he would be taking a step which was within the competence of the Fifth Committee.

28. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) stated that in the past the Secretary-General had believed that by approving the budget, the General Assembly thereby indicated the maximum number of posts to be filled. It would be unfortunate if the Secretary-General were obliged by the Assembly to retain personnel in posts throughout a whole year even if the need for a particular post had disappeared during the year. The suggestion made by the Polish representative would mean that the Secretary-General would have to remunerate officials even if they had no work to do.

29. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Fifth Committee was approving the budget, section by section, and not according to the manning tables.

30. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that, according to Mr. Andersen's statement, the manning tables corresponded to the maximum number of posts to be filled. The Secretary-General was not bound to fill all those posts. Nor should every reduction made in the budget by the General Assembly be taken as an automatic reduction in the number of posts.

31. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) felt that the Polish representative's question raised important issues not connected with the second reading of the budget, including the right of an official to the post he held and the Secretary-General's right to transfer staff. He reserved his position with regard to the Polish representative's question and Mr. Andersen's reply. With regard to the connexion between the manning table and the adoption of budgetary credits section by section, he recalled that at the third session the Canadian representative had given it as his opinion, based on regulation 17 of the financial regulations, that the Secretary-General should apply credits in accordance with the General Assembly's decision.

32. Mr. TARN (Poland) asked that the question he had raised should be examined by the Advisory Committee.

33. Mr. VANER (Turkey) said that the question ought not to be examined. It would be inadvisable to interfere with the contractual relations between the Secretary-General and his staff.

34. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) considered that the Advisory Committee, which was to examine the report of the Committee of Experts on Salary, Allowance and Leave Systems might study the Polish representative's question. In any event the Secretary-General would take it into account.

35. The CHAIRMAN said the Advisory Committee would consider the question in due course. He requested the Committee to come to a decision with regard to the USSR proposal to reduce the credits in section 7 by 16,000 dollars.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 34 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

Section 7, amounting to 512,000 dollars, was adopted by 35 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

SECTION 7a

Section 7a, Library Services, was unanimously adopted at 449,500 dollars.

SECTION 8

36. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the item of 19,000 dollars for the Interim Committee should be deleted from the estimates for the Department of Security Council Affairs.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 34 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Section 8, amounting to 841,200 dollars, was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

SECTION 9

37. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) submitted the Secretary-General's report on the Military Staff Committee secretariat (A/C.5/337). He realized that considerable economies could be made if the question was considered from the purely administrative point of view. There were other factors, however, which should be taken into account. The Military Staff Committee had in general shown a co-operative attitude and had lent staff from its secretariat whenever possible.

38. Colonel WILLIAMS (Military Staff Committee Secretariat) stated that the question of integrating the staff of the secretariat of the Military Staff Committee into the appropriate Departments of the Secretariat was dealt with in the

Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/337). The question of possible reductions in the budget of the Military Staff Committee had been carefully considered, but it had not been thought possible to make any reduction. The staff had, however, effectively co-operated in the work of the other Departments. Since 31 March 1949 the interpreters of the Military Staff Committee had worked 206½ days for other organs of the United Nations and since 25 July 1949 its translators had translated 522 pages in order to assist the Translation Division of the Department of Conference and General Services.

39. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) recalled that during the first reading of the budget he had stated that if the Secretary-General did not suggest a satisfactory solution, he would raise the question again.¹ Two possible solutions had been considered: either the integration of the secretariat of the Military Staff Committee into the United Nations Secretariat, or a reduction in the estimated expenditure under section 9. The figures supplied during the first reading of the budget did not justify the maintenance of twenty-nine posts, nor did the Secretary-General's report. The Military Staff Committee's programme of work for 1950 was not known; the budgetary estimates, therefore, had to be based on past experience.

40. The Military Staff Committee stated that it was impossible to integrate its personnel into the corresponding Departments of the United Nations. He was fully aware of the special difficulties confronting the Military Staff Committee, but he felt at the same time that the Fifth Committee would be failing to do its duty if it allowed the existing situation to remain as it was. No section of the budget was sacrosanct. If integration was impossible, he would suggest that the number of interpreters should be reduced from ten to five, translators from two to one and secretaries or clerks from six to three. He did not wish the Military Staff Committee's efficiency to be adversely affected, and accordingly recommended that if its work increased unexpectedly the Secretary-General should be authorized to ask the Advisory Committee for the necessary funds.

41. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, should the Committee vote for a reduction and the credits were found insufficient, then the Advisory Committee would be prepared to consider either appropriate transfers between sections or withdrawal from the Working Capital Fund.

42. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) supported the proposal made by the Union of South Africa. He was glad to see that the Military Staff Committee was taking a co-operative attitude, but he was not entirely satisfied with the figures given by Colonel Williams.

43. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) agreed with the representative of the Union of South Africa. He asked whether it would be easy to recruit the kind of specialized staff needed by the Military Staff Committee.

44. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Military Staff Committee was an organ of the Security Council and that it was provided for in Articles 47 and 48

¹ See the Summary Record of the 199th meeting.

of the Charter. The Committee could not, therefore, taken any decisions relating to section 9 without first ascertaining the views of the Security Council.

45. The staff members of the Military Staff Committee's secretariat were highly specialized. He considered that they should not be dismissed, especially as they spent all the time they had left free by their duties for the Military Staff Committee in working for other Departments of the Secretariat. He therefore opposed the reduction suggested by the Union of South Africa.

46. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) thought that it appeared from information supplied to the Committee that the personnel of the Military Staff Committee was far too numerous. He therefore supported the proposal for a reduction put forward by the representative of the Union of South Africa.

47. Mr. TARN (Poland) pointed out that the Advisory Committee had approved the budget estimates for the Military Staff Committee, although it could easily have proposed a reduction (A/934, paragraph 84). That proved that the Secretary-General's arrangements were satisfactory and reasonable.

48. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) felt that caution was indicated. He asked for a description of the structure of the Military Staff Committee secretariat, and referred to the security problems which arose in the case of that body. He assumed that the staff of twenty-nine was being kept fully employed, if not on Military Staff Committee work, then on translation work supplied from Lake Success. If that were the case, any staff member who was dismissed would involve a replacement in the Department of Conference and General Services, since his services would be needed by the Translation or Interpretation Division to reduce the back-log of translation work.

49. Colonel WILLIAMS (Military Staff Committee secretariat) explained that the recruitment of personnel for the Military Staff Committee was carried out on special lines: in particular, the interpreters had to be able to translate technical military terms into four different languages.

50. The Military Staff Committee fully realized the necessity for economy. In 1949 it had saved 20,000 dollars on salaries, certain vacant posts not having been filled, and 11,030 dollars on home leave.

51. With regard to the structure of the Military Staff Committee secretariat, he read the relevant passages of that body's rules of procedure. He pointed out that the South African proposal was inapplicable in view of the fact that only twenty-two persons were currently employed in the secretariat.

52. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) was disappointed that the Military Staff Committee took a stand on the legal position. He was convinced that subject to observing priorities for its own work, the fullest integration possible of the staff of the Military Staff Committee should be made with the headquarters Secretariat. He appreciated that there might be some special difficulties in recruiting members of that secretariat and that the Fifth Committee should therefore act with caution. Still, some of the staff were not specialists and

could consequently be attached to the appropriate Department of the headquarters Secretariat. He therefore suggested that the representative of the Union of South Africa should amend his proposal so that the number of interpreters and specialized translators would not be reduced.

53. Furthermore, the members of the Military Staff Committee secretariat ought to be fully occupied; nothing less than full employment ought to be countenanced by the Fifth Committee. Accordingly, he asked the Principal Secretary to give the Fifth Committee a categorical assurance that, outside their special employment, members of his secretariat would at all times be at the disposal of other Departments. He suggested that the representative of the Union of South Africa should amend his proposal so that it covered only staff easily and readily replaceable.

54. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) considered that a question of principle was involved. The Fifth Committee could not authorize a certain number of staff members for a unit of the Secretariat, and at the same time stipulate that those staff members might be employed elsewhere.

55. The main argument advanced against all proposals for reduction, when financial implications were discussed, was that recruiting was difficult. If that argument was accepted, it would be very difficult to effect any savings.

56. He was pleased to note the savings which had already been realized by the Military Staff Committee. They were the best argument in support of his own proposal. He could not accept the suggestion of the Canadian representative, as he thought the Military Staff Committee might well maintain that no members of its secretariat could easily be replaced. In any case, however, the seven vacant posts should not be included in the estimates.

57. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said the work of the Military Staff Committee had often been discussed and that statistics had been provided on its activities. He wished to know how many meetings the Committee had held, how long they had lasted and the number of substantial resolutions it had adopted, as well as what the future prospects in that field were.

58. The proposal of the representative of the Union of South Africa would be more acceptable if it related to a sum of money rather than to posts.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that the reductions proposed by the representative of the Union of South Africa amounted to 53,000 dollars.

60. Colonel WILLIAMS (Military Staff Committee secretariat) said that the Military Staff Committee had so far held fifty-five meetings. The meetings had lasted from ten minutes to five or six hours. In 1949, 225 documents had been drawn up, with a total of 3,500 pages.

61. The assurance requested by the representative of Canada had already been given in writing. The Military Staff Committee secretariat was at present in a difficult position as its staff numbered only twenty-two, instead of the twenty-nine for which provision had originally been made. It should not be forgotten that, in principle, that secretariat should be made up of equal proportions of members from each of the five countries represented in the Military Staff Committee itself.

62. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) accepted the arguments put forward by the representative of Belgium and proposed that the estimate for section 9 should be reduced by 53,000 dollars.

The proposal of the Union of South Africa was adopted by 19 votes to 10, with 8 abstentions.

63. Mr. TARN (Poland) pointed out that the discussion of section 9 had related to posts. It was therefore incorrect to say that the Fifth Committee merely accepted or rejected sums of money.

64. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the vote had been taken on a sum of money.

The estimate of 144,800 dollars for section 9 was adopted by 32 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

SECTION 10

The estimate for section 10, Department of Economic Affairs, was adopted unanimously at 2,450,000 dollars.

SECTION 11

65. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that the Secretary-General had presented supplementary estimates for the Department of Social Affairs as a result of three decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council at its ninth session. The Fifth Committee had refused, on first reading, to appropriate the credits necessary for the establishment of a cartographic service.¹ As a member of the Economic and Social Council and as the author of the resolution for the establishment of that service, he asked that the decision taken by the Committee should not be interpreted as prohibiting the Secretary-General from establishing such a service, if he was able to do so out of savings on other items.

66. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) supported the Brazilian proposal. In the Economic and Social Council his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution for the establishment of a cartographic service, but had reserved its position regarding the estimates for that project. He had voted against the appropriation of the 13,000 dollars requested by the Secretary-General for the implementation of the resolution, in the hope that it would be possible to save that sum on the budget of the Department of Social Affairs. It had not been his intention to prohibit the Secretary-General from undertaking that activity, if he was able to find the necessary funds. In the circumstances, he expressed the hope that the Fifth Committee would accept the Brazilian representative's interpretation, namely, that the Secretary-General should be authorized to set up a cartographic service if he was able to do so within the total appropriation for the Department of Social Affairs.

67. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) agreed with the representative of the United States of America. His delegation had voted in favour of the resolution in the Economic and Social Council but against the appropriation requested by the Secretary-General of the Fifth Committee. It considered that the Secretary-General should be able to carry out the proposal without supplementary credits.

68. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted for the supplementary credit requested by the Secretary-General.

He was consequently inclined to support the Brazilian proposal, but he feared that it might present certain procedural difficulties. It might create a dangerous precedent which, if followed, could make all the work of the Fifth Committee valueless. It would therefore be wiser simply to restore the credit requested by the Secretary-General and refused in the first reading.

69. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Brazilian proposal did not invite the Secretary-General to establish a cartographic service but authorized him to do so if he thought he could find the necessary funds.

70. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) agreed that a procedure whereby the Secretary-General was authorized to undertake a certain activity of his own accord, when the Fifth Committee had specifically refused the necessary credits, would be inadvisable. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General did sometimes state that such and such a draft resolution had no financial implications, as he would be able to implement it within the limits of the budget authorized by the General Assembly. There was therefore no reason why the Committee should not authorize the Secretary-General to set up a cartographic service, if he could do so without asking for supplementary credits.

71. Mr. LARRAÍN (Chile) said his delegation in the Economic and Social Council had voted for the establishment of a cartographic service. He would therefore support the Brazilian proposal.

72. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said he had voted against the suppression of the appropriation of 13,000 dollars requested by the Secretary-General, and therefore favoured the Brazilian proposal. He agreed with the representative of the Netherlands that the broad formula suggested by the representative of the United States in his first statement might prove dangerous, for if the Fifth Committee gave the Secretary-General complete freedom, the budget could no longer be controlled.

73. In his second speech, however, the representative of the United States had circumvented the question very carefully; he had proposed that the Secretary-General should be authorized to use any budgetary surplus arising within the budget for the Department of Social Affairs for the purpose of setting up a cartographic service.

74. Mr. Lebeau found that proposal acceptable.

75. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) reminded the Committee that when the Secretary-General had requested supplementary credits for the Department of Social Affairs, he had stated that he would be able to carry out all but three of the resolutions of the Economic and Social Council without asking for additional appropriations. That being so, why was it necessary to say that the Secretary-General might use the budgetary surplus of the Department of Social Affairs? He should be able to use any savings, regardless of the Department in which they were effected.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General would take into account the statements made by the representatives of Brazil, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Chile.

Section 11 was adopted unanimously at 1,689,500 dollars.

¹ See the Summary Record of the 223rd meeting.

SECTION 12

The estimates of 935,000 dollars for section 12, Department for Trusteeship and Non-Self-Governing Territories, were adopted by 39 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

SECTION 13

77. Mr. CRISTÓBAL (Philippines) regretted the Committee's decision to suppress the Opinion Survey Section which he considered very useful.¹ He would therefore propose that the appropriations for section 13, Department of Public Information, should be increased by 36,560 dollars, and that the Opinion Survey Section should be re-established.

78. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) recalled that the Committee had decided to suppress that section, but that no specific sum had been voted. The decision had therefore been one of substance.

79. The CHAIRMAN stated that no decision taken during the first reading of the budget estimates should be considered final. He would therefore put the Philippine proposal to the vote.

80. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) felt that in those circumstances the Philippine proposal required a two-thirds majority vote to be adopted.

81. The CHAIRMAN proposed that a vote should be taken first on the question whether rule 112 of the rules of procedure was applicable in the present case.

82. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) regretted that his statement at the preceding meeting should have been the cause of the difficulty that had arisen. He had not meant that rule 112 of the rules of procedure applied to decisions taken during the first reading of the budgetary estimates, and would have no objection if the Philippine proposal were put to the vote.

83. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) supported the Chairman's proposal.

It was decided, by 11 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions, that rule 112 of the rules of procedure was applicable in the case of the Philippine proposal.

84. Mr. CRISTÓBAL (Philippines) also proposed that the publications of the Opinion Survey Section should be maintained, which would involve an additional expenditure of 36,560 dollars.

The Philippine proposal was rejected by 25 votes to 4, with 12 abstentions.

Section 13, amounting to 3,264,250 dollars, was adopted by 30 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

SECTION 14

Section 14, Legal Department, was unanimously adopted at 527,300 dollars.

SECTION 15

85. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in its twenty-seventh report of 1949 (A/1155) for the approval of a supplementary estimate of 10,000 dollars under chapter I of section 15, Department of Conference and General Services.

86. Mr. TARN (Poland) noted with concern rumours that certain members of the Secretariat, namely, maintenance staff and guards, were being

discharged, and that the Secretary-General was concluding contracts with commercial firms for those services. While some savings might no doubt thus be effected, it would be necessary to discharge members of the Secretariat, and those replacing them would be exploited by the contractors. Mr. Tarn considered that the United Nations could not so far demean itself as to tolerate such exploitation; moreover, it would have no control over that kind of employees. He asked that the Secretary-General should submit a full report on the subject.

87. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) felt that it was premature to discuss that question since no decision had as yet been taken. It would seem that certain tasks might be carried out at less cost by a local contractor than by Secretariat employees. Any decision on the subject would be submitted to the Advisory Committee before being put into effect. The Secretary-General would take the Polish representative's remarks into consideration.

88. Mr. TARN (Poland) recalled that all persons discharging similar functions for the United States Government were civil servants. He thought, moreover, that it would be dangerous for the Organization to have at its Manhattan headquarters a large number of persons having no direct relations with the United Nations.

89. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) said that the question was entirely new to him. He thought that the Secretary-General would consult the Advisory Committee before taking a decision and that he would avoid any injustice towards the staff.

90. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that the question had already been dealt with by the Advisory Committee, which had recommended effecting certain economies by relying upon the services of contractors. He thought that the Committee might leave to the Advisory Committee the task of considering that question when it studied the report of the Committee of Experts on Salary, Allowance and Leave Systems.

91. Mr. TARN (Poland) understood that, according to paragraph 122 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/934), promotions had been deferred until after the submission of the report of the Committee of Experts. As the Committee had decided to refer that report to the Advisory Committee which would report upon it to the General Assembly at its fifth session, he thought that it would be unfair to continue to suspend all promotions. The necessary credits should therefore be restored in the budget estimates.

92. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) thought that that was a very important question. He agreed with the representative of Poland that since the Committee had decided to refer the report of the Committee of Experts to the Advisory Committee, that meant that the Secretary-General could not continue to suspend all promotions and maintain the personnel at the level at which it had been for several months. However, the financial consequences of the resumption of promotions might be serious and Mr. Lebeau thought that that question should be studied separately.

93. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that paragraph 122 of the report of the Advisory Committee concerned the promotions of interpreters, while paragraph 21 of that report dealt with the

¹ See the Summary Record of the 201st meeting.

question of promotions as a whole. The additional expenses resulting from a favourable decision of the Committee in regard to interpreters amounted only to 5,000 dollars, and the representative of Brazil, so far as he was concerned, was prepared to approve them. In general, the classification of interpreters within the framework of the new plan must be different from that of the other members of the Secretariat. The Secretary-General might classify them according to the number of languages they knew.

94. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee could rest assured that the Secretary-General

would take all the measures possible to benefit the staff.

95. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) reminded the Committee that it was considering section 15 of the budget estimates. It could not, therefore, consider in connexion with that subject a paragraph of the report of the Advisory Committee which dealt with a question that was entirely general and the exact financial implications of which should first be known. Under section 15, the Committee could consider only paragraph 122 of the Advisory Committee's report.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 2 December 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1950 (*second reading continued*)

SECTION 15 (*continued*)

1. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that at the previous meeting the representative of Poland had raised the question whether the deferment of classifications referred to in paragraphs 21 and 122 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/934) would be affected by the postponement of the examination of the Committee of Experts' report.

2. It was obvious that the Committee's decision on that report introduced a new factor which must affect the recommendation of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee considered that it would be unjust to insist that all reclassifications should be deferred until the General Assembly had taken a decision on the report of the Committee of Experts.

3. The Polish representative had mentioned specifically paragraph 122 of the report of the Advisory Committee, in which the Committee recommended a reduction of 5,000 dollars in the sum provided for certain reclassifications in the Interpretation Division. The Secretary-General had proposed the reclassification of eighteen interpreter posts, ten of them from grade 13 to grade 15 and the remaining eight from grade 13 to grade 14.

4. The Advisory Committee's recommendation in that connexion in no way related to the report of the Committee of Experts. The Advisory Committee considered that it might be unduly liberal to reclassify eighteen posts, and that was its only reason for recommending the reduction of 5,000 dollars. Such a recommendation was not unique; the Committee had made similar recommendations with regard to other sections of the budget, for example, in paragraph 128 of its report.

5. A distinction should consequently be made between the reclassifications approved in principle by the Advisory Committee and those which did not seem to be justified, irrespective of the decision taken on the report of the Committee of Experts.

6. Mr. TARN (Poland) proposed the restoration of the sum of 5,000 dollars, which it had been decided to eliminate at the first reading. He also wished to ask the Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services whether he would agree that the question of the dismissal or retention of the staff members engaged upon maintenance and guard duties should be discussed with the Advisory Committee before any decision was taken on the subject.

7. Mr. PELT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services) stated that that question would be considered by the Administration with the Advisory Committee; that would be essential, since the decision that would be taken would influence the budget.

8. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the estimates for section 15 were of great importance. He therefore considered that it would be useless to approve a further sum of 5,000 dollars, since it should be possible to find such a small sum.

9. Mr. PELT (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Conference and General Services) stated that he would do what he could in that respect, but could give no guarantee. If he was unable to save that sum, the staff members entitled to the reclassification concerned would not obtain it.

10. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) supported the Polish proposal on grounds of principle; the Committee had approved a considerable number of reclassifications in other Departments of the Secretariat and it could not, therefore, adopt a discriminatory measure in the case of the Interpretation Division.

11. Sir William MATTHEWS (United Kingdom) considered that it would be absurd to add 5,000 dollars to the estimates for section 15, since those estimates exceeded the sum of 8,500,000 dollars. He proposed that the Committee should state that no discrimination would be exercised against the interpreters, and that the Committee should go on record to the effect that the sum required could be found within the estimates for section 15.