



This electronic version (PDF) was scanned by the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) Library & Archives Service from an original paper document in the ITU Library & Archives collections.

La présente version électronique (PDF) a été numérisée par le Service de la bibliothèque et des archives de l'Union internationale des télécommunications (UIT) à partir d'un document papier original des collections de ce service.

Esta versión electrónica (PDF) ha sido escaneada por el Servicio de Biblioteca y Archivos de la Unión Internacional de Telecomunicaciones (UIT) a partir de un documento impreso original de las colecciones del Servicio de Biblioteca y Archivos de la UIT.

(ITU) نتاج تصوير بالمسح الضوئي أجراه قسم المكتبة والمحفوظات في الاتحاد الدولي للاتصالات (PDF) هذه النسخة الإلكترونية نقلاً من وثيقة ورقية أصلية ضمن الوثائق المتوفرة في قسم المكتبة والمحفوظات.

此电子版（PDF 版本）由国际电信联盟（ITU）图书馆和档案室利用存于该处的纸质文件扫描提供。

Настоящий электронный вариант (PDF) был подготовлен в библиотечно-архивной службе Международного союза электросвязи путем сканирования исходного документа в бумажной форме из библиотечно-архивной службы МСЭ.



### **Documents of the Plenipotentiary Conference (Buenos Aires, 1952)**

To reduce download time, the ITU Library and Archives Service has divided the conference documents into sections.

- This PDF includes Document No. 201-300
- The complete set of conference documents includes Document No. 1-537

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 201-E  
6 November 1952

The Secretary General of the Union has received the following letter, from the World Federation of United Nations Associations :

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS

Central Office : 1, Avenue de la Paix, Geneva, Switzerland

Mr. L. MULATIER,  
Secretary General,  
International  
Telecommunication Union

B u e n o s   A i r e s

Sir,

We have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter D 158/BA/Cab, dated 14 October 1952, informing us that the Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U., in plenary assembly, readily agreed that representatives of the World Federation of United Nations Associations should attend the Buenos Aires Conference.

We have also taken note of the fact that, according to the existing provisions of the I.T.U. Convention, non-governmental organizations cannot, formally, attend I.T.U. conferences as observers. We wonder whether, at the Buenos Aires Conference, it would not be possible to revise these provisions in such a way as to enable the non-governmental international organizations interested in the aims of the I.T.U. to enjoy, at I.T.U. meetings, a status similar to that accorded to them by the other specialized agencies of the United Nations.



- 2 -  
(201-E)

We cannot but express our gratification at the facilities which you are prepared to accord to the representatives of our Federation. In thanking you for this act of courtesy, we trust that you will give some thought to the possibility (perhaps under Article 27 of the I.T.U. Convention) of adopting new provisions which would redound to the advantage not only of our organization, but also of other, more technical, bodies with which the I.T.U. has maintained relations for many years.

Our representatives in Buenos Aires will certainly be at your disposal should you be prepared to give detailed consideration to the suggestion we have taken the liberty of submitting.

With every good wish for the complete success of the Conference,

I have the honour to be, Sir, etc.,

(signed) John A.F. Ennals

Secretary General

---

The Chairman of the Conference considers that the above letter should be brought to the notice of delegates.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No.202-E  
6 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE 3

Buenos Aires, 1952

CORRIGENDUM No. 1 TO DOCUMENT No. 184

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE 3 A.

Annex 1

Article 6, paragraph 4 to be replaced by:

4. The Rules of Procedure of the Board are defined in the General Regulations annexed to this Convention.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

TEXTS OF TWO DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND A DRAFT PROTOCOL  
SUBMITTED BY WORKING GROUP No. 1 OF COMMITTEE 3.

DRAFT RESOLUTION (A)

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U. of Buenos Aires

Considering

that the present organization and working methods of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. should be simplified as far as possible;

that, nevertheless, no decision as to the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. can be taken before the Plenary Assemblies of those two bodies have had an opportunity of considering the matter;

Resolves

that both these Plenary Assemblies shall include in the Agenda of their next meeting the detailed study of such an amalgamation, and shall formulate their recommendations on the subject, which shall be presented to the next Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference of the Union.

DRAFT PROTOCOL

1. The Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference of the I.T.U., which is due to meet in 1954, is hereby authorized to approve the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. into one permanent organ of the Union, should it judge that this course is in the best interests of the Union as a whole. In coming to its decision, the Conference shall be guided by the recommendations on this subject of the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F., which in accordance with Resolution (A) of the Plenipotentiary Conference of Buenos Aires, shall be laid before it.
2. Should the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference decide that the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. with the C.C.I.F. is to be effected, then
  - a) the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. with the C.C.I.F. shall take effect from a date, not earlier than the 1st of January 1955, to be fixed by that Conference;
  - b) the provisions of sub-paragraphs (d) and (c) of paragraph 3 of Article 4 of the International Telecommunication Convention shall be deemed to have been amended with effect from that date, so as to form a single sub-paragraph reading as follows:

"Article 4 (3) (d)

the International Telegraph and Telephone  
Consultative Committee (C.C.I.T.)";

and the provisions of sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph 1 of Article 8 of the International Telecommunication Convention shall be deemed to have been amended with effect from that date, so as to form a single sub-paragraph reading as follows:

"Article 8 (1) (1)

The duties of the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (C.C.I.T.) shall be to study technical operating and tariff questions relating to telegraphy, facsimile and telephony, and to issue recommendations on them";

- c) The Study Groups and the specialised secretariats of the C.C.I.T. and of the C.C.I.F. shall be replaced by Study Groups and a single specialised secretariat of the amalgamated organization in a manner to be determined by the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference in the light of the recommendations made by the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F.
3. In the event of the postponement of the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference beyond 1954, the Administrative Council of the Union is hereby authorized to exercise, after consulting the Members of the Union, the same powers as are conferred on the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference by paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Protocol.
4. Unless and until the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. with the C.C.I.F. is decided upon and brought into effect in accordance with the above provisions, the Assistant Secretary General in charge of the Telegraph and Telephone Division of the General Secretariat shall continue to accept responsibility for the functioning of the C.C.I.T., in accordance with Resolution 172 of the Administrative Council (Fifth Session) and in derogation from the provisions of sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 4 of Article 8 of the International Telecommunication Convention.

DRAFT RESOLUTION (B)

Authorising the approval, by the Administrative Council, of the budgets and accounts of a single C.C.I. formed by the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. with the C.C.I.F. in the event of such amalgamation taking place before the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

---

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U. of Buenos Aires

Considering

that under the provisions of Protocol No. .... the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. with the C.C.I.F. to form one single permanent organ of the Union may take place before the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

Resolves

that the Administrative Council of the Union is hereby authorized, subject to the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and to the provisions of Protocol No. .... , to approve the annual ordinary and extraordinary budgets and accounts of a combined C.C.I., replacing the present C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F., from such date as may be fixed by the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference (1954) or, (in the event of that Conference having been postponed beyond 1954) by the Administrative Council itself, under the provisions of Protocol No. ....

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 204-E  
6 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

Summary Record of the Fourteenth Meeting

Monday 3 November, 1000 hours

Chairman: Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted the summary records of the 9th and 10th meetings (Documents Nos. 145 and 153) to the Committee for approval.

The summary record of the 9th meeting (Document No. 145) was approved after making the following amendments:

- page 23, in the statement by the Delegate of Italy, replace the word "authority", in the seventh line of the statement, by "competence" and delete the last sentence of the statement.

- page 25, replace the statement by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by:

"The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the Conference had not yet arrived at a decision concerning the maintenance of the I.F.R.B. His Delegation, and many others, had already expressed the opinion that the I.F.R.B. should be discontinued. That question could only be decided by the Plenary Assembly.

"The Plenary Assembly had not yet examined the question and his Delegation considered that it should."



The summary record of the 10th meeting was then approved without amendment.

° ° °

The Chairman said that, according to instructions received from the Steering Committee (Vide Doc. No. 167), the Committee should pass as quickly as possible to the study of Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention so that the work of Committees 3 and 4 could be better coordinated. Since discussion had already begun however, on the proposals for the fusion of the C.C.I.F. and C.C.I.T., the matter should be pursued before turning to Articles 10 and 11, so that a decision could be reached.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia reminded that his country, at Atlantic City, had opposed the fusion of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. But the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention concerning the C.C.I.T. had not been applied; the Plenary Assembly of the C.C.I.T. had twice decided not to appoint a Director, and the Administrative Council had been forced, twice, to take practical steps which, in the opinion of his Delegation, were not in full agreement with the Convention.

The Administration of Czechoslovakia had therefore reconsidered its position and arrived at the conclusion that the provisions of the Convention relative to the C.C.I.T. should be modified to make them applicable in practice. There were many questions that were studied by both C.C.I.'s, for example, circuit matters, maintenance, protection, telecommunication vocabulary, lease rates, etc.....

His Administration had also proposed (Proposal No. 622) either the fusion of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F. (as proposed by Norway at Atlantic City), or the merger of the two Committees under a single Director assisted by a single Secretariat. The latter proposal by several Delegations had been submitted to the C.C.I.F. Plenary Assembly at Paris in 1949.

The merger of the two Committees would result in a better coordination of the two Committees' work, it would introduce economies, not only for the Union but also for administrations and particularly for the small countries. His Delegation was therefore in favour of the merger.

The Delegate of Turkey referred to his country's proposal for the unification of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T. The proposal was designed to produce a more rational and less costly organization. It was well known, and the Report by the Administrative Council mentioned it, that the two Committees had frequently worked together, as for example when they set up joint Study Committees. He would not insist on considerations of economy since he had noticed that, although there had been much talk of economy at the Conference, the majority had so far always been in favour of maintaining the status quo when the time came to take a decision.

It was regrettable that during the previous meeting several Delegates had opposed unification, even before the originators of the proposal had explained their reasons. Some had stated that they considered a merger laudable but only possible at some future date. The Turkish Delegation considered that unification could start without delay; the decision could be taken immediately and the merger be carried through by stages. The Turkish proposal was also concerned with a matter of detail (statistical study of interruptions on international telecommunication channels) and the Turkish Delegation reserved the right to revert to the matter when a decision of principle had been taken on the point at issue.

The Delegate of India declared in favour of fusion of the two C.C.I.'s for technical and financial reasons. He could not see what difficulties could ensue. Would Messrs. Valensi and Townshend give their views? The proposal of the Delegation of Switzerland as amended by the Netherlands suggested a correct procedure to which he gave his support.

The Director of the C.C.I.F. made the following statement:

"Since the C.C.I.F. was set up in 1926 I have taken part, as head of the C.C.I.F., in studies pursued in common, on the international plane, by telegraph and telephone experts. I have always found that harmonious relations exist between them and decisions have generally been adopted unanimously. There should be no narrow telephone or telegraph spirit but, above both, a spirit of "international telecommunications."

"In discussing the possible fusion of the C.C.I.F. and C.C.I.T. I shall draw upon the experience I have gained. I shall be objective, with the serenity of a man who is mature and at the end of his career so that he demands nothing for himself.

"With regard to the fusion of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T., International Telegraph and Telephone Regulations respectively have been mentioned. I would like, first, to remind you that a C.C.I. is not an Administrative Conference and it is not called upon to draw up Regulations. Its role is to follow closely technical progress and the evolution of public needs, to make a profound study of both, and to propose the means that appear most appropriate to bring to the public of the world the benefits of progress and technique. Whereas a Conference is concerned with the present, a C.C.I. is rather orientated towards the future; it is a laboratory where the solutions of future problems are worked out.

"The outline of these solutions is generally to be found on the national plane of countries that are in the vanguard of technical progress. It is thus already possible to perceive the contours of international telegraphy of the future which will be superposed upon, and amalgamated with, the present state of affairs.

"I am thinking particularly of the international telex service which has a great future, and also of the combined use of telephone and telegraph to accelerate the transmission of a telegram from a small locality of a country where a telegraph installation is not justified, or urgently to advise a telephone subscriber of the contents of a telegram which will later be delivered to him in printed form. I am also thinking of the extension, to more and more territories, of the General Switching Programme.

"In short, side by side with present international telegraphy (which is governed in detail by the International Telegraph Regulations), another international telegraphy is going to develop using switching to a greater degree, as is common in telephony; the problems that will arise in the organization of this future international telegraphy will often resemble telephone problems, without however, being completely identified with them.

"Many engineers think that the evolution of technique will take place in this way and that explains why this question of the fusion of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T., already timidly raised at Atlantic City in 1947, has been taken up again with greater insistence today in Buenos Aires.

"There is already sufficient ground common to the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T. and I must confirm, as is mentioned in Document No. 62 of Sweden, that the following questions are always dealt with by the C.C.I.T. in very close liaison with the C.C.I.F.:

" - General Switching programme, namely, the planning of new lines to be installed, and general recommendations for the direction of international traffic on these lines;

" - Problems related to trunk transmission, linked with the specification of lines and associated equipment. I need hardly mention that facsimile uses telephone lines as for telephone calls and that, with the modern technique of carrier currents, 18 or 24 telegraphic channels can be obtained simply by dividing the frequency band effectively transmitted by a telephone channel;

" - The organization of periodical preventative maintenance of telegraph circuits; periodical maintenance must be carried out by close liaison, on the telegraph channels and the telephone channel which carries them;

" - Protection against disturbance or corrosion due to the vicinity of electric current transmission lines or lines used for electric traction; in this case both telegraphy and telephony have the same enemies;

" - Operation of, and rates for facsimile, since this is transmitted over the same lines and through the same installations as telephone calls.

"Outside these main questions that I have just enumerated, there are, on the ground common to the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T., other less important questions, such as: - vocabulary, definitions, graphic or literal symbols, etc.

"How are these common questions dealt with at present? Draft recommendations are first drawn up by joint study groups, and generally telegraph and telephone experts are fully in agreement. These draft recommendations have subsequently to be separately endorsed by the two Plenary Assemblies and this naturally involves some duplication of correspondence, documents, and oral discussion. It has even happened (seldom, fortunately) that after so-called 'purely drafting' amendments the final recommendations promulgated by the two C.C.I.'s separately have given rise to differences of interpretation.

"This question of the merger of the C.C.I.F. and C.C.I.T. is nevertheless worthy of profound study, taking into consideration the two main aspects: on the one hand economy, and on the other efficiency.

"At present, the C.C.I.T. does not in fact possess the 'specialized secretariat' envisaged in the Atlantic City Convention and the General Regulations, 1947. It has an Interim Director, who can give it some of his time, and it has (all the time) a counsellor and a shorthand-typist. Observing the great future for international telegraphy, and bearing in mind all the problems linked with this future, can one escape the conclusion that the C.C.I.T. is at present rather penalized? Should a 'specialized secretariat', provided with all the means necessary to satisfactory operation, be set up for the C.C.I.T., or would it be better to amalgamate the present resources in international staff of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T., and to bring in the necessary re-inforcements?

"I think the second solution would be more economical than the first, but that is of little importance for the general budget of the Union, since the three C.C.I.'s account for only a quarter of the four millions which form the present ceiling to the Union's ordinary expenses. A gain in efficiency would, perhaps, ensue, and for the following reasons:

"By placing in the same team the present technical counsellor of the C.C.I.T. and the present engineers of the C.C.I.F., the task of the chairmen of study groups would be considerably lightened, whereas at present it is much heavier during meetings of the C.C.I.T. than during those of the C.C.I.F. It must be borne in mind, that during the course of any meeting, all technical questions are not dealt with at the same time; furthermore, the aforementioned international technicians have, during the studies pursued in their youth, learned the foundations of both telegraphy and telephony.

"The fusion of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T. would perhaps have another advantage on the national level, namely, to render less water-tight the bulkheads which, in the same administration, too frequently separate telephone and telegraph experts.

"Lastly, in relations between the I.T.U. and the United Nations or other specialized agencies, this fusion would lead to a greater uniformity in the views of I.T.U. Delegates.

"Nevertheless, such a fusion of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T. cannot be improvised; it must be the object of careful study to ensure it redounding as much to the advantage of telegraphy as telephony. The two C.C.I.'s concerned should undertake the study, if the Conference comes to a decision in principle."

The Interim Director of the C.C.I.T. said that he would like to take advantage of the Chairman's invitation to speak in order to place before the Committee some factual considerations, particularly in regard to the probable financial effect of the various alternative proposals before them which might, he hoped, be of use to the Committee in arriving at a decision.

The tasks of the C.C.I.T., as prescribed in the Atlantic City Convention, and its methods of work, were exactly parallel in the field of telegraphy and facsimile to those of the C.C.I.F. in the field of telephony (Art. 8 of the Convention); and these tasks were being carried out by the prescribed methods (Study Groups). The Atlantic City Convention also prescribed parallel organizations for the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F., but in one important respect the Convention had been departed from in the case of the C.C.I.T.; namely, that it had no Director, as provided for in

Par. 4 (c) of Art. 8. Instead, by derogation authorized by the Administrative Council, the general responsibility for the work of the C.C.I.T. at the official level was being undertaken by one of the Assistant Secretaries General. He wished to emphasize, however, that there was no departure from the Convention in regard to the provision of Par. 4 (d), namely that the C.C.I.T. should have a specialized secretariat. There had been such a secretariat, since 1950, and its existence was quite vital to the work of the C.C.I.T. in modern conditions. The secretariat consisted of one telegraph engineer, and a secretary, and this was sufficient at present. There was one difference between the specialized secretariat of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F., namely that the latter also included a small number of non-engineering officials (e.g. a mimeograph operator), whereas the C.C.I.T. relied for such work on the services of the General Secretariat. In his view, this arrangement had advantages and disadvantages, but the choice was not very important; what was essential was the engineering element in the specialized secretariat.

There seemed to be three possible choices before the Committee:

- 1) to implement the arrangements prescribed in the Atlantic City Convention;
- 2) to amalgamate the C.C.I.T. with the C.C.I.F., and
- 3) to maintain the status quo.

The first alternative would be expensive - the Administrative Council had estimated the cost as of the order of 100,000 Swiss francs a year. No Member had actually proposed this solution, and in Mr. Townshend's opinion it could not be recommended, because the C.C.I.T. was not large enough to justify a wholly independent organization at the official level. In his view, the practical choice lay between the second and third courses.

The second course, an amalgamation with the C.C.I.F. was perfectly practicable, but he strongly supported the view expressed by Mr. Valensi that, if the Conference should decide on this course, the modalities should be left to the Plenary Assemblies of the two C.C.I.'s

to work out, since it was at these Plenary Assemblies that expert representatives of all the Member countries actually interested in the work of the C.C.I.'s met together, and these representatives were of course fully familiar with the details.

As regards the advantages and disadvantages of an amalgamation, about 75% of the work of the C.C.I.T. was strictly technical, i.e. engineering character, and it was true that the development of telegraph technique tended to approach more and more closely the corresponding technical work of the C.C.I.F. Nevertheless, he thought that the Committee would wish to bear in mind that the degree of this approach varied in different circumstances; it was much greater when dealing with the technical problems of the services of highly developed countries than in the case of the problems of countries which had not yet reached so high a state of development, where for example separate telegraph line-plant still existed on a considerable scale. The remaining 25% of the C.C.I.T. work was not engineering work, but it was both highly specialized and important. It comprised such vital matters as the development of telex operating methods, as well as problems connected with quality of service and a number of other matters affecting the International Telegraph Regulations, and also such specialized administrative problems as that of the telegraph needs of the aeronautical services. This work was not closely connected with that of the C.C.I.F.

The third course was the maintenance of the status quo. The present arrangements, as Mr. Townshend had reported to the Administrative Council, were unsatisfactory in that they involved the supervision of work, of which a substantial part was of a technical engineering character, by an official who was not a qualified engineer; and in his opinion it would be out of the question to maintain them indefinitely. As a temporary expedient, however, it had proved possible so far to make them work, he thought, reasonably satisfactorily, and if the Conference so desired, they could be continued, on a temporary basis, for a few years.

As regards financial effects, it was necessary to consider separately a) the ordinary expenditure, b) the extraordinary expenditure, and c) the direct expenditure of Members of the Union in attending Study Group Meetings and Plenaries; this last did not, of course, enter into the accounts of the Union, but obviously concerned Members as much as expenditure which did enter into these accounts.

In Mr. Townshend's opinion, amalgamation with the C.C.I.F. would involve a small element of additional expenditure on ordinary account, because the small specialized secretariat of the C.C.I.F., even although strengthened by the addition of the still smaller secretariat of the C.C.I.T. would not, in his judgment, be able to do all the work of both C.C.I.'s without some further addition to the staff. In his opinion, however, only a sum of the order of 30 or 40,000 Swiss francs a year would be involved.

The effect on extraordinary expenditure could not be estimated in figures, because the extraordinary expenditure was borne, not by all Members of the Union, but only by those who participated actively in the work of the C.C.I.'s. A list of these Members would be found in the Report of the Administrative Council to the Conference, and it would be seen that some administrations and private operating agencies shared in the expenses of the C.C.I.F. without sharing the expenses of the C.C.I.T., and vice versa. It could not be known beforehand whether those administrations and operating agencies would all be willing to participate in the expenses of a combined C.C.I.T., and their decision would, of course, effect the share of the other Members. However, on balance, Mr. Townshend considered that there would be some saving on extraordinary account by amalgamation.

As regards the direct expenditure of Members themselves, this was a matter which they were in the best position to judge, but it would seem likely that some administrations, although not all, would effect some saving.

On balance, Mr. Townshend was quite satisfied that the financial effect of amalgamation, one way or the other, would be so small that the Committee could safely take that decision on considerations of efficiency only.

Summing up, Mr. Townshend expressed the following views:

- 1) the C.C.I.T. was not large enough to justify an entirely separate organization at the official level; it would therefore have to be amalgamated with the C.C.I.F. or to remain partially amalgamated - as at present - with the General Secretariat;
- 2) there was nothing material to choose from the point of view of economy between the two solutions;
- 3) amalgamation would need detailed study by the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F., before being put into effect;
- 4) meanwhile, the present arrangement, though quite unsuitable as a permanent organization, could be continued without serious loss of efficiency.

The Delegate of Pakistan said that what he had just heard from Messrs. Valensi and Townshend confirmed his opinion that the two C.C.I's should be unified. The fusion would result in far greater economy than one thought, particularly for distant countries, which often, because of excessive expense, could send a representative to only one of the C.C.I's.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that he had listened with interest to the speeches of preceding Delegates and to the statements of Messrs. Valensi and Townshend. He now considered that all confirmed once again that the fusion of the two C.C.I's was advisable.

It must be remembered that the systems of communication used in telephony and telegraphy had many elements in common, both from the technical and operational points of view. In many countries the same organizations directed the operation and research in the sphere of

both telegraphic and telephonic communications; in general, when new lines were installed they were planned with a view to simultaneous use for both telegraphy and telephony.

The fusion of the two committees would facilitate a better direction of work and would permit the resolution, in a more complete and general way, of a whole series of questions common to both telegraphy and telephony. Furthermore, the fusion of the two C.C.I's would result in considerable economy both for the Union and for Administrations.

Consequently, the decision must be taken to unify the two C.C.I's in a single organization. It would be useful to arrange for a meeting of the two C.C.I's together to solve the problem of organization and technique. In the meantime, the Directors of the two C.C.I's should be instructed to prepare the documentation and necessary proposals and to arrange for their distribution to Members of the Union.

His Delegation gave its support to the proposal for the fusion of the two C.C.I's in a single organization.

The Delegate of Japan said that his administration preferred the status quo to the fusion of the two C.C.I's which, however desirable it may be, could be effected later.

The Delegate of China considered that the moment to effect the fusion of the two Committees had not yet arrived. Much thought was necessary before deciding to modify the structure of the Union, which the Atlantic City Conference had established in full knowledge of the facts. Above all, it must be known if the two Committees concerned consented to this fusion.

The Delegate of Belgium considered that it would be premature for the Conference to take an immediate decision upon the fusion of the two Committees. There existed, particularly in telegraphy, many questions both of technique and operation which demanded separate study by specialized persons. The fusion envisaged would hardly permit any reduction in the number of representatives that administrations

had to send to meetings of the Committees or to their study groups. He was not opposed to the principle of fusion but considered that the question should be examined by the Plenary Assemblies of the two Committees and that a decision should be taken by the next Plenary Conference.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic made the following statement:

"We support the proposal to unify the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. submitted by Sweden. This fusion will be useful because telegraph and telephone systems have many points in common, both from the technical and operational points of view. The unification of the two Committees will not prejudice their activities and will lead to a considerable reduction in the expenses of the Union. We consider this question clear and sufficiently ripe to be resolved by this Conference.

"Consequently, we support the proposal of Sweden relating to the fusion of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F".

The Delegate of Sweden said that he did not share the opinion of those who considered that the fusion of the two C.C.I's should be carried out later, since there was the risk of being faced by a position where the Plenary Assemblies of the Committees had taken decisions (for example the election of new Directors to replace persons in office reaching the age limit) that would render the fusion more difficult than it was at present. It would be advisable to draft an alternative text for Article 8 which could become valid if the Plenary Assemblies of the two C.C.I's considered the fusion to be desirable and possible.

The Delegate of Iceland said that he was in agreement with all that the Delegate of Sweden had said.

The Delegate of Denmark was, in principle, in favour of the merger proposed by Sweden, although the main reason was not economy, in the first few years at any rate, but increased efficiency. The merger was possible since the aims and methods of working of the two C.C.I's were similar. There were, moreover, sound technical reasons for such a merger; for example, it was often the case that the technical aspect of a particular problem should be referred to one Committee and the operational aspect to another, and new systems of communication

used telegraph principles for telephone problems and vice-versa. This situation could certainly best be dealt with by a joint organization. It might even be practicable one day to have just one single C.C.I. to co-ordinate the technical activities in the various specialized fields, although this would certainly be premature at present.

However, for the reasons given, he felt that the merger of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F. should be planned now, although, since it was not important that it should be carried out in the near future, he was quite agreeable to the question being studied by the two C.C.I.'s Plenary Assemblies, as proposed by the Delegate of the Netherlands.

He thought, however:

- 1) the Convention itself should make a merger possible if the two C.C.I.'s accept it;
- 2) during the interim, nothing should be done to prejudice the merger, e.g. in respect of staff, accommodation, etc.;
- 3) a suitable protocol should be drafted to cover this.

The Chairman summed up the opinions of preceding speakers.

"Some considered that the present Conference should decide if the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. were to be unified in a single committee, at a date which could be the same as the entry into force of the new Convention, for example 1 January 1954. This solution could apparently not be adopted since the question had not been sufficiently studied.

"The second solution was that proposed by Switzerland. It was more prudent, but since the decision was postponed until the next Plenipotentiary Conference, many Delegations felt that it was excessively "long term".

There remained the Dutch proposal according to which the Plenary Assemblies of the two C.C.I.'s would have to make known their opinion on the matter and the Telegraph and Telephone Conference would adopt a definitive decision. If this last solution were adopted the present Conference would have to draft a protocol to this effect.

He asked the Committee if this last solution satisfied everyone.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that since many Delegations had declared in favour of the fusion of the two C.C.I.'s the Committee should come to a decision on principle. Subsequently the details and the means of bringing about the fusion could be discussed. He did not agree to the matter being referred to the Administrative Telephone and Telegraph Conference. The structure of the Union was governed by Article 4 of the Convention and could only be modified by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

His Delegation was in favour of the fusion of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F. into a single Consultative Committee and he supported that proposal.

The Chairman said that the proposal of Switzerland, amended by the Netherlands, constituted a perfectly legal procedure. In fact, the present Conference could delegate the necessary authority to the Administrative Telephone and Telegraph Conference.

The Delegates of Turkey and of the Lebanon having both expressed the opinion that questions relating to the structure of the Union were essentially the concern of the Plenipotentiary Conference, the Chairman said that he would put the original proposal of Sweden to the vote; namely that the Committee should decide for or against the principle of fusion of the two C.C.I.'s.

Speaking as the Delegate of Portugal, the Chairman said that he would vote against this proposal. The persons who took part in the work of the C.C.I.'s should examine the question. After showing that the number of questions to be studied by both Committees

together was not as great as was believed, that the fusion would not result in any considerable reduction in the number of Study Groups, and that, if everything was taken into consideration, there were many common points, not only between the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F., but also between the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.R., he said that the Administration of Portugal was not opposed to the fusion of the two committees but it was opposed to the present Conference itself taking a decision to bring about this fusion.

The Delegate of the United States of America shared this opinion. The Conference was not competent to take such a decision. The two consultative committees concerned must take the decision themselves and the Telephone and Telegraph Conference bring the decision into force. Flexible provisions should be included in a protocol by the present Conference. He would therefore vote against the proposal of Sweden.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia said he would vote in favour of the proposal. The Chairman had just said that the fusion of the two C.C.I.'s would not result in much economy as far as the Study Groups or Specialized Secretariats were concerned. It was precisely in the way of carrying out study that economy would be possible since such questions would not be sent from one committee to another as was done at present.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics then made the following statement:

"I cannot agree with the remarks that have just been made, according to which the fusion of the two C.C.I.'s in a single organ would be a question for them themselves to decide. The Convention envisages that the structure of the Union can only be fixed by the Plenipotentiary Conference. Why has it been stated that we would not be competent to examine this question?"

"The proposals on the fusion of the two C.C.I.'s were published some months ago. All Members of the Union have had the opportunity to study the position and to arrive at considered opinions. It is evident that every Delegation arrived at the Conference with a well-considered opinion. We are therefore perfectly competent to adopt a decision on the point at issue.

"Since the proposal to unify the two C.C.I.'s has been presented it must be examined first, as being the one farthest from the present text of the Convention."

The Delegate of France considered that it was reasonable to begin with decisions of principle and to continue with details. Decisions on principle should be taken by the Plenary Assemblies of the two C.C.I.'s as the Swiss and Dutch proposals envisaged. On the other hand, the same Plenary Assemblies should also decide the details of the single Committee's structure which would replace the two existing Committees. If the definitive decision were to rest with the Telegraph and Telephone Conference, the points of view of the two Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.'s might well be completely modified. In answer to a question by the Chairman, the Delegate of France stated that he was not submitting an amendment to the Swiss proposal, but simply making a suggestion.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia said that he would vote in favour of the fusion proposed by Sweden and Turkey. He could not accept the procedure proposed by the Swiss and Dutch Delegations, which in fact maintained the status quo. The Plenipotentiary Conference, which was sovereign in all that concerned the structure of the Union, should take a decision on principle relating to the fusion of the two C.C.I.'s, leaving it to the Plenary Assemblies of the Committees to study the means of bringing the fusion into force.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stressed the great importance of the issue which the Committee was about to decide. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was not averse to a merger in principle, but agreed with Portugal that the question had not been studied in sufficient detail for such an important decision to be taken. Moreover, since as all had heard, the merger would have no appreciable effect on the budget for some years, it was clearly not a matter of urgency. Moreover, a consideration of the field of studies of the two C.C.I.'s showed that it would not be wise to bring about the proposed merger for some time. In the technical field, as Mr. Townshend had said, only about 20% of the problems were common to the two C.C.I.'s; in the operating field, there was very little common ground

at all; in the tariff field, the telegraphs and telephones were very wide apart, and it would be a long time before they had much in common.

He had originally been in favour of leaving the final decision to the next Plenipotentiary Conference. In view of the feeling expressed on the Committee, however, and of the fact that there were proposals to lengthen the period before the next Plenipotentiary Conference, he now supported the proposal of Switzerland as amended by the Netherlands.

Following all these statements the Committee voted by roll-call on the Swedish proposal (No. 106) relating to a decision of principle on the merger of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F. into a single Consultative Committee.

The proposal was rejected by 24 votes to 20 with 28 abstentions.

In favour: 20 Delegations:

Afghanistan, P.R. of Albania, Bielorussian S.S.R., P.R. of Bulgaria, Ceylon, Denmark, Hungarian P.R., Iceland, Italy, Norway, Pakistan, P.R. of Poland, Federal German Republic, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, U.S.S.R.

Against: 24 Delegations:

Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Vatican City, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Costa Rica, Egypt, U.S.A., Indonesia, Japan, New Zealand, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Syria, Territories of the U.S.A., Venezuela.

Abstained: 28 Delegations:

Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Dominican Republic, Spain, Ethiopia, France, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, French Oversea Territories, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, South Africa, Uruguay, Viet-Nam, Yomen, Spanish Morocco.

The Delegation of Switzerland and those Delegations supporting the Swiss proposal said that they accepted the Dutch amendment. The Chairman said he would put to the vote the only proposal before the Committee: that of Switzerland as amended by the Netherlands. That proposal could be summarised as follows: "The text of the Convention remains unchanged, the two Consultative Committees concerned being called upon to give their opinion on the possibility of a merger, and the definitive decision rests with the Telegraph and Telephone Conference, bearing in mind the opinions expressed by the C.C.I.'s. If the Committee adopted this proposal a working group would be set up to draft a protocol."

The proposal of Switzerland, with the Dutch amendment, was put to the vote and adopted by 55 votes in favour, six against and 10 abstentions.

In favour: 55 Delegations:

Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, Spain, U.S.A., France, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Netherlands, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Territories of the U.S.A., French Overseas Territories, Portuguese Overseas Territories, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Yemen, Spanish Morocco.

Against: 6 Delegations:

P.R. of Albania, Saudi Arabia, Bielorussian S.S.R., P.R. of Bulgaria, Hungarian P.R., P.R. of Poland.

Abstentions: 10 Delegations:

Cambodia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Iran, Italy, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R.

Following this vote a working group was instructed to draw up a draft protocol for submission to the Committee. The working group was made up as follows:

- Chair: Switzerland.

- Members: India, Norway, Netherlands, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, Turkey, Messrs. Valensi and Townshend.

The meeting rose at 1315 hours.

Rapporteurs:

E. Luraschi  
G. Terras  
R. V. Hatton  
J. Revoy

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 205-E  
7 November 1952

COMMITTEE 4

REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 2 TO COMMITTEE 4

Working Group 2 has examined, according to the instructions received from Committee 4, Proposals 328 to 344, inclusive, 587, 588, 589, 684, 694 and 708 relating to changes in the text of Annex 2 to the Convention.

It devoted three meetings to the study of these proposals. The Working Group submits to Committee 4 a draft revised text of Annex 2 (see attached pages).

J. Doublet  
Chairman of Working Group 2  
of Committee 4

Annex: 1

A N N E X

A N N E X 2

Definition of terms used in the International Telecommunication Convention and its Annexes.

---

Administration - Any governmental department or governmental service responsible for implementing, or causing to be implemented, the International Telecommunication Convention, the General Regulations, the Administrative Regulations and any other provisions that may be annexed thereto.

Private operating agency - Any individual, company or corporation other than a governmental department or service which operates a telecommunication installation for the purpose of providing an international service or a telecommunication installation which is capable of causing harmful interference and upon which the obligations provided for in Article 20 are imposed by the Member or Associate Member in whose territory the head office of the agency is situated.

Recognised private operating agency - Any private operating agency as defined above which operates a service of public correspondence or of broadcasting.

Delegate - A person representing the government of a Member or Associate Member of the Union at a Plenipotentiary Conference or a person representing a government or an administration at an Administrative Conference, or at a meeting of an International Consultative Committee.

Representative - A person representing a recognized private operating agency at an Administrative Conference, or at a meeting of an International Administrative Committee.

Expert(1) -

Observer - A person representing:

- a) the United Nations under Article II of the agreement between the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union;
- b) the Government of a country non-member of the Union invited to take part in a Conference;
- c) one of the international organizations referred to in Article 27 of the Convention;
- d) (2) ....

- 
- (1) The Working Group has noted that certain proposals submitted refer to Chapter 6, Rule 7, of the General Regulations, while others refer to Chapters 2 and 8 of the General Regulations. There are discrepancies between these Chapters. The Working Group concluded that a question of principle was involved which it was not for the Group to settle. Hence it decided to propose no definition for the time being.
  - (2) The Working Group has given careful attention to the following question: Can a Member or Associate Member of the Union be represented at a Union Conference by an observer only? The Group considered that it could not answer that question. It is of the opinion that if the reply were to be in the affirmative, the Plenipotentiary Conference should specify how the share of the country concerned in defraying the expenses of the Conference should be determined.

Delegation: The totality of the delegates and of any representatives, attachés, (experts) or interpreters sent by the same country.

Each Member and Associate Member shall be free to make up its delegation as it wishes. In particular it may include in its delegation in the capacity of delegate, of adviser (or expert) persons belonging to private telecommunication operating agencies which it recognizes or belonging to other private enterprises interested in telecommunication.

International service: A telecommunication service between any combination of offices or fixed, land or mobile stations which are in different countries or are subject to different countries.

Mobile service: A service of radiocommunication between mobile and land stations or between mobile stations.

Broadcasting service: A radiocommunication service of transmissions to be received directly by the general public<sup>(1)</sup>.

Telecommunication: Any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, visual or other electromagnetic systems.

Telegraphy: A system of telecommunication for the transmission of written matter by the use of a signal code.

Telephony: A system of telecommunication set up for the transmission of speech or, in some cases, other sounds.

Telegram: Written matter intended to be transmitted by telegraphy; this term also includes radiotelegram unless otherwise specified.

---

(1) This service may include transmissions of sounds or transmissions by television, facsimile or other means.

Government telegrams and government telephone calls: These are telegrams or telephone calls originating with any of the authorities specified below:

- a) the Head of a State;
- b) the Head of a Government and members of a Government;
- c) the Head of a colony, protectorate, oversea territory or territory under suzerainty, authority, trusteeship or mandate of a Member or Associate Member or of the United Nations;
- d) Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air;
- e) diplomatic or consular agents;
- f) the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Heads of the principal organs and of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations;
- g) the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Replies to Government telegrams as defined herein shall also be regarded as Government telegrams.

Service telegrams: See the Telegraph Regulations for the time being in force.

Private telegrams: Telegrams other than service or Government telegrams.

Service telephone calls: See the Telephone Regulations for the time being in force.

Public correspondence: Any telecommunication which the offices and stations, by reason of their being at the disposal of the public, must accept for transmission.

Radiocommunication: Any telecommunication by means of Hertzian waves.

(Ann. to Doc. 205-E)

Hertzian waves: Electromagnetic waves of frequencies between 10 kc/s and 3,000,000 Mc/s.

Radio: A general term applied to the use of Hertzian waves.

Harmful interference: Any radiation or any induction which endangers the functioning of a radionavigation service or of a safety service, <sup>(1)</sup> or obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radio service operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations.

---

(1) Any radio service, the operation of which is directly related, whether permanently or temporarily, to the safety of human life and the safeguarding of property, shall be considered as a safety service.

International  
Telecommunication Union

                      
PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 206-E

6 November 1952

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT

At the request of the Chairman of Committee 4, the  
attached communications are distributed as a conference  
document.

Annexes: 2

- 2 -  
(206-E)

A N N E X 1

U.I.T.

CONFERENCIA PLENIPOTENCIARIA INTERNACIONAL  
DE TELECOMUNICACIONES

Secretario General

No. 283/BA/Cab

Buenos Aires,  
5 November 1952

Mr. I.A. Tsingovatov  
Chairman, Committee IV,  
BUENOS AIRES.

Sir,

I attach a letter from the Chairman of the Argentine Delegation at the Plenipotentiary Conference, to the effect that the Argentine Delegation is withdrawing Proposals 409, 413, 415, 418, 420, 433, 436, 443, 452, 456, 462, and 478, which relate to the Rules of Procedure of conferences (Chapter 6 of the General Regulations annexed to the Convention), but that it considers as its own the corresponding texts which appear in the Rules of Procedure approved by Committee 4.

I have the honour to be, Sir, .....

L. Mulatier  
Secretary General

Annex: 1

- 3 -  
(Ann.1-Doc.206-E)

Buenos Aires, 5 November 1952

Léon Mulatier,  
Secretary General, I.T.U.

Dear Mr. Mulatier,

In accordance with the decisions taken by Committee 4 at its meeting on 4 November, the Argentine Delegation is withdrawing its proposals 409, 413, 415, 418, 420, 433, 436, 443, 452, 456, 462, and 478, which relate to the Rules of Procedure of conferences (Chapter 6 of the General Regulations annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention). We regard as ours the corresponding texts appearing in the Rules of Procedure approved by Committee 4.

Yours faithfully,

Marco Aurelio Andrada  
Chairman

- 4 -  
(206-E)

A N N E X 2

6 November 1952

The Japanese Delegation withdraws its proposals

No. 449

457

465

480

in favour of the Rules of Procedure adopted by Committee 4  
(Document No. 186 - 4 November 1952).

K. Hanaoka  
Deputy Chief of the  
Delegation of Japan

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 207-E  
6 November 1952

COMMITTEE 7

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH THE  
UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

A G E N D A

for 4th meeting  
Saturday 8 November at 1600 hours

Plenary Hall

1. Communication from the International Red Cross Committee (Docs. Nos. 38 and 45)
2. Priority for telegrams of the Specialized Agencies - draft resolution submitted by France (Doc. No. 178)
3. Proposed abrogation of Art. IV Section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies - draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Doc. No. 177)

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 208-E

7 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

Summary Record of the 15th meeting on

Wednesday, 5 November, 1952 at 1000 hours

Chairman : Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted for approval the summary record of the 11th meeting (Document No. 174) which was adopted without change.

The Committee then proceeded to consider Article 10 (Plenipotentiary Conferences) as asked to do by the Steering Committee (Document No. 167).

The Chairman said that in considering Article 10 (and for that matter Article 11), the Committee should deal with questions of principle only, leaving to a working group all proposals on matters of drafting. The Committee might consider the tasks of Plenipotentiary Conferences (Article 10, paragraph 1, sub-paragraphs a to g) in the order in which they appeared in the Convention, examining, as it did so, the additional sub-paragraphs zero, b bis) d bis) and e bis) proposed by certain administrations.

Article 10, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph "zero"

Proposal 150 (United States of America) ran as follows :

"Zero. The Plenipotentiary Conference shall be composed of delegations of the Members and Associate Members of the Union."

The Chairman said that the above proposal did not appear essential. It could be referred to the Working Group.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought inclusion of the text proposed unnecessary. The membership of conferences was dealt with in unambiguous fashion in the General Regulations. Proposal 150 should be rejected and not referred to a Working Group.

The Delegate of the United States of America said he would not too emphatically insist on his proposal, but it seemed only reasonable to begin by recalling what the membership of the Plenipotentiary Conference was. Hence his proposal should be referred to the Working Group.

The Delegates of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, Denmark, and of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay agreed.

On the other hand, the Delegates of France, Egypt, Pakistan and India thought that the text might give rise to practical difficulties, and was pointless, since the matter was dealt with in Chapter 1 of the General Regulations.

The Chairman called for a vote on Proposal 150 by show of hands.

The proposal was rejected by 41 votes to 10 with 14 abstentions.

Article 10, sub-paragraph 1, a)

In the Convention, this runs as follows :

" The Plenipotentiary Conference shall :

a) consider the report of the Administrative Council on the activities of the Union".

Two proposals had been submitted:

1) Proposal 151 (United States of America): for "activities of the Union", read : "Activities and finances of the Union".

2) Proposal 173 (paragraph 1-1) (France), as follows :

" 1. consider the report by the Administrative Council on its activities and those of the Union since the last Plenipotentiary Conference".

The Chairman said that the wording of the paragraph could safely be left to the Working Group. The United States proposal merely grouped together the existing paragraphs a) and c), while the French proposal was no more than a drafting amendment.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. thought that those proposals could not simply be referred to the Working Group unless that Group were given some instructions. Hence the Group should maintain sub-paragraph a) - if it changed the existing text, it ran the risk of making amendments which would give rise to further discussion in the Committee.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia said that the United States proposal was more than a mere juxtaposition of the existing sub-paragraphs a) and c), since it specified that the Conference should consider the finances of the Union, whereas the existing sub-paragraph c) laid down that the Conference should "finally approve the accounts of the Union".

The Chairman thought that the United States proposal was certainly not intended to prevent the Conference from approving the accounts of the Union. The Working Group should be left to choose between the two proposals (Nos. 151 and 173 - 1.1) without making any substantive amendment thereto.

The suggestion gave rise to no objection.

N.B. At this same meeting, when sub-paragraph c) was being discussed, the Delegate of the United States of America withdrew his Proposal 151, so that the Working Group merely has to deal with the French proposal;

Article 10, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph b)

In the Convention, this runs as follows :

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall :

.....

- b) establish the basis for the budget of the Union for the next five years;".

There were two proposals for amendment of this paragraph : No. 152 (Argentine Republic) and No. 153 (United States of America), to replace "for the next five years" by: "until the next Plenipotentiary Conference". This amendment was adopted in principle, without observation, by the Committee.

Proposal No. 153 (United States of America) introduced a fresh idea, namely, that the Plenipotentiary Conference should lay down the maximum amount the Union might spend.

The Chairman invited comments on the proposal, pointing out that it had been evolved with the idea in mind that a consolidated budget would be adopted. In view of the vote in Committee 5 in connection with the institution of a consolidated budget, it seemed unlikely that that assumption would be fulfilled.

During the preceding five years, it had been the practice to set a limit on ordinary expenditure alone. It was practically impossible (the question had been raised by the Delegate of Turkey) to do the same for extraordinary expenditure.

The Delegates of France, Portugal, and of the Argentine Republic were against inclusion of a reference to maximum expenditure. Sub-paragraph b) should simply mention the basis of the budget, as in Proposal 152 (Argentine Republic) and Proposal 173, paragraph 1.3 (France). A resolution annexed to the Convention should lay down rules governing maximum ordinary expenditure.

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia proposed that the matter be referred to Committee 5, or that, at least, consideration of it should be postponed until Committee 5 had come to some decision on financial questions.

This proposal was seconded by the Delegate of the United States of America, but the Delegates of India, Egypt, and Mexico thought that it was for Committee 3 to reach a decision. The Yugoslav proposal was thereupon put to the vote and rejected by 42 votes to 4 with 10 abstentions.

The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. found the terms "establish the basis for the budget of the Union" entirely satisfactory, and proposed that the following be added thereto : "... and determine a fiscal limit for the ordinary expenditure of the Union". This amendment, seconded by the Delegates of the Bielorussian S.S.R. and of the Ukrainian S.S.R., was put to the vote and adopted by 30 votes to 2 with 22 abstentions. Hence the decision of principle taken by the Committee was as follows :

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall :

. . . . .

b) establish the basis for the budget of the Union and determine a fiscal limit for the ordinary expenditure of the Union, until the next Plenipotentiary Conference."

It was agreed that the final drafting should be left to the Working Group.

It was further agreed, on specific request by the Delegates of France and the Argentine Republic, that a resolution should be annexed to the Convention in which details such as the amount of the fiscal limit and its application, and the need to consult Members of the Union if the limit was likely to be exceeded, should be set forth.

Article 10, sub-paragraph 1, b bis)

Proposal 156 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland):

"b bis) establish the basic emoluments of all the permanent staff of the Union."

Proposal 173 (France), paragraph 1 (3):

"..... and determine the salaries of the staff of the General Secretariat, the Consultative Committees, and the International Frequency Registration Board."

There was considerable discussion as to what expression to use: salaries, basic salaries, basis for salaries, or salary scales.

The Committee finally agreed to use the expression: "basic salary scales". Those scales, showing, for each class, a minimum and a maximum, would appear in a Resolution similar to that on page 105 of the Atlantic City Conference resolutions. It was agreed that the question of the authority to be bestowed on the Administrative Council to enable that body to adapt salaries to the cost of living came within the province of Committee 5, and that the decision to include sub-paragraph b bis) in Article 10 by no means implied that staff salaries were intangible, as they had been under the Atlantic City Convention.

It was also agreed that the word "permanent" should be deleted from Proposal 156, since I.T.U. temporary staff was paid in accordance with the same scales as applied to permanent staff.

Lastly, on a remark made by the Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, the Committee agreed that mention should be made of I.F.R.B. members, on the grounds that the persons in question were neither permanent nor temporary officials. However, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. declared that no mention should be made of them.

The following decision of principle was adopted by the Committee:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:

.....

"b bis) establish the basic salary scales of all I.T.U. staff and of the members of the I.F.R.B."

The final drafting was entrusted to the Working Group.

°  
° °

Article 10, sub-paragraph 1 c):

The Convention:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:

.....

"c) finally approve the accounts of the Union;"

Proposal 157 (United States of America) proposed that this sub-paragraph should be deleted as a consequence of Proposal 151 (considered at the beginning of the meeting), which proposed amalgamation of a) and c).

Proposal 173, paragraph 1.2. (France):

"....2. finally approve the annual accounts of the Union, drawn up by the Administrative Council."

The Delegates of the U.S.S.R. thought that sub-paragraph c) should remain as it was. The Plenipotentiary Conference was the supreme authority which should approve Union accounts. United States Proposal 151 spoke merely of consideration, and not of approval, and should be rejected.

The Delegates of Belgium, India, and the Ukrainian S.S.R. agreed, whereupon the Delegate of the United States of America agreed

to withdraw Proposals 151 and 157. He had had no intention of preventing the Plenipotentiary Conference from approving the accounts of the Union.

The Delegate of France likewise withdrew paragraph 1 (2) of Proposal 173, in order to speed up the work of the Committee.

Hence sub-paragraph c) of paragraph 1 remains unchanged

o

o o

Article 10, sub-paragraph d) :

The Convention:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:

.....

"d) elect the Members of the Union which are to serve on the Administrative Council;"

The only proposal was that by France (Proposal 173, para. 1.4).

The Delegate of France withdrew his proposal to avoid a loss of time. Hence sub-paragraph d) remains unchanged.

o

o o

Article 10, sub-paragraph d bis):

There was no further point in the proposals advocating election of I.F.R.B. members by the Plenipotentiary Conference, since the Committee had decided that the Radio Conference should elect them.

The Delegate of Brazil thought that the new Convention should lay down that the Plenipotentiary Conference should specify the number (or the maximum number, on a remark by the Delegate of Lebanon) of members the I.F.R.B. should have.

The Committee decided not to consider this matter until it came to study the report by the sub-committee sitting under Mr. Pedersen (Doc.No.184).

o

o o

Article 10, sub-paragraph 1 e):

The Convention:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:

.....

"e) revise the Convention if it considers this necessary;".

Three proposals had been submitted: 159 (United States of America); 160 (Switzerland); 173, paragraph 1.5 (France).

The proposal by the United States of America:

"e) adopt amendments to the Convention for acceptance by Members and Associate Members;".

The Delegate of the United States of America observed that the proposal was closely bound up with Proposal 1 (a basic proposal). Hence he would withdraw it provisionally until Proposal 1 came up.

The Swiss proposal: read: "e) revise the Convention and its annexes if it considers this necessary." The Committee agreed that the original text covered the addition proposed. Hence the Delegate of Switzerland did not press his point.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed, and it was so decided (incidentally, in accordance with the French proposal) that the sub-paragraph should remain unchanged.

o  
o o

Article 10, sub-paragraph 1 e bis):

Proposal 161 (United States of America):

"e bis) adopt the General Regulations;".

The Delegate of the United States of America said that the proposal was a consequence of that his country had submitted in connection with Article 13 (Regulations), and that he would revert to it when that article came up for consideration.

o  
o o

Article 10, sub-paragraph 1 f):

The Convention:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:

.....

"f) if necessary, enter into any formal agreement or revise any existing formal agreement between the Union and any other international body;".

There were three proposals: 162 (Argentina); 163 (United States of America), and 173, paragraph 1-6 (France).

Proposal 162 (Argentina)

"f) if necessary, enter into any formal agreement, or revise any existing formal agreement between the Union and any other international body;"(drafting change to the Spanish and French texts).

Proposal 163 (United States of America)

"f) approve any formal agreement or the revision of any existing formal agreement between the Union and the United Nations or any other international bodies;".

Proposal 173 (France)

"6. if necessary, enter into formal agreements, or renew such agreements, between the Union and other international organizations;".

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said there was a difference of meaning between the existing text, which talked about "entering into" agreements, and the proposals which talked about "approving" them. Only Members of the Union, meeting in Plenipotentiary Conferences, were competent to enter into agreements with other international organizations. Hence he was against Proposal 163, which amended the meaning of the existing text, and was of the opinion that Proposal 162 did not constitute an improvement. Thus the existing paragraph f) should remain unchanged.

The Delegates of Lebanon and of France thought that the existing provisions should be extended, since experience had shown that the Administrative Council and the Secretary General could be embarrassed by excessively rigorous texts. The Delegate of France, seconded by the Delegate of the Argentine, proposed that the text proposed by the United States of America be changed to read:

"f) enter into, revise, or approve .....".

He would submit an amendment to Article 5 which would enable the Council to enter into provisional agreements.

The Chairman asked the Delegates of the Argentine, France, and the United States of America to draft a new sub-paragraph f) for consideration at the next meeting.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. recalled that the Committee had also to consider his proposal, in favour of keeping the text as it was.

The meeting rose at 1330 hours.

Reporters:

E. Luraschi - G. Terras  
R.V. Hutton - J. Revoy

Chairman:

C. RIBEIRO

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 2

PROPOSAL No. 725

SPAIN

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

The Members of the Administrative Council shall be elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference in plenary assembly.

To this end, a list of countries wishing to stand for election shall be drawn up for each Region, and their names shall be proclaimed in plenary assembly.

reasons:

- a) Members of the Administrative Council are first and foremost the executives of the Union as a whole. They are, that is to say, a working instrument of the Plenipotentiary Conference itself and of the International Telecommunication Union, and hence should be elected by the organization as a whole, without let or hindrance.
- b) Geographical considerations do not affect the point made above; indeed, they are entirely compatible with it. A Member elected to represent a given geographical area will be technically more familiar with the conditions there prevailing, but must at all times maintain its character of Union executive, as explained above.
- c) Members of the Administrative Council are elected as representatives of their particular geographical area. But their nomination has previously to be agreed upon within those geographical areas, with the result that particular interests are given priority over general interests, and the real opinion of the majority is neglected. Hence the case may very well arise that the Members of a Region - a minority of Members of the Union - may reach a decision which may prevent, or seriously impede, implementation of the views of the majority of the Conference.



A N N E X

SPECIMEN FORM FOR ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE

I.T.U. ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

<u>R e g i o n "A"</u>	<u>R e g i o n "B"</u>	<u>R e g i o n "C"</u>	<u>R e g i o n "D"</u>
. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .	. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .		. . . . .
. . . . .	. . . . .		. . . . .

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

PROPOSAL No. 726

SPAIN

Article 5, paragraph 1(1):

For the last sentence :

"They shall be eligible for re-election.",

read:

"Not more than three Members for each of the areas A, B, and C, and not more than two Members for area D, may be re-elected at the end of a period in office."

and add:

"If, as a result of the vote, more Members are re-elected in each area than the number prescribed above, then the number prescribed above shall be considered elected and the remaining Members in each area shall be eliminated in favour of countries not already Members of the Council, which have obtained the next highest number of votes.

"If, as a result of the vote, any post on the Council should remain vacant, another election shall be held to fill the vacancy."

Reasons:

To maintain some continuity in the work of the Council while admitting new countries, and at the same time to avoid a situation arising (as it may well do with the present wording) in which Members obtain a permanent seat on the Council.



PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

PROPOSAL No. 727

SPAIN

Article 49, paragraph 2

Replace by:

"In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the Convention in a single copy in the Spanish, French and English languages, the three texts being authentic; this copy shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the Argentine Republic and a duplicate shall be forwarded to each signatory Government."

Reason:

To bring into line with Proposal No. .... amending  
Article 15, paragraph 2.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No.212-E  
6 November 1952

COMMITTEE 6

WORKING GROUP

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES OF THE CONFERENCE

The Secretariat has prepared and submitted to the Working Group of Committee 6 the annexed comparative table of the budget of the Conference approved by the Administrative Council and the expenses incurred up to October 31, 1952, with estimates of expenditures up to December 10, 1952.

The figures in the table have not been examined in detail and have not as yet been approved by the Working Group. However, it was felt that the delegations may wish to have a general idea of the current financial situation of the Conference as soon as possible and for that reason the annexed information is published in its present form at this time.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE BUDGET APPROVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL  
AND THE EXPENSES INCURRED UP TO 31 OCTOBER 1952, WITH ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE UP TO 10 Dec. 1952

Sub-heads and articles	Budget approved by the council	Expenses up to 31.10.52	Budget balance	Estimate of expenses up to 10.12.52	Estimated budget balance	Amount by which credits were exceeded
<u>Sub-head I. Staff expenses</u>						
1. Administration	466.000.-	172.104,55	293.895,45	196.000.-	98.000.-	1) 5.000.-
2. Languages	650.000.-	258.636,45	391.363,55	382.200.-	9.000.-	
3. Roneo	40.500.-	15.560,40	24.939,60	29.400.-		
4. Insurance	35.000.-	15.637,30	19.362,70	2.000.-	17.000.-	
	1.191.500.-	461.938,70	729.561,30	609.600.-	124.000.-	
<u>Sub-head II. Premises and equipment</u>						
5. Premises, furniture, machines	90.000.-	77.297.-	12.703.-	2.500.-	10.000.-	2) 20.000.-
6. Documents	85.500.-	31.602,25	53.897,75	30.000.-	24.000.-	
7. Supplies and office overheads	65.000.-	42.307,35	22.692,65	42.000.-		
8. Simultaneous interpretation and other technical installations	90.000.-	8.000.-	82.000.-	64.600.-	17.000.-	
9. Unforeseen	31.000.-	3.372,60	27.627,40	3.000.-	24.000.-	
	361.500.-	162.579,20	198.920,80	142.100.-	75.000.-	
<u>Sub-head III. Accounting expenses</u>						
10. Interests on advances	20.800.-	667,25	20.132,75	18.500.-	1.000.-	
EXPENSES OF AN EXCEPTIONAL CHARACTER						
<u>Sub-head IV. Preparatory work</u>						
11. Publc. and distrib. of proposals	60.000.-	95.083,70 <sup>3)</sup>	35.083,70	.-	.-	35.083,70
12. Journey to Buenos Aires for preparation of the Conference	17.500.-	17.312,70	187,30	.-	.-	
<u>Sub-head V. Sundry</u>						
13. Participation of the I.F.R.B. in B.A.	28.700.-	10.667,35	18.032,65	14.900.-	3.000.-	
14. Participation of the C.C. I.F. in B.A.	15.000.-	5.598,-	9.402.-	6.200.-	3.000.-	
15. Participation of the C.C. I.T. in B.A.	.-	.-	.-	.-	.-	
16. Participation of the C.C. I.R. in B.A.	25.000.-	3.742,60	21.257,40	17.000.-	4.000.-	
Total: Swiss francs	1720.000.-	757.589,50	962.410,50	808.300.-	150.000.-	net balance

- 1) The roneo staff has had to be increased by 4 persons. However, the credit balance as foreseen for staff expenses will suffice to cover the amount by which the credit is exceeded.
- 2) The amount by which the credit has been exceeded is attributable to the heavy expense of shipping documents and equipment from Geneva to Buenos Aires. For the return journey, expenses will be heavier still because of the literature to be taken back to Geneva.
- 3) Expenses are attributable as follows:

Compendium of Proposals for the Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952	71,731.70
Administrative Council Report for the Buenos Aires Conference, 1952	23,352.--

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 213-E  
6 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

PROPOSAL BY ARGENTINA, THE UNITED STATES  
OF AMERICA AND FRANCE

ARTICLE 10

1. f) if necessary, conclude or revise agreements between the Union and other international organizations, and approve the provisional agreements concluded with such organizations, on behalf of the Union, by the Administrative Council.

COMMENTS :

The French Delegation will propose an addition to Article 5 of the Convention to enable the Administrative Council to conclude provisional agreements.

CONFERENCIA PLENIPOTENCIARIA

Buenos Aires, 1952

PROGRAMA PARA LA SEMANA 17 AL 22 DE NOVIEMBRE

EMPLOI DU TEMPS POUR LA SEMAINE DU 17 AU 22 NOVEMBRE

SCHEDULE FOR WEEK 17 TO 22 NOVEMBER

	Lunes 17	Martes 18	Miércoles 19	Jueves 20	Viernes 21	Sábado 22
ASAMBLEA PLENARIA						
Com. 1					19-20(B)	
Com. 2						
Com. 3	16-19(PL)	16-19(PL)		16-19(PL)	16-19(PL)	
Com. 4 GT/1	10-13(PL) 16-19(C)	10-13(C)	10-13(PL)	10-13(PL) 16-19(C)		10-13(PL)
Com. 5 GT 5/1 GT 5/2 GT 5/3	09-13(C) 10-13(B)	10-13(PL)	10-13(B) 16-19(B)	10-13(A)	10-13(PL)	09-13(C) 10-13(B) 16-19(B)
Com. 6 GT/1			10-13(C)			
Com. 7					10-12(A)	
Com. 8			16-19(C)			



PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Special Meeting

Friday, 24 October 1952 at 1800 hours

Celebration of "United Nations Day"

Chairman: Dr. M. A. Andrada (Argentine Republic)

The Chairman, opening the meeting, gave the floor to the Delegate of Brazil.

The Delegate of Brazil felt obliged to take up the time of the Assembly with a short statement in connection with an advent which could not but evoke the feelings of friendship and mutual respect which should exist between peoples.

His Delegation had been deeply moved to learn of the disastrous typhoon which had so sorely tried the people of the Philippines. Besides the material damage caused, several hundred persons - alas - had lost their lives. That piece of news, received by a telegram, had put the Filipino Delegation into mourning.

He was sure that he was speaking on behalf of all delegations proposing that the Assembly send a message of sympathy to the Filipino people.

The Chairman, on behalf of the Assembly, associated himself with the sentiments expressed by the Delegate of Brazil, and proposed that there should be one minute's silence as a mark of sympathy with the people of the Philippines.



The Assembly rose and observed one minute's silence.

The Chairman then delivered the following address:

"Ladies and Gentlemen, as you know, the 24th of October, anniversary of the entry into force of the United Nations Charter, is now officially called United Nations Day.

"In all the Member States of this great organization, it is customary to celebrate this anniversary and, more especially, to devote the day to bringing before the public throughout the world the aims and achievements of the United Nations, inviting it to give every support to that organization.

"I feel authorized to state that the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union feels that it is a happy coincidence that it should be sitting on its 7th anniversary of the entry into force of the San Francisco Charter, so that, in this way, the world of telecommunication can officially celebrate this event.

"Permit me to request the United Nations representative here present to transmit to Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General, for announcement in the General Assembly of the United Nations now in session, a fraternal greeting and an expression of the warmest sympathy from the world of telecommunication, for those who throughout the world are indefatigably working for the achievement of the aims of the United Nations.

"The spirit of brotherhood and mutual aid, becoming steadily more intense, which inspired the creation of the United Nations, has extended to all fields of human activity, and today the United Nations, in its resolute advance towards a better world, is intimately connected with all the great organizations of international cooperation.

"As might reasonably have been expected, the International Telecommunication Union has become one of the family of specialized agencies collaborating with the United Nations. In effect, for nearly one hundred years, the I.T.U. had been pursuing ends in every way similar to those of the United Nations.

"We are, I feel, fully justified in stating that the I.T.U. has been thoroughly successful in its undertakings, and the best wish we can offer on this occasion is that the mission of the United Nations be attended with the same degree of success.

"The ends pursued by the United Nations may conceivably appear ambitious in this tormented world. But may it not be that any such objectives would appear ambitious, when an attempt is made to bring about international collaboration? Surely the Plenipotentiary Delegates who, in 1865, approved the first International Telegraph Convention in Paris must have been animated by an ardent faith and much enthusiasm to affront problems which at that date many considered impossible of solution.

"The history of international telecommunication shows that there is no such thing as insuperable difficulty, when the spirit of cooperation is accompanied by steady continuous endeavour. In the small field of telecommunication, too, international cooperation obliges all countries, quite apart from the considerable material and moral demands which may be made on them, to make political concessions, economic concessions, and may even oblige them to abandon some part of their sovereign rights. There can be no doubt that that which has been achieved in the field of telecommunication and, today, in almost all branches of economic and social affairs (I refer more especially to the work of all the specialized agencies) can also be achieved in the general political sphere. Indeed, the United Nations does no other than to complete and round off the work of the other intergovernmental organizations, which themselves will not fail to coordinate their activities and their efforts in order to integrate themselves into the international community of tomorrow.

"In the same way as not conferences or meetings constitute telecommunications, but the millions of persons working in that field throughout the world, so the aims pursued by the United Nations cannot be achieved without the effective participation of citizens throughout the world. Hence we must also on this occasion pay tribute to those endeavouring to make it possible for men to be able to cooperate in this great work. Especially, we should pay tribute to those thousands of organizations of all kinds which are endeavouring to publicize the spirit of the United Nations and to explain its ends, and to those which, in the reverse direction, enable the voice of what we might call the international public to be heard.

"I am persuaded that the Conference will authorize me to affirm, in conclusion, that the International Telecommunication Union, which has made its contribution to the organization of the extraordinary network by which intelligence can be transmitted to all points of the globe, has participated, and will continue so to participate with pride and with the utmost enthusiasm in the work of international cooperation on which the United Nations has embarked."

(Applause).

The Chairman then invited Mr. de Wolf (United States of America) Chairman of Committee 7, (Relations with the United Nations and Specialized Agencies) to take the floor.

The Delegate of the United States of America wished, first of all, to associate himself with the sympathy expressed by the Brazilian Delegation for the Filipino people, tried by the recent typhoon. The United States of America had entertained, over a long period of years, feelings of friendship and respect for the Filipino people - feelings which had never varied.

Continuing, he briefly described how, at Atlantic City, an agreement had been signed between the I.T.U. and the United Nations. At that moment, the United Nations had only just been born, while the I.T.U. was already nearly a hundred years old. Since then, while remaining within the general framework of United Nations activities, the I.T.U. had maintained its traditional autonomy. At Atlantic City, the Delegation of the United States of America had proposed that the headquarters of the I.T.U. should be in the neighbourhood of the United Nations headquarters. That suggestion had not been adopted, and the I.T.U. had remained in Switzerland. However, in order to give satisfaction to the considerations which had inspired that proposal, it had been decided that the headquarters of the I.T.U. should be transferred from Berne to Geneva, i.e., that the I.T.U. should be installed close to the European Office of the United Nations.

There was no call to regret that decision, not only because Geneva was always a pleasant place to visit, but also because the two organizations had got to know each other better, and their relations had become steadily closer and more confident. He could testify to that, since he had twice been Chairman of the Administrative Council and for two years had been Chairman of the Council Committee on relations with the United Nations.

But this Committee would have to hold only a few meetings as the number of questions that had to be studied was becoming smaller every day.

This state of affairs could only be a cause for satisfaction and it proved that in every sphere, and in particular in the realm of telecommunications, the spirit of international collaboration had borne fruit. He was also delighted to take the opportunity of warmly associating himself with the feelings of those who were to-day celebrating the 7th anniversary of the United Nations Charter.

(Applause)

In response to the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. A. David, the United Nations representative, addressed the Assembly :

He thanked the Assembly on behalf of Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, for the tribute to the United Nations represented by the meeting held specially to celebrate, in the great capital of the Argentine, what had been called "United Nations Day". He regretted however, that Mr. Gnome, the popular doyen of the I.T.U., was not present and wished him a prompt recovery.

It was during its second session, in 1947, that the General Assembly of the United Nations decided that the 24 October, the anniversary of the Charter of the United Nations coming into force should be officially known as "United Nations Day" and would be dedicated to making known to the whole world the aims of the United Nations and the results obtained by the organization, with the object of increasing the support that the task undertaken by the United Nations enjoyed.

But it was only the 7th anniversary, and the I.T.U. was a veteran among international organizations. Mr. David always regarded it as a pleasant duty to represent the United Nations at the I.T.U. and at the sister organization, the Universal Postal Union. These two assemblies included the greatest number of delegations and their work affected directly the greatest number of people. While so many discussions wandered into the realm of politics, these two institutions had never ceased to work for an

improvement in the economic and social conditions of international life. But few people realised, when they sent a telegram, or switched on their radio, the joint effort that made the efficient working of telecommunication services possible. This effort should be recognised. It is not spectacular, but it demands technical knowledge and frequently a renunciation of a part of national sovereignty. In the very new field of technical assistance the I.T.U. has also a very important part to play.

For all these reasons it was satisfying to see that the work of this Conference was being followed with interest by the World Federation of United Nations Associations. Mr. David was sure that these associations would find here a useful lesson and that, thanks to them, the people of this great Republic of which the Delegates were the guests, and which had played such an important part in the work of the United Nations and of the Specialized Agencies, would understand even better the use and value of the work accomplished by the United Nations.

It would be impossible to ignore that the world situation sometimes appeared gloomy enough, but it was certain that the wise and efficacious work undertaken by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, particularly the I.T.U., symbolized the great hope of everyone in a better world and a happier mankind.

(Applause).

The Chairman, after thanking the speakers, said that Committee 7 would meet immediately and that it could not do so in a better atmosphere than that which had marked the celebration of United Nations Day. He wished Committee 7 every success in its work.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

Rapporteur

Secretary General

Chairman

G. Deniker

Mr. L. Mulatier

Mr. M.A. Andrada

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL  
TO THE BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

EXAMINATION OF THE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT OF THE UNION AT THE  
BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Article 5, No. 11 f) of the Atlantic City Convention provides that the Administrative Council shall:

" f) arrange for the annual audit of the accounts of the Union prepared by the Secretary General and approve them for submission to the next plenipotentiary conference;"

Moreover, Article 9, No. 2 n) provides that the Secretary General shall:

" n) prepare a financial operating report and accounts to be submitted annually to the Administrative Council and a consolidated account immediately preceding each plenipotentiary conference; these accounts, after audit and approval by the Administrative Council, shall be circulated to the Members and Associate Members and submitted to the next plenipotentiary conference for examination and final approval;"

This consolidated account was examined and adopted by the Administrative Council during its special session on 2 November 1952 at Buenos Aires.



Since the Atlantic City Convention entered into force 1 January 1949, the above provisions apply strictly to the accounts for the years 1949 to 1951.

However, certain accounts for 1947 and 1948 are still awaiting approval. Those of the Telegraph and Telephone Division for these two years were approved by the Telegraph and Telephone Conference (Paris, 1949) but the accounts for the Radio Division for the same period have yet to be approved. Since nothing has been decided as to the date of the Ordinary Administrative Radio Conference, which in the ordinary course would approve these accounts, it would seem advisable for the Plenipotentiary Conference to take stock of the whole financial position to the end of 1951.

The following documents are therefore attached hereto:

- for information, the accounts of the Telegraph and Telephone Division for 1947 and 1948, approved by the Telegraph and Telephone Conference (Paris, 1949);
- for formal approval
  - a) the accounts of the Radio Division for 1947 and 1948;
  - b) the complete accounts of the Union for the years 1949 to 1951.

°  
° °

It should be borne in mind that at its sessions in the years 1949 to 1952, the Administrative Council passed the following resolutions and decisions on the accounts of the Union:

Accounts for 1947 and 1948

Resolution No. 129, approving the financial operating report for the year 1948 and giving discharge to the Swiss Government for the management of the accounts of the Radio Division for 1947 and 1948.

Accounts for 1949

Resolution No. 182, concerning the approval of the accounts of the Union from 1 January 1949 to 31 July 1950;

Document No. 806/CA5, 36th meeting of the Administrative Council (5th session) 1950, approving the Financial Operating Report for 1949.

Accounts for 1950

Resolution No. 219, concerning the approval of the Financial Operating Report for 1950;

Resolution No. 220, approving, from the actuarial and accounting point of view, the accounts of the Union for the period 1 August to 31 December 1950.

Accounts for 1951

Resolution No. 239, concerning the approval of the Financial Operating Report for 1951;

Resolution No. 240, approving, as regards arithmetical accuracy, the accounts for the period 1 January to 31 December 1951.

All the registers and accounting documents for the year 1947 to 1951 have been brought to Buenos Aires, where they are at the disposal of the Administrative Council and the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Annex: Summary of accounts.

A N N E X

COMPARATIVE TABLES  
SHOWING BUDGETS, INCOME AND EXPENDITURE,  
BOTH ORDINARY AND EXTRAORDINARY  
OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL  
TELECOMMUNICATION UNION  
1947 TO 1951

---

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE DIVISION (reminder (1))

Ordinary account

<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	<u>1947 Budget</u>	<u>1947 Account</u>	<u>1948 Budget</u>	<u>1948 Account</u>
	<u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Sw. Francs</u>
I. Staff .....	288,174.50	167,867.20	350,781.--	349,054.25
II. Travelling expenses ....	500.--	41.50	4,000.--	4,006.92
III. Rent .....	8,600.--	8,600.--	8,600.--	8,600.--
IV. Office equipment .....	3,800.--	3,349.09	5,000.--	5,020.30
V. Office overheads .....	13,400.--	13,197.36	26,000.--	26,124.16
VI. Printed matter .....	167,700.--	100,418.37	155,000.--	179,756.26
VII. Special expenditure ....	---	25,479.57	66,000.--	66,454.17
VIII. Interest .....	---	12,153.95	8,000.--	23,863.85
IX. Unforeseen .....	1,525.50	37,612.62	4,119.--	7,612.75
X. Miscellaneous .....	3,000.--	993.22	1,000.--	1,145.75
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE ....</b>	<b>486,700.--</b>	<b>369,712.88</b>	<b>628,500.--</b>	<b>671,638.41</b>
<u>INCOME</u>				
I. Sale of printed matter..	206,600.--	76,080.20	126,100.--	166,182.49
II. Interest .....	---	12,153.95	8,000.--	23,863.85
III. Unforeseen .....	100.--	91.65	1,700.--	3,314.41
IV. Credit balance brought forward from the preceding year	---	---	---	---
	206,700.--	88,325.80	135,800.--	193,360.75
V. Contributory shares ....	280,000.--	281,387.08	492,700.--	478,277.66
<b>TOTAL INCOME .....</b>	<b>486,700.--</b>	<b>369,712.88</b>	<b>628,500.--</b>	<b>671,638.41</b>

Extraordinary account

IX. Special conference expenses	<u>Expenditure</u>	998,000.--	1,354,871.51	96,200.--	173,285.63
Sale of documents and other conference income	<u>Income</u>	1,500.--	207,508.70	20,000.--	21,063.75
Contributory shares		996,500.--	1,147,362.81	76,200.--	152,221.88

(1) Accounts approved by the Telegraph and Telephone Conference, Paris 1949, at its fifth Plenary Meeting.

RADIO DIVISION

Ordinary account

EXPENDITURE

	<u>1947 Budget</u>	<u>1947 Account</u>	<u>1948 Budget</u>	<u>1948 Account</u>
	<u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Sw. Francs</u>
I. Staff	418,309.50	247,697.60	535,633.--	534,759.35
II. Travelling expenses	24,500.--	12,694.35	4,000.--	4,543.15
III. Rent	8,600.--	8,600.--	8,600.--	8,600.--
IV. Office equipment	6,000.--	4,305.84	13,300.--	12,904.86
V. Office overheads	13,400.--	13,907.19	26,000.--	28,434.37
VI. Printed matter	318,000.--	368,503.88	355,000.--	400,594.--
VII. Special expenditure	---	203,337.59	174,000.--	174,364.77
VIII. Interest	---	14,051.70	10,000.--	33,386.05
IX. Unforeseen	2,190.50	24,619.42	4,967.--	10,116.28
X. Miscellaneous	3,000.--	1,039.40	1,500.--	858.75
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	<u>794,000.--</u>	<u>897,756.97</u>	<u>1,133,000.--</u>	<u>1,208,561.58</u>

INCOME

I. Sale of printed matter	511,900.--	602,347.45	321,000.--	421,292.16
II. Staff seconded to the Copenhagen Regional Conference	---	---	40,000.--	40,763.95
III. Interest	---	14,051.70	10,000.--	33,386.05
IV. Unforeseen	100.--	46.30	10,000.--	9,993.44
V. Credit balance brought forward from the preced- ing year	---	---	---	---
	<u>512,000.--</u>	<u>616,445.45</u>	<u>381,000.--</u>	<u>505,435.60</u>
VI. Contributory shares	<u>282,000.--</u>	<u>281,311.52</u>	<u>752,000.--</u>	<u>703,125.98</u>
TOTAL INCOME	<u>794,000.--</u>	<u>897,756.97</u>	<u>1,133,000.--</u>	<u>1,208,561.58</u>

<u>Extraordinary account</u>	<u>1947 Budget</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1947 Accounts</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1948 Budget</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1948 Accounts</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>
IX. Special conference expenses				
<u>Expenditure</u>	1,927,000.--	2,484,993.63	62,500.--	193,172.47
Sale of documents and other conference income				
<u>Income</u>	5,000.--	152,048.60	30,000.--	59,732.85
Contributory shares	<u>1,922,000.--</u>	<u>2,332,945.03</u>	<u>32,500.--</u>	<u>133,439.62</u>

(Ann. t D-c.216-B)

ORDINARY EXPENDITURE

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL (1)

<u>Sub- heads</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Budget 1948</u> (2 sessions) <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts 1948</u>	<u>Budget 1949</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts 1949</u>	<u>Budget 1950</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts 1950</u>	<u>Budget 1951</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts 1951</u>
1.1	Members' travelling expenses.....	82,700.—	77,239.25	40,000.—	34,192.05	54,000.—	48,466.60	54,000.—	56,490.70
1.2	Per diem allowances.....	78,000.—	85,230.—	56,000.—	73,240.—	54,000.—	65,450.—	54,000.—	73,230.—
1.3	Insurance and luggage.....	6,300.—	4,762.40	5,000.—	4,384.15	6,000.—	4,162.40	6,000.—	4,633.90
1.4	Overheads.....	71,000.—	84,991.06	99,000.—	129,862.35	60,000.—	100,161.37	86,000.—	98,338.36
	Totals.....	238,000.—	252,222.71	200,000.—	241,678.55	174,000.—	218,240.37	200,000.—	232,792.96

(Ann. to Doc. 216-E)

GENERAL SECRETARIAT (A)

<u>Subheads</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>1949 Budget</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1949 Accounts</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1950 Budget</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1950 Accounts</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1951 Budget</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>1951 Accounts</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>
.1	Staff .....	1,359,800.--	1,294,566.04	1,695,000.--	1,617,647.51	1,557,000.--	1,475,263.76
.2	Travel and re- presentation expenses .....	27,000.--	18,058.35	17,300.--	15,046.82	19,000.--	16,036.23
.3	Offices .....						
.30	Rent .....	17,300.--	17,236.50	32,000.--	28,531.35	34,000.--	29,012.--
.31	Office equipment.	24,000.--	21,769.72	10,000.--	9,416.64	10,000.--	9,270.56
.32	Office overheads.	61,000.--	55,962.39	58,000.--	55,160.79	59,300.--	63,299.88
.33	Installations, removals and repairs .....	320,000.--	318,614.81	6,000.--	5,669.63	10,000.--	3,126.14
.34	Central Library .	—	—	3,000.--	2,944.67	3,000.--	2,302.72
.35	Darkroom .....	—	—	500.--	76.70	500.--	414.14
.5	Miscellaneous and unforeseen .....	16,900.--	37,951.18	11,200.--	10,743.54	7,500.--	6,157.60
.7	Special expenses.						
.71	Existing Provident Fund...	200,000.--	200,000.--	100,000.--	100,000.--	60,000.--	100,000.--
		2,026,000.--	1,964,158.99	1,933,000.--	1,845,237.65	1,760,300.--	1,704,883.03

(Ann. to Dec. 216-B)

INTERNATIONAL FREQUENCY REGISTRATION BOARD  
(I.F.R.B.) (3)

<u>Sub-</u> <u>heads</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1949</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1949</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1951</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1951</u>
		<u>Swiss Francs</u>		<u>Swiss Francs</u>		<u>Swiss Francs</u>	
.1	Staff .....	848,220.—	838,969.55	937,750.—	918,353.10	1,062,100.—	979,228.24
.2	Travel and represen- tation expenses .....	22,200.—	21,621.—	1,400.—	66.20	10,000.—	8,779.40
.3	Offices .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
.30	Rent .....	9,700.—	9,672.—	13,000.—	12,920.—	13,000.—	12,920.—
.31	Office equipment .....	6,000.—	5,227.30	10,300.—	9,233.80	10,000.—	9,937.77
.32	Office overheads .....	17,500.—	12,784.70	17,700.—	15,456.81	19,500.—	18,779.45
.33	Installations, removals and repairs .....	—	—	1,000.—	483.15	1,000.—	224.25
.34	Central Library .....	—	—	3,000.—	2,344.67	3,000.—	2,302.72
.35	Darkroom .....	—	—	500.—	76.70	500.—	414.04
.5	Miscellaneous and un- forecasted .....	1,380.—	260.—	1,350.—	230.—	2,900.—	536.30
TOTALS		905,000.—	888,534.55	986,000.—	959,824.43	1,122,000.—	1,033,122.17

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
(C.C.I.F.) (4)

<u>Sub-heads</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Budget</u> 1949	<u>Accounts</u> 1949	<u>Budget</u> 1950	<u>Accounts</u> 1950	<u>Budget</u> 1951	<u>Accounts</u> 1951
		<u>Swiss Francs</u>		<u>Swiss Francs</u>		<u>Swiss Francs</u>	
1	Staff .....	189,700.—	190,322.75	214,189.—	218,325.65	228,198.—	228,247.95
2	Travelling and Representation Expenses .....	5,000.—	3,491.75	5,000.—	1,224.50	5,000.—	4,522.10
3	Offices .....	—	—	—	—	—	—
30	Rent .....	5,700.—	5,519.25	5,520.—	5,519.40	5,520.—	5,519.40
31	Office Equipment .....	1,000.—	1,452.70	1,500.—	1,186.69	1,000.—	873.45
32	Office Overheads .....	26,000.—	26,155.—	26,900.—	22,966.40	27,500.—	26,628.37
33	Installations, removals and repairs .....	50,000.—	50,000.—	—	—	—	—
34	Central Library .....	—	—	3,000.—	2,944.67	3,000.—	2,302.72
35	Darkroom .....	—	—	500.—	76.65	500.—	414.04
5	Miscellaneous and unforeseen .....	5,000.—	4,914.40	3,929.—	2,174.26	3,781.—	3,776.25
6	Laboratory .....	83,300.—	80,020.47	109,962.—	109,491.35	115,701.—	115,122.25
61	Upkeep of Laboratory ...	7,000.—	4,593.53	8,800.—	8,660.18	7,000.—	6,863.95
62	Equipment and Fittings for the Laboratory .....	10,300.—	12,085.40	—	—	20,000.—	8,639.—
TOTALS .....		383,000.—	378,555.25	379,300.—	372,569.75	417,200.—	402,909.48

INTERNATIONAL TELEGRAPH CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
(C. C. I. T. ) (5)

<u>Subheads</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1949</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1949</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1950</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1950</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1951</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1951</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>
.1	Staff .....	500.--	505.05	53,100.--	49,931.50	77,600.--	79,405.05
.2	Travelling and representation expenses .....	1,500.--	---	3,000.--	552.90	4,000.--	2,701.20
.3	Offices .....	---	---	---	---	---	---
.30	Rent .....	4,500.--	4,500.--	9,000.--	8,440.--	1,000.--	1,000.--
.31	Office equipment ...	3,500.--	---	3,500.--	2,426.92	3,500.--	1,429.58
.32	Office Overheads ...	3,800.--	1,643.85	3,400.--	2,409.92	4,600.--	2,977.72
.34	Central Library ....	---	---	3,000.--	2,944.62	3,000.--	2,302.72
.35	Darkroom .....	---	---	500.--	76.65	500.--	413.94
.5	Miscellaneous and unforeseen .....	3,200.--	555.85	3,700.--	56.75	2,300.--	560.15
TOTALS		17,000.--	7,204.75	79,200.--	66,839.26	96,500.--	90,790.36

(Ann. to Doc. 216-B)

INTERNATIONAL RADIO CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE  
(C.C.I.R.) (6)

<u>Sub-</u> <u>heads</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1949</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1949</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1950</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>Budget</u> <u>1951</u> <u>Sw. Francs</u>	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1951</u>
.1	Staff.....	229,600.-	173,861.49	335,050.-	279,932.77	403,050.-	357,463.68
.2	Travelling and represent- ation expenses	18,000.-	9,608.85	20,500.-	11,854.05	20,500.-	13,648.85
.3	Offices.....						
.30	Rent.....	6,000.-	6,031.25	9,000.-	9,000.-	15,000.-	15,000.-
.31	Office equip- ment.....	32,400.-	30,813.92	7,000.-	6,521.01	7,000.-	6,509.72
.32	Office over- heads.....	10,800.-	10,893.44	15,100.-	14,426.65	13,800.-	14,168.90
.33	Installations, re- movals & repairs	10,000.-	9,500.30	31,200.-	30,957.64	20,000.-	19,943.93
.34	Central Library	---	---	3,000.-	2,944.62	3,000.-	2,302.77
.35	Darkroom.....	---	---	500.-	76.65	500.-	413.92
.5	Miscellaneous and unforeseen.	6,200.-	5,061.40	6,350.-	548.75	5,650.-	817.93
	Totals...	313,000.-	245,770.65	427,700.-	356,262.14	488,500.-	430,269.70

Reduction on the budget as a whole .....16,000.-

472,500.-      430,269.70

SUMMARY OF ORDINARY EXPENDITURE AND INCOME

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>BUDGET</u> <u>1949</u>	<u>ACCOUNTS</u> <u>1949</u>	<u>BUDGET</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>ACCOUNTS</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>BUDGET</u> <u>1951</u>	<u>ACCOUNTS</u> <u>1951</u>
<u>INCOME</u>	<u>Swiss francs</u>		<u>Swiss francs</u>		<u>Swiss francs</u>	
Credit balance brought forward from the pre- ceding year....	--	--	337.139.-	337.138,93	342.762.-	342.762,68
Contributory shares.....	3.918.348.-	3.933.897.-	4.004.310.-	4.005.623,75	3.929.450.-	3.948.333,35
Unforeseen.....	652.-	662,25	6.551.-	16.026,10	4.000.-	1.268,31
Staff seconded to regional Conferences....	50.000.-	69.360,50	--	--	--	--
Withdrawal from the CCIF Reserve Fund.....	--	--	--	--	20.000.-	8.639.-
Interest	3.969.000.- 115.000.-	4.003.919,75 218.158,84	4.348.000.- 250.000.-	4.358.788,78 475.191,78	4.296.212.- 450.000.-	4.301.003,34 433.754,22
TOTALS.....	4.084.000.-	4.222.078,59	4.598.000.-	4.833.980,56	4.746.212.-	4.734.757,56
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

EXPENDITURE

Sub- heads	Items	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Accounts</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Accounts</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Accounts</u>
		<u>1949</u>	<u>1949</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1951</u>	<u>1951</u>
		<u>Swiss Francs</u>		<u>Swiss Francs</u>		<u>Swiss Francs</u>	
1.	Administrative Council	200.000,--	241.678,55	174.000,--	218.240,37	200.000,--	232.792,96
2.	General Secretariate	2.026.000,--	1.964.158,99	1.933.000,--	1.845.237,65	1.760.300,--	1.704.883,03
3.	I.F.R.B.	905.000,--	888.534,55	986.000,--	959.824,43	1.122.000,--	1.033.122,17
4.	C.C.I.F.	383.000,--	378.555,25	379.300,--	372.569,75	417.200,--	402.909,48
5.	C.C.I.T.	17.000,--	7.204,75	79.200,--	66.839,26	96.500,--	90.790,36
6.	C.C.I.R.	313.000,--	245.770,65	427.700,--	356.262,14	472.500,--	430.269,70
		3.844.000,--	3.725.902,74	3.979.200,--	3.818.973,60	4.068.500,--	3.894.767,70
	INTEREST	100.000,--	159.036,92	180.000,--	438.825,06	370.000,--	278.414,38
		3.944.000,--	3.884.939,66	4.159.200,--	4.257.798,66	4.438.500,--	4.173.182,08
	Balance carried forward to the following year	140.000,--	337.138,93	(	(	(	(
					342.762,68		291.096,03
	I.T.U. Reserve Account			438.800,--	(	307.712,--	(
		--	--		233.419,22		270.479,45
		4.084.000,--	4.222.078,59	4.598.000,--	4.833.980,56	4.746.212,--	4.734.757,56

EXTRAORDINARY INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

1948	<u>Budget 1948</u>	<u>Accounts 1948</u>
	(in Swiss francs)	
1. Preparatory Committee of Experts for the London Conference (safety of life) . . . . .	19.000.-	18.943,55
2. International Frequency Registration Board (I.F.R.B.) . . . . .	1.130.000.-	1.060.713,64
3. Provisional Frequency Board (P.F.B.) . . . . .	735.000.-	1.043.649,01
4. International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference, Geneva . . . . .	315.000.-	444.611,09
	<u>2.199.000.-</u>	<u>2.567.917,29</u>
	=====	

Summary of ordinary and extraordinary expenses  
borne by all Members of the Union

	<u>Accounts at the</u> <u>end of 1948</u>
Administrative Council (page 8) . . . . .	252.222,71
Conferences and meetings . . . . .	2.567.917,29
	<hr/>
	2.820.140.--
	<hr/>

- 17 -  
(Ann. to Doc.216-E)

1949		<u>Amended budget</u> <u>1949</u> (in Swiss francs)	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1949</u>
1.	Provisional Frequency Board(P.F.B.) . . . . .	1.544.900.-	1.523.807,14
1.	International High-Frequency Broadcasting Conference, Mexico City, 1948/1949 . . . . .	3.260.000.-	3.219.591,40
2.	Technical Plan Committee of the International High-Frequency Broadcasting Conference, 1st session, Paris 1949(further to the Mexico City Conference) .	845.000.-	591.547,47
3.	International Telegraph and Telephone Conference, Paris 1949 . . . . .	977.000.-	1.030.279,92
4.	International Telephone Consultative Committee, XVth Plenary Assembly, Paris 1949 . . . . .	25.500.-	28.694,36
5.	International Telephone Consultative Committee, meeting of technical study groups at Scheveningen, 1949 . . . . .	22.800.-	24.040,91
6.	Administrative Radio Conference for Region 1, Geneva 1949 . . . . .	264.000.-	246.369,44
7.	Administrative Radio Conference for Region 2 and 4th Inter-American Radio Conference (FIAR), Washington, D.C., 1949 . . . . .	820.000.-	893.134,80
8.	Administrative Radio Conference for Region 3, Geneva 1949 . . . . .	205.200.-	214.614,12
9.	International Administrative Aeronautical Radio Conference, 2nd session, Geneva 1949 . . . . .	324.000.-	298.495,12
10.	Conference for the North-East Atlantic , LORAN . .	40.100.-	40.114,45
11.	C.C.I.R. Study Group No. 11, Zurich . . . . .	17.900.-	18.852,85
		<u>8.346.400.-</u>	
12.	Regional Broadcasting Conference, Montreal (NARBA) (as a reminder) . . . . .	385.000.- (1)	-
	carried forward	<u>8.731.400.-</u>	<u>8.129.541,98</u>

(1) See Note overleaf

<u>1949</u>	<u>Amended budget</u> <u>1949</u> (in Swiss francs)	<u>Accounts</u> <u>1949</u>
brought forward....	8.731.400.-	8.129.541.98
1. 5th Meeting of the International Radio Consultative Committee (C.C.I.R), Stockholm, 1948.....	640.000.-	633.195.04
2. European Broadcasting Conference and Maritime Regional Radio Conference, Copenhagen, 1948....	650.000	1.302.564.36
	<u>10.021.400</u>	<u>10.065.301.38</u>

---

(1) Funds for the conference were provided by the Canadian Administration. The I.T.U. General Secretariat undertook to obtain payment of participants' quotas expressed in Canadian dollars. Hence these expenses had no effect on our debit account.

<u>1950</u>	<u>AMENDED BUDGET</u>		<u>ACCOUNT</u>
	<u>1950</u> (in Swiss francs)	<u>1950</u>	
1. Provisional Frequency Board (P.F.B.)	500.000.-		419.214.30
2. Expenses entailed by imple- mentation of the Copenhagen Plans	-		4.805.25
3. Technical Plan Committee, International High-Frequency Broadcasting Conference, 2nd session, Florence 1950 . . .	106.000.-		80.921.70
4. International High-Frequency Broadcasting Conference, Florence/Rapallo 1950 . . . . .	1.243.000.-		1.253.763.26
5. C.C.I.R., various meetings:			
Study Groups 6 and 10, Washington, 1950 . . . . .	30.000.-		29.477.32
Television demonstrations in U.S.A., 1950 . . . . .	20.000.-		22.275.75
Ditto in France, 1950 . . . . .	3.000.-		3.300.-
Ditto in U.K. 1950 . . . . .	6.000.-		6.854.48
Ditto in the Netherlands, 1950 . .	2.000.-		2.002.77
Study Group 11, London 1950 . . .	9.000.-		10.017.-
Gerber Sub-Committee, Geneva 1950	30.000.-		2.012.35
6. Regional Broadcasting Conference, Washington (NARBA), 2nd session...	600.000.-		324.440.20
	<hr/> 2.549.000.-		<hr/> 2.159.084.38

<u>1951</u>		<u>Budget</u> 1951 1) ( in Swiss francs)	<u>Accounts</u> 1951
1. Conference for the Reorganization of Maritime Radiobeacons in Region 1, Paris 1951 .....	35.000.-		54.944,40
2. VIth Plenary Assembly of the Inter- national Radio Consultative Committee (C.C.I.R.), Geneva 1951 .....	450.000.-		401.245,60
3. XVIth Plenary Assembly of the Inter- national Telephone Consultative Committee(C.C.I.F.), Florence 1951 ..... 3)	32.000.- 73.700.-	11.313,45 <sup>5)</sup> 87.543,55	98.857.--
4. Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference ( E.A.R.C.), Geneva 1951 ..... 2)	1.550.000.-	1.543.261,05 200.000.--	1.743.261,05 <sup>4)</sup>
	<u>2.340.700.-</u>		<u>2.298.308,05</u>

1) Budget amended and revised.

2) 1952 budget, for completion of work, from 1 January to 30 June 1952.

3) 1950 budget.

4) From this figure should be deducted 61,625 Swiss francs, representing the expenses defrayed by those countries alone which asked for the use of Russian

5) Study Group expenses.

PUBLICATIONS SERVICE BUDGET

	<u>Expenditure</u>	<u>Income</u>
	<u>Swiss Francs</u>	
1949 .....	709,900.-	535,960.-
1950 .....	1,155,600.-	855,850.-
1951 .....	1,309,900.-	1,285,035.-
1952 .....	1,536,985.-	1,522,110.-

PUBLICATIONS SERVICE ACCOUNTS

	<u>Expenditure</u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Surplus Income</u>
	<u>Swiss Francs</u>		
1949 .....	548,263.38	697,940.30	149,676.22
1950 .....	761,049.29	864,859.06	103,809.77
1951 .....	1,311,830.91	1,726,026.81	414,195.90

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 7th Meeting

Wednesday, 5 November, 1952

Chairman : Mr. K. Prasada (India)

I. ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2ND MEETING.

The Chairman submitted for approval the summary record of the second meeting (Document No. 139).

This was approved, with the following slight change on page 2: after paragraph 4, insert a sub-title : "IV ..... I.T.U. Building".

II. WORKING CAPITAL FUND.

The Chairman summarized the position in relation to the question of a working capital fund, the creation of which had been suggested by the Administrative Council. In 1949, the debt of the Union towards the Government of the Swiss Confederation had amounted to more than 15 million Swiss francs, diminishing to some 4,300,000 Swiss francs in 1952 - a sum which was still more than the fiscal limit on ordinary expenditure set at Atlantic City. That meant a heavy outlay in the form of interest. Creation of a working capital fund would eliminate such outlay. Proposals 224 (Argentine Republic), 226 and 710 (United States of America), 229 (Japan) and 230 (Portugal) advocated the creation of such a fund. Proposal 227 (France) brought out certain special aspects of the question. Proposal 225 (Australia) advocated advance payment of all expenses, both ordinary and extraordinary which would make it unnecessary to create a working capital fund. The Chairman proposed that only the principle involved be discussed.



The Delegate of Portugal said that from the discussions that had taken place on the subject of consolidation of the budget, he had formed the opinion that the majority of members were not convinced of the need to make reforms in the financial organization of the Union. Hence he withdrew Proposal 230, reserving the right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly, if he saw fit.

The Delegate of the United States of America maintained his Delegation's proposal and commented on the advantages to be gained from a working capital fund. That fund would, to begin with, reduce advances from the Swiss Government and would subsequently make it possible for the Union to do without them entirely. In any case, recourse to advances was a questionable procedure for an international organization as important as the I.T.U. Only the question of principle involved would be embodied in Article 14 of the Convention, and the details whereby it is to be implemented would be set forth in a Resolution.

The Chairman, the Delegate of France and other speakers spoke of the weight they attached to the views expressed by the Delegate of Portugal (Mr. Carlos Ribeiro), who over five years had done such admirable work as Chairman of the Administrative Council Finance Committee.

The Delegate of France said that the chief support for the working capital fund was the consolidated budget which had not been adopted by the Committee. Hence he would abandon the idea of setting up a fund.

The Delegate of Brazil recalled that an embryonic working capital fund had been set up by the Council in the form of a Reserve Fund. He did not think there was much connection between the consolidated budget and the working capital fund, and he supported the statement made by the Delegate of the United States of America.

The Delegate of Switzerland supported these statements.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that the system of having recourse to the Swiss Government for advances had been practiced for more than 80 years. That Government could have put a stop to it when the Atlantic City Convention came into force, but the Swiss Government were obliging enough to let the system continue. The I.T.U. could not be too grateful for the accommodation extended. It would be injudicious to alter a procedure tried and tested over such a period, all the more so since a working capital fund would not remedy the difficulties arising from unpaid contributions. Comparison with the United Nations was misleading, since that organization was a political one, the I.T.U. being essentially technical. How would the fund be set up? By means of large advances from Members, or by a slight increase in their contributions? In the first case, many Members would have considerable difficulty in finding Swiss francs to pay their additional contributions. In the second case, if advances were progressively reduced, there would, over a long period, be a certain amount of duplication which would complicate accounting. Be that as it might, the Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland could not accept the principle of the fund unless it were clearly understood that the fund was not to be used to make good the shortcomings of debtors.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa said that if all ordinary expenses were paid in advance, as laid down in the Convention, there would not be much point in establishing a working capital fund.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics thought that, as things were, the fund was unnecessary. The difficulties encountered arose from the non-payment of contributions.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic was in favour of the working capital fund which could be constituted by means of small additional payments, for instance 5 % of the annual contribution. It would not constitute too heavy a burden for Members.

The Delegate of Portugal, speaking on behalf of his country, could not agree, although he had withdrawn Proposal No. 230, to the suggestion made by the Delegate of the United States of America that the fund should be set up within a short period. If the expenses of the Union were borne in mind, it would be seen that the working capital fund would amount to some 5 or 7 million Swiss francs, and to constitute it in 4 or 5 years would involve a heavy increase in contributions.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that he would be content if it were decided in principle to set up such a fund, the details being worked out later.

The Delegates of French Oversea Territories, the Hungarian People's Republic, and the Roumanian People's Republic did not think that it was desirable to set up such a fund at the present time.

The Chairman, after summarizing the views expressed, put to the vote the question as to whether a working capital fund should be set up.

A vote by show of hands gave the following results:

For: 14

Against: 11

Abstentions: 6

The Delegate of France stated that there had been a mix up and the Delegates were not clear on the issue on which they were voting. He suggested that a fresh vote be taken after the issue had been clearly defined.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated:

"My Delegation protests at the proposal to set up a working capital fund, on the grounds that it would mean an increase in the expenses of I.T.U. Member administrations.

"There is no need for such a fund. All financial difficulties arise from breaches of Article 14, paragraph 6, of the Convention. To eliminate the present financial difficulties, steps must be taken to obtain prompt payment by all countries of their contributions."

The Delegate of France agreed that a fund should, in principle, be set up. It would be enough if an opinion to that effect were annexed to the Convention. The Chairman and the Delegate of the United States of America did not agree with this last speaker.

There was a short break. The Delegate of France spoke on behalf of other delegations which had appeared, like the French Delegation, to have misunderstood the vote. He did not demand that the vote should be taken again, but asked the following question: "Is the constitution of a working capital fund feasible at the present time?"

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa supported this statement.

There followed some discussion. The Delegates of the Argentine Republic, United States of America, and France spoke.

The Secretary General, at the request of the Chairman, stated that the question of having a working capital fund arose when the Council decided to set up a Reserve Fund made up of the credit balance obtained at the end of the financial year and of profits made on the sale of documents. By that means a working capital fund could, over a long period, be constituted, without any substantial increase in contributions.

After fresh discussion, there was a vote by show of hands, and eventually, by 17 votes to 12 with 2 abstentions, it was decided that a working capital fund should not, in principle, be set up.

### III. III. I.T.U. PUBLICATIONS BUDGET.

The Chairman, passing on to the next item on the agenda, said that the question of how publications should be financed had been exhaustively examined by the Administrative Council (Document No.969/CA 6). Various proposals (Nos. 224, 225, 228, 229 and 230) dealt with the matter. There was a proposal (No. 223) by the United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Northern Ireland advocating a separate account for publication expenditure and income.

The Delegate of Portugal said he had withdrawn Proposal No. 230 in favour of the present Article 14 of the Convention (but he made an exception for paragraph 4 of Article 14, to which he would revert later). As regards publications, he supported paragraph 8 of Proposal No. 227 (France) on the understanding that notifications, circulars, etc. - in fact printed correspondence - should not be considered as covered by that paragraph. The Delegate of France confirmed that that was so.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland withdrew Proposal No. 223 and supported paragraph 8 of Proposal No. 227.

The Delegate of the United States of America was not against it, but thought that such details should appear, not in the Convention, but in an annex thereto. The Delegate of Portugal agreed to this.

The Delegate of Lebanon wanted a return to the system whereby a certain number of copies were distributed free. If necessary not more than one such copy might be distributed.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics thought that profit should not be made on publications. Inclusion in the sale price of documents of the salaries of staff engaged in the work of publications was a breach of the Atlantic City Convention fixing a ceiling on ordinary expenditure.

The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic agreed with these views, but they were not shared by the Delegates of Portugal and France, who stressed how difficult it was to calculate an exact price. Publications were sold not only to Members of the I.T.U., but also to recognized private operating agencies and to individuals. Those two latter categories of recipient took no share in defraying ordinary expenditure.

The Chairman put to the vote paragraph 8 of Proposal No. 227, which was adopted by 21 votes to 5 with 1 abstention.

IV. OTHER QUESTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLICATIONS.

The Chairman submitted Proposals Nos. 231 (Italy), 232 (Portugal) and 233 (Sweden).

The Delegate of Portugal said that, broadly speaking, Proposal No. 231 was the same as paragraph 8 of Proposal No. 227 which had just been adopted. Besides, he was not in favour of including a list of I.T.U. publications as an annex to the Convention. Such details would be more in keeping with the administrative regulations. He withdrew Portuguese Proposal No. 232.

No one else took the floor on Proposal No. 231 and, since that Proposal had not been seconded, it was rejected.

The Chairman said that there was only one more proposal to be considered, namely, Proposal No. 233 (Sweden) in favour of including Articles in the Telecommunication Journal in the language in which they had been written, only a brief summary being given in the other two working languages.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia thought that that Proposal was connected with Article 15 (Languages). It could be considered only after a decision had been taken on that Article, which fell within the province of Committee 3.

The Delegates of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Portugal spoke. The Chairman concluded by saying that he would discuss the matter with the Chairman of Committee 3.

The meeting rose at 1920 hours.

Reporters:

J. T. Arregui  
R. A. Vargues  
M. Caws

Chairman:

K. Prasada

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No.218-E

(revised)

21 November 1952

COMMITTEE 5

FIRST REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2

TO COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

SUBJECT: Difficulties resulting from fixed salary scale - Chapter 5, paragraph 1.1, of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference.

During its Meetings on 29 and 30 October and 6 November, Working Group 2 examined the question of difficulties resulting from fixed salary scales.

To eliminate these difficulties in the future, the Group proposes to give the Administrative Council the power eventually to grant, in addition to basic salaries, temporary allowances, and not increases in salaries, since the latter would give rise to a supplementary increase in expenses in the form of contributions that the Union, in such cases, would have to make to the Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds.

As regards the reasons on which the Administrative Council would be authorized to base itself in granting these allowances, the Group could not agree. Two opinions were expressed :

Opinion A, which considers that these allowances could be granted taking into consideration fluctuations in the level of salaries and other relevant factors in the country where the Union has its headquarters and also, as far as possible, the practice followed in this matter by the government of that country and by international organizations established there.

Opinion B, which considers that allowances could be granted only following fluctuations in the cost of living in the country where the Union has its headquarters, and following the practice in this matter adopted by the government of that country and the international organizations established there.

Under these circumstances, Working Group 2 considered itself obliged to submit to Committee 5 ~~drafts~~ A and B (Annexes 1 and 2) which differ only in the sense of the two opinions given above,



each of them including :

- 1) A proposal for amendment of Article 5 of the Convention;
- 2) A draft resolution concerning salaries and temporary allowances which would later be completed by the insertion of basic salary scales.

The question of expatriation allowances and, eventually, of all other allowances will be the subject of a separate resolution.

Working Group 2 is continuing its study of the other questions which form the subject of Chapter 5 of the Report by the Administrative Council.

At the beginning of its first Meeting, Working Group 2, in conformity with the wishes expressed by Committee 5, heard the opinion of the representative of the I.T.U. Staff Association, who made the statement which forms the subject of Annex 3.

Chairman Working Group 2:

R. Vandenhove

Annexes : 3

A N N E X 1

DRAFT A

PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE  
CONVENTION

1. Include in Article 5 of the Convention, under B. "Duties of the Administrative Council", in paragraph 11, the following new sub-paragraph f bis) :

f bis) Fix the salaries of the members of the I.F.R.B. and of all the officials of the Union, taking into account the basic salary scales determined in accordance with Art. 10, par. 1(b) bis by the Plenipotentiary Conference;

Determine the amount of any temporary additional allowances taking into consideration fluctuations in salary levels and other relevant factors in the country where the headquarters of the Union are situated and, as far as possible, the practice followed in that connection by the Government of that country and the international organizations established there.

DRAFT A

RESOLUTION ON SALARIES

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Telecommunication Conference,

resolves :

That the basic scales to be applied in fixing the salaries of the members of the I.F.R.B. and the officials of the Union as from 1 January 1953 shall be as follows :

(salaries to be inserted)

further resolves :

that in addition to these salaries a supplementary allowance may be granted to the members of the I.F.R.B. and to the officials of the Union and to this end, the following steps shall be taken :

- a) For the purpose of adapting the emoluments of the officials to fluctuations in salary levels in other employments and general price levels a sum of .....shall be incorporated in the ceiling of ordinary expenditure of the Union;
- b) When such fluctuations in the country which is the seat of the Union necessitate the granting of an allowance, the Administrative Council shall insert in the ordinary budget of the Union, under a separate sub-heading, within the limits strictly necessary to cover the corresponding expense, a credit taken from that sum.

A N N E X 2

DRAFT B

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION

1. Include in Article 5 of the Convention, under title B, "Duties of the Administrative Council", on paragraph 11 of the new sub-paragraph f bis) the following :

f bis) Fix the salaries of the Members of the I.F.R.B. and of all the officials of the Union, taking into account the basic salary scales determined in accordance with the terms of Article 10, paragraph 1 b) bis by the Plenipotentiary Conference;

Determine if necessary the amount of any temporary additional allowances taking into consideration the fluctuations in the cost of living in the country where the headquarters of the Union are situated. It will follow, as far as possible in this matter the practice of the Government of that country and the international organizations established there.

DRAFT B

RESOLUTION ON SALARIES

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Telecommunication Conference

resolves :

That the basic scales to be applied in fixing the salaries of the Members of the I.F.R.B. and officials of the Union as from 1 January 1953 shall be as follows :

(Salaries to be inserted)

further resolves :

That in addition to these salaries, a temporary cost of living allowance may be granted to Members of the I.F.R.B. and to officials of the Union and to this end, the following steps shall be taken :

- a) A sum of..... shall be incorporated in the ceiling of ordinary expenditure of the Union;
- b) When such fluctuations in the cost of living in the country which is the seat of the Union necessitate the granting of a cost of living allowance, the Administrative Council shall insert in the ordinary budget of the Union, under a separate heading, within the limits strictly necessary to cover the corresponding expense, a credit taken from that sum.

A N N E X 3

STATEMENT MADE BY THE REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE I.T.U. STAFF ASSOCIATION TO  
WORKING GROUP 2 OF COMMITTEE 5

Mr. Chairman, Honourable Delegates, Gentlemen :

I thank you on behalf of the Staff Association of the I.T.U. for the privilege you have granted it by permitting its representative to put forward its views. The Association has entrusted me with this task and I shall endeavour to put them to you quite impartially as and when they are required. In the same manner I shall try to answer any questions which may be asked of me.

At the moment, however, I hope you will bear with me since the main theme of my present statement is, unhappily, that root of all evils - money.

At Atlantic City it was decided that the I.T.U. should be staffed internationally and take its stand as an equal with the United Nations and the other specialized agencies forming what I shall call the family of Nations. Unfortunately, however, although the work the I.T.U. was given to do was of equal significance to that of the other branches of the family, the salaries and conditions of service were not the same. This has meant that the staff of the I.T.U. have come to be considered as a poor relation to the other branches of the family rather than as an equal as had been intended by the Agreement with the United Nations, particularly Article VIII. During the past five years certain of the staff members recruited on the new international basis have left the Union because their salaries were insufficient in relation to their positions - some having gone to other organizations where the pay and conditions are much better. In a few cases, wives and children have returned to their home countries, since this was the only way expenses could be covered. In one or two cases, offers of positions with higher pay in other organizations have been refused, partly because of esprit de corps and partly because the persons concerned were persuaded that the conditions of service in the Union would be considerably improved by this Conference.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen : our submission is that if staff are to be on an international plane, are to put aside national considerations and to serve the whole world impartially, then their terms of service should also be international. International service is not for a specific number of hours per day : the sacrifices demanded of your officials (and readily made) in the past five years have been exceedingly heavy. Many hours to which the wife and children are normally entitled have been freely given instead to the Union. The call of duty has never gone unanswered even though the family has not always understood.

The staff of the I.T.U. is confident that the representatives of the telecommunications interests of the family of Nations who are gathered here to consider the provision of funds for the maintenance of international telecommunication relations will not agree that the salaries and conditions of service for the staff of the I.T.U. should be less favourable than those which have been agreed by other representatives for the staffs of the majority of the other branches of the same family.

In support of this submission, during 1951 and early 1952, the Staff Association carried out a study of the salaries and conditions existing in the I.T.U. with those of the U.N. and the other specialized agencies in Geneva, and submitted its report and proposals to the Council at its 1952 session. This study was carried out over a period of one year and represents the spare time efforts of competent officers of the Association with the object of making available a carefully considered factual report. The comparison of I.T.U. salaries with those of the U.N. was made only after careful investigations had been conducted with the help of the Staff Associations of the U.N. and the other specialized agencies in Geneva. The Association earnestly hopes, therefore, that its study and the proposals contained therein will also be taken into consideration by this Conference.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

FIRST REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2

TO COMMITTEE 5  
(I.T.U. Finances)

SUBJECT: Difficulties resulting from fixed salary scale - Chapter 5, paragraph 1.1, of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference.

During its Meetings on 29 and 30 October and 6 November, Working Group 2 examined the question of difficulties resulting from fixed salary scales.

To eliminate these difficulties in the future, the Group proposes to give the Administrative Council the power eventually to grant, in addition to basic salaries, temporary allowances, and not increases in salaries, since the latter would give rise to a supplementary increase in expenses in the form of contributions that the Union, in such cases, would have to make to the Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds.

As regards the reasons on which the Administrative Council would be authorized to base itself in granting these allowances, the Group could not agree. Two opinions were expressed:

Opinion A, which considers that these allowances could be granted taking into consideration fluctuations in the level of salaries and other factors operative in the country where the Union has its headquarters and also, as far as possible, the practice adopted in this matter by the government of that country and by international organizations established there.

Opinion B, which considers that allowances could be granted only following fluctuations in the cost of living in the country where the Union has its headquarters, and following the practice in this matter adopted by the government of that country and the international organizations established there.

Under these circumstances, Working Group 2 considered itself obliged to submit to Committee 5 drafts A and B (Annexes 1 and 2) which differ only

in the sense of the two opinions given above, each of them including:

- 1) A proposal for amendment of Article 5 of the Convention;
- 2) A draft resolution concerning salaries and temporary allowances which would later be completed by the insertion of basis salary scales.

The question of expatriation allowances and, eventually, of all other allowances will be the subject of a separate resolution.

°

° °

Working Group 2 is continuing its study of the other questions which form the subject of Chapter 5 of the Report by the Administrative Council.

°

° °

At the beginning of its first Meeting, Working Group 2, in conformity with the wishes expressed by Committee 5, heard the opinion of the representative of the I.T.U. Staff Association, who made the statement which forms the subject of Annex 3.

Chairman Working Group 2:

R. Vandenhove

Annexes: 3

A N N E X 1

DRAFT A

PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION

1. Include in Article 5 of the Convention, under B. "Duties of the Administrative Council", in paragraph 11, the following new sub-paragraph f bis):

f bis) Fix the salaries of the members of the I.F.R.B. and of all the officials of the Union, taking into account the basic salary scales approved under Art. 10, par. 1(b)bis by the Plenipotentiary Conference;

Determine the amount of any temporary additional allowances taking into consideration fluctuations in salary levels and other relevant factors in the country where the headquarters of the Union are situated and, as far as possible, the practice followed in that connection by the Government of that country and the international organizations established there.

DRAFT A

RESOLUTION ON SALARIES

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Telecommunication Conference,

resolves:

That the basic scales to be applied in fixing the salaries of the members of the I.F.R.B. and the officials of the Union as from 1 January 1953 shall be as follows:

(salaries to be inserted)

further resolves:

that in addition to these salaries a supplementary allowance may be granted to the members of the I.F.R.B. and to the officials of the Union and to this end, the following steps shall be taken:

- a) For the purpose of adapting the emoluments of the officials to fluctuations in salary levels in other employments and general price levels a sum of ..... shall be incorporated in the ceiling of expenditure of the Union;
- b) When such fluctuations in the country which is the seat of the Union necessitate the granting of an allowance, the Administrative Council shall insert in the ordinary budget of the Union, under a separate sub-heading, within the limits strictly necessary to cover the corresponding expense, a credit taken from that sum.

A N N E X 2

DRAFT B

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 5 OF THE CONVENTION

1. Include in Article 5 of the Convention, under title B, "Duties of the Administrative Council", on paragraph 11 of the new sub-paragraph f bis) the following:

f bis) Fix the salaries of the Members of the I.F.R.B. and of all the officials of the Union, taking into account the basic salary scales approved under Article 10, paragraph 1 b) bis by the Plenipotentiary Conference;

Determine the amount of any temporary additional allowances taking into consideration the fluctuations in salary levels and other relevant factors in the country where the headquarters of the Union are situated and, as far as possible the practice followed in that connection by the Government of that country and the international organizations established there.

DRAFT B

RESOLUTION ON SALARIES

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Telecommunication Conference  
resolves:

That the basic scales to be applied in fixing the salaries of the Members of the I.F.R.B. and officials of the Union as from 1 January 1953 shall be as follows:

(Salaries to be inserted)

further resolves:

That in addition to these salaries, a temporary cost of living allowance may be granted to Members of the I.F.R.B. and to officials of the Union and to this end, the following steps shall be taken:

- a) A sum of.....shall be incorporated in the coiling of expenditure of the Union;
- b) When such fluctuations in the cost of living in the country which is the seat of the Union necessitate the granting of a cost of living allowance, the Administrative Council shall insert in the ordinary budget of the Union, under a separate heading, within the limits strictly necessary to cover the corresponding expense, a credit taken from that sum.

A N N E X 3

STATEMENT MADE BY THE REPRESENTATIVE  
OF THE I.T.U. STAFF ASSOCIATION TO  
WORKING GROUP 2 OF COMMITTEE 5

Mr. Chairman, Honourable Delegates, Gentlemen:

I thank you on behalf of the Staff Association of the I.T.U. for the privilege you have granted it by permitting its representative to put forward its views. The Association has entrusted me with this task and I shall endeavour to put them to you quite impartially as and when they are required. In the same manner I shall try to answer any questions which may be asked of me.

At the moment, however, I hope you will bear with me since the main theme of my present statement is, unhappily, that root of all evils - money.

At Atlantic City it was decided that the I.T.U. should be staffed internationally and take its stand as an equal with the United Nations and the other specialized agencies forming what I shall call the family of Nations. Unfortunately, however, although the work the I.T.U. was given to do was of equal significance to that of the other branches of the family, the salaries and conditions of service were not the same. This has meant that the staff of the I.T.U. have come to be considered as a poor relation to the other branches of the family rather than as an equal as had been intended by the Agreement with the United Nations, particularly Article VIII. During the past five years certain of the staff members recruited on the new international basis have left the Union because their salaries were insufficient in relation to their positions - some having gone to other organizations where the pay and conditions are much better. In a few cases, wives and children have returned to their home countries, since this was the only way expenses could be covered. In one or two cases, offers of positions with higher pay in other organizations have been refused, partly because of esprit de corps and partly because the persons concerned were persuaded that the conditions of service in the Union would be considerably improved by this Conference.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: our submission is that if staff are to be on an international plane, are to put aside national considerations and to serve the whole world impartially, then their terms of service should also be international. International service is not for a specific number of hours per day: the sacrifices demanded of your officials (and readily made) in the past five years have been exceedingly heavy. Many hours to which the wife and children are normally entitled have been freely given instead to the Union. The call of duty has never gone unanswered even though the family has not always understood.

The staff of the I.T.U. is confident that the representatives of the telecommunications interests of the family of Nations who are gathered here to consider the provision of funds for the maintenance of international telecommunication relations will not agree that the salaries and conditions of service for the staff of the I.T.U. should be less favourable than those which have been agreed by other representatives for the staffs of the majority of the other branches of the same family.

In support of this submission, during 1951 and early 1952, the Staff Association carried out a study of the salaries and conditions existing in the I.T.U. with those of the U.N. and the other specialized agencies in Geneva, and submitted its report and proposals to the Council at its 1952 session. This study was carried out over a period of one year and represents the spare time efforts of competent officers of the Association with the object of making available a carefully considered factual report. The comparison of I.T.U. salaries with those of the U.N. was made only after careful investigations had been conducted with the help of the Staff Associations of the U.N. and the other specialized agencies in Geneva. The Association earnestly hopes, therefore, that its study and the proposals contained therein will also be taken into consideration by this Conference.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 219-E  
8 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

Summary Record of the Sixteenth Meeting

Friday, 7 November 1952, 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. C. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted the Summary Record of the 12th and 13th Meetings (Documents Nos. 175 and 176) to the Committee for approval. The Summary Record of the 12th Meeting (Document No. 175) was approved with the following amendments:

- Page 6, statement by the Chairman:

The first sentence was replaced by:

"The Chairman was of the same opinion as the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning the secret ballot."

- Page 6, statement by the Delegate of the U.S.A., to read:

"The Delegate of the U.S.A. also considered that the opinion of the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. on the Rules of Procedure was perfectly correct."

- Page 6, statement by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., speaking as Chairman of Committee 4:



Fourth line, replace "examined" by "raised".

Fourth line, replace "one abstention" by "one or two abstentions".

Sixth line, read "requested by five Delegations".

- Page 8, statement by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, at the end of the first sub-paragraph, replace "Article 6" by "Article 6 of the Convention".

- Page 9, statement by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, penultimate paragraph, last sentence, to read:

"These questions are very important and it is above all necessary to know what will be the decision of the Conference relating to them."

The Delegates of India, Egypt and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requested several amendments which affect only the English text of Document No. 175.

India, page 2, line 7, instead of "so" read "to".

Egypt, page 3, paragraph 2, third line, delete "not".

U.S.S.R., page 9, paragraph 2, third line, read "Soviet proposals Nos. 35 and 98 and ....", and page 9, paragraph 3, third line, read "basic questions of principle".

After hearing the amendments requested by the Chairman and by the Delegate of the U.S.A., the Delegate of Brazil thanked them. These statements had removed the concern of his Delegation, which was now quite satisfied and would, therefore, dispense with the statement it had intended to make.

o o o

The Summary Record of the 13th Meeting (Document No. 176) was then approved without amendment.

o o o

The Committee then turned again to its examination of Article 10, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph f).

Before reopening the debate, the Chairman reminded the Committee that it had, at its 2nd Meeting, decided to deal "first with questions of principle, on which decisions could be directly adopted by the Committee, if they were simple questions, and in the case of complex matters to hand them over to working groups".

He regretted that at the last Meeting he had been obliged to adopt a much slower procedure which had no advantages, and he asked the Committee to return to the practice it had itself adopted.

The Committee confirmed that it was in agreement with the Chairman.

The Chairman then read the text that had been drafted jointly by the Delegations of the Argentine, the U.S.A. and France (Document No. 213):

"Plenipotentiary Conferences:

f) if necessary, conclude, or if necessary revise, agreements between the Union and other international organizations, and approve the provisional agreements concluded with such organizations, on behalf of the Union, by the Administrative Council."

Furthermore, the French Delegation would propose an addition to Article 5 of the Convention to enable the Administrative Council to conclude provisional agreements.

The Delegate of France said that the text he had helped to draft did no more than reflect the state of affairs that had existed since Atlantic City. In effect, the Council had been called upon to establish the agreement on technical assistance and to guarantee the agreement with UNESCO. The Council must, therefore, be authorized to act similarly in the future. But, in view of the importance that these agreements might have and their possible financial repercussion, they must only be of a provisional nature until they were approved by the following Plenipotentiary Conference. Observing the interval between conferences, it was therefore necessary to authorize the Council to act in this way.

Two amendments were proposed to the text under discussion.

1) The first, proposed by the Delegate of Egypt, consisted in replacing the words "provisional agreements" by "draft agreements".

Although the Delegate of the United States of America observed that a simple draft agreement without executive force would rest a dead letter, and that, in addition, in pursuance of paragraph 11 b) of Article 5, the Council would "be responsible for effecting the coordination with all international organizations", and was therefore authorized to establish or guarantee agreements, the Delegate of Egypt upheld his

amendment. He feared that the Council might conclude agreements which were contrary to the interests of countries not represented thereon. The competence of the Council could be extended as far as concluding agreements with a government, for example with the Swiss Government, but not with international organizations.

This proposal was supported by the Delegate of Saudi Arabia. Put to the vote, it was rejected by 36 votes to 13 and 5 abstentions.

2) The second amendment was proposed by the Delegate of Mexico. He was afraid that the present text would place the Conference under an obligation to approve the provisional agreements concluded by the Council. He asked that the word "approve" be replaced by "approve for eventual revision".

Finally, the authors of the text under discussion accepted the following draft: "examine and approve" and these words were included in the initial text.

A long discussion followed on whether it was advisable to give the Administrative Council the authority to conclude provisional agreements, to be submitted to the Plenipotentiary Conference, which must examine and could approve them.

The Delegate of F.P.R. of Yugoslavia considered that the Conference should be very prudent in thus delegating a part of its duties. If the Council had concluded an agreement, even provisional, the Members of the Union should be asked to give their opinion. The question had a legal and a practical aspect. The rule was (Article 27) that the Union would cooperate with international organizations. The practice was (Article 11), that the Council was responsible for cooperation with international organizations. The Committee must, in the first place, give its opinion on the exact limits of the Council's duties.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the following statement:

"In the opinion of the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Administrative Council should not be authorized to conclude agreements, including provisional agreements, with international organizations.

"Agreements with international organizations relate to questions that are very important and which interest all Members of the Union. The consequences of such agreements affect all Members of the Union. Consequently, to conclude international agreements all countries, Members of the Union, must have the opportunity of taking part in a discussion.

"The Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics therefore considers that it is quite pointless to modify the text of paragraph 1 f) of Article 10 of the Convention in force, and proposes that the present text should be retained."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. and the Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. both gave their support to the proposal to retain the present text. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. made the following statement:

"The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. considers that the existing text of paragraph 1 f) of Article 10 of the Convention should be retained.

"We consider that only the Plenipotentiary Conference can conclude agreements with international organizations, since the obligations arising from these agreements affect all the Members of the Union.

"Since, in these cases, the interests of all countries are at stake, the Administrative Council cannot be given the right to conclude such agreements.

"This is an important question of principle, and the Members of the Union are sovereign states. It is only the Plenipotentiary representatives of these countries that can conclude agreements at the Plenipotentiary Conference."

The Delegate of the Lebanon considered that the status quo was adequate. In effect, according to Article 10, it was the basic agreements that must be concluded by the Plenipotentiary Conference, and this let it be understood that other agreements were evidently within the competence of the Administrative Council.

The Delegate of Italy was in favour of the proposed text. In any case, sub-paragraph f) already laid down that the Conference should ..... "revise any existing formal agreement" which let it be understood that certain agreements were passed by the Administrative Council; there was therefore no difference.

The Delegate of Turkey also supported the text proposed by the U.S.A., France, and the Argentine. What this text proposed was analogous to the practice followed by governments to conclude treaties subject to approval by the legislative body.

The observer of the United Nations reminded the Committee of the Administrative Council's role as a coordinating body and the importance of agreements, more or less formal, concluded thanks to the Council.

The Delegate of France pointed out that, in any case, the status quo was inadequate. In the last few years the Council had negotiated one agreement and guaranteed another. Those who refused this authority to the Council should at least propose that a provision of the Convention prohibit the Council from concluding any form of agreement. It was inconceivable that, for five or six years, the Union should be inactive in so far as its relations with international organizations were concerned.

The Chairman then put to the vote the text contained in Document No. 213 where the word "approve" was replaced by "examine and approve".

This text was approved by 43 votes to 13 with 4 abstentions.

Following the vote, the Delegate of Egypt, speaking on behalf of his Delegation and that of Syria, said that those countries formally reserved their right to take the necessary steps to protect their interests, in case the Administrative Council should conclude an agreement with an international organization which they considered against their interests. He also reserved the right to raise this question again in Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of Iraq requested the inclusion in the Summary Record of his opinion which was: "that agreements concluded by the Council should only be provisional and that they could not enter into force until they had been submitted to the Members of the Union and approved by two-thirds of them."

Article 10, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph g)

This sub-paragraph reads as follows:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference:

.....

"g) deal with such other telecommunication questions as may be necessary".

Only one proposal had been submitted concerning this sub-paragraph (No. 173, paragraph 1, 7); it was sent to the working group without comment.

o  
o

Article 10, paragraph 2

The Chairman said that he was only going to discuss the question of intervals of time between Plenipotentiary Conferences. At present, this question was governed by the first part of paragraph 2, Article 10 which read as follows:

" 2. The Plenipotentiary Conference normally shall meet once every five years....."

The proposals submitted to the Conference mentioned an interval of five years (U.S.A., No. 164, and France, No. 173) of six years (Italy, No. 165 and Portugal, No. 166) or of seven years (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, No. 167).

The Delegates of Portugal and Italy withdrew their proposal in favour of that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, reserving the right to return to the matter if this last proposal were rejected.

The Delegate of Canada was also in favour of an interval of seven years, it being understood that, for reasons of economy, the Conference should meet at the seat of the Union.

The Delegate of ~~the~~ United States of America said that he would, willingly, accept an interval which would be, normally, six or seven years and the Administrative Council could take the initiative in fixing the time and place of the Conference exactly according to necessity.

This idea was put into concrete form by the Delegate of Sweden who made the following proposal:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference normally shall meet once every five to seven years at a time and place fixed by the Administrative Council, taking into consideration the recommendation of the preceding Plenipotentiary Conference."

This proposal would permit, for example, a meeting of the Conference in 1965, the year in which the Union would celebrate its centenary.

Other Delegates were in favour of the status quo and for the following reasons:

- The Delegate of Pakistan because the Council should not intervene in fixing the date of the Conference. This would permit the Council to extend its mandate; the Council depended on the Conference and not the contrary.

- The Delegate of France for a practical reason: the present work of the I.F.R.B. would be finished in 1957; the Ordinary Radio Conference could then meet to study the results and, if it considered necessary, to modify the structure of the I.F.R.B. It could only do so if a Plenipotentiary Conference were meeting at the same time. The French Administration insisted upon the two conferences taking place simultaneously.

- The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia because, in the present circumstances, an interval of five years was in fact very long.

The Chairman, then put to the vote Proposal 167 which envisaged an interval of seven years between Plenipotentiary Conferences.

This Proposal was rejected by 25 votes to 19 with 22 abstentions.

In favour of the Proposal: 19 Delegations:

Argentina, Australia, Canada, Ceylon, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Denmark, United States of America, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Netherlands, Philippines, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States Territories, South Africa, Viet-Nam.

Against the proposal: 25 Delegations:

Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Austria, Belgium, China, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Monaco, New Zealand, Pakistan, Protectorate of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, Roumanian P.R., Syria, Czechoslovakia, French Oversea Territories, Yemen.

Abstentions: 22 Delegations:

P.R. of Albania, Bielorussian S.S.R., Brazil, P.R. of Bulgaria, Korea, El Salvador, Spain, Ethiopia, Hungarian P.R., India, Japan, Mexico, Paraguay, P.R. of Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., Sweden, Switzerland, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Turkey, U.S.S.R., Uruguay, Spanish Morocco.

The Chairman said, that in accordance with normal procedure, he was going to put to the vote the proposals of Portugal and Italy which envisaged an interval of six years and which had only been withdrawn in the event of seven years being adopted.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that if the interval of six years were not accepted, he would give his support to the proposal of Sweden.

The Delegate of France said that the proposal of Sweden seemed quite satisfactory and he would willingly support it, not because it increased the Council's prerogatives, but precisely because the E.A.R.C. had charged the Council to follow the progress of work in the I.F.R.B. Thus it was this body which was best placed to ensure that the Radio Conference and the Plenipotentiary Conference took place simultaneously.

The Delegates of Portugal and Italy withdrew their proposal in favour of the proposal of Sweden, which was also supported by the Delegate of Switzerland.

The Chairman said that in these conditions he would put the proposal of Sweden to the vote, although the Delegates of Pakistan, Czechoslovakia and the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia stated that they were opposed to such an increase in the prerogatives of the Council, and asked that a vote should first be taken on the status quo.

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia considered that the rejection of the proposal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland prevented taking the proposal of Sweden into consideration, since this proposal envisaged an interval of seven years.

This opinion was supported by the Delegate of Pakistan and the Chairman, therefore, decided to take a vote on whether or not the proposal of Sweden should be discussed. The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. pointed out that it was not possible to discuss only the interval, since, in the proposal of Sweden, there was a new element: It was the organ which would fix the date of the Conference. If it were the preceding Conference, the Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. agreed. If it were the Council, he did not agree. It was the Council which took its authority from the Conference, and not the contrary. It must first be decided which body was competent to fix the time and place of the Conference.

The Chairman recognized the sound basis of this contention; it was logical to reply to the question raised by the Delegate of Bielorussian S.S.R..

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. made the following statement:

"The Delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. supports the opinion of the Delegation of the Bielorussian S.S.R. according to which the proposal of Sweden for an indeterminate interval of five to seven years for the convocation of the Plenipotentiary Conference cannot be put to the vote. If the question were put in this way it would not be clearly stated who will determine the date of the Conference.

"Our Delegation is categorically opposed to the date and place of the Conference being fixed by the Administrative Council.

"We consider this question should only be decided by the Plenipotentiary Conference itself."

The Chairman said that in effect several delegates were in favour of maintaining the status quo. The Rules of Procedure obliged him to put to the vote first those proposals furthest from the status quo, but, if the Committee were of the opinion that the status quo should be put to the vote in the first instance, he would conform to their wishes.

By 51 votes to 1, the Committee decided first to vote on the status quo.

The Chairman therefore put to the vote the present text of the Convention:

"The Plenipotentiary Conference normally shall meet once every five years".

The Committee decided to retain the present text by 52 votes to 6, with 4 abstentions.

+

+ +

The Chairman said that the Meeting for to-morrow would be dedicated to an examination of paragraph 1 and 2 of Article 11 (Administrative Conferences), and then paragraphs 3 of Articles 10 and 11. Subsequently, the Committee would have to examine the report of Sub-Committee 3 A (Document No. 184).

The Meeting rose at 1:10 p.m.

Rapporteurs:

E. Luraschi

G. Terras

C.K. Collins

J. Revoy

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

P.V. 6.

M I N U T E S

of the Sixth Plenary Meeting

Tuesday, 4 November at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. M. A. Andrada (Argentina)

Subjects discussed:

1. Proposal by the Delegate of India concerning statements;
2. Approval of the Minutes of the Fourth and Fifth Meetings (Docs. Nos. 120, 121 and 136 with Corrigenda Docs. Nos. 164, 172 and 179);
3. First Report by Committee 5 (Doc. No. 165);
4. Second Report by Committee 3 (Doc. No. 142);
5. Third Report by Committee 3 (Doc. No. 154);
6. Disaster in the Philippines: Expressions of Sympathy.

1. PROPOSAL BY THE DELEGATE OF INDIA CONCERNING STATEMENTS

The Delegate of India made the following statement:

"Mr. Chairman,

"Before you take up other business I wish to make a suggestion regarding a matter in which every delegate is interested, namely speeding up the business of the Conference. I placed it before a meeting of the Steering Committee which approved of it. The text of it will be handed over to the Rapporteurs and I should like it included in the proceedings of this meeting.

"The Delegations have a right, after a vote has been taken on an issue, to make a statement and to ask that it be incorporated in the proceedings of the assembly or a meeting. The right has been asserted and has been recognised by the President of the Conference and the Chairman of the various Committees. Since we all wish to save the time of the meetings, I have been wondering whether a suitable working arrangement cannot be evolved for shortening the proceedings and saving our time.

"Of course, our right to make statements is there and has been fully asserted and unreservedly recognised, but without prejudice to this right and without derogation to the Rules of Procedure, we can perhaps come to a working arrangement.

"The idea that has occurred to us is this:

"The Delegations which wish to make formal statements and to have them incorporated in the proceedings may raise their hands. The President may depute officials of the secretariat to collect the statements which will be perused by the President who will order their incorporation in the proceedings.

"This will save the time of the Conference entailed in reading formal statements and the saving will not be inconsiderable.

"This suggestion is made for your consideration and consideration of the Assembly.

"We hope it will not be construed as an attempt to gag discussion or thought that it is directed against any country or group of countries. India is one of the countries which have taken the time of this Assembly by making a formal statement. We were loath to do so, but are anxious to save the time of the Conference."

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the following statement:

"Mr. Chairman, we have just heard a proposal by the Honourable Delegate of India - a proposal which he thinks will make for a saving of time.

"In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I should like to give the views of my Delegation. Should a delegation wish to make a statement, then, firstly, it would show disrespect not to listen to that statement but simply to have it included in the minutes. Secondly, all delegations, we imagine, have an interest in being informed of the views of other delegations in connection with a whole series of questions. Many delegations can also make their comments on the same occasion. Hence it would be incorrect to consign such statements to the minutes without listening to them.

"As regards time saving, and acceleration of the work of the Conference, we have come to the conclusion that time is being wasted, not on statements, but on discussion of trivial matters which in fact do not require to be discussed. I do not wish to give examples, but I can do so if required.

"The Indian proposal should not, we consider, be adopted."

The Chairman said that as there was no unanimity on the point, it would be preferable to continue as in the past. But he would ask all Delegates to bear in mind the need for expediting the work.

The Delegate of India was sorry his proposal had been misunderstood. He had submitted it merely to save the time of the Conference and without any ulterior motive. He would bow to the Chairman's opinion and not press his proposal further, in order to save time.

The Chairman thanked the Delegate of India.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE FOURTH AND FIFTH MEETINGS (Docs.Nos.120, 121 and 136 with Corrigenda Docs. Nos. 164, 172 and 179).

Approved, subject to the final amendments issued in Document No. 198.

3. FIRST REPORT BY COMMITTEE 5 (Doc. No. 165)

Approved without comment.

4. SECOND REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3 (Doc. No. 142)

The Delegate of Portugal, Chairman of Committee 3, in introducing the Document, pointed out a drafting change on page 2, 4th paragraph. "....at the request of ten of its Members...." should read: "....at the request of the majority of its Members....".

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"Document No. 142 constitutes the report by Committee 3 on the question of how many members the Administrative Council should have. Since this document is now before us, I have the following comments to make.

"At the present time, the Administrative Council has 18 Members. When it was set up at Atlantic City, the principle was adopted that the various parts of the world should be equally represented. To this end the world was divided into four regions (Atlantic City Document No. 423 TR).

"In fact, however, of those four regions, three are represented on the Council by five Members each, whereas the Eastern Europe and Northern Asia Region is represented by only three. Such a state of affairs is, we feel, wrong, and should be put right at this Conference. Eastern

Europe and Northern Asia make up a huge region, with extensive territories, teeming populations and highly-developed telecommunications.

"Hence the Soviet Union proposes that all four regions defined at Atlantic City should be equally represented, i.e., that each region should be represented on the Council by 5 countries.

"To this end, Membership of the Council must be increased to twenty.

"We disagree with the decision of Committee 3 on this matter, referred to in Document No. 142, and we hereby submit our proposal relative to paragraph 1 (1) of Article 5 of the Convention for consideration at this Plenary Assembly. It has already been published as Proposal No. 38.

"We propose that Article 5, paragraph 1 (1) of the Convention should be worded thus:

"The Administrative Council shall be composed of twenty Members of the Union, elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference, with due regard to the need for equitable representation of all parts of the world."

The Chairman pointed out that the matter had been fully discussed in Committee 3, although the Soviet Representative had every right to raise the question again in Plenary Assembly. Since Document No. 142 did not contain any recommendation to alter the number of Members of the Administrative Council, he would bring Proposal No. 38, submitted by the U.S.S.R., before the Assembly for discussion.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic said:

"My Delegation supports the proposal submitted by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. to the effect that Membership of the Administrative Council should be increased to twenty.

"In order that all four regions of the world should be equally represented, each region ought to be represented in the Administrative Council by five countries.

"The principle of equitable representation is at present being infringed by the fact that three regions are each represented in the Council by five countries, while the Eastern Europe and Northern Asia Region is represented by only three.

"We disagree with the decision taken by Committee 3 on this matter, and support Proposal No. 38, submitted by the Soviet Union."

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland said that his Delegation had supported Proposal No. 38 when it was discussed in Committee 3. It had been decided at Atlantic City that there would be 18 Members of the Administrative Council. At that time the Membership of the Union was about 70. It had since increased to over 90. The insignificant increase proposed in the Membership of the Administrative Council was thus necessary if there was to be fair representation of all parts of the world. He therefore supported Proposal No. 38 submitted by the U.S.S.R.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria said that Committee 3 had discussed Proposal No. 38, submitted by the Soviet Union, along with Proposal No. 617 submitted by the People's Republic of Bulgaria. Both those proposals were aimed at increasing the number of Members of the Administrative Council to twenty, which would give a fair and uniform representation of the four regions of the world. It had been argued that such an increase would be costly, but that argument was untenable, since the insignificant increase in expense would be more than counterbalanced by the increased efficiency of the Council.

In addition, under Article 5 of the Convention, the Council was acting on behalf of the Plenipotentiary Conference in the intervals between meetings of the latter. It was therefore essential that the increased Membership of the Union since 1947 should be adequately reflected in the Council.

He, therefore, supported Proposal No. 38.

The Delegate of Pakistan had supported the Proposal during the discussions in Committee 3, but had one further point to make. At the time of Atlantic City, such important countries as Germany and

Japan had not been in a position to take an active part in the work of the Union. Since then, their position had fortunately changed for the better. He was not advocating a restricted redistribution of Council seats on a geographical basis, but he did feel that the proposed increase of Membership to twenty would provide a much fairer representation of countries which had recently acquired independence, of which there were several in the Asiatic Region anxious to take their full share in the work of the L.T.U.

The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic supported the proposal submitted by the U.S.S.R., since a Membership composed of four groups of five Members would be truly democratic and would give fair representation to the various geographical regions.

The Delegate of Pakistan wished it to be made quite clear before a vote was taken that the distribution of seats would be worked out on a fair basis. He hoped the decision would not be influenced by talk of any particular region. It should be understood that any underdeveloped region could claim its fair share of representation.

The Chairman put Proposals Nos. 38 and 617 to a roll-call vote.

Results of the vote:

In favour: 12 Delegations:

Afghanistan, P.R. of Albania, Saudi Arabia, Bielorussian S.S.R., P.R. of Bulgaria, Hungarian P.R., Pakistan, P.R. of Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R.

Against: 55 Delegations:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Spain, United States of America, France, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Netherlands, Philippines, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, U.S. Territories, French Oversea Territories, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Spanish Possessions.

Abstentions: 10 Delegations:

Austria, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Israel, Laos, Lebanon, Norway, Syria, Yemen.

Five Delegations were absent.

Proposals Nos. 38 and 617 were thus rejected.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the following statement:

"We interpret the decision taken by the Conference to mean that it is unwilling to increase the Membership of the Council. That, however, does not solve the question of how to ensure equal representation of the various regions of the world within the Council. My Delegation reserves the right to revert to this matter at the appropriate time."

The Chairman then opened discussion on point 2) on page 2 of Document No. 142, with the amendment previously announced by the Chairman of Committee 3.

Point 2) was approved without comment.

The remainder of Document No. 142 was also approved without comment.

5. THIRD REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3 (Doc. No. 154).

The Chairman opened discussion on paragraph 1 on page 1 of Document No. 154.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the following statement:

"When Articles 4 and 6 of the Convention were being considered by Committee 3 of this Conference, my Delegation submitted its proposals. Those proposals, published by the I.T.U. General Secretariat as Nos. 35 and 98, advocated deletion of Article 6 from the Convention and the liquidation of the I.F.R.B.

"My Delegation was not in agreement with the decision taken by Committee 3 to reject Proposals 35 and 98, and reserved the right to revert to the matter when it came up before the Plenary Assembly of the Conference.

"The decision taken by Committee 3 is, we feel, wrong, and we hereby submit our proposals Nos. 35 and 98 for consideration by the Plenary Assembly.

"The Soviet Union proposes that Article 6 of the Convention be deleted, that paragraph 3 c) be deleted from Article 4, that the I.F.R.B. be disbanded, while making the I.T.U. General Secretariat responsible for frequency registration and for the preparation and publication of frequency lists, on the basis of the notifications received from administrations, as set forth in our Proposal No. 123.

"These measures we consider essential, since there can be no justification for the existence of the I.F.R.B. in the absence of the new International Frequency List which might serve as a basis for the commencement of the activities of the I.F.R.B.

"In addition, it should be pointed out that there is no call for setting up a special, and costly, organ for frequency registration. These duties could be entrusted to the Secretary General of the Union in exactly the same way as they were entrusted to the International Bureau by the Madrid Convention of 1932 and by the General Radio Regulations (Cairo Revision, 1938).

"Hence, my Delegation urges the Plenipotentiary Conference to adopt Proposals Nos. 35, 98, and 123."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic said:

"My Delegation supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union to the effect that the I.F.R.B. should be wound up and that Article 6, and paragraph 3 c) of Article 4, should be deleted from the Convention. We disagree with the decision taken by Committee 3 on this matter.

"There can be no grounds for the existence of the I.F.R.B. in the absence of the new International Frequency List. Frequency registration duties, on the basis of the notifications made by countries, and publication of frequency lists, can be entrusted to the Secretary

General of the Union in exactly the same way as such duties were entrusted to the Bureau of the Union by the Madrid Convention and the Cairo Radio Regulations.

"Hence my Delegation will vote in favour of Proposals Nos. 35, 98 and 123, submitted by the Soviet Union."

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia pointed out that his administration had submitted a proposal for the abolition of the I.F.R.B. and the deletion of Article 6 from the Convention. That proposal (No. 619) had been rejected by Committee 3. He could not agree with that decision and warmly supported the U.S.S.R. proposal that the matter be reconsidered.

The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic said:

"My Delegation is authorized to state that in the absence of the new International Frequency List which could serve as a basis for the activities of the International Frequency Registration Board, there can be no grounds for the existence and activities of that body.

"There is no call to have a costly body such as the I.F.R.B., since frequency registration duties can be entrusted to the Secretary General of the Union.

"Hence my Delegation warmly supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union, the Bulgarian People's Republic, and Czechoslovakia, to the effect that Article 6 be deleted from the Convention and that the I.F.R.B. be disbanded."

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria drew attention to the proposals submitted by his administration - Nos. 616 and 618 - to abolish the I.F.R.B. and to delete Article 6 from the Convention. He could not agree with the unjust decision taken in Committee 3 and supported the U.S.S.R. proposal.

The Chairman put to a roll-call vote Proposals Nos. 98, 618 and 619, for the deletion of Article 6 from the Convention, and Proposals Nos. 35 and 616, for the deletion of the I.F.R.B. from the list of permanent organs of the Union in Article 4 of the Convention.

Results of the vote:

In favour: 9 delegations:

P.R. of Albania, Bielorussian S.S.R., P.R. of Bulgaria, Hungarian P.R., P.R. of Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R.;

Against: 66 delegations:

Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, Franco, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Netherlands, Philippines, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, German Federal Republic, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, U.S. Territories, French Oversea Territories, Portuguese Overseas Territories, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Yemen, Spanish Possessions;

Abstention: 1 delegation

Afghanistan.

6 Delegations were absent.

The above Proposals were thus rejected.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the following statement:

"My Delegation considers that the decision to maintain the I.F.R.B. is wrong.

"However, since the Conference has decided to maintain the I.F.R.B., my Delegation hereby proposes that the work of the I.F.R.B. in connection with frequency registration be based, in accordance with Article 47 of the Radio Regulations (1947), on the Berne Frequency Lists.

"This proposal is based on the provisions of the Radio Regulations in force (Article 47, No. 1077), and we consider it indispensable that the Conference, conforming to the Radio Regulations, should adopt this proposal."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic made the following statement:

"My Delegation considers that the decision to maintain the I.F.R.B. is wrong.

"However, since the I.F.R.B. is to be maintained, my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union to the effect that I.F.R.B. activities in connection with frequency registration be based on the Berne Frequency Lists, in accordance with Article 47 of the Radio Regulations."

The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic then made the following statement:

"The decision taken by the Plenary Assembly to maintain the International Frequency Registration Board is, my Delegation considers, wrong.

"Since the Conference has decided to maintain the I.F.R.B., my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union, that, in accordance with Article 47 of the Radio Regulations, the work of the I.F.R.B. should be based on the Berne Frequency Lists."

The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic said:

"The Delegation of the Roumanian People's Republic considers that the decision adopted by the Plenary Assembly to maintain the I.F.R.B. is incorrect.

"However, since the I.F.R.B. has been maintained, we consider it absolutely necessary that the activities of the I.F.R.B. should be based on the Berne Frequency Lists. This will secure continuity in the solution of the difficult problems of the distribution and registration of frequencies until such time as a complete International Frequency List may be drawn up.

"Until then, the Berne Lists constitute a solid basis, tested by experience, which will give satisfaction to a great majority of the countries Members of the Union.

"Only in this way will the activities of the I.F.R.B. not run counter to the interests of the Union.

"For these reasons, our Delegation warmly supports the proposal of the Soviet Union."

The Chairman pointed out that the Soviet proposal meant going back on a decision already adopted by the Plenary Assembly at its Meeting on 21 October, according to which Article 47 and No. 1077 of the Radio Regulations were in effect no longer in force.

The Delegate of Egypt felt that the matter had already been sufficiently discussed. It would suffice merely to put the Russian proposal to the vote.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland spoke as follows:

"In Document No. 99 it is stated that the Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland wholeheartedly supported the proposal submitted by the U.S.S.R., the People's Republic of Bulgaria, and the Republic of Czechoslovakia, namely, that the I.F.R.B. should be abolished and that Article 6, on the I.F.R.B., should be omitted from the future Convention.

"My attitude was to a large extent dictated by the fact - the incontrovertible fact - that according to the Convention and Radio Regulations now in force (Atlantic City, 1947), there can be no justification for the existence of the I.F.R.B., and a fortiori for any extension of its activities (from which no positive results can be expected) until such a time as the draft new International Frequency List has been prepared and approved. And there is another incontrovertible fact to be

borne in mind, namely, that the I.F.R.B. has in the past been unable, and, if it continues with its old methods, will go on being unable to eliminate the difficulties arising in the realm of radio. What is more, no less than 25% of I.T.U. ordinary expenditure is accounted for by the I.F.R.B.

"I shall not here analyse the problems which the Atlantic City Conference set before the I.F.R.B. They are sufficiently well known and are set forth in the Convention and Radio Regulations in force (Atlantic City, 1947), but I shall dwell a moment on the situation now obtaining.

"We all know that the E.A.R.C. adopted, as a basis for the draft new International Frequency List, the results of the work of the P.F.B. In the first place, however, the results achieved by the P.F.B. were obviously unsatisfactory. Secondly, the E.A.R.C. did not solve the problem of the fixed and broadcasting services over the whole band from 4 to 27 Mc/s. Thirdly, in taking the decisions it took in relation to the I.F.R.B. and the work of that body, the E.A.R.C. was guilty of an open breach of the Convention and Radio Regulations.

"As a result of the decisions there taken, the role and the significance of the I.F.R.B. were increased, and this resulted in a greater financial outlay for its upkeep.

"Let us now consider what the I.F.R.B. is doing. In Document No. 117-revised (report by Mr. Delamulla, Chairman and Member of the I.F.R.B.), we find that the I.F.R.B. is busy with:

"a) the assignment and allocation of frequencies appearing in the plans and lists adopted by the E.A.R.C., 'to which are applied, or will be applied, the provisions of Article 11 of the Regulations.' But if in fact the I.F.R.B., using substitute plans which do not meet the requirements of many administrations - unfinished, irresponsible, disorderly, uncoordinated plans - begins applying Article 11 of the Radio Regulations to them, then its activities will be productive of no other result than an increase in the chaos reigning in the ether, since Article 11 of the Regulations can be applied only after production of the final draft of the new International Frequency List, coordinated between administrations and approved at the appropriate conference. Hitherto no such List has been forthcoming. Hence we consider such 'activities' to have been not only premature but completely useless.

"b) The I.F.R.B. is also busy with 'the frequency assignments notified by administrations to the I.F.R.B., in respect of the present use of frequencies, for all the services to which the procedure established by the E.A.R.C. applies.' One does not have to be a specialist of exceptional qualifications to do this sort of work. The General Secretariat of the Union did this a good deal more cheaply, and possesses the requisite experience. Besides which, the action decided upon by the E.A.R.C. was wrong and unjustified.

"c) The I.F.R.B. is also busy on the preparation of a Master Record, which the E.A.R.C. decided should replace the Borne Lists and provide a basis for the new International Frequency List. If the I.F.R.B. thinks it can solve the problem which, because of the erroneous working methods, numerous conferences have been unable to solve, then it is undoubtedly sadly mistaken. And if the I.F.R.B. arbitrarily makes entries in the Master Record without consulting the administrations concerned, then it has no right to do so, since administrations have the sovereign right to organize their communications as they will, and since questions of mutual interference should be solved between administrations direct.

"d) The I.F.R.B. is also busy checking the adequacy of the data appearing in frequency notifications. If they are not inadequate, what happens? Presumably the I.F.R.B. then approaches the administrations concerned, as the General Secretariat of the I.T.U. did, and did well, over a period of many years.

"The I.F.R.B. cannot do otherwise. But one does not have to be an eminent specialist to do this sort of work. As regards the analysis hitherto effected of 200,000 frequency notifications, I do not think I am likely to be far wrong in saying that no valid conclusions can be drawn from the analysis of such a quantity of frequencies, and that their use cannot be coordinated from an I.F.R.B. office in Geneva. If administrations don't solve this problem, then the I.F.R.B. won't.

"e) The last point on which I wish to touch is the statistical work which the I.F.R.B. is carrying out with the help of special equipment. I myself have seen this equipment; ordinary sorting machines, automatically sorting frequency notification cards in any way you please, in ascending or descending order of frequencies, in the alphabetical order of the names of countries or according to call signs or in any order.

"But what is the use of such equipment if there are as yet no agreed principles for mutual action by countries in the sphere of radio, and if justice and mutual respect in these matters are lacking? And of course there is no need to have an I.F.R.B. to service these machines.

"To sum up, then. While the I.F.R.B., as a result of an erroneous interpretation of the Convention and Radio Regulations, is busy with purely paper work (work which, nevertheless, is costing very dear) radiocommunications are rapidly developing, and now problems, fresh difficulties, calling for solution, are continually arising.

"But the situation can change for the better. Things will undoubtedly improve in the I.F.R.B. bases its frequency registration work on the Berne List, this being a generally accepted document - if you like, a document containing a whole history of radio and a complete summary of the present situation; a document from which, in addition, the future development of radio can be deduced. If it does so, the I.F.R.B. will obtain a technically impeccable basis from which it can go forward with honour to the completion of its task.

"Hence my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R., namely, that in strict accordance with Article 47 of the Radio Regulations, the Berne List be used by the I.F.R.B. as a basis for its work in connection with frequency registration matters.

"That proposal seems to us both constructive and realistic. We are convinced that should this proposal be adopted, the I.F.R.B. would have the essential prerequisites for the successful completion of its task, to wit, a legitimate basis in accordance with the Convention and Radio Regulations and technical aims worthy of its expert members, and that in this manner it would be able to give full satisfaction to the majority of administrations."

The Chairman recalled the decision reached by the Plenary Assembly on 21 October, approving the resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Document No. 61. That decision implied the cancellation of Article 47 and No. 1077 of the Radio Regulations. The U.S.S.R. proposal was therefore incompatible with the decision already reached by the Plenary Assembly. He was nevertheless prepared, if the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. insisted, to put that proposal to the vote.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some comments on what you have said.

"You said that No. 1077 of the Radio Regulations (Article 47) had, as you put it, been cancelled by the decision taken at this Conference. This statement is wrong and it is not in accordance with the facts, for the Conference decision to which you alluded neither alters nor cancels any provisions of the Radio Regulations. It does not annul No. 1077, Article 47, either.

"This is evident from a perusal of the resolution adopted by this Conference. Hence Article 47 of the Radio Regulations (1947) continues in force now.

"As regards your reference to the resolution adopted by this Conference on a proposal by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Document No. 61), the Soviet Delegation has already pointed out that adoption of that resolution constituted an inadmissible attempt belatedly to justify the illegal decisions taken by the E.A.R.C. That resolution runs counter to the provisions of the Telecommunication Convention in force, and was adopted in violation of the basic regulations of the I.T.U. governing its practical activities. The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. voted against the adoption of this wrong and illegal decision which contradicts the basic acts of the I.T.U.

"The proposal just now submitted by my Delegation for consideration by the Plenary Assembly is based on the provisions of the Radio Regulations now in force (Article 47, No. 1077). It is in full accordance with the Radio Regulations, and indicates the only possible lines on which now, in the absence of an International Frequency List, frequency registration can be performed.

"There is nothing to prevent the Plenary Assembly from considering and adopting this proposal. Hence we consider it essential that the Plenary Assembly adopt the proposal we have submitted."

The Chairman put the U.S.S.R. proposal to a roll-call vote.

Results of the vote:

In favour: 10 Delegations:

Afghanistan, P.R. of Albania, Bielorussian S.S.R., P.R. of Bulgaria, Hungarian P.R., P.R. of Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R. ;

Against: 63 Delegations:

Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chilo, China, Vatican City, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Netherlands, Philippines, Portugal, Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, U.S. Territories, French Oversea Territories, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Spanish Possessions ;

Abstentions: 3 Delegations:

Iran, Iraq, Jordan.

6 Delegations were absent.

The U.S.S.R. proposal was thus rejected.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"My Delegation wishes to state that this decision, adopted in defiance of the Radio Regulations, is illegal."

The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic said:

"My Delegation fully supports the statement made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic said:

"My Delegation considers the decision taken to be illegal on the grounds that it runs counter to the Radio Regulations."

6. DISASTER IN THE PHILIPPINES: EXPRESSIONS OF SYMPATHY

The Delegate of the Republic of the Philippines said:

"I am sorry to take up the time of the Assembly, but I have a debt of honour to discharge. On 24 October of the current year, in this Plenary Assembly, the honourable Head of the Delegation of Brazil was kind enough to propose a motion of sympathy on the occasion of the recent typhoons which have ravaged the Philippines - a motion which was supported by the Delegation of the United States of America.

"Inspired by similar feelings of mutual sympathy, the Head of the Argentine Delegation, who was Chairman of the Assembly, proposed that Delegates should observe a minute's silence in mourning for the victims of the hurricane in my country.

"These expressions of common human sympathy with the disaster which has befallen our people, sanctioned by this honourable Assembly with the unanimous consent of all the Delegates present and their spontaneous association with the sorrows of a tiny distant people such as that of the Philippines, fills our hearts with appreciation and gratitude.

"Mr. Chairman, we should like to express, to you, to all the Delegates in this Assembly and, through you and through them, to all the nations represented here and to their peoples, the deep appreciation felt by my people, my government and myself.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman; thank you, Delegates."

The Chairman was sure that all the Delegates had been as deeply moved as he had been by the statement of the Delegate of the Philippines. They would all convey that statement to their governments.

Discussion of Document No. 154 was adjourned to the following Meeting.

The Meeting rose at 7 p.m.

Rapporteurs:

H. Heaton  
G. Deniker

Secretary General:

L. Mulatier

Chairman:

M. A. Andrada

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

P.V. 7

P L E N A R Y   A S S E M B L Y

Minutes

of the Seventh Meeting

Thursday, 6 November 1952

at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. M.A. ANDRADA (Argentine Republic)

- - - - -

- Questions discussed:
1. Greetings to the Soviet Union on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the October Revolution;
  2. Adoption of the agenda (Document No. 194);
  3. Report by Committee 5 to the Plenary Assembly (Document No. 154, paragraphs 3 to 5) - discussion continued;
  4. Report by Committee 4 and draft Rules of Procedure (Documents Nos. 186 and 188-revised);
  5. First Report by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee (Document No. 197).

1. GREETINGS TO THE SOVIET UNION ON THE OCCASION OF THE 35th ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

1.1. The Chairman said that before passing to the agenda, he wished, as Chairman of the Plenipotentiary Conference, to say a few words on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the October Revolution.

1.2. As Chairman of an international conference, he felt called upon to salute the great Russian people. He asked the delegates representing it to transmit to their government the cordial greetings of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

1.3. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics replied in the following terms :

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,

"Allow me to thank you for the greetings and congratulations offered by you on behalf of this Conference to the Soviet People and the Soviet Government on the 35th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

1.4. "Thirty-five years ago, the workers and peasants of our country, at the summons of the Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, brought about a socialist Revolution, overthrew the rule of the exploiters, and founded the first Socialist State in the world.

1.5. "The October Revolution brought about an unparalleled outburst of creative energy and initiative on the part of the broadest strata of our people.

1.6. "In the past thirty-five years the Soviet people has achieved great successes. It has created a powerful socialist industry, and its agriculture is now the most highly mechanized in the world. Much has been achieved in the development of socialist culture and science and in improving the living conditions of all the various peoples of the Soviet Republics.

1.7. "The peaceful labour of the Soviet peoples was interrupted in 1941 by the attack of fascist Germany. However, the Soviet Army victoriously routed and annihilated Hitler's war machine, freed our country from fascist occupation and freed the peoples of Europe from the brown plague of fascism.

- 1.8. "Grievous were the losses our country suffered in that war. But within a short time the heroic Soviet people managed to make good its war losses and to initiate a new and powerful boom in the national economy. It should suffice to point out that our industrial production will in 1952 be 2,3 times more than it was in 1940.
- 1.9. "Under the guidance of its great leader - Josef Vissarionovitch Stalin - the Soviet people is now at work on a great programme for the transformation of nature, the construction of huge hydro-electric plants, and irrigation canals, and the recovery of desert country. It is confidently on the march towards the high goal - communism.
- 1.10. "The new five-year plan now adopted in our country is a plan for peaceful constructive work and for development both economic and cultural.
- 1.11. "One of the chief aims of the new five-year plan is by 1955 to double the production of consumer goods, to bring about a new and appreciable rise in the material well-being of the Soviet people and the further development of socialist culture.
- 1.12. "Since the very creation of the Soviet State, the Soviet Government has invariably worked for peace and for the development of friendly relations with other countries on a basis of respect for the principles of equality and independence.
- 1.13. "The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is designed to avert war and preserve the peace. It is a policy of peace and security, international cooperation, and the development of business relations with all countries.
- 1.14. "It is common knowledge that this policy of peace enjoys - and deservedly enjoys - the sympathy and support of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.
- 1.15. "Mr. Chairman, we shall transmit the congratulations and good wishes offered by you on behalf of the Conference to the Soviet people and the Soviet Government, in connection with this thirty-fifth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.
- 1.16. "Long live friendship between peoples in their struggle to avert war and to ensure a lasting peace throughout the world."

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Document No. 194)

The agenda (Document No. 194) was approved with the following item added:

First Report by the Chairman of the  
Credentials Committee (Document No. 197).

3. REPORT BY COMMITTEE 5 TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY (Document No. 154, paragraphs 3 to 5).

3.1. Document No. 154, paragraph 4 a) - number of I.F.R.B. members.

3.2. The Delegate of Brazil:

"My Delegation supports the constructive suggestions made by Mr. Prasada, of India, at the last plenary meeting, but only as regards formal statements. Hence we are unable this time to follow his indications. For this we apologize.

3.3. "At a time when we are attempting to reach a final solution of the problem set by the I.F.R.B., we wish to make a statement which will take up a little of our precious time.

3.4. "My Delegation, recognizing, as it has already stated, the necessity of keeping the I.F.R.B. (a body absolutely indispensable) to solve the problems arising out of an equitable use of the radio spectrum by the various Members of the I.T.U., submitted a proposal which may be summarized as follows:

1) "Include in the Convention certain general provisions which, we feel, should appear in the Magna Carta governing telecommunications, leaving in the Radio Regulations only provisions relative to the working methods of the I.F.R.B.

2) "Adhere strictly to the present principles insisting on the need for technical and practical knowledge of radio frequencies on the part of the members of the I.F.R.B., until the extent of such knowledge has been more clearly specified.

3) "Maintain the international character of the mandate of the members of the Board, who must themselves give proof of an international outlook.

4) "Make it an explicit obligation that members shall possess, in addition, knowledge of the geography and economy of the various regions of the world or of the region to which they belong (and not merely of one given region, as at present), because of the ignorance of important regional peculiarities already observed in practice.

3.5. "The Brazilian proposal to increase the number of members of the I.F.R.B. to fifteen was made with a view to fulfilling this latter condition. This idea is, moreover, justified by the increased tasks of the I.F.R.B. referred to in our proposal, by the need for the Board to reach decisions of a technical nature more speedily, as the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Fioravanti Dellamula, explained in his important statement, and finally by the opinion of the great majority, which considers that we shall never have a fair representation of all the regions of the world if we merely expect the members of the I.F.R.B. to have a partial knowledge of the conditions in these regions, and if we keep the present number of members.

3.6. "The Brazilian proposal, particularly as regards the number of members of the I.F.R.B., has received enthusiastic support from a large number of countries.

3.7. "It is very unusual, Mr. Chairman, in the annals of the I.T.U., for there to be a vote such as that one in favour of a point of view which has not been unanimously approved.

3.8. "There is no doubt that the conclusions now being reached by Committee 3 do not represent the solution desired by a great number of members of the I.T.U. This has been clearly demonstrated.

3.9. "We do not wish to criticise in any way the procedure adopted for studying these questions in Committee 3, nor the ballots concerning them, since we must recognize in them the result of the view already adopted regarding proposals for budgetary changes and also the result of the anxiety - exaggerated in our view - to change the present provisions of the Convention and the Regulations as little as possible. We do not consider that this procedure has produced the best results, especially since the delegations which supported the proposal to increase the number of members to fifteen were asked to vote immediately in favour of proposals to maintain the number at eleven so that the Committee should not remain in doubt as to the size of the Board. For this reason, it amounted to admitting the idea of returning to a discussion either of new proposals or of earlier proposals advocating a reduction to 9, 7 or even 5 in the number of members of the I.F.R.B.

3.10. "And we must not forget that the Chairman of Committee 3, when asked what would happen if the Franco-Mexican proposal were rejected, admitted the possibility of submitting once more the proposals to reduce the numbers, as the honourable Delegate of France pointed out.

3.11. "Comparison of the results of the two ballots authorizes the false interpretation which the less wise will give it. It is clear, however, that those who would like the I.F.R.B. to be composed of fifteen members did not want only eleven, and the fact that they have voted for the latter figure has the effect of making the result of the ballot appear impressive.

3.12. "That is why, Mr. Chairman, we sincerely regret at this time that some members of the I.T.U. have not yet understood our loyal and constructive proposals, since the arguments against them have been entirely refuted, as is evident from Document No. 145, of which the information and calculations have been confirmed and upheld, even by the Chairman of Committee 3.

3.13. "The Delegation of Brazil has nevertheless good reasons for appearing to be quite satisfied, since, without any doubt, its proposal will have rendered the I.T.U. a great service, will have served the

interests of its Members in general and those of telecommunications, by contributing, or rather leading, to the rejection of the idea of reducing the membership of the I.F.R.B., a point of view expressed, before our statement, by a great number of delegations.

"To sum up, the Delegation of Brazil wishes it to be clearly understood that:

3.14. "The reasons which justified the submission and constituted the defence of the proposal it had the honour to submit to this Conference still hold good. The opinion of our government has in no way changed.

3.15. "We also think, Mr. Chairman, that this is still the view of all the delegations which explicitly or implicitly approved and continue to approve the Brazilian proposal.

3.16. "Our Delegation therefore wishes to announce now that if its proposal is finally rejected by this Plenary Assembly it will make a statement to the effect that it will not assume any responsibility - and neither will the countries which have followed it in this affair - for the efficient and regular functioning of the services of the I.F.R.B., already made heavier by the I.F.R.B., and today perhaps still more by this Conference.

3.17. "The Delegation of Brazil feels that these reasons are sufficient for using its right to make reservations, when the time comes, as to the course followed by this Conference in the problem of the I.F.R.B.; it will do this when the time of the Final Protocol to the Convention arrives, although with regret, since Brazil, abstaining up to the present from fighting certain claims, has always supported without restriction all the acts and resolutions of the Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U."

3.18. The Delegate of Pakistan supported the Delegate of Brazil. He thought that all regions should be represented in the same way on the I.F.R.B. If the ration were taken between the number of countries per region and the number of representatives on the I.F.R.B., on the basis of the ration 11 to 2 existing for Eastern Europe, the following would be the result for all the regions of the world:

<u>Regions</u>	<u>Number of countries per region</u>	<u>Present number of members on the I.F.R.B.</u>	<u>Number of members in the ratio</u> 11 to 2	<u>i.e. In round figures</u>
Eastern Europe and Northern Asia.....	11	2	2	2
American Region.....	23	3	4.2	4
Western Europe and African Region.....	23	3	4.2	4
China, India & Australia	27	3	4.9	<u>5</u>
				15
				(number proposed by Brazil)

3.19. It could be seen from the table that the proposal to appoint fifteen members to the I.F.R.B. was quite justified. If a region did not wish to be so represented, it could refuse, but it was certain that the Region of China, India and Australia, and the American Region, were in favour of a fair and equitable representation on the lines of the table above.

3.20. The argument in favour of economy that had been advanced against the Brazilian proposal no longer stood, because the I.F.R.B. had taken over part of the work of the Radio Conferences.

3.21. The Committee had decided that the whole question should be referred to the Radio Conference, partly because the countries with representatives on the Board did not wish them to leave it. If another four members were elected at Buenos Aires, the others could remain in office until the next Ordinary Radio Conference. If that Conference decided to reduce the number of members of the I.F.R.B., the countries which had been represented on the Board since Atlantic City could decide among themselves which representatives should be withdrawn.

3.22. It could be seen from the document submitted by the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. that a number of the jobs were being handled by one member alone; if the number were increased the work could proceed more smoothly and efficiently.

3.23. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. then made the following statement:

"My Delegation wishes to state that its attitude towards the I.F.R.B. was exhaustively explained when this matter was considered at the 6th Plenary Meeting of this Conference (Document No. 220).

3.24. "The views then expressed by us we continue wholeheartedly to entertain.

3.25. "Now, when the Plenary Assembly is taking a decision in connection with the Report by Committee 3 (Document No. 154), my Delegation wishes to state that it does not support that decision and reserves its attitude to Document No. 154."

3.26. The Delegates of Iraq, Colombia and Venezuela supported the statements by the Delegates of Brazil and Pakistan.

3.27. A vote was taken by a show of hands to decide whether the present provisions in the Radio Regulations concerning the number of members of the I.F.R.B. should be transferred and defined in a text of the Convention (or in a Resolution or in a Protocol).

3.28. By 49 votes to 11 it was decided to include the provisions in question in the Convention.

3.29. The Assembly then considered the Brazilian proposal (Document No. 66) to increase the number of members of the I.F.R.B. to fifteen.

3.30. The Delegate of Pakistan made an appeal to everyone present and, in a spirit of compromise, suggested a number between eleven and fifteen, i.e. thirteen. He thought his suggestion might satisfy those who had placed all their faith in the I.F.R.B. and who considered that it should carry on with its work.

3.31. The Delegate of Costa Rica was in favour of increasing the number of members of the I.F.R.B., in view of the work done by that organ and in spite of the arguments about economy which had been adduced against the proposal. In a spirit of compromise, he supported the Pakistan proposal.

3.32. The Delegate of Brazil explained that his idea in submitting the proposal had been that it was necessary to strengthen the I.F.R.B. on the basis of the geographical regions, so that it could undertake the tasks entrusted to it by the E.A.R.C. and those that the present Conference might give it.

3.33. For Brazil, it was a question of principle and equity. The number of fifteen was the minimum that should be accepted, since such an increase would not create a problem as to distribution among the regions.

3.34. In a spirit of collaboration, however, he was prepared to withdraw his original proposal and support the Pakistan proposal.

3.35. The Delegate of Colombia wholeheartedly supported the proposal by Pakistan. The I.F.R.B. could never achieve its purpose if the Conference did not give it the complement required to apply the decisions of the E.A.R.C. and the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the Atlantic City Convention. It was essential for all regions of the world to be represented equitably on the I.F.R.B. The Delegate of Brazil had already shown that an increase in the number of members of the I.F.R.B. would not have serious financial repercussions. He thought it unnecessary to revert to that point.

3.36. The Delegate of the United States of America asked the Delegate of Pakistan:

- 1) from which regions should the two additional members come?
- 2) should they be elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference?
- 3) should their mandate last until the next Radio Conference?

3.37. The Delegate of Pakistan replied that it was for the Plenary Assembly to decide on the first question: they might set up a working group for that purpose. The Assembly knew which regions were under-represented.

- 3.38. As regards the other questions he thought that the mandate of all the members of the I.F.R.B. should last until the next Administrative Radio Conference, but if at that time some of them had to be withdrawn, the countries that had been represented on the I.F.R.B. since Atlantic City should decide amongst themselves which of their representatives should retire. That would be the fair procedure.
- 3.39. The Delegate of Venezuela supported the statement by Brazil and the compromise proposal by Pakistan.
- 3.40. The Delegate of Denmark also considered that the I.F.R.B. should be strong, which was particularly important for the small countries. He thought that there should be provisions in the Convention establishing the independence of the members of that organ. Committee 3 had successfully acquitted itself of that task. With regard to the increase in the number of members, Denmark could not approve the Brazilian proposal, or even the compromise proposal by Pakistan, for reasons of principle and economy. If every Conference increased the number of members of the I.F.R.B., it would become top-heavy and too difficult to handle.
- 3.41. The Delegate of Pakistan thought that if a principle was to be observed, it should be the principle of equitable representation of the regions in the I.F.R.B.
- 3.42. On a proposal by the Ukrainian S.S.R., supported by the Delegations of the U.S.S.R., the Hungarian P.R., the Belorussian S.S.R., the P.R. of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, a vote was taken by secret ballot.
- 3.43. The Chairman asked the Delegates of Poland, Denmark, Lebanon and Colombia to act as tellers.
- 3.44. By 42 votes to 33 with 1 abstention and 1 vote invalid, the compromise proposal by Pakistan was rejected.
- 3.45. At the request of the Ukrainian S.S.R., supported by several delegations, a vote by secret ballot was also taken on the proposal by France and Mexico to keep the number of members of the I.F.R.B. at eleven. The same persons acted as tellers.

- 3.46. The proposal by France and Mexico was adopted by 51 votes to 27.
- 3.47. Paragraphs 4 b, 4 c, 4 d and 5 were then approved without discussion.
- 3.48. The third report by Committee 3 (Document No. 154) was then approved as a whole, subject to the reservations made by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. (see para.3.25).
4. REPORT BY COMMITTEE 4 AND DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE (Documents Nos. 186 and 188-Revised).
- 4.1. Mr. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.), Chairman of Committee 4, introduced his report (Document No. 188 Revised):
- "Speaking as Chairman of Committee 4, I have to state that Document No. 188-revised contains the Report by the Chairman of Committee 4 on the draft Rules of Procedure prepared for this Conference.
- 4.2. "In accordance with the decisions taken at the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly, Committee 4 considered Document No. 21, submitted by the Argentine Delegation, with a view to evolving draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference.
- 4.3. "Twelve meetings were devoted to this. A great deal of work was also done by the Working Group, which, with Mr. Mayo (Argentina) in the Chair, prepared the draft Rules of Procedure appearing in Document No.186.
- 4.4. "At its twelfth meeting, Committee 4 adopted the draft Rules of Procedure in Document No. 186 by 36 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.
- 4.5. The Committee's decision was not unanimous. Several delegations, including those of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and others, declared the draft Rules of Procedure to be unacceptable, on the grounds that a number of the provisions appearing therein were designed to restrict discussion, which would make it difficult for Members of the Union to join freely in consideration

of points at issue. These delegations declared that they had, accordingly, voted against adoption of the draft Rules of Procedure and would reserve the right to submit their comments to the Plenary Assembly."

4.6. The Chairman thanked Mr. Tsingovatov for his report and for the work done by his Committee.

4.7. The Delegate of Uruguay wished first of all to thank the Argentine Delegation as authors of the draft Rules of Procedure. Committee 4 had examined it and had not made many changes; that was a tribute to those who had prepared it, and he thought the authors should be congratulated.

4.8. It was true that some delegations had said in Committee 4 that they could not accept the draft Rules of Procedure because in their view they contained provisions restricting freedom of thought. But it was nevertheless true that other delegations, including the Delegation of Uruguay, supported by the United States, the Philippines etc., had affirmed that freedom of expression was not restricted and that the debates were entirely free.

4.9. To exercise a right, it was absolutely necessary for it to be defined. For example, Article 4 of the Declaration of Human Rights specified that the natural rights were those that did not encroach on the rights of others. Similarly at the Conference, the exercise of the right to speak was in no way restricted by the fact that the right was defined. On the contrary such a delimitation was an advantage and enabled everyone to exercise that right. Otherwise it might happen, for example on a point of procedure, that four or five delegates would speak for an hour each, which would mean a restriction of the right of other delegations to speak.

4.10. The Delegate of Argentine made the following statement :

"I should first of all like to thank the honourable Delegation of Uruguay for its kind remarks about our Delegation as authors of the draft Rules of Procedure.

4.11. "Turning to the report by the Chairman of Committee 4, I should like to say that this morning we raised a question in that Committee which we will repeat here.

4.12. "The Argentine Delegation has carefully read the report submitted by the Chairman of Committee 4 to the Assembly (Document No. 188-E revised) in which he submits the Rules of Procedure to this Conference for study (Document No. 186). It regrets having to examine this report very closely, and asks for this observation to be included in the minutes of the present meeting.

4.13. "In the last paragraph of the report the Chairman of Committee 4 has mentioned several delegations which stated that they could not accept the draft Rules of Procedure because several of its provisions envisaged the limitation of discussions, thus rendering it difficult for Members of the Union freely to participate in the discussions.

4.14. "For this reason they had voted against approval of the Rules of Procedure and reserved to themselves the right to raise the question again in the Plenary Assembly.

4.15. "Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is correct that these delegations expressed these views, but one thing has been omitted from the report: the fact that the Argentine Delegation expressly refuted those statements, as can be seen from its statement which appears in extenso in the summary record of the debates in that meeting of Committee 4.

4.16. "In the circumstances, and to make the report more objective, the Argentine Delegation will now repeat its comments in full at this plenary meeting :

4.17. "My Delegation, representing a Member of the Union, has proposed some Rules of Procedure for this Conference and wishes specifically to put on record that Document No. 186 constitutes a code of work providing ample safeguards for the right of all Members of the I.T.U. to express their views both fully and freely.

4.18. "None of the Rules in this document in any sense restricts the rights of delegations. On the contrary, they ensure that debates will be both orderly and expeditious, to the advantage of all, so that all may enjoy the same rights without the possibility of their being abused to the detriment of all."

4.19. The Delegate of Brazil said that he had intended, at the meeting of Committee 4 that day, to add to his statement in Document No. 188 revised. As, for obvious reasons, he had been unable to do so at the committee meeting, he wished to affirm that the Brazilian Delegation had emphasized not only the large amount of work done by the Delegation of Argentina, but also the fact that the work reflected a deep sense of democracy, as could be seen from the draft Rules of Procedure themselves.

4.20. The Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland made the following statement :

"At the beginning of the Conference, as is well known, the Delegation of the Argentine Republic submitted a new draft set of Rules of Procedure for application at this Conference.

4.21. "After scrupulous perusal of the draft, my Delegation repeatedly expressed the view that in spite of the vast amount of work done on the draft by the Argentine Administration, that draft was unsuitable, and that it would be better to keep the old Rules of Procedure for Conferences as adopted at Atlantic City. I refer to the Rules of Procedure for Conferences set forth in Annex 4 to the Convention now in force.

4.22. "Explaining our attitude, we pointed out that the old Rules of Procedure, used at numerous conferences between 1947 and 1952, had not worked out at all badly. They have, of course, certain failings (which can easily be put right), but in general we feel that they are clear and precise and that they do not give rise to difficulties of interpretation or ambiguities in connection with the appraisal of the procedural questions involved in the organization of activities and discussions at conferences.

4.23. "Hence we stated that the old Rules of Procedure for Conferences (Atlantic City, 1947) should be maintained in the draft of the new Convention and should be applied at this Conference.

4.24. "Our views were shared by many other countries, but did not prevail, and the whole matter was referred to Committee 4, in which a final text of the draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference was evolved.

4.25. "I shall not here attempt to analyse individual rules in Document No.186. That I have done in Committee 4. I shall merely say that the document as a whole is for me unacceptable, firstly, for the reasons indicated by me at the outset, and secondly, because most of the provisions therein appearing are designed, not to ensure freedom of discussion, but to curtail it. Practical application of the document will give rise to difficulties impeding the free expression of views on any matter by the delegates accredited by the governments of their countries. We cannot but take exception to such a procedure.

4.26. "Without those essential amendments which my Delegation either made or supported in Committee 4, when the draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference were discussed, we cannot accept Document No.186."

4.27. The Delegate of Egypt thought that the title of Document No.188 should be changed from "First Report by Committee 4" to "First Report by the Chairman of Committee 4".

He also requested the Assembly to consider Document No.186 rule by rule.

4.28. Mr. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.), Chairman of Committee 4, made the following statement:

"I wish, first of all, to make a few observations as Chairman of Committee 4.

4.29. "Document No.188-Revised, as I have already said, is the report by the Chairman of Committee 4. Due to lack of time, we were unable to prepare and discuss the report by the Committee.

4.30 "As to the statement made by the Delegate of Argentina, I would make the following comments:

4.31 "When Committee 4 was considering the draft Rules of Procedure (Doc.No.171), a number of Delegations said that that draft was unacceptable, since some of its provisions were designed to restrict the rights of Union Members in discussion and would prevent the free expression of opinion. Those Delegations voted against the draft Rules of Procedure, and asked that their views be mentioned in the report which was to be submitted to the Plenary Assembly. I have complied with that request.

4.32 "Certain other Delegations, for example, those of Argentina and Brazil, expressed different views, stating that in their opinion the draft Rules of Procedure were entirely acceptable. They did not, however, request inclusion of their statements in the report to the Plenary Assembly. Hence their views are recorded in the Minutes of Committee 4, but not in the report.

4.33 "I repeat that had those Delegations so requested, their views would have been recorded in the report.

4.34 "Hence I cannot agree with the Delegate of Brazil, who has said that he 'did not have the possibility' of having his views included in the report.

4.35 "He only had to request such inclusion and his request would have been complied with. He did not do so and hence his complaints lack any foundation.

4.36 "As Delegate of the U.S.S.R., I wish to state the following:

"The Delegate of Uruguay in the lengthy speech made by him, in connection with Document No.186, endeavoured to justify the necessity of restricting discussions. Thus his statement merely confirms that the restrictions to which my Delegation has referred do in fact exist.

4.37. "His attempt, however, was unsuccessful. The arguments adduced by him are baseless and irrelevant. Talking about the need to curtail the rights of "individuals" in the interests of the community as a whole, he tried to draw an analogy and to compare the position of individuals with the position of countries. Such analogies are inadmissible.

4.38. "He forgot that sovereign countries are represented here at the Conference. Any attempt to restrict or to cast doubts on the sovereignty of I.T.U. Member countries must be emphatically resisted.

4.39. "Hence the analogies adduced by him are inadmissible.

4.40. "In the realm of international relations, in relations between countries, one of the most fundamental principles is that of sovereignty, the principle that sovereignty of countries should be respected. Members of the Union must have complete freedom to defend their points of view in discussion, without any restriction. Hence we emphatically oppose the statement made by the Delegate of Uruguay.

4.41. "As regards the substance of Document 186 (Draft Rules of Procedure) it should be emphasized that this Plenipotentiary Conference if called upon to solve a series of important problems. Hence, in the interests of our work, in the interests of our cause, in order to reach agreed decisions, we must have Rules of Procedure conducive to discussion and to the exchange of views - Rules of procedure which do not make discussion more difficult, as would happen with the Rules set forth in Document No. 186.

4.42. "We consider that the restrictive provisions contained therein invite abuse. This would lead to prolongation of discussion and to procedural squabbles, and will not facilitate the regular work of the Conference. All these restrictive provisions are unnecessary and merely harmful.

4.43. "We should like to adopt these Rules of Procedure, but they are rendered unacceptable by these provisions.

4.44. "In fact, why are paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Rule 13 required? All these restrictions, all these "priority" motions for discontinuation of discussion and closure of meetings, for postponement of deliberations, for time limits on speeches - all this merely complicates the work of the Conference, and opens the way to abuse. Is it not a shocking thing when at the outset of this Conference, in connection with the so-called point of order raised by the Delegation of the United States of America, it was decided to postpone the discussion of the question of Chinese representation and of eviction of the Kuomintang representatives - a question so vital for the I.T.U.? Is it not a shocking thing when the Delegation of the United States of America, with the aid of the voting machine, evoked the Rules of Procedure to stop a vote and to prevent a decision in connection with a matter of moment for the Union?

4.45. "That is why these restrictive procedural provisions are unacceptable and should be deleted from the Rules of Procedure. The Rules of Procedure should not contain provisions open to abuse by Delegations.

4.46. "For our Conference it is essential to safeguard the possibility of a tranquil, businesslike discussion of problems, and we can do without these paragraphs, restricting as they do the sovereign rights of Members of the Union. No one here wishes to make unnecessarily long declarations, but when that is necessary, in the interests of the work before us, Delegations should have the possibility of explaining their views.

4.47. "We cannot, for example, object when the Delegate of France spoke for 35 or 40 minutes in Committee 3, in connection with the I.F.R.B. We do not agree with the views by him expounded, but we respect his opinion and consider that he, like any other Delegate, should have the opportunity to express it. Each Delegation must decide for itself how long its statements shall be.

4.48. "Hence we propose the following amendments in Document No.186:

1) "Delete Rule 13, paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8, and make the corresponding changes in paragraph 4 of this Rule. This is the first amendment.

2) "Redraft Rule 14, paragraph 1, bringing it into strict accordance with Chapter 3, paragraph 2 (1) of the General Regulations. This is the second amendment.

4.49. "With these amendments, we could support the Document.

"I request that our amendments be considered."

4.50. The Delegate of Pakistan said he had suggested several amendments to the Committee, and since they had been accepted he was quite satisfied with the Rules of Procedure. He congratulated the Argentine Delegation on having prepared a detailed draft that complied with parliamentary procedure and that would consequently considerably shorten discussions on procedure.

4.51. The Delegate of Uruguay wished to reply briefly to the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. When he had spoken he was not thinking solely of individuals but also of legal entities. The Members of the Union were countries, and the delegates to the Conference representatives of their countries. Everything that had been said concerning freedom of speech naturally applied not only to persons but to countries too. It was in fact a somewhat theoretical problem. The Rules of Procedure protected the rights of all, and in particular, Rule 4 (3) clearly stated : "It shall be the duty of the Chairman to protect the right of each delegation to express its opinion freely and fully on the point at issue."

4.52. The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. made the following statement :

"My Delegation disagrees with certain sections of the proposed draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference (Document No. 186). These draft Rules of Procedure contain paragraphs which either directly or indirectly restrict freedom of discussion. For example, Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and certain other Rules.

4.53. "My Delegation takes exception to precisely those Rules and paragraphs.

4.54. "The Plenipotentiary Conference of the Union meets but once every five years, and delegates come from the most remote corners of the earth. Hence they must not be deprived of the right freely and fully to set forth their views and their wishes in connection with amelioration of the basic Acts of the Union and of its activities themselves.

4.55. "The proposed draft Rules of Procedure, as they stand, will not be conducive to the successful solution of the problems with which the Conference is faced.

4.56. "Hence my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union that Rule 13, paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8, be deleted from the draft Rules of Procedure, and that Rule 14, paragraph 1, be re-drafted."

4.57. The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia also thanked the Argentine Delegation for its contribution to the Conference in the form of the draft Rules of Procedure. He recalled that he too had made certain comments, particularly with regard to Rule 15, Paragraph 5. His Delegation still thought that the provision making it necessary for five delegations to request a secret ballot was contrary to the interests of the small countries, which were often unable to get the support of five delegations.

4.58. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. made the following statement :

"The draft Rules of Procedure for the Conference appearing in Document No. 186, are unacceptable, containing as they do provisions aimed at restricting discussion.

4.59. "Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are such restrictive provisions. They are incompatible with the sovereign right of every delegation freely and fully to express their views on points at issue.

4.60. "Hence my Delegation supports the proposal by the Soviet Union to delete Rule 13, paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8, from the Rules of Procedure and to re-draft Rule 13, paragraph 4, and Rule 14, paragraph 1."

4.61. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia said:

"If a sovereign country is prepared to conclude an agreement, it often implies that that country agrees to a certain limitation of its sovereign rights. But such a country would not be happy if, during the discussion of an agreement, the free expression of its ideas and suggestions were restricted. We have already had some unfortunate experiences: many delegates here could give us examples. I remember the attempts to restrict the debates at the last meeting of the C.C.I.R. A committee of the C.C.I.R. had adopted similar Rules of Procedure; they were abused and the result was complete confusion.

"For these reasons, paragraphs 5 to 8 are not acceptable to the Czechoslovak Delegation, and we support the amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. Delegation."

4.62. A vote was taken on the U.S.S.R. proposal to delete paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Rule 13.

4.63. By 52 votes to 9, the Assembly decided to retain the paragraphs.

4.64. The Assembly then passed to Rule 14.

4.65. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked for the first paragraph of Rule 14 to be brought into line with the General Regulations, which made no distinction between the powers of delegates to vote or to sign. The General Regulations had been approved by governments, and were very clear.

4.66. Some delegations had pointed out in Committee 4 that it was the procedure in their country to give two types of credentials. It could not be used as an argument against the U.S.S.R. proposal, which in no way prevented a delegation from complying with the custom of his country and submitting two documents if it so desired.

4.67. The Delegate of Argentina said the problem had already been thoroughly discussed in the Working Group set up by Committee 4. Document DT 178 was clear. The question was dealt with in detail there, and the views of Argentina were clearly stated.

4.68. A vote was taken on the U.S.S.R. proposal concerning Rule 14 (1).

4.69. By 59 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions, the proposal was rejected.

4.70. The Assembly then proceeded to study Rule 19.

4.71. The Delegate of Egypt asked for the words "any part" to be added after the words "at the end of" in paragraph 2 of Rule 19, so that committees could submit partial or interim reports to a plenary meeting.

4.72. After a short discussion, in which the Delegates of Argentina, Egypt and France took part, it was decided that paragraph 2 of Rule 19 would be drafted as follows:

"Committees and sub-committees may prepare any interim reports they deem necessary and, if circumstances warrant, at the end of their work they may submit a final report in which they shall recapitulate in concise terms the proposals and conclusions resulting from the studies which have been entrusted to them."

4.73. The title of Rule 19 was amended in the French and Spanish texts only.

4.74. Paragraph 2 of Rule 20 was also amended in the same way to read:

"Any interim or final report must be approved by the committee or sub-committee concerned."

4.75. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. made the following statement:

"Since the Plenary Assembly has rejected the amendments submitted by us, we shall vote against adoption of Document No. 186.

4.76. The Rules of Procedure (Document No. 186) amended were adopted as a whole by 62 votes to 9.

5. FIRST REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (Document No.197)

5.1. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as Chairman of the Credentials Committee, submitted his report (Document No. 197). He had not had time to submit it to the Committee. Hence he was now presenting it as the Chairman's Report.

5.2. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"When, in the Credentials Committee, the credentials presented by the representatives of the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, Syngman Rhee, and Bonn authorities were being considered, my Delegation expressed the view that those credentials were illegitimate.

1) "The credentials emanating from the Bonn authorities are legally invalid, since the Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany and participation by their representatives in the Conference, in the absence of representatives of the German Democratic Republic, is illegal.

"The decision taken by the Credentials Committee on this matter is wrong and we declared that we disagreed with it.

2) "As regards the credentials submitted by the Kuomintang representatives, the Soviet Delegation has already stated in the Credentials Committee that they were legally invalid, emanating as they did from authorities which do not represent China. Hence my Delegation proposed in that Committee that those credentials should not be recognized.

5.3. "We disagree with the decision taken by the Committee and at this moment, when the Plenary Assembly is considering credentials, we wish emphatically to reiterate our views.

5.4. "Hence the Soviet Delegation hereby proposes that the credentials presented by the Kuomintang representatives should not be recognized, as not emanating from authorities representing China.

3) "When the Credentials Committee was considering the credentials presented by the Bao-Dai and Syngman Rhee representatives, my Delegation stated that those credentials were legally invalid, having been issued by puppet authorities which do not represent Viet-Nam and Korea.

5.5. "We made our proposal in the Committee and we disagree with the decision taken by the Committee. Hence we hereby propose that the credentials presented by the Bao-Dai and Syngman Rhee representatives should not be recognized, as emanating from puppet regimes which do not represent Viet-Nam and Korea."

5.6. The Chairman begged the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics henceforward to refrain from using unsuitable terms such as "Kuomintang representatives" when talking about the delegates of China. The Assembly had already decided that China was legitimately represented at the Conference.

5.7. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stated:

"Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to you as Chairman of this Conference, I have to state that we are unable to accept your remarks. All of us, including you, Mr. Chairman, are perfectly well aware that China is not represented at this Conference. The Kuomintang representatives here endeavouring to play the part of "Chinese representatives", do not in fact represent China. We pointed this out when the question of Chinese representation was being considered by this Conference. Many other delegations at this Conference, and not only that of the Soviet Union, hold these views.

"Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that at this Conference there are no representatives of China. There is no Chinese Delegation. That is a fact which cannot be concealed.

"Incidentally, at a recent meeting of the Credentials Committee at the United Nations General Assembly, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he was unable to recognize the Kuomintang credentials.

"The representatives of the Kuomintang Group can be called by no other name, since they do not represent any country."

5.8. The Chairman replied that he himself could do no other than abide by the decisions taken by the Assembly, which had decided that the Chinese delegates present were representatives of China and not representatives of a group of Chinese.

5.9. The Delegate of the United States of America thanked the Chairman of Committee 4 for his report.

5.10. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that, on page 1 of the Report (paragraph 3), Czechoslovakia should be added to the list of countries which had objected to certain credentials.

5.11. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. :

"My Delegation entirely associates itself with the statement made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union, and is of the opinion that the Conference cannot recognize the credentials presented by the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, and Syngman Rhee representatives, since those credentials emanate from authorities which do not represent China, Viet-Nam, or Korea. The representatives of the Bonn authorities cannot represent the whole of Germany and hence their participation in this Conference, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is illegitimate.

5.12. "Hence my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union, namely, that the credentials presented by the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, and Syngman Rhee representatives be declared null and void."

5.13. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia :

1) "My Delegation considers the credentials presented by the delegates claiming to represent China to be invalid, on the grounds that they are not signed by the Head of the Chinese State, Mr. Mao Tse-Tung, or by Mr. Tchou En-Lai, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

2) "Neither can we recognize the credentials submitted by the Viet-Nam and Korean Delegations, these credentials not having been signed by the appropriate persons in the governments concerned.

3) "We can recognize the credentials presented by the Delegation of the Federal German Republic as valid for a part of German territory only. These credentials cannot be considered valid for the whole of Germany and they do not entitle their holders to speak on behalf of the whole of Germany."

5.14. The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation wholeheartedly supports the statement made by the Soviet Union to the effect that the decisions taken by the Credentials Committee to recognize the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives and of the representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and Syngman Rhee Korea, is illegitimate."

5.15. "My Delegation also wishes to say that the credentials emanating from the Bonn authorities are likewise null and void, since those authorities do not represent the whole of Germany, and since participation in this Conference by their representatives, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is illegitimate."

5.16. The Delegate of Viet-Nam:

"I have listened with scrupulous attention to the statements made by the Delegates of the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and the Bielorusian Soviet Socialist Republic. Their objections were the same as those expressed in Committee 2 (Credentials Committee), to wit, that my credentials are invalid for the simple reason that the authorities signing them do not represent Viet-Nam."

5.17. "Now I hasten to say that such statements were judged out of order. Committee 2, by a regular vote, unambiguously decided that my credentials were valid."

5.18. "I hereby pay a well-earned tribute to the impartiality of that Committee, which, neglecting political considerations, limited itself strictly to matters of form, in accordance with its terms of reference."

5.19. "Sir Bertrand Jerram, Chairman of that Committee, laid down the following as a working rule, in accordance with the Convention, which is the basic law of the Union:

5.20. "The Committee's terms of reference are set forth in paragraph 2.2. of the General Regulations, namely, "to examine the credentials of each delegation. Paragraph 2.1 lays down that such credentials are letters signed by the Head of the Government or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Member in question." That is clear. That is definite.

5.21. "Now what form do the Viet-Nam credentials take? Well, they take the form of a letter drafted in French - the diplomatic language par excellence - signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Viet-Nam, the Government of His Majesty Bao-Dai - a sovereign government I have the honour to represent, a government I am proud to represent. The form of my credentials is nothing less than impeccable, and gave rise to no comment. Hence their validity is incontrovertible.

5.22. "Committee 2, I repeat, has already given a ruling at its third meeting. It is my contention, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that this Assembly is not called upon to give another.

5.23. "I believe I have said all that could be said without going beyond the question of the form which credentials are required to take.

5.24. "As regards the question of whether a particular government represents a given country or not, I declare the matter out of order. Regular Membership of the Union for Viet-Nam, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, was settled by a vote in plenary assembly on 9 October, when the Polish proposal was rejected. That vote you all remember, and I shall not revert to it."

5.25. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

"For the reasons already given in Committee 2, my Delegation shares the views of the Soviet Union, namely, that the validity of the credentials presented by the representatives of Kuomintang China, South Korea, and of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam, should not be recognized."

5.26. The Delegate of Korea said that the Republic of Korea had been a sovereign country since 1948. The Koreans were a free people. There was no reason to object to the presence of a delegation from that country. In accordance with Article 1 of the Convention, the Republic of Korea had requested Membership of the Union. The Government of the Republic of Korea was the real government of the country. That country was legally a Member of the I.T.U., and the Plenary Assembly had decided that it should be entitled to be represented at the Conference.

5.27. The Delegate of Pakistan supported what had been said by the previous speaker. It was not for the Conference to decide whether a government did or did not represent a people. All a Credentials Committee had to do was to ensure that the credentials submitted were duly signed by the appropriate persons.

5.28. The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic:

1) "In Committee 2, my Delegation queried the validity of the credentials presented by the Delegates of Western Germany, since those Delegates cannot represent the whole of Germany, and in the absence of a delegation from the German Democratic Republic, their credentials cannot be taken into account.

2) "My Delegation has queried the credentials submitted by the Chinese Delegation, on the grounds that they are not signed by the Government of the People's Republic of China, the only competent government. Hence we demand that these credentials be not accepted.

3) "We have queried the credentials of the so-called Republic of Korea, being of the opinion that they are not signed by properly qualified persons.

4) "We have queried the credentials of the Delegates of Viet-Nam because they are signed by a puppet government.

"Hence we support the proposal made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

5.29. The Delegate of Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories Administered as such:

"My Delegation supports the views advanced by Viet-Nam and Pakistan.

5.30. "We are entirely persuaded that the present discussion arises out of a completely misconceived idea of the terms of reference of Committee 2.

5.31. "That Committee had certainly to do no more than examine the validity of credentials. That being so, it will be readily seen that the credentials submitted by the Delegation of Viet-Nam are fully valid. Viet-Nam is a Member of the Union regularly admitted in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2 c) of the Convention, and its admission obtained majority approval at the referendum prescribed in that paragraph. Viet-Nam being a Member of the Union, the Delegation of the State of Viet-Nam here present is provided with credentials in due and proper form, signed by the Government (a Member of the Union) represented by that Delegation. Hence it seems to my Delegation that there is nothing to discuss, and that the Credentials Committee has completed its task. I move that its report be approved."

5.32. The Delegate of the P.R. of Poland:

"My Delegation took part in the work of Committee 2.

1) "Committee 2 of course considered the credentials issued to certain persons by the Kuomintang authorities. That is a fact. Those credentials are far from being sufficient to enable anybody to take part in a Plenipotentiary Conference, not having been issued by the Central Government of the People's Republic of China. The Kuomintang does not represent China. It represents nothing but itself, and its representatives must not take part in this Conference.

2) "We consider that participation in the Conference by representatives of the Bonn authorities, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is incorrect, since the Bonn authorities do not of course represent the whole of Germany.

3) "We also consider that participation by the representatives of South Korea and of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam is illegitimate, their credentials having been signed by authorities which do not in fact represent Korea and Viet-Nam.

5.33. "We support the proposal by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that the credentials presented by the adherents of Bao-Dai and Syngman Rhee be rejected."

5.34. The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic:

"My Delegation has already stated, in Committee 4, that from the legal point of view, acceptance by the Conference of the credentials in question is incorrect. Hence my Delegation shares the views of the Soviet Delegation and supports its proposal."

5.35. The Delegate of the Federal German Republic:

"The Government of the Federal German Republic is a legally constituted Government which, pending unification of Germany, can speak on behalf of Germany and represents the German people in international affairs, particularly vis-à-vis the I.T.U. That Government was set up as the result of free democratic elections. The Federal German Republic has been recognized by the majority of States.

5.36. "Hence there can be no doubt that the credentials signed by that Government are valid as regards the I.T.U., and I thank Committee 2 for its clear and impartial decision."

5.37. The Delegate of China thanked the Chairman for having requested the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. to refrain from using incorrect terms to describe the Chinese Delegation.

He strongly objected to the preposterous allegations made by certain delegations, to the effect that his Delegation did not represent China. The Government of the Republic of China was established in strict conformity with due constitutional process, and was headed by a President freely elected by the Chinese people. The Credentials Committee

had studied the credentials of his Delegation, and having seen that they were signed by the President and counter-signed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and also bore the Grand Seal of the Republic, had agreed that they were in perfectly good and proper form. Consequently, these credentials were just as valid as those of other delegations. Moreover, since the so-called question of the representation of China had already been discussed in the Plenary Assembly, and since the Plenipotentiary Conference had decided to recognize the Government of the Republic of China as the sole authority entitled to represent China in the I.T.U., the Delegation of China considered it out of order for any delegation to raise the question again in connection with the examination of credentials.

5.38. There was a vote by show of hands on the U.S.S.R. proposal not to recognize the credentials presented by the Delegate of China.

5.39. The Soviet proposal was rejected by 48 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

5.40. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

"I am now speaking as head of the United Kingdom Delegation. In explanation of the vote of my Delegation on the question of the credentials of the Delegation of China, I should like to make it clear that this vote was concerned only with the question of whether these credentials are in due form, bearing in mind the decision, which was taken by the Plenary Assembly at its first meeting, to postpone consideration of the question of Chinese representation for the duration of this Conference."

5.41. There was a vote by show of hands on the Soviet proposal not to recognize the credentials submitted by the Delegate of Viet-Nam and Korea.

5.42. By 49 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions, the Soviet proposal was rejected.

5.43. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation did not submit any proposals in connection with the credentials presented by the representatives of the Bonn authorities. The statement made by my Delegation in connection with those credentials must be included in extenso in the minutes of this meeting."

The Chairman thereupon ruled that the report by the Credentials Committee should be put to the vote as a whole.

5.44. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked for a roll-call vote.

5.45. There was a vote by roll-call on the first Report by Committee 2.

For ..... Afghanistan; Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bolivia; Brazil; Kingdom of Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; Chile; China; Republic of Colombia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi; Republic of Korea; Costa Rica; Denmark; Republic of El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Franco; Iraq; Ireland; Iceland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Kingdom of Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands; Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Swiss Confederation; Territories of the United States of America; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa; Oriental Republic of Uruguay; United States of Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Yemen; Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions.

Against .... People's Republic of Albania; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Hungarian People's Republic; People's Republic of Poland; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; Czechoslovakia; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstentions .... Republic of Indonesia; Iran.

Did not take part in the vote ..... Egypt; India; Syrian Republic.

5.46. By 54 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions and 3 delegations not taking part in the vote, the first Report by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee (Document No. 197) was approved as a whole.

5.47. The Delegate of Egypt asked that mention should be made in the minutes of the fact that neither Egypt nor Syria had taken part in the vote for want of instructions in the matter.

5.48. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The decision taken by the Conference in connection with the credentials submitted by the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, and Syngman Rhee representatives is illegal and wrong.

5.49. "Further, the representatives of the Bonn authorities cannot represent the whole of Germany. Hence their participation in this Conference, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is illegal."

5.50. "The Delegates of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, and the Roumanian People's Republic asked that the minutes should record the fact that their Delegations entirely supported the statement made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.

5.51. The Delegate of Iraq said that his Government and that of the Hashomite Kingdom of Jordan did not recognize the State of Israel, and their participation in the Conference did not mean that they recognized that State.

5.52. The Delegate of Spain made the following statement:

"The Delegation of Spain has followed with great interest the debates of this Conference as regards the E.A.R.C. Agreements (Geneva, 1951) and the work of the I.F.R.B. Now that these agreements have been approved by the Plenary Assembly and that the work of the International Frequency Registration Board does not run the risk of being paralyzed but, on the contrary, has been increased so that it may attain the target for which it was created, our Delegation would like to make a statement and request the Chairman to transmit it to the Chairman of the I.F.R.B.

5.53. "Spain, for reasons known to all and that I am not going to analyse, was not present at the Atlantic City Conference where a new Convention was drawn up in replacement of that of Madrid, then in force. For the same reasons, she did not take part either in the High Frequency Broadcasting Conference where the Mexico City basic Plan was adopted.

5.54. "Our Delegation knows that, in spite of our forced absence from these two conferences, many countries including those speaking the Spanish language have done their very best to defend the interests of Spain; we thank them all. However, perhaps because adequate material for judgement was lacking, the interests of Spanish broadcasting were not in fact protected as they should have been in the Mexico City Plan. That was why Spain, when acceding to the Atlantic City Convention, made express reservations on the Mexico City and Copenhagen Plans. "

5.55. "The Chairman will remember that when the E.A.R.C. Agreements were approved by this Assembly, our Delegation made a similar declaration. At the same time, we pointed out that we voted in favour of the proposal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to ratify these agreements because what interests Spain, who has always worked in the interests of the Union, is to achieve constructive work and to try to resolve by technical means the problems raised by the use of the frequency spectrum.

5.56. "We hope that the desire to collaborate advocated by the honourable Delegate of the Netherlands and greeted by the unanimous applause of the Plenary Assembly, can be put into practice.

5.57. "This is why, without insisting on the arguments already propounded in this Conference, such as those relating to the expenses incurred up to the present by the I.F.R.B., the necessity of not interrupting work already started, etc. .... we would like these tasks to be accomplished as soon as possible and with the utmost exactitude within the means at the disposal of the Board. We should be the first to welcome the withdrawal of the reservations that our country is still obliged to maintain,

5.58. "The I.F.R.B. will have to inform the Administrative Council of the I.T.U. at its 1953 Session of the degree of progress attained in the preparation of the high frequency broadcasting plans. It will also have to examine, during its 1955 meeting, the progress achieved during the interim period and recommend a date for the beginning of the first adjustment to the Atlantic City Table of Frequency Allocations, bearing in mind the fact that, for high frequency broadcasting, the putting into force of the revised plan must have been accepted and decided.

5.59. "However, to attain this object, it would be advisable to make as much headway as possible with the revision of the Mexico City Basic Plan, taking into account the up-to-date requirements submitted by the administrations. That is why the Delegation of Spain requests the I.F.R.B. to take the necessary steps, within the means at its disposal, for the modifications to the Mexico City Basic Plan and the relevant studies to be completed by 31 December 1953. In this way, all the administrations could send in their observations on the new plan for submission to the Administrative Council at its 1954 session.

5.60. "I would be grateful, Mr. Chairman, if you would transmit this request to the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. Our Delegation would like to know the Board's opinion as regards the possibility of accepting this suggestion.

5.61. "We ourselves, in accordance with the E.A.R.C. Agreements (Geneva, 1951) have notified our frequency requirements within the stipulated time-limits. If this plan gave satisfaction to Spanish broadcasting, our administration would study the possibility of leaving its reservations to the Mexico City plan without effect."

5.62. The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. said that the question raised by the Delegate of Spain was quite in conformity with the programme fixed by the I.F.R.B. in the framework of the decisions of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference. The programme as fixed by the Board covered the recommendation of the Delegate of Spain on the revision of the Mexico City Basic Plan for the following year.

5.63. The only point to be stressed was that the I.F.R.B. should have at its disposal all the necessary means to accomplish its work successfully, in other words, adequate staff and supplies.

5.64. The Delegate of Yemen stated that his Government did not recognize the State of Israel and that, consequently, the Delegation of Yemen to the Conference did not recognize the representation of that State.

5.65. The Delegate of the State of Israel declared that the State of Israel was a Member of the I.T.U. and had acceded to the Atlantic City Convention in 1949. The credentials of his Delegation to the

Plenipotentiary Conference had been approved by the Credentials Committee. He therefore considered that the remarks made by the Delegations of Iraq and Yemen were merely of a political nature and consequently should not be taken into consideration.

5.66. The Delegate of Saudi Arabia said that his Government did not recognize the so-called State of Israel and that his vote in favour of document No. 197 merely meant that he approved of the general work performed by the Committee.

The Delegate of Spain requested that the answer of the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. should be included in the minutes and would be happy if a recommendation on the lines of his request were sent to the I.F.R.B.

The Chairman answered that the request of the Delegation of Spain would be included in the minutes along with the answer by Mr. Dellamula, Chairman of the I.F.R.B., who would certainly consider how to comply with it.

The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.

Rapporteur:

G. Tripet

Secretary General:

L. Mulatier

President:

M.A. Andrada

P L E N A R Y   A S S E M B L Y

Minutes

of the Seventh Meeting

Thursday, 6 November 1952

at 4 p.m.

Chairman : Mr. M.A. ANDRADA (Argentine Republic)

- - - - -

- Questions discussed :
1. Greetings to the Soviet Union on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the October Revolution;
  2. Adoption of the agenda (Document No. 194);
  3. Report by Committee 5 to the Plenary Assembly (Document No. 154, paragraphs 3 to 5) - discussion continued;
  4. Report by Committee 4 and draft Rules of Procedure (Documents Nos. 186 and 188-revised);
  5. First Report by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee (Document No. 197).

1. GREETINGS TO THE SOVIET UNION ON THE OCCASION OF THE 35th ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

1.1. The Chairman said that before passing to the agenda, he wished, as Chairman of the Plenipotentiary Conference, to say a few words on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the October Revolution.

1.2. As Chairman of an international conference, he felt called upon to salute the great Russian people. He asked the delegates representing it to transmit to their government the cordial greetings of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

1.3. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics replied in the following terms :

"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,

"Allow me to thank you for the greetings and congratulations offered by you on behalf of this Conference to the Soviet People and the Soviet Government on the 35th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

1.4. "Thirty-five years ago, the workers and peasants of our country, at the summons of the Communist Party under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, brought about a socialist Revolution, overthrew the rule of the exploiters, and founded the first Socialist State in the world.

1.5. "The October Revolution brought about an unparalleled outburst of creative energy and initiative on the part of the broadest strata of our people.

1.6. "In the past thirty-five years the Soviet people has achieved great successes. It has created a powerful socialist industry, and its agriculture is now the most highly mechanized in the world. Much has been achieved in the development of socialist culture and science and in improving the living conditions of all the various peoples of the Soviet Republics.

1.7. "The peaceful labour of the Soviet peoples was interrupted in 1941 by the attack of fascist Germany. However, the Soviet Army victoriously routed and annihilated Hitler's war machine, freed our country from fascist occupation and freed the peoples of Europe from the brown plague of fascism.

1.8. "Grievous were the losses our country suffered in that war. But within a short time the heroic Soviet people managed to make good its war losses and to initiate a new and powerful boom in the national economy. It should suffice to point out that our industrial production will in 1952 be 2,3 times more than it was in 1940.

1.9. "Under the guidance of its great leader - Josef Vissarionovitch Stalin - the Soviet people is now at work on a great programme for the transformation of nature, the construction of huge hydro-electric plants, and irrigation canals, and the recovery of desert country. It is confidently on the march towards the high goal - communism.

1.10. "The new five-year plan now adopted in our country is a plan for peaceful constructive work and for development both economic and cultural.

1.11. "One of the chief aims of the new five-year plan is by 1955 to double the production of consumer goods, to bring about a now and appreciable rise in the material well-being of the Soviet people and the further development of socialist culture.

1.12. "Since the very creation of the Soviet State, the Soviet Government has invariably worked for peace and for the development of friendly relations with other countries on a basis of respect for the principles of equality and independence.

1.13. "The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is designed to avert war and preserve the peace. It is a policy of peace and security, international cooperation, and the development of business relations with all countries.

1.14. "It is common knowledge that this policy of peace enjoys - and deservedly enjoys - the sympathy and support of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

1.15. "Mr. Chairman, we shall transmit the congratulations and good wishes offered by you on behalf of the Conference to the Soviet people and the Soviet Government, in connection with this thirty-fifth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

1.16. "Long live friendship between peoples in their struggle to avert war and to ensure a lasting peace throughout the world."

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Document No. 194)

The agenda (Document No. 194) was approved with the following item added:

First Report by the Chairman of the  
Credentials Committee (Document No. 197).

3. REPORT BY COMMITTEE 5 TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY (Document No. 154, paragraphs 3 to 5).

3.1. Document No. 154, paragraph 4 a) - number of I.F.R.B. members.

3.2. The Delegate of Brazil:

"My Delegation supports the constructive suggestions made by Mr. Prasada, of India, at the last plenary meeting, but only as regards formal statements. Hence we are unable this time to follow his indications. For this we apologize.

3.3. "At a time when we are attempting to reach a final solution of the problem set by the I.F.R.B., we wish to make a statement which will take up a little of our precious time.

3.4. "My Delegation, recognizing, as it has already stated, the necessity of keeping the I.F.R.B. (a body absolutely indispensable) to solve the problems arising out of an equitable use of the radio spectrum by the various Members of the I.T.U., submitted a proposal which may be summarized as follows:

1) "Include in the Convention certain general provisions which, we feel, should appear in the Magna Carta governing telecommunications, leaving in the Radio Regulations only provisions relative to the working methods of the I.F.R.B.

2) "Adhere strictly to the present principles insisting on the need for technical and practical knowledge of radio frequencies on the part of the members of the I.F.R.B., until the extent of such knowledge has been more clearly specified.

3) "Maintain the international character of the mandate of the members of the Board, who must themselves give proof of an international outlook.

4) "Make it an explicit obligation that members shall possess, in addition, knowledge of the geography and economy of the various regions of the world or of the region to which they belong (and not merely of one given region, as at present), because of the ignorance of important regional peculiarities already observed in practice.

3.5. "The Brazilian proposal to increase the number of members of the I.F.R.B. to fifteen was made with a view to fulfilling this latter condition. This idea is, moreover, justified by the increased tasks of the I.F. R.B. referred to in our proposal, by the need for the Board to reach decisions of a technical nature more speedily, as the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Fioravanti Dellamula, explained in his important statement, and finally by the opinion of the great majority, which considers that we shall never have a fair representation of all the regions of the world if we merely expect the members of the I.F.R.B. to have a partial knowledge of the conditions in these regions, and if we keep the present number of members.

3.6. "The Brazilian proposal, particularly as regards the number of members of the I.F.R.B., has received enthusiastic support from a large number of countries.

3.7. "It is very unusual, Mr. Chairman, in the annals of the I.T.U., for there to be a vote such as that one in favour of a point of view which has not been unanimously approved.

3.8. "There is no doubt that the conclusions now being reached by Committee 3 do not represent the solution desired by a great number of members of the I.T.U. This has been clearly demonstrated.

3.9. "We do not wish to criticise in any way the procedure adopted for studying these questions in Committee 3, nor the ballots concerning them, since we must recognize in them the result of the view already adopted regarding proposals for budgetary changes and also the result of the anxiety - exaggerated in our view - to change the present provisions of the Convention and the Regulations as little as possible. We do not consider that this procedure has produced the best results, especially since the delegations which supported the proposal to increase the number of members to fifteen were asked to vote immediately in favour of proposals to maintain the number at eleven so that the Committee should not remain in doubt as to the size of the Board. For this reason, it amounted to admitting the idea of returning to a discussion either of new proposals or of earlier proposals advocating a reduction to 9, 7 or even 5 in the number of members of the I.F.R.B.

3.10. "And we must not forget that the Chairman of Committee 3, when asked what would happen if the Franco-Mexican proposal were rejected, admitted the possibility of submitting once more the proposals to reduce the numbers, as the honourable Delegate of France pointed out.

3.11. "Comparison of the results of the two ballots authorizes the false interpretation which the less wise will give it. It is clear, however, that those who would like the I.F.R.B. to be composed of fifteen members did not want only eleven, and the fact that they have voted for the latter figure has the effect of making the result of the ballot appear impressive.

3.12. "That is why, Mr. Chairman, we sincerely regret at this time that some members of the I.T.U. have not yet understood our loyal and constructive proposals, since the arguments against them have been entirely refuted, as is evident from Document No. 145, of which the information and calculations have been confirmed and upheld, even by the Chairman of Committee 3.

3.13. "The Delegation of Brazil has nevertheless good reasons for appearing to be quite satisfied, since, without any doubt, its proposal will have rendered the I.T.U. a great service, will have served the

interests of its members in general and those of telecommunications, by contributing, or rather leading, to the rejection of the idea of reducing the membership of the I.F.R.B., a point of view expressed, before our statement, by a great number of delegations.

"To sum up, the Delegation of Brazil wishes it to be clearly understood that:

3.14. "The reasons which justified the submission and constituted the defence of the proposal it had the honour to submit to this Conference still hold good. The opinion of our government has in no way changed.

3.15. "We also think, Mr. Chairman, that this is still the view of all the delegations which explicitly or implicitly approved and continue to approve the Brazilian proposal.

3.16. "Our Delegation therefore wishes to announce now that if its proposal is finally rejected by this Plenary Assembly it will make a statement to the effect that it will not assume any responsibility - and neither will the countries which have followed it in this affair - for the efficient and regular functioning of the services of the I.F.R.B., already made heavier by the I.F.R.B., and today perhaps still more by this Conference.

3.17. "The Delegation of Brazil feels that these reasons are sufficient for using its right to make reservations, when the time comes, as to the course followed by this Conference in the problem of the I.F.R.B.; it will do this when the time of the Final Protocol to the Convention arrives, although with regret, since Brazil, abstaining up to the present from fighting certain claims, has always supported without restriction all the acts and resolutions of the Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U."

3.18. The Delegate of Pakistan supported the Delegate of Brazil. He thought that all regions should be represented in the same way on the I.F.R.B. If the ration were taken between the number of countries per region and the number of representatives on the I.F.R.B., on the basis of the ration 11 to 2 existing for Eastern Europe, the following would be the result for all the regions of the world:

<u>Regions</u>	<u>Number of countries per region</u>	<u>Present number of members on the I.F.R.B.</u>	<u>Number of members in the ratio</u>	<u>i.e. In round figures</u>
			11 to 2	
Eastern Europe and Northern Asia.....	11	2	2	2
American Region.....	23	3	4.2	4
Western Europe and African Region.....	23	3	4.2	4
China, India & Australia	27	3	4.9	<u>5</u>
				15
				(number proposed by Brazil)

3.19. It could be seen from the table that the proposal to appoint fifteen members to the I.F.R.B. was quite justified. If a region did not wish to be so represented, it could refuse, but it was certain that the Region of China, India and Australia, and the American Region, were in favour of a fair and equitable representation on the lines of the table above.

3.20. The argument in favour of economy that had been advanced against the Brazilian proposal no longer stood, because the I.F.R.B. had taken over part of the work of the Radio Conferences.

3.21. The Committee had decided that the whole question should be referred to the Radio Conference, partly because the countries with representatives on the Board did not wish them to leave it. If another four members were elected at Buenos Aires, the others could remain in office until the next Ordinary Radio Conference. If that Conference decided to reduce the number of members of the I.F.R.B., the countries which had been represented on the Board since Atlantic City could decide among themselves which representatives should be withdrawn.

3.22. It could be seen from the document submitted by the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. that a number of the jobs were being handled by one member alone; if the number were increased the work could proceed more smoothly and efficiently.

3.23. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. then made the following statement:

"My Delegation wishes to state that its attitude towards the I.F.R.B. was exhaustively explained when this matter was considered at the 6th Plenary Meeting of this Conference (Document No. 220).

3.24. "The views then expressed by us we continue wholeheartedly to entertain.

3.25. "Now, when the Plenary Assembly is taking a decision in connection with the Report by Committee 3 (Document No. 154), my Delegation wishes to state that it does not support that decision and reserves its attitude to Document No. 154."

3.26. The Delegates of Iraq, Colombia and Venezuela supported the statements by the Delegates of Brazil and Pakistan.

3.27. A vote was taken by a show of hands to decide whether the present provisions in the Radio Regulations concerning the number of members of the I.F.R.B. should be transferred and defined in a text of the Convention (or in a Resolution or in a Protocol).

3.28. By 49 votes to 11 it was decided to include the provisions in question in the Convention.

3.29. The Assembly then considered the Brazilian proposal (Document No. 66) to increase the number of members of the I.F.R.B. to fifteen.

3.30. The Delegate of Pakistan made an appeal to everyone present and, in a spirit of compromise, suggested a number between eleven and fifteen, i.e. thirteen. He thought his suggestion might satisfy those who had placed all their faith in the I.F.R.B. and who considered that it should carry on with its work.

3.31. The Delegate of Costa Rica was in favour of increasing the number of members of the I.F.R.B., in view of the work done by that organ and in spite of the arguments about economy which had been adduced against the proposal. In a spirit of compromise, he supported the Pakistan proposal.

3.32. The Delegate of Brazil explained that his idea in submitting the proposal had been that it was necessary to strengthen the I.F.R.B. on the basis of the geographical regions, so that it could undertake the tasks entrusted to it by the E.A.R.C. and those that the present Conference might give it.

3.33. For Brazil, it was a question of principle and equity. The number of fifteen was the minimum that should be accepted, since such an increase would not create a problem as to distribution among the regions.

3.34. In a spirit of collaboration, however, he was prepared to withdraw his original proposal and support the Pakistan proposal.

3.35. The Delegate of Colombia wholeheartedly supported the proposal by Pakistan. The I.F.R.B. could never achieve its purpose if the Conference did not give it the complement required to apply the decisions of the E.A.R.C. and the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the Atlantic City Convention. It was essential for all regions of the world to be represented equitably on the I.F.R.B. The Delegate of Brazil had already shown that an increase in the number of members of the I.F.R.B. would not have serious financial repercussions. He thought it unnecessary to revert to that point.

3.36. The Delegate of the United States of America asked the Delegate of Pakistan:

- 1) from which regions should the two additional members come?
- 2) should they be elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference?
- 3) should their mandate last until the next Radio Conference?

3.37. The Delegate of Pakistan replied that it was for the Plenary Assembly to decide on the first question: they might set up a working group for that purpose. The Assembly knew which regions were under-represented.

3.38. As regards the other questions he thought that the mandate of all the members of the I.F.R.B. should last until the next Administrative Radio Conference, but if at that time some of them had to be withdrawn, the countries that had been represented on the I.F.R.B. since Atlantic City should decide amongst themselves which of their representatives should retire. That would be the fair procedure.

3.39. The Delegate of Venezuela supported the statement by Brazil and the compromise proposal by Pakistan.

3.40. The Delegate of Denmark also considered that the I.F.R.B. should be strong, which was particularly important for the small countries. He thought that there should be provisions in the Convention establishing the independence of the members of that organ. Committee 3 had successfully acquitted itself of that task. With regard to the increase in the number of members, Denmark could not approve the Brazilian proposal, or even the compromise proposal by Pakistan, for reasons of principle and economy. If every Conference increased the number of members of the I.F.R.B., it would become top-heavy and too difficult to handle.

3.41. The Delegate of Pakistan thought that if a principle was to be observed, it should be the principle of equitable representation of the regions in the I.F.R.B.

3.42. On a proposal by the Ukrainian S.S.R., supported by the Delegations of the U.S.S.R., the Hungarian P.R., the Bielorussian S.S.R., the P.R. of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, a vote was taken by secret ballot.

3.43. The Chairman asked the Delegates of Poland, Denmark, Lebanon and Colombia to act as tellers.

3.44. By 42 votes to 33 with 1 abstention and 1 vote invalid, the compromise proposal by Pakistan was rejected.

3.45. At the request of the Ukrainian S.S.R., supported by several delegations, a vote by secret ballot was also taken on the proposal by France and Mexico to keep the number of members of the I.F.R.B. at eleven. The same persons acted as tellers.

3.46. The proposal by France and Mexico was adopted by 51 votes to 27.

3.47. Paragraphs 4 b, 4 c, 4 d and 5 were then approved without discussion.

3.48. The third report by Committee 3 (Document No. 154) was then approved as a whole.

4. REPORT BY COMMITTEE 4 AND DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE (Documents Nos. 186 and 188-Revised).

4.1. Mr. Tsingovator (U.S.S.R.), Chairman of Committee 4, introduced his report (Document 188 Revised) :

"Speaking as Chairman of Committee 4, I have to state that Document 188-revised contains the Report by the Chairman of Committee 4 on the draft Rules of Procedure prepared for this Conference.

4.2. "In accordance with the decisions taken at the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly, Committee 4 considered Document No. 21, submitted by the Argentine Delegation, with a view to evolving draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference.

4.3. "Twelve meetings were devoted to this. A great deal of work was also done by the Working Group, which, with Mr. Mayo (Argentina) in the Chair, prepared the draft Rules of Procedure appearing in Document 186.

4.4. "At its twelfth meeting, Committee 4 adopted the draft Rules of Procedure in Document 186 by 36 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

4.5. The Committee's decision was not unanimous. Several delegations, including those of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Hungarian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and others, declared the draft Rules of Procedure to be unacceptable, on the grounds that a number of the provisions appearing therein were designed to restrict discussion, which would make it difficult for Members of the Union to join freely in consideration

of points at issue. These delegations declared that they had, accordingly, voted against adoption of the draft Rules of Procedure and would reserve the right to submit their comments to the Plenary Assembly."

4.6. The Chairman thanked Mr. Tsingovatov for his report and for the work done by his Committee.

4.7. The Delegate of Uruguay wished first of all to thank the Argentine Delegation as authors of the draft Rules of Procedure. Committee 4 had examined it and had not made many changes; that was a tribute to those who had prepared it, and he thought the authors should be congratulated.

4.8. It was true that some delegations had said in Committee 4 that they could not accept the draft Rules of Procedure because in their view they contained provisions restricting freedom of thought. But it was nevertheless true that other delegations, including the Delegation of Uruguay, supported by the United States, the Philippines etc., had affirmed that freedom of expression was not restricted and that the debates were entirely free.

4.9. To exercise a right, it was absolutely necessary for it to be defined. For example, Article 4 of the Declaration of Human Rights specified that the natural rights were those that did not encroach on the rights of others. Similarly at the Conference, the exercise of the right to speak was in no way restricted by the fact that the right was defined. On the contrary such a delimitation was an advantage and enabled everyone to exercise that right. Otherwise it might happen, for example on a point of procedure, that four or five delegates would speak for an hour each, which would mean a restriction of the right of other delegations to speak.

4.10. The Delegate of Argentina made the following statement :

"I should first of all like to thank the honourable Delegation of Uruguay for its kind remarks about our Delegation as authors of the draft Rules of Procedure.

4.11. "Turning to the report by the Chairman of Committee 4, I should like to say that this morning we raised a question in that Committee which we will repeat here.

4.12. "The Argentine Delegation has carefully read the report submitted by the Chairman of Committee 4 to the Assembly (Document No. 188-E revised) in which he submits the Rules of Procedure to this Conference for study (Document No. 186). It regrets having to examine this report very closely, and asks for this observation to be included in the minutes of the present meeting.

4.13. "In the last paragraph of the report the Chairman of Committee 4 has mentioned several delegations which stated that they could not accept the draft Rules of Procedure because several of its provisions envisaged the limitation of discussions, thus rendering it difficult for Members of the Union freely to participate in the discussions.

4.14. "For this reason they had voted against approval of the Rules of Procedure and reserved to themselves the right to raise the question again in the Plenary Assembly.

4.15. "Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is correct that these delegations expressed these views, but one thing has been omitted from the report: the fact that the Argentine Delegation expressly refuted those statements, as can be seen from its statement which appears in extenso in the summary record of the debates in that meeting of Committee 4.

4.16. "In the circumstances, and to make the report more objective, the Argentine Delegation will now repeat its comments in full at this plenary meeting :

4.17. "My Delegation, representing a Member of the Union, has proposed some Rules of Procedure for this Conference and wishes specifically to put on record that Document No. 186 constitutes a code of work providing ample safeguards for the right of all Members of the I.T.U. to express their views both fully and freely.

4.18. "None of the Rules in this document in any sense restricts the rights of delegations. On the contrary, they ensure that debates will be both orderly and expeditious, to the advantage of all, so that all may enjoy the same rights without the possibility of their being abused to the detriment of all."

4.19. The Dologato of Brazil said that he had intended, at the meeting of Committee 4 that day, to add to his statement in Document No. 188 revised. As, for obvious reasons, he had been unable to do so at the committee meeting, he wished to affirm that the Brazilian Delegation had emphasized not only the large amount of work done by the Delegation of Argentina, but also the fact that the work reflected a deep sense of democracy, as could be seen from the draft Rules of Procedure themselves.

4.20. The Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland made the following statement :

"At the beginning of the Conference, as is well known, the Delegation of the Argentine Republic submitted a new draft set of Rules of Procedure for application at this Conference.

4.21. "After scrupulous perusal of the draft, my Delegation repeatedly expressed the view that in spite of the vast amount of work done on the draft by the Argentine Administration, that draft was unsuitable, and that it would be better to keep the old Rules of Procedure for Conferences as adopted at Atlantic City. I refer to the Rules of Procedure for Conferences set forth in Annex 4 to the Convention now in force.

4.22. "Explaining our attitude, we pointed out that the old Rules of Procedure, used at numerous conferences between 1947 and 1952, had not worked out at all badly. They have, of course, certain failings (which can easily be put right), but in general we feel that they are clear and precise and that they do not give rise to difficulties of interpretation or ambiguities in connection with the appraisal of the procedural questions involved in the organization of activities and discussions at conferences.

4.23. "Hence we stated that the old Rules of Procedure for Conferences (Atlantic City, 1947) should be maintained in the draft of the new Convention and should be applied at this Conference.

4.24. "Our views were shared by many other countries, but did not prevail, and the whole matter was referred to Committee 4, in which a final text of the draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference was evolved.

4.25. "I shall not here attempt to analyse individual rules in Document No.186. That I have done in Committee 4. I shall morely say that the document as a whole is for me unacceptable, firstly, for the reasons indicated by me at the outset, and secondly, because most of the provisions therein appearing are designed, not to ensure freedom of discussion, but to curtail it. Practical application of the document will give rise to difficulties impeding the free expression of views on any matter by the delegates accredited by the governments of their countries. We cannot but take exception to such a procedure.

4.26. "Without these essential amendments which my Delegation either made or supported in Committee 4, when the draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference were discussed, we cannot accept Document No.186."

4.27. The Delegate of Egypt thought that the title of Document No.183 should be changed from "First Report by Committee 4" to "First Report by the Chairman of Committee 4".

He also requested the Assembly to consider Document No.186 rule by rule.

4.28. Mr. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.), Chairman of Committee 4, made the following statement:

"I wish, first of all, to make a few observations as Chairman of Committee 4.

4.29. "Document No.188-Revised, as I have already said, is the report by the Chairman of Committee 4. Due to lack of time, we were unable to prepare and discuss the report by the Committee.

4.30 "As to the statement made by the Delegate of Argentina, I would make the following comments:

4.31. "When Committee 4 was considering the draft Rules of Procedure (Doc.No.171), a number of Delegations said that that draft was unacceptable, since some of its provisions were designed to restrict the rights of Union Members in discussion and would prevent the free expression of opinion. Those Delegations voted against the draft Rules of Procedure, and asked that their views be mentioned in the report which was to be submitted to the Plenary Assembly. I have complied with that request.

4.32. "Certain other Delegations, for example, those of Argentina and Brazil, expressed different views, stating that in their opinion the draft Rules of Procedure were entirely acceptable. They did not, however, request inclusion of their statements in the report to the Plenary Assembly. Hence their views are recorded in the Minutes of Committee 4, but not in the report.

4.33. "I repeat that had those Delegations so requested, their views would have been recorded in the report.

4.34. "Hence I cannot agree with the Delegate of Brazil, who has said that he 'did not have the possibility' of having his views included in the report.

4.35. "He only had to request such inclusion and his request would have been complied with. He did not do so and hence his complaints lack any foundation.

4.36. "As Delegate of the U.S.S.R., I wish to state the following:

"The Delegate of Uruguay in the lengthy speech made by him, in connection with Document No.186, endeavoured to justify the necessity of restricting discussions. Thus his statement merely confirms that the restrictions to which my Delegation has referred do in fact exist.

4.37. "His attempt, however, was unsuccessful. The arguments adduced by him are baseless and irrelevant. Talking about the need to curtail the rights of "individuals" in the interests of the community as a whole, he tried to draw an analogy and to compare the position of individuals with the position of countries. Such analogies are inadmissible.

4.38. "He forgot that sovereign countries are represented here at the Conference. Any attempt to restrict or to cast doubts on the sovereignty of I.T.U. Member countries must be emphatically resisted.

4.39. "Hence the analogies adduced by him are inadmissible.

4.40. "In the realm of international relations, in relations between countries, one of the most fundamental principles is that of sovereignty, the principle that sovereignty of countries should be respected. Members of the Union must have complete freedom to defend their points of view in discussion, without any restriction. Hence we emphatically oppose the statement made by the Delegate of Uruguay.

4.41. "As regards the substance of Document 186 (Draft Rules of Procedure) it should be emphasized that this Plenipotentiary Conference if called upon to solve a series of important problems. Hence, in the interests of our work, in the interests of our cause, in order to reach agreed decisions, we must have Rules of Procedure conducive to discussion and to the exchange of views - Rules of procedure which do not make discussion more difficult, as would happen with the Rules set forth in Document No. 186.

4.42. "We consider that the restrictive provisions contained therein invite abuse. This would lead to prolongation of discussion and to procedural squabbles, and will not facilitate the regular work of the Conference. All these restrictive provisions are unnecessary and merely harmful.

4.43. "We should like to adopt these Rules of Procedure, but they are rendered unacceptable by these provisions.

4.44. "In fact, why are paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Rule 13 required? All these restrictions, all these "priority" motions for discontinuation of discussion and closure of meetings, for postponement of deliberations, for time limits on speeches - all this merely complicates the work of the Conference, and opens the way to abuse. Is it not a shocking thing when at the outset of this Conference, in connection with the so-called point of order raised by the Delegation of the United States of America, it was decided to postpone the discussion of the question of Chinese representation and of eviction of the Kuomintang representatives - a question so vital for the I.T.U.? Is it not a shocking thing when the Delegation of the United States of America, with the aid of the voting machine, evoked the Rules of Procedure to stop a vote and to prevent a decision in connection with a matter of moment for the Union?

4.45. "That is why these restrictive procedural provisions are unacceptable and should be deleted from the Rules of Procedure. The Rules of Procedure should not contain provisions open to abuse by Delegations.

4.46. "For our Conference it is essential to safeguard the possibility of a tranquil, businesslike discussion of problems, and we can do without these paragraphs, restricting as they do the sovereign rights of Members of the Union. No one here wishes to make unnecessarily long declarations, but when that is necessary, in the interests of the work before us, Delegations should have the possibility of explaining their views.

4.47. "We cannot, for example, object when the Delegate of France spoke for 35 or 40 minutes in Committee 3, in connection with the I.F.R.B. We do not agree with the views by him expounded, but we respect his opinion and consider that he, like any other Delegate, should have the opportunity to express it. Each Delegation must decide for itself how long its statements shall be.

4.48. "Hence we propose the following amendments in Document No.186:

1) "Delete Rule 13, paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8, and make the corresponding changes in paragraph 4 of this Rule. This is the first amendment.

2) "Redraft Rule 14, paragraph 1, bringing it into strict accordance with Chapter 3, paragraph 2 (1) of the General Regulations. This is the second amendment.

4.49. "With these amendments, we could support the Document.

"I request that our amendments be considered."

4.50. The Delegate of Pakistan said he had suggested several amendments to the Committee, and since they had been accepted he was quite satisfied with the Rules of Procedure. He congratulated the Argentine Delegation on having prepared a detailed draft that complied with parliamentary procedure and that would consequently considerably shorten discussions on procedure.

4.51. The Delegate of Uruguay wished to reply briefly to the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. When he had spoken he was not thinking solely of individuals but also of legal entities. The Members of the Union were countries, and the delegates to the Conference representatives of their countries. Everything that had been said concerning freedom of speech naturally applied not only to persons but to countries too. It was in fact a somewhat theoretical problem. The Rules of Procedure protected the rights of all, and in particular, Rule 4 (3) clearly stated: "It shall be the duty of the Chairman to protect the right of each delegation to express its opinion freely and fully on the point at issue."

4.52. The Delegate of the Belorussian S.S.R. made the following statement:

"My Delegation disagrees with certain sections of the proposed draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference (Document No. 186). These draft Rules of Procedure contain paragraphs which either directly or indirectly restrict freedom of discussion. For example, Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and certain other Rules.

4.53. "My Delegation takes exception to precisely those Rules and paragraphs.

4.54. "The Plenipotentiary Conference of the Union meets but once every five years, and delegates come from the most remote corners of the earth. Hence they must not be deprived of the right freely and fully to set forth their views and their wishes in connection with amelioration of the basic Acts of the Union and of its activities themselves.

4.55. "The proposed draft Rules of Procedure, as they stand, will not be conducive to the successful solution of the problems with which the Conference is faced.

4.56. "Hence my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Soviet Union that Rule 13, paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8, be deleted from the draft Rules of Procedure, and that Rule 14, paragraph 1, be re-drafted."

4.57. The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia also thanked the Argentine Delegation for its contribution to the Conference in the form of the draft Rules of Procedure. He recalled that he too had made certain comments, particularly with regard to Rule 15, Paragraph 5. His Delegation still thought that the provision making it necessary for five delegations to request a secret ballot was contrary to the interests of the small countries, which were often unable to get the support of five delegations.

4.58. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. made the following statement :

"The draft Rules of Procedure for the Conference appearing in Document No. 186, are unacceptable, containing as they do provisions aimed at restricting discussion.

4.59. "Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are such restrictive provisions. They are incompatible with the sovereign right of every delegation freely and fully to express their views on points at issue.

4.60. "Hence my Delegation supports the proposal by the Soviet Union to delete Rule 13, paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8, from the Rules of Procedure and to re-draft Rule 13, paragraph 4, and Rule 14, paragraph 1."

4.61. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia said:

"If a sovereign country is prepared to conclude an agreement, it often implies that that country agrees to a certain limitation of its sovereign rights. But such a country would not be happy if, during the discussion of an agreement, the free expression of its ideas and suggestions were restricted. We have already had some unfortunate experiences: many delegates here could give us examples. I remember the attempts to restrict the debates at the last meeting of the C.C.I.R. A committee of the C.C.I.R. had adopted similar Rules of Procedure; they were abused and the result was complete confusion.

"For these reasons, paragraphs 5 to 8 are not acceptable to the Czechoslovak Delegation, and we support the amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. Delegation."

4.62. A vote was taken on the U.S.S.R. proposal to delete paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 of Rule 13.

4.63. By 52 votes to 9, the Assembly decided to retain the paragraphs.

4.64. The Assembly then passed to Rule 14.

4.65. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked for the first paragraph of Rule 14 to be brought into line with the General Regulations, which made no distinction between the powers of delegates to vote or to sign. The General Regulations had been approved by governments, and were very clear.

4.66. Some delegations had pointed out in Committee 4 that it was the procedure in their country to give two types of credentials. It could not be used as an argument against the U.S.S.R. proposal, which in no way prevented a delegation from complying with the custom of his country and submitting two documents if it so desired.

4.67. The Delegate of Argentina said the problem had already been thoroughly discussed in the Working Group set up by Committee 4. Document DT 178 was clear. The question was dealt with in detail there, and the views of Argentina were clearly stated.

4.68. A vote was taken on the U.S.S.R. proposal concerning Rule 14 (1).

4.69. By 59 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions, the proposal was rejected.

4.70. The Assembly then proceeded to study Rule 19.

4.71. The Delegate of Egypt asked for the words "any part" to be added after the words "at the end of" in paragraph 2 of Rule 19, so that committees could submit partial or interim reports to a plenary meeting.

4.72. After a short discussion, in which the Delegates of Argentina, Egypt and France took part, it was decided that paragraph 2 of Rule 19 would be drafted as follows:

"Committees and sub-committees may prepare any interim reports they deem necessary and, if circumstances warrant, at the end of their work they may submit a final report in which they shall recapitulate in concise terms the proposals and conclusions resulting from the studies which have been entrusted to them."

4.73. The title of Rule 19 was amended in the French and Spanish texts only.

4.74. Paragraph 2 of Rule 20 was also amended in the same way to read:

"Any interim or final report must be approved by the committee or sub-committee concerned."

4.75. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. made the following statement:

"Since the Plenary Assembly has rejected the amendments submitted by us, we shall vote against adoption of Document No. 186.

4.76. The Rules of Procedure (Document No. 186) amended were adopted as a whole by 62 votes to 9.

5. FIRST REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE (Document No.197)

5.1. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as Chairman of the Credentials Committee, submitted his report (Document No. 197). He had not had time to submit it to the Committee. Hence he was now presenting it as the Chairman's Report.

5.2. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"When, in the Credentials Committee, the credentials presented by the representatives of the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, Syngman Rhee, and Bonn authorities were being considered, my Delegation expressed the view that those credentials were illegitimate.

1) "The credentials emanating from the Bonn authorities are legally invalid, since the Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany and participation by their representatives in the Conference, in the absence of representatives of the German Democratic Republic, is illegal.

"The decision taken by the Credentials Committee on this matter is wrong and we declared that we disagreed with it.

2) "As regards the credentials submitted by the Kuomintang representatives, the Soviet Delegation has already stated in the Credentials Committee that they were legally invalid, emanating as they did from authorities which do not represent China. Hence my Delegation proposed in that Committee that those credentials should not be recognized.

5.3. "We disagree with the decision taken by the Committee and at this moment, <sup>we</sup> when the Plenary Assembly is considering credentials, we wish emphatically to reiterate our views.

5.4. "Hence the Soviet Delegation hereby proposes that the credentials presented by the Kuomintang representatives should not be recognized, as not emanating from authorities representing China.

3) "When the Credentials Committee was considering the credentials presented by the Bao-Dai and Syngman Rhee representatives, my Delegation stated that those credentials were legally invalid, having been issued by puppet authorities which do not represent Viet-Nam and Korea.

5.5. "We made our proposal in the Committee and we disagree with the decision taken by the Committee. Hence we hereby propose that the credentials presented by the Bao-Dai and Syngman Rhee representatives should not be recognized, as emanating from puppet regimes which do not represent Viet-Nam and Korea."

5.6. The Chairman begged the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics henceforward to refrain from using unsuitable terms such as "Kuomintang representatives" when talking about the delegates of China. The Assembly had already decided that China was legitimately represented at the Conference.

5.7. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, with all due deference to the Chairman, was unable to accept that remark. When the Plenary Assembly had examined that problem, his Delegation had declared its disagreement with the decision taken. The Chinese delegation at the Conference did not really represent China. That fact was well known, and a good many other delegations shared the views of the Soviet Delegation on the subject. Besides, at a meeting of the United Nations Credentials Committee, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had himself declared his inability to recognize the credentials submitted by that delegation. Hence he could do no other than describe the Chinese delegates as Kuomintang representatives.

5.8. The Chairman replied that he himself could do no other than abide by the decisions taken by the Assembly, which had decided that the Chinese delegates present were representatives of China and not representatives of a group of Chinese.

5.9. The Delegate of the United States of America thanked the Chairman of Committee 4 for his report.

5.10. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that, on page 1 of the Report (paragraph 3), Czechoslovakia should be added to the list of countries which had objected to certain credentials.

5.11. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. :

"My Delegation entirely associates itself with the statement made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union, and is of opinion that the Conference cannot recognize the credentials presented by the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, and Syngman Rhee representatives, since those credentials emanate from authorities which do not represent China, Viet-Nam, or Korea. The representatives of the Bonn authorities cannot represent the whole of Germany and hence their participation in this Conference, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is illegitimate.

5.12. "Hence my Delegation supports the proposal made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union, namely, that the credentials presented by the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, and Syngman Rhee representatives be declared null and void."

5.13. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia :

1) "My Delegation considers the credentials presented by the delegates claiming to represent China to be invalid, on the grounds that they are not signed by the Head of the Chinese State, Mr. Mao Tse-Tung, or by Mr. Tchou En-Lai, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

2) "Neither can we recognize the credentials submitted by the Viet-Nam and Korean Delegations, these credentials not having been signed by the appropriate persons in the governments concerned.

3) "We can recognize the credentials presented by the Delegation of the Federal German Republic as valid for a part of German territory only. These credentials cannot be considered valid for the whole of Germany and they do not entitle their holders to speak on behalf of the whole of Germany."

5.14. The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation wholeheartedly supports the statement made by the Soviet Union to the effect that the decisions taken by the Credentials Committee to recognize the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives and of the representatives of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and Syngman Rhee Korea, is illegitimate."

5.15. "My Delegation also wishes to say that the credentials emanating from the Bonn authorities are likewise null and void, since those authorities do not represent the whole of Germany, and since participation in this Conference by their representatives, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is illegitimate."

5.16. The Delegate of Viet-Nam:

"I have listened with scrupulous attention to the statements made by the Delegates of the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. Their objections were the same as those expressed in Committee 2 (Credentials Committee), to wit, that my credentials are invalid for the simple reason that the authorities signing them do not represent Viet-Nam."

5.17. "Now I hasten to say that such statements were judged out of order. Committee 2, by a regular vote, unambiguously decided that my credentials were valid."

5.18. "I hereby pay a well-earned tribute to the impartiality of that Committee, which, neglecting political considerations, limited itself strictly to matters of form, in accordance with its terms of reference."

5.19. "Sir Bertrand Jerram, Chairman of that Committee, laid down the following as a working rule, in accordance with the Convention, which is the basic law of the Union:

5.20. "The Committee's terms of reference are set forth in paragraph 2.2. of the General Regulations, namely, "to examine the credentials of each delegation. Paragraph 2.1 lays down that such credentials are letters signed by the Head of the Government or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Member in question." That is clear. That is definite.

5.21. "Now what form do the Viet-Nam credentials take? Well, they take the form of a letter drafted in French - the diplomatic language par excellence - signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Viet-Nam, the Government of His Majesty Bao-Dai - a sovereign government I have the honour to represent, a government I am proud to represent. The form of my credentials is nothing less than impeccable, and gave rise to no comment. Hence their validity is incontrovertible.

5.22. "Committee 2, I repeat, has already given a ruling at its third meeting. It is my contention, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that this Assembly is not called upon to give another.

5.23. "I believe I have said all that could be said without going beyond the question of the form which credentials are required to take.

5.24. "As regards the question of whether a particular government represents a given country or not, I declare the matter out of order. Regular Membership of the Union for Viet-Nam, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, was settled by a vote in plenary assembly on 9 October, when the Polish proposal was rejected. That vote you all remember, and I shall not revert to it."

5.25. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

"For the reasons already given in Committee 2, my Delegation shares the views of the Soviet Union, namely, that the validity of the credentials presented by the representatives of Kuomintang China, South Korea, and of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam, should not be recognized."

5.26. The Delegate of Korea said that the Republic of Korea had been a sovereign country since 1948. The Koreans were a free people. There was no reason to object to the presence of a delegation from that country. In accordance with Article 1 of the Convention, the Republic of Korea had requested Membership of the Union. The Government of the Republic of Korea was the real government of the country. That country was legally a Member of the I.T.U., and the Plenary Assembly had decided that it should be entitled to be represented at the Conference.

5.27. The Delegate of Pakistan supported what had been said by the previous speaker. It was not for the Conference to decide whether a government did or did not represent a people. All a Credentials Committee had to do was to ensure that the credentials submitted were duly signed by the appropriate persons.

5.28. The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic:

- 1) "In Committee 2, my Delegation queried the validity of the credentials presented by the Delegates of Western Germany, since those Delegates cannot represent the whole of Germany, and in the absence of a delegation from the German Democratic Republic, their credentials cannot be taken into account.
- 2) "My Delegation has queried the credentials submitted by the Chinese Delegation, on the grounds that they are not signed by the Government of the People's Republic of China, the only competent government. Hence we demand that these credentials be not accepted.
- 3) "We have queried the credentials of the so-called Republic of Korea, being of the opinion that they are not signed by properly qualified persons.
- 4) "We have queried the credentials of the Delegates of Viet-Nam because they are signed by a puppet government.

"Hence we support the proposal made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

5.29.     The Delegate of Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories Administered as such:

"My Delegation supports the views advanced by Viet-Nam and Pakistan.

5.30.     "We are entirely persuaded that the present discussion arises out of a completely misconceived idea of the terms of reference of Committee 2.

5.31.     "That Committee had certainly to do no more than examine the validity of credentials. That being so, it will be readily seen that the credentials submitted by the Delegation of Viet-Nam are fully valid. Viet-Nam is a Member of the Union regularly admitted in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2 c) of the Convention, and its admission obtained majority approval at the referendum prescribed in that paragraph. Viet-Nam being a Member of the Union, the Delegation of the State of Viet-Nam here present is provided with credentials in due and proper form, signed by the Government (a Member of the Union) represented by that Delegation. Hence it seems to my Delegation that there is nothing to discuss, and that the Credentials Committee has completed its task. I move that its report be approved."

5.32.     The Delegate of the P.R. of Poland:

"My Delegation took part in the work of Committee 2.

1)        "Committee 2 of course considered the credentials issued to certain persons by the Kuomintang authorities. That is a fact. Those credentials are far from being sufficient to enable anybody to take part in a Plenipotentiary Conference, not having been issued by the Central Government of the People's Republic of China. The Kuomintang does not represent China. It represents nothing but itself, and its representatives must not take part in this Conference.

2)        "We consider that participation in the Conference by representatives of the Bonn authorities, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is incorrect, since the Bonn authorities do not of course represent the whole of Germany.

3) "We also consider that participation by the representatives of South Korea and of Bao-Dai Viet-Nam is illegitimate, their credentials having been signed by authorities which do not in fact represent Korea and Viet-Nam.

5.33. "We support the proposal by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that the credentials presented by the adherents of Bao-Dai and Syngman Rhee be rejected."

5.34. The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic:

"My Delegation has already stated, in Committee 4, that from the legal point of view, acceptance by the Conference of the credentials in question is incorrect. Hence my Delegation shares the views of the Soviet Delegation and supports its proposal."

5.35. The Delegate of the Federal German Republic:

"The Government of the Federal German Republic is a legally constituted Government which, pending unification of Germany, can speak on behalf of Germany and represents the German people in international affairs, particularly vis-à-vis the I.T.U. That Government was set up as the result of free democratic elections. The Federal German Republic has been recognized by the majority of States."

5.36. "Hence there can be no doubt that the credentials signed by that Government are valid as regards the I.T.U., and I thank Committee 2 for its clear and impartial decision."

5.37. The Delegate of China thanked the Chairman for having requested the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. to refrain from using incorrect terms to describe the Chinese Delegation.

He strongly objected to the preposterous allegations made by certain delegations, to the effect that his Delegation did not represent China. The Government of the Republic of China was established in strict conformity with due constitutional process, and was headed by a President freely elected by the Chinese people. The Credentials Committee

had studied the credentials of his Delegation, and having seen that they were signed by the President and counter-signed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and also bore the Grand Seal of the Republic, had agreed that they were in perfectly good and proper form. , Consequently, these credentials were just as valid as those of other delegations. Moreover, since the so-called question of the representation of China had already been discussed in the Plenary Assembly, and since the Plenipotentiary Conference had decided to recognize the Government of the Republic of China as the sole authority entitled to represent China in the I.T.U., the Delegation of China considered it out of order for any delegation to raise the question again in connection with the examination of credentials.

5.38. There was a vote by show of hands on the U.S.S.R. proposal not to recognize the credentials presented by the Delegates of China.

5.39. The Soviet proposal was rejected by 48 votes to 11, with 1 abstention.

5.40. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

"I am now speaking as head of the United Kingdom Delegation. In explanation of the vote of my Delegation on the question of the credentials of the Delegation of China, I should like to make it clear that this vote was concerned only with the question of whether these credentials are in due form, bearing in mind the decision, which was taken by the Plenary Assembly at its first meeting, to postpone consideration of the question of Chinese representation for the duration of this Conference."

5.41. There was a vote by show of hands on the Soviet proposal not to recognize the credentials submitted by the Delegates of Viet-Nam and Korea.

5.42. By 49 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions, the Soviet proposal was rejected.

5.43. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics having said that he had submitted no proposal with regard to the credentials of the Delegation of the Federal German Republic, and had simply made a statement for the minutes, the Chairman ruled that the assembly should vote on the report as a whole.

5.44. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked for a roll-call vote.

5.45. There was a vote by roll-call on the first Report by Committee 2.

For ..... Afghanistan; Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bolivia; Brazil; Kingdom of Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; Chile; China; Republic of Colombia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi; Republic of Korea; Costa Rica; Denmark; Republic of El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; France; Iraq; Ireland; Iceland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Kingdom of Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands; Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Swiss Confederation; Territories of the United States of America; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa; Oriental Republic of Uruguay; United States of Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Yemen; Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions.

Against .... People's Republic of Albania; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Hungarian People's Republic; People's Republic of Poland; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; Czechoslovakia; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstentions .... Republic of Indonesia; Iran.

Did not take part in the vote ..... Egypt; India; Syrian Republic.

5.46. By 54 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions and 3 delegations not taking part in the vote, the first Report by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee (Document No. 197) was approved as a whole.

5.47. The Delegate of Egypt asked that mention should be made in the minutes of the fact that neither Egypt nor Syria had taken part in the vote for want of instructions in the matter.

5.48. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The decision taken by the Conference in connection with the credentials submitted by the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, and Syngman Rhee representatives is illegal and wrong.

5.49. "Further, the representatives of the Bonn authorities cannot represent the whole of Germany. Hence their participation in this Conference, in the absence of representatives from the German Democratic Republic, is illegal."

5.50. "The Delegates of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, and the Roumanian People's Republic asked that the minutes should record the fact that their Delegations entirely supported the statement made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.

5.51. The Delegate of Iraq said that his Government and that of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan did not recognize the State of Israel, and their participation in the Conference did not mean that they recognized that State.

5.52. The Delegate of Spain made the following statement:

"The Delegation of Spain has followed with great interest the debates of this Conference as regards the E.A.R.C. Agreements (Geneva, 1951) and the work of the I.F.R.B. Now that these agreements have been approved by the Plenary Assembly and that the work of the International Frequency Registration Board does not run the risk of being paralyzed but, on the contrary, has been increased so that it may attain the target for which it was created, our Delegation would like to make a statement and request the Chairman to transmit it to the Chairman of the I.F.R.B.

5.53. "Spain, for reasons known to all and that I am not going to analyse, was not present at the Atlantic City Conference where a new Convention was drawn up in replacement of that of Madrid, then in force. For the same reasons, she did not take part either in the High Frequency Broadcasting Conference where the Mexico City basic Plan was adopted.

5.54. "Our Delegation knows that, in spite of our forced absence from these two conferences, many countries including those speaking the Spanish language have done their very best to defend the interests of Spain; we thank them all. However, perhaps because adequate material for judgement was lacking, the interests of Spanish broadcasting were not in fact protected as they should have been in the Mexico City Plan. That was why Spain, when acceding to the Atlantic City Convention, made express reservations on the Mexico City and Copenhagen Plans. "

5.55. "The Chairman will remember that when the E.A.R.C. Agreements were approved by this Assembly, our Delegation made a similar declaration. At the same time, we pointed out that we voted in favour of the proposal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to ratify these agreements because what interests Spain, who has always worked in the interests of the Union, is to achieve constructive work and to try to resolve by technical means the problems raised by the use of the frequency spectrum.

5.56. "We hope that the desire to collaborate advocated by the honourable Delegate of the Netherlands and greeted by the unanimous applause of the Plenary Assembly, can be put into practice.

5.57. "This is why, without insisting on the arguments already propounded in this Conference, such as those relating to the expenses incurred up to the present by the I.F.R.B., the necessity of not interrupting work already started, etc. .... we would like these tasks to be accomplished as soon as possible and with the utmost exactitude within the means at the disposal of the Board. We should be the first to welcome the withdrawal of the reservations that our country is still obliged to maintain.

5.58. "The I.F.R.B. will have to inform the Administrative Council of the I.T.U. at its 1953 Session of the degree of progress attained in the preparation of the high frequency broadcasting plans. It will also have to examine, during its 1955 meeting, the progress achieved during the interim period and recommend a date for the beginning of the first adjustment to the Atlantic City Table of Frequency Allocations, bearing in mind the fact that, for high frequency broadcasting, the putting into force of the revised plan must have been accepted and decided.

5.59. "However, to attain this object, it would be advisable to make as much headway as possible with the revision of the Mexico City Basic Plan, taking into account the up-to-date requirements submitted by the administrations. That is why the Delegation of Spain requests the I.F.R.B.: to take the necessary steps, within the means at its disposal, for the modifications to the Mexico City Basic Plan and the relevant studies to be completed by 31 December 1953. In this way, all the administrations could send in their observations on the new plan for submission to the Administrative Council at its 1954 session.

5.60. "I would be grateful, Mr. Chairman, if you would transmit this request to the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. Our Delegation would like to know the Board's opinion as regards the possibility of accepting this suggestion.

5.61. "We ourselves, in accordance with the E.A.R.C. Agreements (Geneva, 1951) have notified our frequency requirements within the stipulated time-limits. If this plan gave satisfaction to Spanish broadcasting, our administration would study the possibility of leaving its reservations to the Mexico City plan without effect."

5.62. The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. said that the question raised by the Delegate of Spain was quite in conformity with the programme fixed by the I.F.R.B. in the framework of the decisions of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference. The programme as fixed by the Board covered the recommendation of the Delegate of Spain on the revision of the Mexico City Basic Plan for the following year.

5.63. The only point to be stressed was that the I.F.R.B. should have at its disposal all the necessary means to accomplish its work successfully, in other words, adequate staff and supplies.

5.64. The Delegate of Yemen stated that his Government did not recognize the State of Israel and that, consequently, the Delegation of Yemen to the Conference did not recognize the representation of that State.

5.65. The Delegate of the State of Israel declared that the State of Israel was a Member of the I.T.U. and had acceded to the Atlantic City Convention in 1949. The credentials of his Delegation to the

Plenipotentiary Conference had been approved by the Credentials Committee. He therefore considered that the remarks made by the Delegations of Iraq and Yemen were merely of a political nature and consequently should not be taken into consideration.

5.66. The Delegate of Saudi Arabia said that his Government did not recognize the so-called State of Israel and that his vote in favour of document No. 197 merely meant that he approved of the general work performed by the Committee.

The Delegate of Spain requested that the answer of the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. should be included in the minutes and would be happy if a recommendation on the lines of his request were sent to the I.F.R.B.

The Chairman answered that the request of the Delegation of Spain would be included in the minutes along with the answer by Mr. Dellamula, Chairman of the I.F.R.B., who would certainly consider how to comply with it.

The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.

Rapporteur:

G. Tripet

Secretary General:

L. Mulatier

Chairman:

M.A. Andrada

International  
Telecommunication Union

---

Document No. 222-E  
10 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENT No. 210

Concerns only the Spanish text.

International  
Telecommunication Union

---

Document No. 223-E  
10 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENT No. 211

Concerns only the Spanish text.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 9th Meeting

29 October, 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman started by submitting the summary records of previous meetings for approval (Documents Nos. 95 and 96 revised, referring to the 2nd and 3rd meetings of the Committee).

There were two comments on Document No. 95 revised. Paragraph 7 on page 3 should read: "The Delegate of Argentina agreed in principle with this view, but also proposed that a vote be taken on the text of Rule 4, item by item". On page 5, the vote proposed by Oversea France was taken on a proposal by Denmark and not by Oversea France.

As the next to last paragraph of Document No. 96 revised, the Delegate of Argentina proposed inserting the following statement:

"The Delegate of Argentina wished to make it clearly understood that the text under discussion had also been adopted by a technical organ, the E.A.R.C., in its Rules of Procedure, Rule 16 bis, paragraphs 6 and 7, which were read out in full".

RGH/KS  
U.T.  
GENEVE

The Chairman then passed to Rule 15, paragraph 8, subparagraph 3, and recalled that the provision had already been the subject of an exchange of views when the last paragraph of Rule 13 was under discussion. As a result of the discussion various amendments had been suggested, since the Committee thought it advisable to stipulate whether it was for the author of an amendment, the Chairman of the Assembly or the Assembly itself to decide the fate of an amendment.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland then made the following formal proposal for an amendment: "No amendment shall be discussed which, in the view of the Assembly, is incompatible with the original proposal."

The Delegate of Australia seconded this proposal.

The Delegate of Egypt thought it contradictory because if the Assembly was to decide whether it wished for an amendment, it must discuss it, and it would thereby automatically act contrary to the first part of the provision proposed.

The Chairman put to the vote the principle of the United Kingdom proposal. The result was as follows:

For :	31
Against :	0
Abstentions :	9

The United Kingdom proposal was thus adopted.

The Delegations of Belgium and Laos suggested alternative texts which did not change the substance.

The Chairman asked them to form a working group with a view to preparing a final text. A decision on paragraph 3 would be taken later.

The Committee reverted to Document No. 21.

Paragraph 8, sub-paragraph 4 was adopted without discussion.

Rule 15, paragraph 9, would be discussed item by item.

Item 1: The Delegate of Poland proposed the deletion of:  
"unless decided to the contrary".

This proposal was seconded by the Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The Delegates of Uruguay and Argentina thought that deletion would render the provision too rigid.

The Delegate of Argentina, seconded by the United States of America and Brazil, proposed: "unless otherwise decided by the Assembly".

The Chairman put the Polish amendment to the vote.

It was rejected by 26 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

The Argentine amendment was adopted without opposition.

Paragraph 1, put to the vote as a whole, was adopted by:

36 votes for

0 against

7 abstentions.

Paragraph 9, sub-paragraph 2: the Delegate of France approved this provision in substance, but proposed to put it between paragraphs 7 and 8 of Rule 15.

The Chairman said that the matter had also to be considered by the working group.

The sub-paragraph as it stood was adopted nemine contradicente.

Rule 15, paragraph 9, sub-paragraph 3.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia thought that the matter had already been settled adequately in paragraph 6 of Rule 13, and feared that if the provision were applied it would cause a great waste of time. He suggested deleting such a superfluous provision.

The Czech proposal, supported by several delegations, was put to the vote with the following result:

In favour of deletion :	14
Against :	12
Abstentions :	10

Sub-paragraph 3 of paragraph 9 was thus deleted.

The whole of paragraph 9 was then put to the vote and adopted by 38 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

Rule 16 was approved without discussion.

Paragraph 1 of Rule 17 was adopted without discussion.

Paragraph 2 was the subject of comment by the Chairman, who thought that the provision was supposed to be an exact repetition of paragraph 2 of Rule 18, Chapter 6 of the Atlantic City General Regulations, and that differences in wording were only accidental. He therefore proposed that paragraph 2 of Rule 17 should be worded exactly the same as paragraph 2 of Rule 18, Chapter 6 of the Atlantic City General Regulations.

The Delegate of Argentina agreed.

The whole of Rule 17 was then approved unanimously, with paragraph 2 amended to reproduce the wording of the Atlantic City General Regulations.

The Committee then studied Rule 18.

Paragraph 1 was approved without discussion.

The Chairman thought that the reference to 48 hours in paragraph 2 was too imperative. He suggested amending it to read "As soon as possible after distribution...".

The Delegate of Argentina agreed, and the paragraph was referred to the working group for redrafting.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Rule 18 were approved without discussion.

The Delegate of Oversea France proposed that Rule 18 should include a provision to the effect that a speaker wishing to hand in the text of his statement should announce the fact before speaking, out of consideration for the reporter.

The Committee agreed, and the working group was asked to prepare a text in line with the proposal.

#### Rule 19.

There being no comments, this Rule was approved unanimously.

The Delegate of Brazil nevertheless reserved the right to revert to the question when the time came to study the Rules of Procedure for inclusion in the General Regulations.

#### Rule 20.

The Delegate of the Biellorussian S.S.R. thought that it was not made sufficiently clear in paragraph 1 that the Chairman must consult the Assembly before approving the summary records.

The Delegate of Argentina was prepared to follow that procedure, but thought that the text under discussion was quite clear.

The Delegate of Oversea France thought that since it was desirable to approve the summary records of a meeting at the next meeting, it would be preferable to have some more precise wording than "As a general rule".

The text was thereupon referred back to the working group for its final draft.

Paragraph 2,2: The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic said that only the minutes of the last plenary meeting should be approved by the Chairman.

After some discussion, it was decided to modify the text as follows : "The minutes of the last plenary meeting.....".

Subject to preparation of a final draft for paragraph 1,1, Rule 20 was then unanimously adopted.

Rule 21 was adopted without discussion.

Rule 22: The Delegate of France thought that this provision curtailed the rights of the Editorial Committee, and proposed that it be deleted.

The Delegate of Egypt pointed out that something similar already appeared in the General Regulations.

The French proposal was then put to the vote and rejected by 35 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

Rule 22, was then put to the vote as a whole and adopted by 45 votes to 0, with 1 abstention.

Rules 23, 24, and 25 were adopted without discussion.

Rule 26:

The Delegate of Italy, seconded by the Delegates of Australia and Brazil, proposed that the word "delegate" be replaced by "members of delegations", so that attachés, interpreters and secretaries of delegations would be covered.

It was decided that the Italian Delegate would help the working group to draft an adequate text.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic explained that in inviting governments, his administration was intending to offer franking privileges not only to the delegates mentioned in Rule 26; but also to all members of delegations. However, in order not to create a formal precedent which might be invoked at future conferences, his Administration had used the word "delegate" which appeared in the General Regulations.

It was decided to make mention in the minutes of the meeting of how grateful the Committee was for the generous interpretation given by Argentina to that provision.

The Delegate of Argentina, as Chairman of the Working Group, then submitted the draft text prepared by the group for Rules 14 and 15 (paragraphs 1.3 and 3). Those texts had just been distributed.

The Chairman then opened discussion on Rule 14, which ran as follows:

"Rule 14

RIGHT OF VOTE

1. At all meetings of the Conference, each Member of the Union shall be entitled to one vote, in accordance with Article 1 of the Convention.
2. A delegation representing a Member of the Union which has expressed a wish to take part in the Conference shall exercise the right to vote:
  - a) Provisionally, from the moment it begins to take part in the work of the Conference;
  - b) Definitively, from the moment the Plenary Assembly has recognised the validity of its credentials.
3. The Credentials Committee shall present its findings within the period specified by the Plenary Assembly.
4. Should the Plenary Assembly decline to recognize the validity of the credentials presented by a delegation, the delegation concerned shall lose the right to vote from that moment.

5. A duly accredited delegation may authorize another duly accredited delegation to represent it and vote on its behalf at one or more meetings which it cannot attend. In such circumstances, it shall inform the Chairman of the Conference.

6. In no case may a delegation exercise more than one proxy vote."

The Delegate of Egypt made two comments:

1) Paragraph 4 made no provision for the case of a delegation the credentials of which had been queried and had subsequently been brought into line with requirements.

2) No mention was made of the form to be taken by credentials.

There was some discussion, and the Delegates of Argentina, Egypt, Brazil and France spoke; it was decided that the Working Group should reconsider paragraph 4 with an eye to the first comment made by the Delegate of Egypt. Similarly, the Working Group would consider the best way of embodying in the Rules of Procedure a provision similar to that of Chapter 3, paragraph 2.1 of the General Regulations.

The text of Rule 14 was then adopted without opposition, subject to a rewording of paragraph 4.

As regards Rule 15, the Working Group submitted the following text:

"Rule 15

VOTES

1. Definition of a majority

Add a sub-paragraph 3) as follows:

"The Delegations present which do not take part in a particular vote or expressly declare their unwillingness to take part therein, shall not be considered absent when the quorum is being determined, nor shall they be considered as having abstained for the purposes of paragraph 3 of this Rule."

3. Abstentions of more than fifty per cent.

Read as follows:

"If the number of abstentions exceeds half the number of votes (for, against, abstentions), the matter shall be reconsidered at a subsequent meeting, at which time abstentions shall not be taken into consideration."

This text gave rise to no comment and was adopted.

Reporters:

A. Wolf  
G.R. Brandon  
S.J.M. Penas

Chairman:

I. Tsingovatorov

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 10th meeting

30 October 1952

Chairman: Mr. Igor Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman opened the meeting and commented on the progress made to date. From a communication received from the Argentine Delegation, it appeared that the Working Group had not made sufficient progress to be able to submit to the Committee the final texts it had been instructed to draw up. The Working Group would have to be given the time to finish, after which the Committee might conceivably meet once or twice to run through Document No. 21 for the last time.

The Committee agreed to this procedure.

The Chairman thereupon passed to Rule 13, paragraph 11, which had been left in abeyance until Rule 15, paragraph 8, had been discussed.

There was a discussion covering more or less the ground covered at the 6th meeting of the Committee. Several amendments and counter-amendments were submitted by the Delegations of Egypt, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Argentine Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Brazil, but nothing really new emerged.

Eventually the Committee gave its attention to an amendment submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and completed by Brazil, as follows:

"Any motion may be withdrawn by its proposer before it has been put to the vote. Any motion, whether amended or not, once withdrawn, may be re-submitted by the author of the amendment or by any other delegation."

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic agreed to the amendment in principle, but reserved the right to consider the text more closely in the Working Group.

The above text, submitted by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and completed by Brazil, was put to the vote and adopted, as follows:

For . . . . . 15 .

Against . . . . . 8

Abstentions . . 17

The meeting was then closed so that the Working Group could get on with the study of the points left in abeyance.

Reporters:

A. Wolf

G.H. Brandon

S.J.M. Penas

Chairman:

Igor Tsingovatov

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 226-E  
17 November, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 11th meeting

31 October, 1952.

Chairman : Mr. I. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman opened the meeting by reviewing the progress made by the Committee. He suggested the creation of a working group to draft new texts for the definitions (Annex 2 to the Convention) on which proposals had been submitted. The proposal was supported by the Argentine Delegation. The Committee made no objections and the working group was formed as follows : France (Chairmanship), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Italy, Bielorussian S.S.R., Belgium, Australia, New Zealand, Czechoslovakia, Japan, Mexico.

The Chairman read out and handed over to the working group the text of its terms of reference, setting forth what it had to do and how long it had to do it. He also mentioned that the definitions for which Members of the Union had not presented amendments would have to stay as they were.

The Delegate of France was grateful for the honour conferred on his Delegation and nominated Mr. Doublet as chairman of the working group.

The Chairman requested the Committee to state if they had any objections to make as regards Document No. 118 (summary record of the 4th meeting of the Committee). No objection being made, the document was approved.

The Chairman went on to examine working document No. 178, which contained the working group's proposals for all the provisions which were in abeyance. In their great majority, these provisions were adopted without discussion. Differences subsisted as regards the following :



Rule 14

A discussion ensued, principally between the Chairman, Argentine, U.S.S.R., Egypt, United States of America, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France. The question was whether paragraph 2, Chapter III of the Atlantic City General Regulation was sufficient or whether a difference should be made between credentials for discussing and voting on proposals and credentials for the signature of final acts. The Chairman and the U.S.S.R. did not deny that a difference could be envisaged for future conferences but considered that the Buenos Aires Conference should be governed entirely by the Atlantic City provisions as it had been convoked under them.

Other Delegations considered rather the practical side of the question and joined the point of view of the majority of the working group.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considered that if Chapter 3 of the General Regulations were rigidly interpreted the views of the U.S.S.R. Delegation were correct. Since other parts of Chapter 3 had not been followed exactly, it was a matter of regret that the U.S.S.R. and certain other delegations had insisted on a rigid interpretation of this point but in view of this lack of unanimity the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland would abstain on any vote on this question.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. declared he had no objections to make to the proposal of the working group, if the Committee agreed to place at the beginning of the text of the working group the terms of paragraph 2.1, of Chapter III of the General Regulations.

Put to the vote, this proposal was rejected by 26 votes against, 7 in favour and 7 abstentions.

The text of the working group, put to the vote in its turn, was adopted by 30 votes in favour, 6 against and 4 abstentions.

Rule 24

The Delegate of Belgium proposed to complete the text as follows: ".....signed by the Head of the State, by the Head of the Government or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs....."

The Rule thus amended was adopted by 32 votes in favour, 8 against and 4 abstentions.

Rule 15, paragraph 6 bis.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. wished the text to indicate clearly that the Chairman was obliged to admit the explanations given by the delegations on their votes, if they so desired. The English word "shall" was exact, and the other texts should conform to it. The French and Spanish texts should conform to the English version.

Put to the vote, this interpretation was unanimously accepted.

Rule 15, paragraph 7.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland pointed out an error in the text and proposed the following change: "Those parts of a proposal which have been adopted shall then be put to the vote together."

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic agreed, but suggested that the text be slightly changed.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., supported by the Delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. proposed an amendment by which any delegation could ask that a proposal be divided.

Put to the vote, the amendment of the U.S.S.R. was rejected by 22 votes against, 7 in favour and 7 abstentions.

The text suggested by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Argentine Republic was adopted without opposition.

The text of the working group, amended, was then put to the vote and adopted by 26 votes in favour, 6 against and 7 abstentions.

Rule 20, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph 2.

The Delegate of France received satisfaction on a point raised by him in connection with the French text.

The Chairman said that the examination of working document No. 178 was finished. In the report that he would submit to the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, he would point out the considerable amount of work done by the Committee and by the working group.

The Regulations that had been discussed in detail would then have to be approved as a whole by the Committee, after which they would be sent to the Plenary Assembly with the minimum delay. The working group made up of the Argentine Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and France would draft the document which the Committee would examine as a whole.

The Committee approved this procedure.

Reporters:

A. Wolf

S.J.M. Penas

G.R. Brandon

Chairman:

I. Tsingovator

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 12th Meeting

4 November, 1952

Chairman : Mr. I. A. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman submitted for approval the summary records of preceding meetings, on which the following comments were made :

Document No. 147 (5th Meeting)

Page 4, the vote on approval of paragraph 5 was 37 votes for and not 34. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. wanted the following amendments :

Document No. 147, page 1, paragraph 2 :

3rd line from the top, delete "and" ;

4th line from the top, add, after the word "Committees" the words "and Working Groups".

The Delegate of Oversea France proposed that the last on page 2 be replaced by the following :



" The Delegate of Oversea France said that the amendment voted by the Committee in connection with paragraph 3 (on the distinction to be made between procedural proposals and points of order) was based on what he had previously said.

" Hence he was perfectly content with the new text prepared by the Delegations of Argentina, Lebanon and France. He supported the text and thanked those Delegations most warmly."

The Document thus amended was approved.

Document No. 151 (6th Meeting).

The Delegate of the Ukrainian wanted the following amendment :

In the statement attributed to him, after the words: "delete the rest of the sentence", add: "that is, the words: provided that no amendments have been presented to this proposal."

Thus amended, the document was approved.

Document No. 159 (7th Meeting) approved without discussion.

Document No. 160 (8th Meeting)

The Delegate of Brazil wanted the 6th, 7th, and 8th paragraphs on page 2 (in connection with a statement by Uruguay) to be shifted to page 3 and inserted after the Chairman's first statement.

The document thus amended was adopted.

The Chairman then turned to Document No. 171, which constituted a revised and completed addition, produced by the Working Group, of Document No. 21. He paid tribute to the zeal displayed by the Working Group and the speed with which it had performed its task, and expressed his gratitude.

He, and several Delegates, pointed out the existence of certain discrepancies in the different languages, which would have to be put right.

The Delegate of Argentina, submitting Document No. 171, pointed out a few shortcomings due to the speed with which the work had been done. He thanked the Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for its assistance and expressed his great satisfaction at the harmony and friendship which had characterized the group's activities.

The Document was discussed paragraph by paragraph, and gave rise to the following comments :

The title of the Document should be, not: "Rules of Procedure of the Conference", but: "Rules of Procedure of the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference."

Rule 10.

Paragraph 1 : After a short discussion, it was decided to add: "They may also be handed to the Secretariat of the Conference for publication and distribution".

Paragraph 5 : There was no objection to changing: "and may be allowed" to: "and shall be allowed."

Rule 13, paragraph 11.

After the words: "taken up", include: "by the author of the amendment or" which the Working Group had deleted for the sake of simplicity.

Rule 15, paragraph 8,1.

"May be divided" should read "shall be divided".

Rule 17, paragraph 2:

It was agreed that the 2nd paragraph of Rule 18 of the Atlantic City General Regulations, Chapter 6, would be reproduced word for word in this paragraph, but that it should be remembered that the provision dealt only with the Convention and General Regulations, although the other Regulations were also mentioned therein.

Detailed discussion on Document No.171 being completed, there was then a debate on the Rules of Procedure as a whole.

The Delegate of Norway said that although it might seem that there were no loopholes in Document No.171, no Rules of Procedure could possibly cover all eventualities. To save time, the Chairman might propose to the Plenary Assembly that the Rules of Procedure, once adopted for the Conference, should be embodied as they stood in the General Regulations.

The Chairman said that the above opinion would be duly noted.

However, the Rules appearing in Document No.171 were designed only for that particular Plenipotentiary Conference and hence could not just be inserted in the General Regulations. When the Committee came to consider Chapter 6 of the General Regulations, it could use a series of provisions from Document No.171.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland thought that time could be gained if Document No.171 were considered at the same time as all the proposals submitted in connection with the General Regulations. Delegations could then withdraw those of their proposals rendered superfluous by Document No.171.

The Chairman urged all Delegations to consider their proposals, and, if they were no longer required, to withdraw them, informing the Secretariat to that effect or making a statement to the Committee.

That would facilitate the future work of the Committee.

The Delegate of Argentina:

"My Delegation, representing a Member of the Union, has proposed some Rules of Procedure for this Conference and wishes specifically to put on record that Document No.171, just approved, constitutes a code of work providing ample safeguards for the right of all Members of the I.T.U. to express their views both fully and freely.

"None of the Rules in this document in any sense restrict the rights of delegations. On the contrary, they ensure that debates will be both orderly and expeditious, to the advantage of all, so that all may enjoy the same rights without the possibility of them being abused to the detriment of all.

"As regards the second point, my Delegation is happy to agree with the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, whose proposal is none other than that which my Delegation was intending to submit. Hence my Delegation hereby withdraws the proposals contained in Document No.171, and urges all other Delegations to do likewise, in the interests of succinctness."

The Delegate of France warmly thanked the Delegation of Argentina for the work it had done in preparing the draft Rules of Procedure.

The Delegate of Brazil, and the Delegate of Lebanon, associated themselves with the French Delegation and asked that the Chairman's report to the Plenary Assembly should mention how grateful the Committee was to the Argentine Delegation.

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia said he could not vote in favour of Rules of Procedure requiring the support of four Delegations for a request that a secret ballot be taken.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., thereupon:

"The draft Rules of Procedure submitted for approval by Committee 4 in Document No.171, contain a series of provisions designed to limit discussion and making it difficult for Members of the Union to freely express their views on the matters under discussion.

"Thus, in Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7, provision is made for the order in which a whole series of so-called procedural proposals are to be considered - proposals for the suspension and adjournment of meetings, and the suspension and adjournment of discussion. Paragraph 8 lays down time limits for speeches.

"Now these paragraphs are not designed to facilitate free discussion in which all delegations could freely and fully set forth the opinions of the countries (Members of the Union) which they represent. They are, on the contrary, designed by all possible means to hamper such discussion. Such a state of affairs runs counter to normal democratic procedure and is not in keeping with the traditions of the International Telecommunication Union. There is a real danger that certain delegations might attempt to use these provisions to the detriment of the interests of other delegations. Hence my Delegation has submitted several amendments designed to eliminate those provisions restricting discussion. Since the Committee has not accepted those amendments, we consider the draft Rules of Procedure contained in Document No.171 unacceptable.

"Rule 14, paragraph 1, does not specifically indicate that participants in the Plenipotentiary Conference must have credentials signed by the Head of the Government or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, as required by Chapter 3, paragraph 2 (1) of the General Regulations, and thus admits varying interpretations of that paragraph, which in future may lead to superfluous discussions.

"My Delegation considers that Rules of Procedure restricting the natural rights of delegations and containing provisions which run counter to the General Regulations, are unacceptable.

"Hence my Delegation will vote against approval of the draft Rules of Procedure as set forth in Document No.171.

"The above views must also appear in the Chairman's report to the Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic:

"During discussion on the draft Rules of Procedure submitted by the Delegation of Argentina, my Delegation has repeatedly protested against the limits set in Rules 13 and 14, and in several paragraphs, on freedom of discussion.

"My Delegation cannot accept this, and will vote against adoption of the draft Rules of Procedure appearing in Document No.171."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation disagrees with the draft Rules of Procedure for this Plenipotentiary Conference, as set forth in Document No.171.

"In these draft Rules there are several paragraphs directly or indirectly restricting freedom of discussion - for example, Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and some others.

"My Delegation does not agree with these restrictive Rules and paragraphs.

"The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union meets once every five years and delegates arrive from all the ends of the earth, and hence they cannot be deprived of the right fully and freely to express their views and make their suggestions when the basic acts of the Union are being revised and when other important items on the agenda are being considered.

"Hence my Delegation will vote against these draft Rules of Procedure.

"We would ask that these views appear in the report to the Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia, for his part, declared:

"The Rules of Procedure (Document No.171, based on Document No.21) have been discussed for nearly three weeks, because of the provisions therein limiting discussion. We wish to point out that those three weeks would not have been lost if such provisions had not been included in the Document, even had there been more ample discussion of the very important questions facing this Conference.

"My Delegation could agree to many of the Rules in Document No.171, but cannot support the Document as a whole.

"We cannot agree with the Delegate of Norway, namely, that the Document should be adopted as it stands, in the shape of an Annex to the General Regulations."

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria:

"During discussion relative to the adoption of Rules of Procedure for this Conference, my Delegation has repeatedly objected to texts limiting the right of delegations freely to participate in discussions. It more particularly objected to Rule 13, paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

"These restrictions, we feel, run counter to the democratic principles on which this Union is based. Further, these restrictions are unjustified in so far as we meet but once every five years, arriving with instructions from our Governments; we should have the possibility of explaining, freely and fully, our views on any question of concern to us.

"Hence my Delegation cannot accept the draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference prepared by Committee 4, as a whole, and reserves the right to revert to the question in Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of Argentina thanked the Delegations of Brazil, France, and of other countries, for their high praise; his Delegation was very happy to have been able to prepare the ground, trying to bear in mind the various points of view, proposals and suggestions submitted.

The Chairman:

"At this point, I feel called upon to explain the Chairman's views in connection with the draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference, as prepared by the Committee.

"These draft regulations, besides some necessary provisions, also contain several provisions (in Rule 13 and elsewhere) which not only do not facilitate discussion, but make it more difficult. A careful perusal of these draft Rules shows that they contain a whole series of provisions designed to interrupt discussion or to suspend it, and to interrupt or close meetings. Furthermore, the Rules do not even allow such proposals to be considered, by specifying that they shall be put to the vote forthwith. Such provisions make it difficult for Members of the Union freely to examine the points at issue.

"The aim of this Conference is to reach agreed decisions in connection with the revision of the Convention and of the General Regulations, and other major items of the Agenda.

"However, this method - the only reasonable one in reality - is replaced in Document No. 171 by the procedure of the vote. It may well be that some delegations will attempt to invoke the Rules of Procedure to settle matters not by discussion, but by use of the voting machine.

"Hence, as Chairman, I consider that the provisions restricting discussion should be excluded from the draft Rules of Procedure in the interests of the International Telecommunication Union itself, the Members of which are called upon to reach decisions by agreement and cooperation."

The Chairman then put Document No. 171 to the vote as a whole, with the following results:

For :	36
Against :	9
Abstention :	1

Hence Committee 4 adopted the draft Rules of Procedure appearing in Document No. 171.

Thereupon, the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation has to state that the draft Rules of Procedure for the I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference (Document No. 171) contain several irregular provisions designed to restrict discussion, which constitutes an infringement of the rights enjoyed by Union Members.

"Hence my Delegation has voted against Document No. 171, and reserves the right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation disagrees with the decision taken by the Committee.

"The draft Rules of Procedure for this Conference, approved by the Committee, contain several Rules and paragraphs directly or indirectly restricting freedom of discussion and hence not conducive to the successful settlement of the problems with which this Conference is faced.

"We reserve the right to revert to this matter in Plenary Assembly. Would you, Mr. Chairman, kindly make reference in your report to the Plenary Assembly of the views expressed by us, and include this statement in the minutes?"

The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic, supporting, also reserved the right to revert in Plenary Assembly, to the question of freedom of discussion.

The Chairman, closing the meeting, said that the next meeting would be devoted to consideration of the General Regulations.

Reporters:

A. Wolf  
A.R. Brandon  
S.J.M. Penas

Chairman:

I. Tsingovatov

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 228-E

17 november 1952

COMMITTEE 7

Memorandum by the representatives of the United Nations

UNITED NATIONS TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1) The United Nations representatives present the attached memorandum for use as a background paper in connection with the discussion of the question whether paid telegraph traffic of the specialized agencies may be carried over the United Nations telecommunication network.

2) In the light of the views expressed by the Administrative Council at its seventh session, the Secretary-General of the United Nations no longer desires to offer the facilities of the United Nations telecommunication system to the specialized agencies at specified rates as originally suggested. He believes, however, that some arrangement should be made for the sharing of costs by the specialized agencies for their traffic carried over that part of the network owned and operated by the United Nations. In the first place the adoption of some such arrangement would be in keeping with practices already adopted for mutual settlement between the United Nations and the specialized agencies for common services. Secondly, some method of charging imposes an element of control which would be lacking were the traffic to be carried free, and makes allowance for differences in membership and budgetary contributions. The Secretary-General therefore, considers that since the United Nations and the specialized agencies may properly be considered as participating in the same or correlated type of undertaking, it would be appropriate if the traffic of the specialized agencies were to be carried at a charge equal to the prorata proportion of the costs of operating, according to the traffic carried.

3) Based on the traffic figures for the period March-August 1952 the total annual traffic of the specialized agencies carried over the United Nations network, including the New York-Geneva rented circuit, amounts to six percent of the whole (1,500.000 words) and the estimated cost if carried at LT and press rates would be approximately \$11,500.

Annex: 1



A N N E X

UNITED NATIONS TELECOMMUNICATIONS

I. HISTORICAL

1. In the following historical section an attempt has been made to touch upon the salient pertinent facts in the development of the telecommunication systems of the League of Nations and of the United Nations.

2. In June 1930, an agreement 1) was signed between the Secretary-General of the League of Nations and the Swiss Federal Council covering the establishment and operation in the neighbourhood of Geneva of a short-wave transmitting and receiving station - the property of the League of Nations, and a similar long-wave station, and a central telegraph office - the property of Radio Suisse. These stations, known collectively as "Radio Nations", were established primarily to satisfy the needs of the League in normal times and to ensure that it had independent communications in times of crisis. During normal times these radio stations were to be operated by Radio Suisse, with the League of Nations collecting the total revenue resulting from the transmission of official communications, without the help of the Swiss Government, and sharing with Radio Suisse any profits arising from the operation of the stations proportionately to the revenue from official and non-official communications sent with the help of the Swiss Government. The Secretary-General of the League was to notify the Swiss Government of the existence of a period of emergency, after which notification Radio Nations was to pass immediately under the exclusive control and operation of the League and was to be used primarily for the despatch and receipt of official communications. The agreement further stated: "It is understood that, as regards the official communications of the League of Nations, the Radio Nations station shall not be deemed to be a party to the Telegraph Union as coming under the Swiss Confederation; nor as regards the installations which are the property of the League of Nations, shall it be a party to the Radio-Telegraphic Union as coming under the Swiss Confederation."

---

1) Document No. C. 191 M. 91.1930 VIII-VIII Transit 1930.VIII.2.

3. As a result of the outbreak of World War II, the operations of Radio Nations practically ceased after 1939, and in 1942 the equipment was handed over to Cie Radio Suisse.

4. In 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations at its first session decided<sup>1)</sup> that the United Nations might negotiate toward establishing at its Headquarters any type of installation which it deemed necessary for the purpose of its work, and in particular might establish its own radio telegraph sending and receiving stations, including broadcasting, teletype, and telephoto services. The United Nations was to make arrangements with the International Telecommunication Union with regard to wavelengths and other similar matters.

5. In 1947 an agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America provided<sup>2)</sup> for the establishment at the United Nations Headquarters of short-wave radio broadcasting and telecommunication facilities, including a point-to-point link between Headquarters and Geneva. The agreement stated that United Nations would make arrangements for the operation of the services referred to with the I.T.U. and with the appropriate agencies of the Government of the United States and of other affected governments with regard to frequencies and similar matters.

6. A comprehensive plan covering broadcasting and telecommunications by the Secretary-General was prepared for the third session of the General Assembly in 1948, and the following resolution (No. 240(III)) was adopted:

"The General Assembly

approves in principle the establishment of a United Nations telecommunications system;

reaffirms the United Nations position as an operating agency in the field of international telecommunications and calls upon all Member Governments to support at all international telecommunications

---

1) Resolution 22 (1) B Sect. 7.

2) Resolution 169 (II), Sect. 4.

conferences the requirements of the United Nations for frequencies and services envisaged in the report of the Advisory Committee on United Nations Telecommunications;

authorizes the Secretary-General to present to the General Assembly at its regular session of 1950 such recommendations as he deems necessary to establish a United Nations telecommunications system."

7. In 1950, a modified plan calling for broadcasting transmitters but relying for the time being on commercial carriers for point-to-point communications was approved<sup>1)</sup> by the General Assembly.

8. At the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris in 1951, the Secretary-General of the United Nations explained that it had been found possible to establish United Nations links between local telecommunication networks established in Palestine, Kashmir and in other areas, and a report on these developments was noted<sup>2)</sup> by the General Assembly.

## II. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE I.T.U. IN THE MATTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS TELECOMMUNICATION NETWORK

9. Relations between the United Nations and the I.T.U. are governed by an agreement similar to the agreements which the United Nations has entered upon with other specialized agencies. In addition to the standard clauses, however, there is a special and unique relationship in respect of the United Nations telecommunication operating services. It has been agreed that these are in a position analagous to that of governmental or private telecommunication operating services. This relationship finds expression in Article XVI<sup>3)</sup> of the Agreement between the United Nations and the Union which is quoted below for convenience of reference.

---

1) Resolution 460 (V) and Doc. A/1454.

2) Resolution 588 (VI) and Doc. A/1919.

3) Formerly Article XV.

- "1. The Union recognizes that it is important that the United Nations shall benefit by the same rights as the Members of the Union for operating telecommunication services.
  2. The United Nations undertakes to operate the telecommunication services under its control in accordance with the terms of the International Telecommunication Convention and the regulations annexed thereto.
  3. The precise arrangements for implementing this article shall be dealt with separately".
10. The Atlantic City Convention, Article 26, para.2, states that "in accordance with the provisions of Article XVI<sup>1)</sup> of the above-mentioned agreement, the telecommunication operating services of the United Nations shall be entitled to the rights and bound by the obligations of this Convention and of the Regulations annexed thereto."
11. Various arrangements for implementing Article XVI in accordance with the provisions for paragraph 3 thereof have been made from time to time. The Atlantic City Conference adopted a resolution admitting the telecommunication operating services of the United Nations in an advisory capacity to the deliberations of the Provisional Frequency Board. Arrangements have also been made through correspondence between the Secretariats of the two organizations, and the question of the United Nations network has been considered by the Administrative Council of the Union at various sessions.
12. The question appeared on the agenda of the second session but was postponed to the third session, to which the Secretary-General of the Union submitted the text of Section 4 (dealing with telecommunication services established and worked by the United Nations at or near its Headquarters) of the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America (Doc. No. 150/CA3)<sup>2)</sup>. Para.5) b) of Section 4 has a special interest for the Union and is worked as follows:

---

1) Subsequently Article XVI.

2) See paragraph 6 of the present memorandum.

(Ann.to Doc.228-E)

"b) The United Nations shall make arrangements for the operation of the services referred to in this section with the International Telecommunication Union, the appropriate agencies of the Government of the United States and the appropriate agencies of other affected governments with regard to all frequencies and similar matters."

13. The Administrative Council duly noted the Document No.150/CA3 and adopted resolution No. 107.

14. The sixth session of the Council had before it a comprehensive document (826/CA6) on the question. The substance of the historical part of this document, brought up-to-date, forms Section I of the present study. The document also gave an outline of the plan for a network resulting from the decisions of the General Assembly in 1950, and this plan, brought up-to-date, forms Section III of the present study.

15. At the sixth session, the representative of the United Nations gave detailed information regarding the point-to-point services of the United Nations and indicated that these services might be further developed after certain studies had been made. The Council recommended that the United Nations should be invited to present their requests for frequencies to the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference.

16. The seventh session of the Council had before it Document No. 1193/CA7, dealing with an offer by the United Nations to carry, against reimbursement, telegraph traffic of the specialized agencies over the United Nations telecommunication network. In answer to comments made in Document No. 1193/CA7, the United Nations representatives explained that the Organization was anxious to abide by the provisions of the Convention and Regulations and was prepared to suspend the arrangement for reimbursement in respect of traffic carried, pending an examination of the question by the Plenipotentiary Conference, meeting in Buenos Aires. Accordingly, for the time being no reimbursement is being required for the specialized agencies for such messages as may be

carried for them on the United Nations telecommunications network to or from points on that network except in respect of the Geneva-New York teleprinter service.

17. This section would be incomplete without reference to Resolution No. 149 entitled "International Collaboration in the field of telecommunication" adopted by the Administrative Council of the Union at its fourth session, which emphasized the need for co-ordination on the national as well as the international level.

### III. UNITED NATIONS TELECOMMUNICATIONS AS AT PRESENT OPERATED

#### A. Point-to-point network.

18. The emphasis of the Covenant of the League of Nations in guaranteeing the peace was placed largely upon action by Members conducting themselves as individual States in accordance with recommendations of the League (Articles 10, 15, 16). The Charter of the United Nations places much greater emphasis upon the position of the United Nations as an organization having its own separate juridical personality with primary responsibility for prompt and effective action for the maintenance of international peace and security being conferred on the Security Council, which is so organized as to be able to function continuously (Articles 24, 28). The United Nations has, in fact, intervened as an organization in a number of regions where peace has been endangered and in pursuance of its objectives has found it necessary to set up local communications systems, firstly in July 1948 in Palestine where communications had broken down in the area after the mandate was relinquished by the mandatory power and active warfare had begun. It was also necessary to arrange for external communications from the Palestine area to New York, and arrangements were made with Mackay Radio to accept United Nations traffic through their Tangier office.

19. In the same year, a similar network was set up in Greece for U.N.S.C.O.B., as local telegraph facilities were inadequate to maintain dependable communications between military observers on the northern frontier and the Headquarters of the Committee. In 1949, when a strike of telegraphic employees occurred in Greece, it was found necessary to inter-connect the two networks and send United Nations cables to New York via Palestine and Tangier.

(Ann. to Doc. 228-B)

20. In 1950, the need arose for communications between military observers and Headquarters when the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan was made responsible for supervising the truce line in Kashmir. In November 1950 contact was made between the radio network in the India/Pakistan area and the radio station in Jerusalem. The three missions were thus able to inter-communicate and, in the interest of economy and expediency, it was possible to file their traffic with New York via Tangier.

21. Following the establishment by the General Assembly of U.N.C.O.K. and the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, it was thought necessary to supply radio personnel for communications within Korea and eventually, owing to difficulties in communications between Korea and points outside it, contact was attempted between Pusan and Rawalpindi. This did not prove successful, owing to the low-powered equipment available and the local terrain around Pusan. Subsequently, it was decided to attempt to transmit from Pusan to Bangkok. This proved successful and, in addition, routing traffic via Bangkok made it possible to offer service to E.C.A.F.E. and U.N.I.C.E.F. It was thus possible for the United Nations to route all its traffic to and from Korea, the India/Pakistan area, the Palestine area, and Greece through one channel, namely Tangier.

22. It then became obvious that if a radio station could be opened in Geneva, the Organization could route its traffic via the European Office, and the Geneva-New York radio teleprinter circuit was established, with consequent substantial financial savings.

Recently it has been possible to establish direct communications between Pusan and Rawalpindi and consideration is being given to closing the Bangkok station.

23. Apart from traffic which moves over the above point-to-point network owned and operated by United Nations, all traffic of the Organization is sent via commercial channels, amongst which is the above-mentioned radio circuit between New York and Geneva, leased jointly from the Radio Corporation of America and Radio Suisse, normally for a period of 90 minutes each day.

24. In columns 4 a) and 4 b) of Appendix 1 is shown a list of radio telegraph circuits operated by stations owned by the United Nations, as of 1 June 1952.

25. The foregoing shows the present situation with regard to the point-to-point network. The Secretary-General of the United Nations believes that this situation should not be considered as permanent since, as matters stand at present the network of United Nations stations, as described above, is to continue only as long as the stations are required for missions concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security or other international action of an urgent character in the areas where they are situated. As conditions change, it may be possible to withdraw some of these or be necessary to establish others. As regards the New York-Geneva circuit, arrangements could be made to take steps in pursuance of the agreement mentioned in paragraph 6 above.

B. Broadcasting

26. The broadcasting service has been maintained by the use of transmitter facilities made available by Member Governments and supplemented by services leased from commercial carriers.

- 10 -  
(Ann.to Doc.228-E)

A P P E N D I X I

UNITED NATIONS

POINT TO POINT

STATIONS

-----

Assigned Frequency in Kos	Date of Notifica- tion	Date of Putting into Service	Call Sign	Name and Country Geographical Position	Area with which Communication is Established	Class of Station and Nature of Service	Class and Band Width of Emission	Description of Transmission	Power in Kw.	Maximum Hours of Use in GMT
1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	5	6	7	8	10
3192.5 4870 7602.5 9122.5 9157 10145 14582 15827 17565 19870	19/3 1947	March 1947	4 UN	Jerusalem, Palestine 31° 45' N 35° 13' E	Tangier Greece India/Pak Geneva	Fixed	A1 A3 F1	On-Off f.s.k. Morse	.5	20.00 - 04.00 24 Hours 04.00 - 20.00 18.00 - 05.00 18.00 - 05.00 14.00 - 03.00 05.00 - 17.00 04.00 - 18.00 04.00 - 15.00 07.00 - 18.00
3192.5	14/3 1947	March 1951	4 UNB	Beirut, Lebanon 33° 50' N 35° 30' E	Palestine Area	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off Morse	.1	20.00 - 04.00
			4 UNC	Customs House, Syria 33° 01' N 35° 40' E	Palestine Area	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off Morse	.1	
4870		May 1952	4 UNG	Gaza, Palestine 31° 31' N 34° 28' E	Palestine Area	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off Morse	.1	24 Hours
			4 UNE	El Auja Palestine 30° 53' N 34° 27' E	Palestine Area	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off Morse	.1	
7602.5		March 1947	4 UNA	Amman, Transjordan 31° 56' N 35° 55' E	Palestine	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off Morse	.5	04.00 - 20.00
7587 9157 14582 19870	19/3 1947	April 1952	4 UGS	Salonika, Greece 40° 38' N 22° 56' E	Geneva Jerusalem Greece	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off Morse	.5	7.00 - 17.30
3192.5 7587	19/3 1947	May 1952	4 UGY	Ioannina, Greece 20° 50' E 39° 40' N	Greece	Fixed	A1 A3	On-Off	.1	7.00 - 17.30

Assigned Frequency in Kcs.	Date of Notification	Date of Putting into Service	Call Sign	Name and Country Geographical Position	Area with which Com- munication is Estab- lished	Class of Station & Nature of Service	Class & Band Width of Emission	Description of Trans- mission	Power in Kw	Maximum Hrs. of Use in GMT
1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	5	6	7	8	10
7587 7597 7607.5 9157 9185 12236 14582 14642 15087 16232 17565 20070	19/3 1947	2 June 1950	4 UA	Rawalpindi, Pak. 73°12'E 33°35'N Bangkok Pusan India/Pak.	Geneva Jerusalem	Fixed	A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> F <sub>1</sub>	On-Off and f.s.k. Morse	.5	02.30 - 15.30 I
3721.5 7587 7597 9122.5 9157 14582 14867	19/3 1947	March 1952	4 UAG	Karachi, Pakistan 24° 9'N 67°E	India/Pak.	Fixed	A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub>	On-Off Morse	.5	24 hours I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I
7587 7597	19/3 1947	4/12/50	4 UAP	Punch, Kashmir 74°24'E 33°45'N	India/Pak.	Land	A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub>	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I
		20/10/51	4 UAH	Bhimbar, Kashmir 74°15'E 33°02'N	"	"	"	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I
		20/ 5/51	4 UAU	Uri, Kashmir 74°13'E 34°8'N	"	"	"	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I
		17/ 5/51	4 UAK	Kotli, Kashmir 74°8'E 33°30'N	"	"	"	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I
		2/ 6/51	4 UAT	Tangdhar, Kashmir 74° E 34°25'N	"	"	"	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I
		23/ 1/51	4 UAR	Rawalkot, Kashmir 73°50'E 33°50'N	"	"	"	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I
		15/ 1/51	4 UAO	Domei, Kashmir 73°50'E 34°20'N	"	"	"	On-Off Morse	.1	02.30 - 15.30 I

Assigned Frequency in Kcs.	Date of Notification	Date of Putting into Service	Call Sign	Name and Country Geographical Position	Area with which Communication is Established	Class of Station & Nature of Service	Class & Band Width of Emission	Description of Transmission	Power in Kw.	Maximum Hrs. of Use in GMT.
1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	5	6	7	8	10
7587 7597		22/2/51 8/51 20/6/50 14/11/51 14/8/51 3/6/50 16/6/50 8/4/50	4 UAN 4 UAB 4 UAL 4 UAC 4 UAJ 4 UAS 4 UAD 4 UAO	Naushera, Kashmir 74° 25'E 33° 10'N Kargil, Kashmir 76° 10'E 34° 32'N Sialkot, Pakistan 74° 32'E 32° 30'N Akhnur, Kashmir 74° 45'E 32° 50'N Jammu, Kashmir 74° 65'E 32° 44'N Srinagar, Kashmir 74° 32'E 32° 10'N Delhi, India 28° 50'N 77° 20'E Skardu, Pakistan 73° 40'E 35° 08'N	India/Pak. " " " " " " "	Land Land Land Land Fixed Fixed Fixed Land	A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub>	On-Off Morse On-Off Morse On-Off Morse On-Off Morse On-Off Morse On-Off Morse On-Off Morse On-Off Morse	.1 .1 .1 .1 .5 .5 .5 .1	02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I 02.30 - 15.30 I
7607.5 9122.5 9197 12236 14642 16232 19730 20070 9157 12236 14582 15827 17565 9762.5 9952.5 15568 17565	19/3 1947       18/3 1947  19/3 1947	28/7/51         18/6/51  18/6/51	4 UZ        4 UT  4 UK	Geneva, Switz. 46° 12'N 6° 09'E      Bangkok, Thailand 14° N 103° E  Pusan, Korea 35° 08'N 129° E	Greece Palestine India/Pak.     India/Pak. Korea Palestine  India/Pak. Bangkok	Fixed      Fixed  Fixed	A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> F <sub>1</sub>     A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub>  A <sub>1</sub> A <sub>3</sub> F <sub>1</sub>	On-Off f.s.k. Morse     On-Off Morse   On-Off f.s.k. Morse	.9      .2  .5	06.30 - 22.00 I      02.00 - 14.00 I  02.00 - 12.00 I

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

SECOND REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 3

TO COMMITTEE 5

(By the Chairman)

Subject: Contributions in arrears - Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, paragraph 4.3 Contributions in abeyance for various reasons.

During its third, fourth and fifth meetings Working Group 3 examined the question of contributions in abeyance for various reasons (paragraph 4.3 of Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference) and decided to submit to Committee 5 (Finance) the draft Resolution which is attached hereto (Annex).

The accounts, dealt with by the Working Group, are in abeyance because of events which occurred during the second world war and have been subject to a special report, dated October 23rd 1952, by the Secretary General of the Union. This report as well as the report dated June 20th 1952 to the U.P.U. Congress at Brussels relating to contributions in arrears owed by the former Italian Colonies, have been carefully studied by the working group.

The working group has taken note of the following statement in connection with German debts to the Union made on October 27th 1952 by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation considers that the question of debts by Germany to the Union for the period up to 9 May 1945 be examined now, since the debts in question were owed by Germany as a whole.

"As is well known, there is as yet no united Germany, nor is there an all-German Government capable of acting on behalf of the German State.



"The Bonn authorities do not, of course, represent Germany in the I.T.U., and cannot represent it. They cannot act on behalf of the whole of Germany. Hence, for the time being, German debts should be posted to the debtors' account, with an indication that they may be settled by the all-German Government to be created after the formation of a united Germany.

"My Delegation is ~~is~~ against any negotiation with the Bonn authorities in connection with the settlement of debts owed by Germany, since those authorities do not represent Germany and cannot act on its behalf."

This statement was supported by the Delegate of the People's Republic of Hungary.

The working group decided at its fifth meeting by a small majority of delegations present to recommend for the approval of Committee 5 the addition of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution under the heading, "resolves".

Chairman of Working Group 3  
of Committee 5:

HAKAN STERKY

Annex: Draft resolution.

ANNEX

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Contributions in abeyance because of events  
which occurred during the second world war

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

in view of

- 1) The Report by the Administrative Council of the Union to the Plenipotentiary Conference, Chapter VI, section 4.3. (Contributions in abeyance for various reasons), and the literature submitted by the Secretary General of the Union;
- 2) Administrative Council Resolutions 52/CA3 and 136/CA4, relative to the arrears of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
- 3) Administrative Council Resolution 52/CA3, relative to the arrears of the Italian Colonies;
- 4) Administrative Council Resolution 18/CA2, relative to the arrears of Germany and Japan;

considering :

- 1) that the accounts in question are in abeyance mainly because of events which occurred during the second world war;
- 2) that in the case of the former Italian Colonies the situation has varied in such a fashion that it is extremely difficult to determine whether the liability incurred under the Madrid Convention in respect of the Membership of the Union of these Colonies has passed to any other Member and, if so, to which;
- 3) that in the case of the South Sea Islands formerly under Japanese Mandate and the former Japanese dependencies, the legal position is extremely obscure;
- 4) that on account of 2) and 3) it is not possible to fix definitely upon any Member of the Union the responsibility for the debts in question; and

5) that it is inadvisable to carry over debts indefinitely in the account books of the Union

resolves

- 1) to write off :
  - a) the book debts shown against the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
  - b) the debts of the former Italian Colonies;
  - c) the debt of the South Sea Islands, formerly under Japanese Mandate;
  - d) the debts of the former Japanese Dependencies;
- 2) to accept the offer made by the Federal German Republic to settle German debts in their entirety on condition that, in accordance with the report of the London Conference on August 8th 1952 on German prewar debts, the interest due is reduced from 6% to 4%; and to write off the difference in the interest;
- 3) to grant the necessary credits, amounting to a sum in round figures of 366,210 Swiss francs, on December 31st to the Secretary General of the Union in order that the Profit and Loss Account, as regards the items mentioned in 1) and 2) above may be balanced;  
and (subject to the approval of Committee 5 - see page 2 of the report)
- 4) to post, however, the sums owed in respect of the former Japanese Dependencies to a special account, and to instruct the Secretary General to endeavour to obtain before the next Plenipotentiary Conference, payment of these sums from the Members of the Union administering the territories in question, such payments to be entered as special income.

PROPOSAL No. 728

F R A N C E

Paragraph 11 of Article 5 of the Convention

Replace the present sub-paragraph (b) by the following:

" b) in the interval between two plenipotentiary conferences, be responsible for effecting coordination with all international organizations contemplated in Articles 26 and 27 of this Convention.

To this end the Council shall draw up provisional agreements with:

the international organizations contemplated in Article 27 of the Convention;

the United Nations, solely with regard to the application of Article 15 of Annex 5 to the Convention.

Submit these provisional agreements to the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

Appoint, on behalf of the Union, one or more representatives ..... " (the rest of the present sub-paragraph remaining unchanged) .

Reasons

1. This amendment is indispensable in view of the new text adopted for Article 10, 1 f) (meeting of Committee 3 on 7 November).

2. Article 15 of the agreement between the U.N. and the I.T.U. provides, in paragraph 3, that "the precise arrangements for implementing this Article shall be dealt with separately".

No agreements have been reached as regards such arrangements and these may prove necessary.



International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 231-E  
17 November 1952

COMMITTEE 5

PROPOSAL No. 729

F R A N C E

The Buenos Aires Conference,

considering:

The Regulations for the I.T.U. Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds, and, in particular, Articles 11 and 19 thereof;

the heavy expenses which, as a result of these Regulations, the Union has to bear;

instructs the Administrative Council

1. to revise the relevant provisions of those Regulations in such a way as to ensure that, in future, the Union shall not be required to share in buying-in fees;
2. to determine, in agreement with the Secretary General, the Directors of the Consultative Committees, and the Chairman of the International Frequency Registration Board, what age limits should be observed as regards the recruitment of staff, without prejudice to the quality of the staff recruited or to the principle of international recruitment;
3. to determine, in the manner described above, what the hierarchy of Union staff shall be, with an eye to service requirements and to the normal possibilities of advancement.



PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

PROPOSAL No. 730

F R A N C E

The Buenos Aires Conference,

considering:

1. That I.T.U. requirements in the way of day-to-day funds are largely attributable to:
  - 1) the difficulties encountered by certain Members and Associate Members in paying their contributions towards ordinary expenditure in the manner laid down in Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention (paragraphs 6 and 7);
  - 2) the time which inevitably elapses before accounts for conferences and for meetings of the Consultative Committees are drawn up and the sums in question recovered;
2. that in the absence of a consolidated budget and of a working capital fund, the Union must make every effort to reduce its calls on the Government of the Swiss Confederation;

requests the Administrative Council:

to consider what budgetary arrangements should be made, and how contributions should be paid, if the Union's need for day-to-day funds is to be reduced, and to submit its findings to Members and Associate Members for their approval.



International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 233-E  
17 November 1952

COMMITTEE 7

DRAFT OF FIRST REPORT OF

COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies)

The following report on questions dealt with at the first four meetings of Committee 7 is submitted to the consideration of the Plenary Assembly.

Definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls

The Committee was entrusted with the consideration of Proposal No. 658 - memorandum submitted by the United Nations on facilities and privileges for Specialized Agencies (Document No. 3). This proposal involved a review of the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls in Annex 2 to the Convention and the Chairman of Committee 4, to which the revision of Annex 2 had originally been allocated, agreed that this particular definition should be examined in Committee 7. The discussion is recorded in the minutes of the 2nd meeting of Committee 7 (Document No. 173). This discussion included also Document No. 155 which contains an extract on telecommunication facilities from the report of the Twelfth Report of the United Nations Administrative Committee on Coordination. This latter report is submitted to the Economic and Social Council and, for information, to the States Members of the United Nations and to the appropriate governing organs of the Specialized Agencies.

As a result of this discussion the Committee makes the recommendations set out below :

- 1) In par. f) of the existing definition the words "Hheads of the principal organs of the United Nations" should be included. This point was adopted nemine contradicente.
- 2) In par. f) of the existing definition the reference to the "Hheads of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations" should be retained. This recommendation was adopted by 18 votes in favour, 13 against and 7 abstentions.
- 3) The proposal of the United Nations to include in par. f) of the existing definition the words "Hheads of the Specialized Agencies" should not be adopted. This proposal of the United Nations was rejected by 19 votes to 11 with 10 abstentions.
- 4) The existing paragraph g) - the International Court of Justice at the Hague- should be retained.

The representatives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and of the International Monetary Fund declared that those two organizations were in a different position from that of the other Specialized Agencies in that their Articles of Agreement obliged the Member Governments of those two organizations to accord governmental treatment to the official communications of the two organizations. The Committee agreed that a decision not to include the Hheads of the Specialized Agencies in the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls would not prejudice the legal right of the Bank and Fund to require their Members to accord the telecommunication privileges set out in their Articles of Agreement.

The complete definition of Government telegrams and Government telephone calls as recommended by the Committee is set out in Annex I to the present report.

The Committee also considered a draft resolution submitted by France (Document No. 178) designed to provide machinery whereby the Administrative Council might consider and, if it saw fit, give effect to requests by specific Specialized Agencies for the priority envisaged

in Article 36 of the Convention to be accorded to certain of their telegrams and telephone calls. This draft resolution was discussed at the 4th meeting of the Committee and a slightly modified draft, adopted by 25 votes in favour, 7 against and 2 abstentions, is submitted in Annex 2 to the present report.

The Committee also began discussion, at its 4th meeting, of a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Document No. 177) concerning measures for the possible abrogation of Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. This matter will be dealt with in a subsequent report of the Committee.

## 2. Communication from the International Red Cross Committee

The Committee considered at its 4th meeting the communication from the International Red Cross Committee reproduced in Document No. 38 together with a draft resolution submitted by Switzerland (Proposal No. 685, Document No. 45). The Committee recommends the adoption of the modified version of this draft resolution which is reproduced in Annex No. 3 to the present report. It was agreed that Switzerland would submit to the Telegraph and Telephone Conference of 1954 a memorandum prepared in consultation with the International Red Cross Committee.

## 3. Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance

At its 3rd meeting (Document No. 199) the Committee considered the Proposal No. 704 of the United States (Document No. 103) to approve resolution No. 244 adopted by the Administrative Council at its 7th Session. The Committee approved this draft resolution in Document No. 103 with an amendment and the revised text as recommended for adoption by the Plenary Assembly is reproduced in Annex No. 4 to the present report.

The Committee agreed that a recommendation should be addressed to the Plenary Assembly that an official of the General Secretariat should be provided, to deal with Technical Assistance and that the expense should be borne by the Technical Assistance Administration.

Annexes : 4

Chairman. Committee No. 7

ANNEX 1

REVISED DEFINITION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 7

Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls: These are telegrams or telephone calls originating with any of the authorities specified below:

- a) the Head of a State;
- b) the Head of a Government and members of a Government;
- c) the Head of a colony, protectorate, overseas territory or territory under suzerainty, authority, trusteeship or mandate of a Member or Associate Member or of the United Nations;
- d) Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air;
- e) diplomatic or consular agents;
- f) the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Heads of the principal organs and of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations;
- g) the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Replies to Government telegrams as defined herein shall also be regarded as Government telegrams.

ANNEX 2

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

APPLICATIONS BY SPECIALIZED AGENCIES FOR PRIORITY  
FOR TELEGRAMS AND TELEPHONE CALLS

The International Telecommunication Conference of Buenos Aires,

considering

1. that the priority envisaged in Article 36 of the Convention, in favour of Government telegrams, and Government telephone calls, could facilitate the work of certain Specialized Agencies of the United Nations,
2. that these Specialized Agencies are not mentioned in Annex 2 to the Convention which enumerates the authorities entitled to originate Government telegrams and Government telephone calls,

recommends

that if Specialized Agencies of the United Nations wishing to benefit from the provisions of Article 36 to the Convention inform the Administrative Council of their request, justifying the particular cases in which the priority envisaged in Article 36 is necessary, the Administrative Council

- (1) should inform Members and Associate Members of the Union of the requests which, in their opinion, should be accepted;
- (2) should take a definitive decision on these requests, bearing in mind the opinion of the majority of Members and Associate Members,

instructs

the Secretary General to notify Members and Associate Members of the decision taken by the Council.

ANNEX 3

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

GENEVA CONVENTIONS ON THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR

AND THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS IN WARTIME

The International Telecommunication Conference  
of Buenos Aires,

considering:

1. the provisions of Article 74, paragraph 5, and of Article 124 of the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War, dated 12 August 1949 (1) and of Articles 110, paragraph 5, and 141 of the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in Wartime, dated 12 August 1949 (1);
2. the provisions of Article 35 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947;

recommends:

that the International Telegraph and Telephone Conference to meet in 1954 consider sympathetically whether, and if so, to what extent the telegraph franking privileges and the reductions in telegraph charges envisaged in the Geneva Conventions mentioned above could be accorded, and make any necessary modifications to the International Telegraph Regulations.

---

(1) See Annex.

ANNEX TO RESOLUTION ON THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS

(Translation)

a) Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War  
(12 August 1949):

ARTICLE 74, PARAGRAPH 5

"The Contracting Parties shall endeavour to reduce as far as possible telegraph rates for telegrams sent by or to prisoners of war."

ARTICLE 124

"National news agencies, and the Central News Agency shall enjoy postal franking privileges together with all the exemptions provided for in Article 74, and, as far as possible, telegraph franking privileges, or, at least, substantial reductions in rates."

b) Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in  
Wartime (12 August 1949):

ARTICLE 110, PARAGRAPH 5

"The Contracting Parties shall endeavour to reduce as far as possible telegraph rates for telegrams sent by or to internees."

ARTICLE 141

"National news agencies, and the Central News Agency shall enjoy full postal franking privileges together with the exemptions provided for in Article 110, and, as far as possible, telegraph franking privileges, or, at least, substantial reductions in rates."

ANNEX 4

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNION

IN THE EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The International Telecommunication Conference  
of Buenos Aires,

considering:

1. the report by the Administrative Council, 1952,  
Chapter VII, paragraph 1;
2. the Report by the Administrative Council, 1952,  
Chapter I, paragraph 3.5;

endorses

the action taken by the Administrative Council on the  
arrangements made for Technical Assistance by the I.T.U.; and,

resolves:

1. that the Administrative Council is authorized, for the time  
being, to continue to participate for the Union in the Expanded  
Programme of Technical Assistance according to the arrangements made  
in 1952, and to call on the various organs of the Union as appropriate  
to facilitate this participation; and,
2. that the Administrative Council shall review developments in  
this field each year and coordinate the work of the permanent organs  
of the Union in connection with its participation in this Programme.

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No.234-E  
17 November 1952

COMMITTEE 7

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS  
WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

A G E N D A

For 5th meeting

Friday 21 November at 1000 hours

Room A

1. Approval of minutes of first three meetings.

1st	Doc.No.140
2nd	Doc.No.173
3rd	Doc.No.199

2. United Nations telecommunications - memorandum by the representatives of the United Nations (Doc.No.228).

3. The case for considering Epidemiological telegrams of the World Health Organization as Government telegrams (Doc.No.190).

4. First Report of Committee 7 to the Plenary Assembly (Doc. No.233).



PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

S A N C T I O N S

The following points will be examined in connection with sanctions to facilitate collection of dues.

1. Should the Convention contain any provision for sanctions?
2. If so, what form should the sanctions take?
3. If it is to be deprivation of the right to vote
  - a) How old must the arrears be?
  - b) Should those arrears pertain to expenses of only Conferences or meetings, or should they include the price of publications?
  - c) To what conferences or meetings should the deprivation apply?
4. Should conferences and meetings be given the power to confer the right to vote if the failure of countries to pay is due to circumstances beyond their control?

N.B. Can sanctions be applied against associate members, private operating agencies, international organs, etc?



PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE 5

Buenos Aires, 1952

PARAGRAPH 7 OF ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION

The following points will be considered in connection with paragraph 7 of Article 14 of the Convention in the meeting of Committee 5.

1. On what date or dates should the annual contributions on account of ordinary expenses fall due?
2. Should any period of grace (that is without interest accruing) be allowed for payment of:-
  - a) Extraordinary expenses on account of Plenipotentiary Conferences, Administrative Conferences and meetings of C.C.I's;
  - b) Cost of the Publications;
  - c) Expenses of regional conferences;
  - d) Expenses resulting from measurements, trials and special research undertaken in the Union's laboratories and with its technical equipment on behalf of certain members, etc.?
3. What should be the rate of interest?
4. Proposition No. 221 of Morocco, page 175.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

WORKING GROUP 5/2

REPORT BY THE SUB-WORKING GROUP

OF WORKING GROUP 5/2

1. Sub-working group 5/2 was instructed to compare the I.T.U. salary scale with that of the other international organizations, neglecting the various systems of allowances and pensions schemes. In practice, this meant a comparison with the United Nations; all the other specialized agencies, except the U.P.U., having adopted the United Nations scale. The U.P.U. at its recent Brussels Congress decided that U.P.U. salary scales should be brought into line with the I.T.U., even if that involved adoption of the United Nations scale. The necessary credits were authorized.
2. A comparison between the I.T.U. and the United Nations salary scales (see Annex 1) can only be based on the job descriptions of the two organizations, bearing in mind the qualifications demanded of candidates for the posts in question. In general, it is somewhat difficult to compare I.T.U. posts with those of the United Nations.
3. The sub-working group, on the basis of the information available, reached the following general conclusions:
  - a) Generally speaking, the United Nations salary scale is more generous than that of the I.T.U. Classes 6 and 7 are better off, at the maximum of the scale, in the I.T.U., but the difference as regards Class 5 is negligible, and the balance swings rapidly against the I.T.U. for Class 4 and above.
  - b) The I.T.U. scale is abnormal for Classes 1 and D in that there is no over-lapping of grades, and there is no sliding scale at all for Counsellors.
  - c) In the I.T.U., the grouping within classes of permanent staff is unsatisfactory, as the percentages of officials in the various classes do not taper off in the normal way from bottom to top of the scale (see Annex 2).



- d) The sub-working group is of the opinion that the report of the experts, contained in document No. 94 (pages 32 to 35) comparing the posts of the U.N. and those of the I.T.U., could be used as a basis for reclassifying the posts of the I.T.U. between classes C and 8.
- e) The sub-working group is also of the opinion that the Conference would find it difficult, if not impossible within the time available, to reclassify satisfactorily I.T.U. posts. It would appear to be essential for such a reclassification to be carried out, based on the duties and qualifications of each post, and that this should be done under the direction of the Administrative Council.

C.J. Acton  
Chairman

Annexes: 2

ANNEX 1

I.T.U.

United Nations

N.B. In addition to information on staff for 1952, information is given, in brackets, on the staffing proposed for 1953.

N.B. The salaries indicated below include a 5% cost-of-living allowance granted as from 1 January 1952.

Class D (32,000)

- 7 (9) 1 Head of the Secretary General's private Secretariat  
2 Division Counsellors  
2 (3) C.C.I. Engineers  
1 Head of Finance Section  
1 Head of Staff Section  
(1 Secretary of the I.F.R.B.)

- D 2 (45,800 - 50,800)  
Director, Head of Division  
  
D 1 (41,600 - 50,00)  
Assistant Director of a Division,  
Head of a large Section  
  
P 5 (36,500 - 45,800)  
Unclassified Administrative  
Officer, Head of Section, Head  
of Languages Service

Class 1 (17,000 - 25,800)

- 14 (19)  
6 (7) Secretaries  
6 Engineers  
2 (6) Translators I

- P 4 (30,400 - 39,600)  
Administrative Officer, 1st Class,  
Assistant Head of Section,  
Translator-Reviser, Minute-writer,  
Interpreter I

Class 2 (12,600 - 21,500)

- 15 (12)  
8 (9) Secretaries  
6 (2) Translators II  
1 Head of Laboratory

- P 3 (25,000 - 33,300)  
Administrative Officer, 2nd Class,  
Translator I, Interpreter II,  
Verbatim Reporter

Class 3 (11,400 - 17,200)

- 12 (11)  
11 (10) Secretaries  
1 Draughtsman

- P 2 (20,000 - 26,600)  
Assistant Administrative Officer  
1st Class, Translator II, Records  
Officer, Head of Roneo Service

Class 4 (10,100 - 14,900)

- 16 (22)  
12 (18) Asst. Administrative  
Officers  
4 Technical Assistants

- P 1 (15,000 - 20,800)  
Assistant Administrative Officer  
2nd Class, new officials in the  
international category  
  
G 7 (13,335 - 19,260) (1)  
Staff Class for special cases only

- 4 -  
(Annex 1 to Doc. 237-E)

Class 5 (8,700 - 13,500)

40 (41)

14 (15) Secretary-Stenographers  
24 Office Assistants  
1 Draughtsman-Photographer  
1 Machine-Operator

G 6 (11,920 - 16,600)<sup>(1)</sup>  
Private Secretary, Librarian,  
Head of Finance Section

G 5 (10,655 - 14,840)<sup>(1)</sup>

Bilingual Secretary, Clerk Secretary  
I, Head Secretary, Technical  
Assistant

Class 6 (7,400 - 12,200)

39 (45)

8 (11) Shorthand-Typists  
31 (34) Office Assistants II

G 4 (9,555 - 13,230)<sup>(1)</sup>

Monolingual Secretary, Clerk  
Secretary II,

Class 7 (6,500 - 10,800)

25 (17)

22 (13) Office Clerks  
2 Roneo Operators  
1 Caretaker  
(1 Messenger)

G 3 (8,625 - 11,760)<sup>(1)</sup>  
Shorthand-Typist

G 2 (7,725 - 10,030)<sup>(1)</sup>

Typist, Store-Keeper, Operator

Class 8 (4,500 - 8,500)

4 (3)

3 (2) Messengers  
1 Assistant Clerk

G 1 (6,925 - 8,925)<sup>(1)</sup>  
Messenger, Caretaker

(1) These salaries apply to "local" staff. In the United Nations there is also a "semi-local" category, under which the salaries are 1,800 Swiss francs higher than those of the "local" category.

A N N E X 2

Percentage of Officials in the Various Grades

	U.N. (Geneva)		I.C.A.O.		I.L.O.		F.A.O.			I.T.U. (1) (1953 budget)	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		Number	%
PD	2	0.31	-	-		0.85	13	1.57	Class D	9	5.
D2	5	0.78	2	0.54		0.50	-	-	Class 1	19	10.60
D1	5	0.78	4	1.08		3.50	4	0.49	Class 2	12	6.65
P 5	10	1.56	10	2.72		2.45	30	3.64	Class 3	11	6.10
P 4	37	5.78	27	7.35	Figures not available	4.20	70	8.52	Class 4	22	12.30
P 3	57	8.90	56	14.82		) 28	75	9.	Class 5	41	23.
P 2	24	3.75	29	8.17			61	7.32	Class 6	45	25.15
P 1	36	5.63	29	8.17		16.75	56	6.83	Class 7	17	9.50
G 7	8	1.25	-	-		-	13	1.58	Class 8	3	1.70
G 6	35	5.47	-	-		-	24	2.90		179	
G 5	65	10.16	8	2.17		12.65	80	9.73	(1) See over for distribution in each organisa- tion.		
G 4	73	11.41	26	7.30		-	183	22.18			
G 3	85	13.28	90	24.52		19.30	76	9.24			
G 2	112	17.50	71	19.34		7.30	40	4.86			
G 1	34	5.31	15	3.82		4.50	100	12.14			
	588		367				825				

I.T.U.

Percentage of officials in the various grades

I. Staffing corresponding to 1952 budget

Class	General Secretariat		I.F.R.B.		C.C.I.F.		C.C.I.T.		C.C.I.R.		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
D	5	4.	-	-	1	6,67	1	50.	-	-	7	4,07
1	8	6,35	2	14,28	1	6,67	-	-	3	20.	14	8,14
2	12	9,50	-	-	2	13,33	-	-	1	6,67	15	8,73
3	7	5,55	3	21,43	2	13,33	-	-	-	-	12	7,
4	9	7,15	1	7,14	4	26,67	-	-	2	13,33	16	9,21
5	29	23,	5	35,73	3	20,	1	50.	2	13,33	40	23,25
6	33	26,20	2	14,28	-	-	-	-	4	26,67	39	22,68
7	20	15,85	-	-	2	13,33	-	-	3	20.	25	14,60
8	3	2,40	1	7,14	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2,32
Totals	126(1)		14(1)		15		2		15		172	

II. Proposed staffing for 1953

Class	General Secretariat		I.F.R.B.		C.C.I.F.		C.C.I.T.		C.C.I.R.		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
D	5	3,76	1	7,14	1	6,67	1	50.	1	6,67	9	5,
1	15	11,28	1	7,14	1	6,67	-	-	2	13,33	19	10,60
2	9	6,78	-	-	2	13,33	-	-	1	6,67	12	6,65
3	6	4,53	3	21,	2	13,33	-	-	-	-	11	6,10
4	14	10,53	1	7,14	4	26,66	-	-	3	20,	22	12,30
5	30	22,60	5	35,73	3	20,	1	50.	2	13,33	41	23.
6	38	28,50	2	14,28	1	6,67	-	-	4	26,67	45	25,15
7	14	10,52	-	-	1	6,67	-	-	2	13,33	17	9,50
8	2	1,50	1	7,14	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1,70
Totals	133(1)		14(1)		15		2		15		179	

(1) 44 officials appearing in the budget of the General Secretariat are in fact staff of the I.F.R.B.

International  
Telecommunication Union

---

Document No. 238-E  
18 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CORRIGENDUM No. 1

TO

DOCUMENT No. 229

Concerns only the French text.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 239-E  
18 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

PROPOSAL No. 731

ITALY

(General Regulations)

Include the following in the General Regulations:

"If, between sessions of the Administrative Council, an urgent decision has to be taken on the place or date of a conference, or on the invitations to be issued for it, the tasks normally incumbent on the Administrative Council in this respect shall be performed by the Secretary General, who shall consult the Members of the Union and shall comply with the majority view."

PREMISES FOR THE I.T.U. IN GENEVA

At its special session (Buenos Aires, 2 November, 1952), the Administrative Council again considered the question of premises for the I.T.U. in Geneva, in accordance with a wish expressed by Committee 5 of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

It adopted the following recommendation:

" The Administrative Council,

" Having examined the question of the housing of the services of the Union,

" Recommends to the Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires,

" That it instruct the new Administrative Council which it is to elect to pursue the studies now being made and to reach a speedy definite conclusion on the basis of the two following considerations:

" The solution to be adopted must be satisfactory as regards the facilities which should be enjoyed by the services of the Union;

" Under appreciably equal conditions in this connection, the Administrative Council will choose the most economical solution."



PROPOSAL No. 732

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

In connection with Article 15, paragraph 5, of the Convention (supersedes Proposals Nos. 257 and 669).

Amend paragraph 5 as follows :

5. "The cost of publishing documents in the five official languages shall be included in the total expenses of conferences and of meetings held by the permanent organs of the Union.

"The cost of oral interpretation from the official languages of the Union shall be included in the total expenses of conferences and meetings.

"These costs shall be apportioned among all Members and Associate Members in accordance with the classes chosen by them under Article 14, paragraph 5, except as regards those Members and Associate Members which have expressed a wish to use other languages subject to the conditions set forth in paragraph 4 (2) of this Article."

Reasons :

1. To put the recognized official languages of the Union on an equal footing as regards their use at conferences and meetings.
2. Those countries which pay for the use of other languages in debates should be exonerated from payment for the use of the official languages.



COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

Summary Record of the 17th Meeting

Saturday 8 November, 10 a.m.

Chairman : Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Committee passed to Article 11 of the Convention  
(Administrative Conferences).

The Chairman began by making a summary of the proposals relating to this Article. They could be divided into two groups :

- first, the proposal of the United States of America (177 and 181) which, the farthest removed from the status quo, assigned to the Administrative Council a comparatively important rôle in the convening of Administrative Conferences,
- second, the other proposals, differing considerably among themselves, based, to a greater or less degree, on Document No. 969 of the 6th Session of the Administrative Council and which, in the main, showed a desire for a more precise classification of Administrative Conferences as ordinary, extraordinary, special, regional, service etc..., the terminology varying according to which country submitted the proposal.

The Chairman considered that the Committee should first decide if it was going to adopt the proposal of the United States of America, or if it preferred a solution, more in keeping with the status quo, which had been proposed by several countries. In the latter case, observing the variety of texts that had been proposed, the definitive drafting would be entrusted to a working group.



The Delegate of France said that it would be advisable to classify Administrative Conferences precisely, the extent of their duties and the nature of the acts they should sign, as Article 11 at present did not cover closely the position arising from the Atlantic City Radio Regulations. In particular, regional or service conferences had to be introduced.

Speaking as the Delegate of Portugal, the Chairman said that none of the proposals in the second group was completely satisfactory to his country. He was prepared to withdraw Proposal No. 187 submitted by Portugal, and to give his support to the proposal of the United States of America, if the two following conditions were fulfilled :

- 1) The competence of the Administrative Council to convene an Administrative Conference, or to modify the date, would be limited by the obligation to consult the Members of the Union and to obtain the approval of the majority;
- 2) Special provisions should be made for the case of regional conferences (the Delegation of Portugal did not consider the idea of service conferences indispensable).

The Delegate of the United States of America was prepared to introduce these two amendments, and the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland announced that he also would withdraw his proposal in favour of the proposal of the United States of America, since it was precisely consultation with Members of the Union and the introduction of conferences with limited agendas which were two essential points of Proposal No. 188 submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Delegate of U.S.S.R. made the following statement :

"We consider that the present procedure for convening Administrative Conferences is satisfactory and should not be modified. The text of Article 11 could be amended to make it more precise in certain details, but as a basis the present text should be retained.

"Administrative Conferences must meet at fixed intervals in order to ensure continuity in the work of the Union; these intervals must be indicated in the Convention. We are therefore opposed to Proposal No. 177 of the United States of America.

"We are also opposed to the extension of the duties of the Council envisaged in Proposal No. 181 of the United States of America. Ordinary Administrative Conferences must meet at intervals laid down in the Convention, and Extraordinary Conferences must not be convened except with the consent of the majority of the Members of the Union : the consent of the majority is an absolutely indispensable condition for the convocation of Extraordinary Conferences.

"Lastly, we are not opposed to Article 11 enumerating the different categories of conferences; Ordinary, Extraordinary, Special, Regional. But the procedure for convening conferences must be retained in its present form, as envisaged in the Convention at present in force."

The Chairman said that there was an agreement of views between the Delegates of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. on the question of consulting Members of the Union; the only difference was that the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. wished the intervals between ordinary conferences to figure in the Convention.

The Delegates of Egypt and Pakistan were also in favour of indicating in the Convention intervals of five, six, or seven years, since the Regulations needed to be revised at about that interval. Furthermore, Administrative Conferences with restricted agendas (such as the E.A.R.C.) must be able to be convened to revise only a part of the Regulations.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. made the following statement :

"I consider that for the convening of ordinary Administrative Conferences, definitive intervals must be established and indicated in the Convention.

"My Delegation is opposed to Proposals Nos. 177 and 181 of the United States of America, and to the extension of the powers of the Administrative Council in questions relating to the convening of conferences. Extraordinary Conferences can be convened in conformity with the procedure laid down in the Convention at present in force."

The Delegate of Switzerland drew the attention of the Committee to Proposal No. 189, of Switzerland, and said that on the question of convening conferences he supported the proposal of the United States of America, amended by Portugal.

The Delegate of France considered that the proposal of the United States of America was too summary : a fixed interval between Administrative Conferences was not possible, but an interval in principle should be established and written into the Convention. The date of an Administrative Conference must be fixed by the preceding Administrative Conference which was the body most qualified to take this decision. The intervention of the Administrative Council, with the consent of the majority of Members, should not take place unless circumstances made this essential.

The Chairman thought that the proposal of the United States of America could be further amended to give satisfaction to the preceding speakers, by introducing, in principle, an interval for Ordinary Conferences.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. wished to give his support to some remarks made by the Delegates of Pakistan and France :

"The Plenipotentiary Conference meets every five years. Why can an interval not be laid down for Administrative Conferences? There is a whole series of considerations in favour of the periodical meeting of these conferences : questions concerning the C.C.I.'s, and those related to Regulations, require regular examination. Members of the Union will thus prepare for these conferences taking into consideration their periodical nature.

"The question of the date of Administrative Conferences cannot be left to the discretion of the Administrative Council. This would permit certain countries which are represented on the Council to fix the date of these conferences only in conformity with their own interests. We consider that such a position should be avoided and that the intervals between Administrative Conferences must be laid down in the Convention.

"The Plenipotentiary Conferences, which meet every five years, will probably decide upon certain revisions of the Convention, and this can give rise to the revisions of this or that Regulation.

"We have no objection to proposal No. 189 by Switzerland, in the part where different categories of conferences are enumerated. It would be useful if the different categories of conferences were enumerated in the Convention."

The Delegate of India was also in favour of mentioning an interval, in principle, for Administrative Conferences in Article 11 of the Convention. He pointed out that, even as amended by Portugal, the proposal of the U.S.A. still gave the Council, or 20 Members of the Union, the opportunity of drawing up the agenda for an Extraordinary Conference. He also asked that service conferences be mentioned.

In short, he preferred the Atlantic City text to that proposed by the U.S.A. Present provisions were quite sufficient: proof of this was that they had already enabled one Extraordinary Conference to be convened and an Ordinary Conference to be postponed. The only amendment consisted in introducing the idea of a service conference.

The Delegate of Italy reminded the Committee of Proposal No. 178, made by his country, and said that he would support the solution proposed by the U.S.A., already amended by Portugal, if the interval, in principle, between Administrative Conferences were mentioned.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia pointed out that the absence of an interval, established in advance, would mean that all conferences would be of an extraordinary nature; he was, therefore, in favour of fixing an interval, with a certain margin of tolerance, for ordinary conferences; for extraordinary conferences, he supported the idea of consulting Members in the case when the Administrative Council was expected to act.

The Delegate of the Argentine considered, that with the exception of a certain lack of precision, the present Article 11 was satisfactory, and in particular paragraph 2, which related to the periodical convocation of Administrative Conferences at the same place and time as Plenipotentiary Conferences. He therefore proposed to send the question under discussion to a Working Group which would be called upon only to correct any lack of precision in the present text. The two points which needed clarification were the following:

- Classification of Administrative Conferences (with the object of avoiding certain of them becoming plenipotentiary conferences and elaborating on texts submitted for ratification);

- To clarify the question of agendas (drawn up by the Convention for ordinary conferences, and by Administrations or on proposals of the Council for extraordinary conferences).

The Delegate of the P.R. of Poland supported the proposal of the Delegate of the Argentine.

The Delegate of the Netherlands said he was in favour of the proposal of the U.S.A. amended by Portugal. It was evidently impossible to convene Administrative Conferences at fixed intervals; events could change the provisions and thus it was not really possible for an Administrative Conference to fix the date of its next meeting. In short, and while accepting in principle a five or six years cycle, the speaker said he preferred that the Council fix the meetings of Administrative Conferences, Members of the Union being called upon to give their opinion on the Council's proposal.

The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. considered, like the Delegate of France, that the proposal of the U.S.A. was not at all satisfactory. In agreement with the Delegate of the Argentine, he felt that a classification of Administrative Conferences was very desirable.

The provisions of the Convention would be very vague if it were stated, as proposed by the U.S.A., that Administrative Conferences would meet "from time to time"; this expression was not acceptable. On the other hand, many speakers had shown that it was essential to establish a time interval and to mention it in the Convention.

In short, he was in agreement with the retention of the present Article 11, with some amendments in form where additional precision was necessary.

The Delegate of Japan considered that the present text could be retained, with some small amendments, in particular the introduction of the idea of regional, and service Administrative Conferences.

As no more Delegates wished to speak, the Chairman summed up the discussion and suggested that the Committee should adopt decisions on the following points:

- a) Was an indication of the normal interval to be retained in the Convention?
- b) Should Administrative Conferences, as laid down in the present Convention, be held at the same time as Plenipotentiary Conferences?
- c) Should Article 11 be redrafted in conformity with the proposal of the U.S.A. (taking into consideration the amendments which had already been made to it and the decisions which would be taken on points a) and b) above), or according to the Proposal of the Delegate of the Argentine (simply an improvement of the present text)?

o  
o o

The Committee gave an affirmative and unanimous reply to the first question. The decision was thus similar to that adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference:

"Ordinary Administrative Conferences shall meet normally every five years."

-oOoOo-

On the second question (simultaneous holding of Ordinary Administrative Conferences and the Plenipotentiary Conference), the Committee was called upon to consider an amendment by Italy (Proposal No. 178) which consisted of adding the words "as far as possible".

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was opposed to this amendment:

"Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Convention gives all the necessary instructions on the convening of Administrative Conferences. We have just decided to retain the interval between meetings of these conferences. The amendment suggested by Italy opposes this decision and therefore contradicts the principle established.

"Who will determine this 'possibility'? The Administrative Council? This means that we are returning to the proposal of the U.S.A., with which the Committee is not in agreement as has been shown by the unanimous vote just given.

"The amendment suggested by Italy is therefore unacceptable as it contradicts decisions already taken. The present paragraph 2 must be retained and put to the vote in its present form."

The Delegate of Pakistan proposed the following draft:

"Ordinary Administrative Conferences shall normally meet every five years, preferably at the same place and time as the Plenipotentiary Conference."

The Delegate of New Zealand withdrew his Proposal No. 579 and the text submitted by the Delegate of Pakistan was accepted unanimously.

Replying to a question raised as a point of order by the Delegate of Egypt, the Chairman clarified the position concerning conferences in the future: if the next Plenipotentiary Conference were held in 1957 or 1958, it was probable that the Radio Conference would coincide with it; on the other hand, as the Telegraph and Telephone Conference was to take place in 1954, it was not very probable that it would have to meet again in 1957 or 1958.

o o c

The Committee then passed to the third question.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. made the following statement:

"Mr. Chairman, you have indicated that we have an alternative: either to support the proposal of the Argentine on the maintenance of the status quo and the setting up of a Working Group, or to accept the proposal of the U.S.A., which is in contradiction with decisions already taken and which suggests basic changes in the present provisions.

"We are in favour of maintaining the status quo to the maximum degree and of introducing only unimportant amendments. We consider that the proposal of the Argentine is acceptable, and we ask that the terms of reference of the Working Group be read to us. This is a proposal related to procedure, and should receive priority."

The Chairman said that the proposal of the U.S.A. should be put to the vote first, since it was the farthest removed from the present provisions; the terms of reference of the Working Group would be established, if this proposal were rejected.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. persisted in his request and the Chairman asked the Committee if it wished first to give its opinion on the maintenance of the status quo, as the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. had asked.

The Committee rejected this request by 23 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

Certain Delegates, however, pointed out that amended as it was, and taking into consideration the decisions adopted, the proposal of the U.S.A. could hardly be distinguished from that of the Argentine; this point of view was expressed by the Delegates of France and Egypt. The Delegate of India considered that a vote on the proposal of the U.S.A. would have no significance and he proposed that a Working Group be nominated to draft a compromise text, taking into consideration all the opinions expressed. The Delegate of the U.S.A. accepted this proposal.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he was in agreement with the remarks made by the Delegates of France, India and Egypt, that it was not possible to vote on the proposal of the U.S.A. As it stood, the proposal could not be put to the vote as it contradicted decisions already taken. He said that it was incorrect procedure to suggest that a vote be taken on Proposal No. 177 of the U.S.A.; the proposal could not be put to the vote as it contradicted decisions already taken by the Committee. He considered, therefore, that a vote should be taken on the proposal of the Argentine and asked once again for the terms of reference of the Working Group to be read.

The Chairman said that from previous statements it was evident that the two proposals under discussion had approached each other very closely. He thought, therefore, that the proposed Working Group could be constituted immediately. The constitution of the Working Group was accepted unanimously.

The Chairman proposed that the terms of reference of this Group should be as follows:

- 1) The Group shall draft the text of Article 11 in keeping with the decisions of principle which had just been taken on paragraph 2; it shall bear in mind that the convening as well as changes in the place and the date of a conference require the approval of the majority of the Members of the Union; it must not forget that the Radio Conference elected Members of the I.F.R.B. and assessed the activities of the Board.
- 2) The Group would also redraft paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 10 in keeping with the decisions already taken by the Committee, and would draft, for paragraphs 3 of Articles 10 and 11, similar texts.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. then submitted the following two amendments:

"We have just stated that the Group shall take as a starting point the decisions adopted by this Committee. That is fair, but it must also be clearly stated that the Group must follow as closely as possible the existing text of the Convention.

"Second amendment: the Group shall only examine those parts of proposals submitted by Members of the Union which do not contradict decisions already taken by the Committee."

The Delegate of the Argentine agreed with the Chairman generally on the terms of reference of the Working Group, which the Chairman had just explained. He insisted that the Group should particularly concern itself with the classification of conferences and with establishing what should be included in their agendas.

In order to take into consideration the remarks of the two preceding Delegates, the Chairman added the following to the Group's terms of reference:

"To examine proposals relating to Article 11 of the Convention, insofar as they do not contradict the decisions of principle adopted by the Committee, and in particular those relating to the classification of Administrative Conferences."

He said that he could not lay down in the terms of reference for the Group the fact that the status quo should be maintained as far as possible, since that would prevent the Group from examining a whole series of proposals differing from the status quo.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. said that he supported the amendment suggested by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., the object of which was to maintain the status quo to the maximum degree possible. The day's discussion, and the unanimous decisions adopted, showed that this was the wish of the Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.A. pointed out that if the Committee had actually adopted decisions unanimously, it was only on certain questions of principle that it had done so, and not on the question of maintaining the status quo. Observing that a difference of opinion still existed, the Chairman announced that draft terms of reference for the Working Group would be issued in the near future and discussed.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

Rapporteurs:

E. Luraschi  
G. Terras  
J. Revoy

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 243-E  
18 November 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CORRIGENDUM

TO THE SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 6TH MEETING

(Document No. 196)

Page 8:

The first sentence of the second paragraph should read:

" Those Delegations would probably have been led to ask for a lower class of contribution or an alteration in the scale of contributory classes. "

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 8th Meeting

18 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. K. Prasada (India)

The Chairman opened the meeting at 1010 hours. The minutes of the 5th Meeting were in the press and were expected shortly. The minutes of the 6th Meeting had already been issued as Document No. 196 and the Chairman inquired whether any alterations to that document were asked for.

Minor amendments were requested by the Delegate of Egypt and by the Delegate of Portugal to their remarks on page 7, and also by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. on page 3 (French text only). The Delegate of Greece also requested that the statement on page 6 referring to Annex 1 should be amplified by the addition of a clause immediately after the words "Greece (see Annex 1)" to the following effect, "which stated that the adoption of a Consolidated Budget would lead it to seek a lower class of contribution".

Subject to these amendments, Document No. 196 was approved.

The Chairman then outlined the tasks which the Committee still had before it, and stressed the very short time at the disposal of the Committee if the Conference were to finish by 10 December. The accounts

of the Union had to be approved, and decisions reached on the questions of the proposed new I.T.U. building, outstanding debts, the annual "ceiling", the budget estimates, what additional financial powers should be given to the Administrative Council, etc. Decisions of principle had already been reached on the Consolidated Budget, the Working Capital Fund, and the Publications Budget. Among the other important points, there remained for consideration paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 of Article 14, and the question of sanctions, and they would be discussed by the Committee. He proposed to form a Working Group to clear the remaining outstanding proposals and to present an agreed text of Article 14 to the Committee. This Working Group would consist of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Argentina, Italy, Australia, France, Japan and Portugal, with Colonel Read (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) as Chairman. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said his Delegation would like to join the Working Group and this was agreed.

The Chairman then proposed that the Committee should examine the report of Working Group 3 (Document No. 229).

The Chairman of the Working Group (Dr. Sterky) drew attention to one or two typing errors in the English, French and Spanish texts.

The Delegation of China, referring to the draft Resolution, objected to the debts owing from former Japanese Dependencies being treated differently from those shown against the South Sea Islands formerly under Japanese Mandate. To make a distinction between them was illogical. Both were impossible to collect. The Secretary General could not be expected to recover them since it was not possible to fix responsibility upon any one Administration. He proposed that para. 4 of the Resolution be deleted.

The Chairman said that he would ask the Chairman of Working Group 3 to furnish information on all the points raised in the debate at one time.

The Delegate of Portugal observed that, according to the Report of the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, debts still outstanding for various reasons amounted to 506,592 Swiss francs. If interest up to 31 December 1952 were added, the figure would become 530,000 Swiss francs. The Working Group's report mentioned a sum of no more than 366,210 Swiss francs. What was the explanation?

The Delegate of Canada asked how the 366,000 Swiss francs were to be collected. Would that amount be collected by the Secretary General from the Members?

The Delegates of Belgium and the Netherlands supported the proposal to delete paragraph 4 of the Resolution.

The Chairman of Working Group 3, replying to the Delegate of Portugal, said that the discrepancy arose from the fact that the Federal German Republic had offered payment of an amount. Also payments made during the war by the State of Croatia had been used to pay off the debt shown against Yugoslavia, which continued to be shown in the books. As regards the question raised by the Delegate of Canada, he could do no more than say that 366,210 Swiss francs were to be debited to all I.T.U. Members. The Working Group had given most careful attention to paragraph 4, and a decision in favour of adding it had been reached by a very small majority. The offer made by the Federal German Republic had given rise to some hope that its example might be followed by other countries.

Further to a remark by the Delegate of Portugal, the Secretary General said that after the payments made by Japan and the Federal German Republic, the situation as regards debts, (interest up to 31 December 1952 included), was as follows:

Yugoslavia.....	31,395 Swiss francs
Germany (difference in the	
rate of interest).....	3,493 Swiss francs
Islands in Oceania formerly	
under Japanese Mandate.....	27,213 Swiss francs
Other Japanese Dependencies.....	173,109 Swiss francs
Italian Colonies.....	131,000 Swiss francs
	<hr/>
	366,210 Swiss francs

The Delegate of France considered that the debt could be met only by a contribution from Union Members. Will such a contribution be recovered as a lump sum, or in instalments?

The Chairman of Working Group 3 pointed out that the sum of 366,210 Swiss francs was not necessarily a final figure. There would probably be additional items from among those mentioned in the Administrative Council's Report. He suggested that the Resolution be accepted. The method of payment could be considered in the final report by the Working Group.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated:

"Consideration of the question of German debts to the Union, for the period up to 9 May 1945, is not at this time, in the opinion of my Delegation, possible, these debts having been incurred by the whole of Germany.

"There is of course as yet no united Germany and no all-German Government capable of accepting responsibility for the German State.

"The Bonn authorities do not and cannot represent Germany in the I.T.U., and cannot act on behalf of the whole of Germany. Accordingly, the sums owed by Germany should, for the time being, be left on the debtors' account, with a statement to the effect that the debt can only be settled by the future all-German Government to be set up after German unification.

"My Delegation objects to any negotiations with the Bonn Authorities in connection with the settlement of German debts, on the grounds that the authorities in question do not represent Germany and cannot act on its behalf.

"As regards the question of settling German debts in accordance with the decisions taken by the London Conference on 8 August 1952. The decisions there taken, without participation of the Soviet Union, are biased and illegitimate. The Potsdam Conference held in 1945 of course laid down that all questions in connection with a peaceful settlement with Germany must be jointly settled by the authorities of the four great Powers responsible for control of Germany and for such a peaceful settlement. The decisions taken at the London Conference are legally invalid in the absence of a peace treaty with Germany.

"We therefore object to the draft resolution submitted by the Working Group on the question of German debts to the Union, and we shall vote against it."

The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic stated:

"My Delegation is of the opinion that German debts owed to the Union up to 9 May 1945 cannot be paid by the Bonn authorities, since those authorities can speak only for the Western Occupation Zones, and cannot represent the whole of Germany in the I.T.U., or act on its behalf.

"Those debts should be settled by the all-German Government to be set up after German unification.

"We consider, then, that it is neither just nor legal to negotiate with the Bonn authorities in connection with the settlement of debts owed by the whole of Germany.

"Accordingly, my Delegation supports the statement just made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., and asks that German debts be posted to the debtors' account until they can be settled by the all-German Government to be set up after German unification.

"My Delegation is therefore against adoption of the draft resolution appearing in Document No. 229 and will vote against it."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic stated:

"The Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany and cannot act on behalf of the whole of Germany. German debts to the I.T.U. for the period up to 9 May 1945 can be settled only by the future all-German Government.

"We object to negotiations with the Bonn authorities in connection with the payment of German debts.

"My Delegation wholeheartedly associates itself with the statement made by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. on this matter, and will vote against the proposed resolution."

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia stated :

"My Delegation hereby formally states that the question of German debts to the I.T.U. for the period up to 9 May 1945 cannot be examined at this Conference since the debts in question are owed by Germany as a whole. There is as yet no united Germany with a single Government, as provided for in the 1945 Potsdam Agreement.

"Thus the Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany in the I.T.U. Hence no negotiations with them in connection with debts owed by the whole of Germany are possible.

"We cannot, then, approve paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution. We support the views expressed by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R."

The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic stated :

"As my Delegation has stated in Working Group 3, it is against negotiations with the Bonn authorities in connection with the settlement of German debts, since these authorities cannot represent the whole of Germany.

"Hence my Delegation wholeheartedly supports the statement made by the Soviet Delegation and will vote against the draft resolution in question."

The Delegate of the Federal German Republic stated :

"As regards the statements made to the effect that the Federal German Republic is not competent to settle the debts of the old German Reich, my Delegation has the following statement to make, and I beg that it be included in the minutes :

"1) The Plenary Assembly has already twice considered the competence of the Federal German Republic. As regards the right of the Federal German Republic to speak and negotiate on behalf of the German people, my Delegation would refer you to the statement made by it in plenary assembly, in connection with credentials. In addition, this is a political matter with which Committee 5 is certainly not competent to deal.

"2) The settlement of outstanding debts is more a commercial question. If that is so, then we see no reason why the I.T.U. should not accept the payment offered by a Member-country, and why it should not leave the Germans themselves to consider whether or not payment should be apportioned among the different zones.

"3) All in all, the German offer is of advantage to both parties - to Germany, because the Germans can hardly be expected, for an indefinite period, to shoulder the burden of steadily-mounting interest, and to the I.T.U., since if the offer be not accepted, the outstanding debts owed by the old German Reich will continue to appear in I.T.U. ledgers with no solution in prospect. Hence we hope that our offer will be accepted. It is made subject to the condition that outstanding German debts be settled by settlement of pre-war debts by the Federal German Republic, without the I.T.U. reserving the right to go back on its decision."

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic associated themselves with the statements made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. and said they would vote against the draft Resolution.

The Chairman said that hitherto discussion had centred exclusively round the debts owed by Germany and Japanese Territories. Might he conclude that the Committee approved of the steps contemplated for Yugoslavia and the Italian Colonies?

The Delegate of Portugal had some general objections. According to paragraphs 1 and 3 of the proposed decision, 366,210 Swiss francs would be written off. To make up for it, one means only was contemplated - increase in the contributions of Members. If payments were staggered, interest would have to be paid in the meantime. Other amounts might be added thereto. There was nothing in the Convention which would allow such arrears to be debited to I.T.U. Members as a whole. His country, for one, could not agree to bear its share of the additional expenditure. It was for the countries, which had created de facto situations in the territories concerned to bear the entire expenditure. Pending a decision as to who the new debtors were, he would agree to 366,210 Swiss francs being "frozen" in the accounts of the Union.

The Delegate of Egypt said he would be prepared to accept the resolution if all countries were to agree to it. If certain countries felt obliged to refuse their share in defraying the sum in question, his country would also refuse to pay.

The Delegate of France said that it would have to be decided who was legally responsible for the debts. It would then be seen whether debtors refused to pay or were unable to do so. "Frozen" debts did not just disappear. They inevitably meant advances from the Swiss Government and bore interest at the rate of 4%. In the last analysis, if no one was found to take responsibility, it would be the Union which would have to pay.

The Delegate of Italy wanted some explanation of how, in practice, "frozen" debts would be settled.

The Delegate of Portugal thought that it was for the countries concerned, and for them alone, to pay. In practice, "freezing" the debts would mean closing them as at 31 December 1952. Interest thereon would continue to accrue, but would be borne by all Members.

The Chairman of Working Group 3 (Dr. Sterky) said that they had unanimously decided to freeze interest on all amounts due, but he thought that that should not be mentioned in the draft Resolution. They hoped that some part might be recovered subsequently (vide paragraph 4 of the Resolution).

Speaking as the Delegate of Sweden, Dr. Sterky considered that there was no other course open to the Union than to write off the debts. Sweden would be willing to pay its share. No loss could be allowed to fall on Switzerland, and if it proved impossible to recover the debts, the amounts must be written off.

As Chairman of the Working Group, he said that in the Working Group, nine hours had been devoted to the question. No one could be found willing to assume responsibility for those debts. The only solution was to write them off and to recover them over a long period.

The Delegate of Japan appreciated the point of view expressed by the Delegate of Portugal. The position of his country had been fully explained in the Working Group. Japan was willing to pay its debt up to 1 September, 1945, but after that date all its dependencies had disappeared, and the occupying powers in Tokyo informed the Secretary General in 1949 that Japan was no longer responsible for those territories. Japan had now reentered the I.T.U. and was considering the question of increasing its unit contribution.

The Delegate of Italy asked how "frozen" debts could be posted in the budget of the I.T.U.

The Chairman agreed that as long as any possibility existed of recovering debts, they should not be written off, but the matter had been very carefully considered by the Working Group before the resolution had been drafted (see the reasons given on page 3 of Document No. 229).

The Delegate of Portugal said that the "frozen" sum would be entered in the asset column under a special heading: "Sums in abeyance for Special Reasons". On the liability side, an equal sum would be entered, the reserve fund would be decreased, or some other means would be adopted. The debts thus balanced would no longer bear interest.

The Delegate of France thought that in a matter of such importance every effort should be made to achieve unanimity. In the case of Germany and Japan, all Members had some degree of responsibility, since at Atlantic City a protocol had been adopted to enable those countries to become Members once more. That meant, obviously, that they had ceased to be Members. Hence, at law, they should have no debts towards the Union to which they no longer belonged. As regards the Italian colonies, could Italy possibly be asked to pay for territories over which it no longer exercised authority? The resolution proposed was the wisest course; any other expedient would not yield good results. If debts were merely "frozen", they would not completely disappear.

The Delegate of Pakistan said that either (a) the original country or (b) the occupying authority should pay; it was not a matter for the Union as a whole. The Plenipotentiary Conference should draw up a list of countries which had been occupied and send accounts to (a) or (b). If there were several occupying powers, then the charge would be divided proportionally. If debts were written off, the money must be found by the remaining Members, and he was opposed to that solution. It was a mistake for the Union to continue to render accounts to a country which had been occupied, and, in any future case, an occupied country should be written off as a Member immediately, in order to avoid a recurrence of the present situation.

The Delegate of Lebanon said that the matter raised a point of international law which might perhaps be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that the matter was not as simple as the Delegate of Pakistan thought. In the case of the Japanese Islands, the debt was created by a single authority - the Japanese Colonial Administration. Now that same area was in the hands of no less than six separate occupying authorities, and he was very doubtful if the original area would ever be reconstituted. He agreed, however, with the second point made by the Delegate of Pakistan, that the Union ought not to go on billing Members which had disappeared. Whatever solution was adopted, all Members must share in it, and he was therefore in favour of accepting the draft Resolution.

The Chairman thought a vote should be taken forthwith on whether the debts in question should continue to be shown in the books or not.

The Delegate of Portugal, after the comments made by the Delegate of the United States of America, agreed to withdraw his objections, provided that (1) the credit of 366,210 Swiss francs should be staggered over 10 years, (2) that that sum should bear no interest after 31 December 1952, and (3) that the measure should not constitute a precedent for other queried debts.

There was some discussion during which the Chairman, and the Delegates of Egypt, Denmark, and Portugal spoke. The Delegate of Portugal provisionally agreed to the proposed text, reserving his country's right to change its views if the sum in question were increased or if the period over which the recovery was spread was unacceptable.

The Chairman thereupon called for a vote on the question of whether or not paragraph 4 of the Resolution should be adopted.

Paragraph 4 was kept by 21 votes to 4, with 17 abstentions.

The second vote was on paragraph 2 of the Resolution (German debts).

Paragraph 2 was retained by 29 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

The other paragraphs of the Resolution having not been objected to, the Resolution, without the qualifying clause governing paragraph 4, was adopted.

The Delegate of Pakistan said that his country would refuse to accept any obligation for those debts since it was a part of India at the time that the debts were incurred. He asked that no account in respect of them should be rendered to Pakistan.

The Chairman, speaking as Delegate of India, thought the matter raised by the Delegate of Pakistan could not be settled on the floor of the House.

Summarizing the decisions taken, the Chairman stated that a report will be drafted for the Plenary Assembly on the Resolution just passed and on the other questions already considered, namely, consolidated budget, working capital fund, publications. He asked if the Committee would authorize him to submit it. The Committee agreed.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. suggested that the Committee should turn its attention to the 1953 budget at the earliest possible moment so that the continued employment of the I.F.R.B. temporary staff could be regularized.

Reporters:

J.T. Arregui

R.A. Vargues

M. Caws

Chairman:

K. Prasada

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations and the  
Specialized Agencies)

Summary Record of the 4th Meeting

Saturday, 8 November, 1952, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. F. Colt de Wolf (United States of America)

The Delegate of Mexico announced that henceforth his Delegation would take part in the work of Committee 7.

1. COMMUNICATION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS COMMITTEE  
(Documents Nos. 38 and 45)

1.1. The Chairman said that Proposal No. 685 by Switzerland (Document No. 45) had been submitted following the publication of Document No. 38, containing Resolution No. 23 on Telegraphic Communications (War Victims), unanimously adopted in August 1952 by the XVIIIth International Red Cross Conference, Toronto.

1.2. The Delegate of Switzerland recalled that aid to war victims was given by the International Red Cross Committee, whose headquarters were in Switzerland. That country therefore felt bound to support Resolution No. 23.

The question raised by that resolution could only be settled by the next International Telegraph and Telephone Conference which was to meet in 1954. The Plenipotentiary Conference could request that Administrative Conference to decide to what extent the facilities required could be granted. That was the purpose of Proposal No. 685.

His proposal referred to prisoners of war as well as to war victims.

1.3. The Delegate of France thought it would be difficult for the future Telegraph Conference to do useful work unless it had details from the International Red Cross Committee as to the conditions under which telegraph franking privileges or major reductions in charges could be made.

1.4. The Delegate of Switzerland said that his government intended to submit to the Telegraph Conference, 1954, a memorandum prepared jointly with the Red Cross, which should enable that Conference to reach a decision in full knowledge of the facts.

1.5. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland proposed some drafting amendments to Proposal No. 685 to make the form less rigid, since the Plenipotentiary Conference could not anticipate the decisions of the future Telegraph Conference.

1.6. After the Delegates of India, the U.S.S.R., France, Switzerland and Mexico had expressed their views, the text reproduced in Annex 1 was unanimously adopted.

2. PRIORITY FOR TELEGRAMS FROM SPECIALIZED AGENCIES - DRAFT RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY FRANCE (Document No. 178)

2.1. The United Nations Observer asked for technical details as to the scope of the draft resolution and the privileges that might be requested by the United Nations for such telegrams.

2.2. The Delegate of France pointed out that the Specialized Agencies were excluded, as agreed by Committee 7. He expressed his opinion in favour of the restrictive interpretation of privileges, limiting them to the priority mentioned in Article 36 of the Convention for Government telegrams and doing away with all other privileges granted in Government telegrams.

The Chairman said that the Delegate of France had clarified the position and referred to what had been done in favour of W.H.O. The Delegate of France had changed his opinion in the sense that the Administrative Council would have to consult the Members.

2.4. The Delegate of France stated that until the Telegraph and Telephone Conference adopted specified amendments to the Regulations, the Council would not be able to adopt resolutions without previously consulting the Members of the I.T.U.

2.5. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated that, in view of the resolution adopted by Committee 7, there was no reason to discuss that contained in Document No. 178 since it had already been settled by that Committee. He asked what consequences an adverse vote would have on the proposal in Document No. 178. He considered that proposal superfluous.

2.6. The Delegate of Australia supported the French proposal and considered that the privileges of government telegrams should not be made too extensive.

The Delegate of India also supported the French proposal.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland supported the proposal in Document No. 178, but proposed a small amendment to paragraph 1 of the recommendation which seemed to be addressed to the Specialized Agencies instead of to the Council.

2.7. The Delegate of France accepted the proposed amendment and dictated the text in French. (See Annex 2).

2.8. Mr. Valensi (Director of the C.C.I.F.) stated that telephone priority could be granted only in the European System.

2.9. Mr. Townshond (Interim Director of the C.C.I.T.) said that precise instructions should be given as regards the telegrams in question.

2.10. The Chairman said that Mr. Townshond, as Assistant Secretary General and Interim Director of the C.C.I.T. would be present at the proper moment to advise members.

2.11. The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. could not see the practical result to be obtained from the adoption of the proposal in Document No. 178 and asked for clarification.

2.12. The Chairman explained that if the proposal did not exist the Administrative Council could abstain from dealing with the requests, but if it were approved, the Council would have to deal with them.

2.13. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia described the way in which priority was given to State telegrams, saying that it should be expressly requested by the sender.

The telegrams under discussion would have to be dealt with by a new regulation since they would constitute a new category of telegrams. He recalled the restrictive tendencies manifested during the Paris Conference as regards telegram categories. He also recalled the reservation made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

If the proposal were accepted, the work of the Administrative Council would be increased and in consequence the expenses. He could not, therefore, support the proposal in Document No. 178.

2.14. The Delegate of France answered the statements made by the Delegate of Czechoslovakia and recalled the resolution adopted by the United Nations in favour of extending government privileges to the telegrams of the Specialized Agencies. He explained what government telegrams were and mentioned those which alone had priority.

2.15. The Delegate of Pakistan suggested a few amendments to the French proposal, which were accepted. (They are incorporated to Annex 2 to this Document).

2.16. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. was against the proposal in Document No. 178 because it ran counter to a resolution adopted by the Committee.

The Delegate of the Belorussian S.S.R. was of the same opinion.

2.17. The Dologato of the United States of America reserved the right to raise the question of according government status to telegrams of the Specialized Agencies in plenary assembly.

2.18. The proposal in Document No. 178 was put to the vote with the following results:

25 votos in favour  
7 " against  
2 abstentions

The draft resolution, as reproduced in Annex 2, was adopted.

3. ABROGATION OF ARTICLE IV - SECTION 11, OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES - DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND (Document No. 177).

3.1. The Chairman pointed out that Section 48 of the International Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies stipulated that an Article could only be revised by a conference convened specially for that purpose; further, such a conference could only be convened if one-third of the parties to the Convention members had so requested.

3.2. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that the draft resolution was the outcome of the decision reached by the Committee at its 2nd meeting.

3.3. The Delegate of the United States of America thought that the proposal to abrogate Article IV, Section 11, of the above-mentioned Convention was impractical because of the complexities involved in amending that Convention. He was not in favour of adopting the draft resolution.

3.4. The United Nations Observer pointed out that such a proposal could not be submitted by the Secretary General of the I.T.U. - it had to come from a country. The Secretary General of the I.T.U. could merely acquaint the Secretary General of the United Nations with the views of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

3.5. The Delegate of France thought that such a step was useful and even necessary. The United Nations would thus realize that the members of the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference had confirmed the views of the Atlantic City Plenipotentiary Conference. The United Nations might also be informed, through the Secretary General of the I.T.U., that even if Article IV, Section 11, of the above Convention were not abrogated, it could not be applied.

3.6. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland suggested amending the text of Document No. 177 to take into account the comments made by the United Nations Observer.

3.7. The Delegate of Argentina wondered whether the approach might not be made in two stages. First, the countries Members of the I.T.U. would ask the Secretary General of the United Nations to convene a conference; if the number of countries requesting the conference was insufficient, the second stage would be for the Secretary General of the I.T.U. to inform the Secretary General of the United Nations of the views of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

3.8. After statements by the Delegates of Pakistan, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and Argentina, and the United Nations Observer, the Chairman suggested setting up a working group to prepare a text, in time for the next meeting of Committee 7, reflecting the opinions expressed. The Group might be composed of the Delegate of Argentina, the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United Nations Observer - the latter in the role of political adviser.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

Reporters:

J. Doublet

J. Carrido Moreno

Chairman:

F. Colt de Wolf

Annexes: 2

ANNEX 1

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

GENEVA CONVENTIONS ON THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR  
AND THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS IN WARTIME

The International Telecommunication Conference,  
Buenos Aires,

considering:

1. the provisions of Article 74, paragraph 5, and of Article 124 of the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War, dated 12 August 1949 (1) and of Articles 110, paragraph 5, and 141 of the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in Wartime, dated 12 August 1949 (1);
2. the provisions of Article 35 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947;

recommends:

that the International Telegraph and Telephone Conference to meet in 1954 consider sympathetically whether, and if so, to what extent the telegraph franking privileges and the reductions in telegraph charges envisaged in the Geneva Conventions mentioned above could be accorded, and make any necessary modifications to the International Telegraph Regulations.

---

(1) See Annex.

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No.246-E  
19 November 1952

COMMITTEE 5

I T A L Y

Replies to questions raised in Document No. 235 - Sanctions

No. 1 - Yes.

No. 2 - Members should lose their right to vote at I.T.U. conferences and meetings, and on the occasion of referenda instituted by the Administrative Council, the I.F.R.B., and the Secretary General. Nor would their representatives be allowed to vote in the Administrative Council or in the I.F.R.B.

No. 3 - a) Two years after the I.T.U. financial year for which the debts have been incurred.

b) They should pertain both to publications and to the expenses of conferences and meetings.

c) See reply to Question No.2 above.

No. 4 - At conferences and meetings, and in the organs mentioned in No.2 above, a two-thirds majority vote of those present and entitled to vote should enable the Members or representatives mentioned in No.2 above to vote, if it is considered that failure to pay is due to circumstances beyond their control or if payments are not overdue by more than five years.

I T A L Y

Answers to questions raised in Document No. 236

Paragraph 7, Article 14 of the Convention

1. Contributions for ordinary expenses should be paid annually, in two equal parts falling due respectively on 1 February and 1 July;
2. According to the informations provided by the Secretary General, the U.N. and other specialized agencies do not require payment of interest on outstanding contributions. The same system should be followed by the I.T.U., taking into consideration the sanctions provided for in the answers to the questions raised in Document No. 235. If the payment of interest should be maintained, then it should be applied to cases under paragraphs a), b), c) but not in the case considered under paragraph d), if the sums in question are small.
3. If required, 3% per year.
4. No agree.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 248-E  
19 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SITUATION OF COUNTRIES IN RELATION  
TO THE ATLANTIC CITY CONVENTION

(Supplement to Documents Nos. 22 and 28)

The deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Atlantic City Convention by the Republic of the Philippines was registered on 13 November 1952.

This brings the number of countries listed in Annex 1 to the Convention which signed and have ratified the Convention to 69 and reduces the number of countries listed in that Annex which signed the Convention but have not yet ratified it to 3.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3  
(Convention)

Summary Record of the 18th Meeting

Monday 17 November, at 1600 hours.

Chairman: Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted the Summary Record of the 14th meeting (Document No. 204) to the Committee, which approved it with the following amendment requested by the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:  
on page 17, 3rd line from the end of the page: "Mr. Townshend" should read: "the Delegate of the Netherlands".

°  
° °

The Committee then studied the report by Sub-Committee 3A  
(Document No. 184 and Corrigendum Document No. 202).

The Chairman of Sub-Committee 3A, Mr. Pedersen, introduced the report by his Sub-Committee:

"The results of the work of Sub-Committee 3A have been presented to your committee in Document No. 184. I must first point out that the speedy conclusion of the task is due to the very fine cooperation between all members of our sub-committee and to the good help we received from the Chairman of the I.F.R.B., Mr. Dellamula and the Assistant Secretary General Mr. Townshend.



"Our task has been first of all to incorporate the various decisions of principle taken by Committee 3 at previous meetings. This has been done, and I do not consider it necessary to comment on that part of the report as all these questions have been fully discussed in Committee 3.

"But in addition we have had the task to study paragraph 1 of Article 6 and also to study all proposals having a bearing on Article 6. That has of course been the most difficult part of our work, and as these problems have not been discussed in Committee 3, I shall comment in some detail on that part of the work. And I shall try to justify the texts proposed in connection with these problems in order to have the background for these provisions known and recorded.

"Paragraph 1.a.

"To this paragraph has been added that the recording of frequencies shall not only be based upon the Radio Regulations, but also upon other provisions - decided upon by competent Conferences of the Union - and having a bearing upon the rules for assignment of frequencies.

"This takes care of the relevant parts of Proposal No. 95 of U.S.A. and No. 701 of Portugal. In this way we have made the definition of the duties of I.F.R.B. more general, and it will cover the tasks given to it by E.A.R.C. or similar Conferences.

"Paragraph 1.b.

"This paragraph has not been changed from the Convention. In connection with this we have considered Proposal No. 85 of Switzerland by which it has been proposed to charge the I.F.R.B. with giving advice also within those parts of the radio frequency spectrum where no international interference will occur. The sub-committee, however, came to the conclusion that questions like that fall outside the natural scope of the I.F.R.B. It is a problem which only concerns a single country, and the sub-committee found that it was not necessary to have such a problem considered by an international Board like the I.F.R.B.

"1.b.bis.

"This paragraph has been added to take care of several proposals in favour of giving the I.F.R.B. the duty to carry out decisions of competent Conferences. In addition, the sub-committee has proposed to charge the Board with the preparation of Conferences, when so decided by a Conference or the Administrative Council. This may be an effective way of shortening the duration of future radio Conferences, and we therefore consider this to be an important addition.

"1.b.ter.

"This paragraph has been added to take care of the task of maintaining any frequency record as decided by E.A.R.C.

"In paragraph 2 it has been stressed that the I.F.R.B. shall act as a body of independent members. Which in practice means that even in regional matters all members are responsible for the decisions taken or the advice given.

"The substance of No. 297 of the R.R. dealing with the technical qualifications of the members has been transferred to this paragraph in accordance with the decision of Committee 3.

"The sub-committee has, however, introduced two important additions. The members should not only have knowledge of frequency assignment, but also of frequency utilization. They must not only know the R.R. by heart, but they also must know how to calculate the frequency order for a given radio circuit, and have knowledge of all the various technical conditions which influence the choice of frequency in each case.

"And in addition we have, at the wise proposal of Brazil, transferred the clause 299 from the R.R. to the Convention. This clause deals with the necessary regional knowledge for the members, and by including this in the Convention, we have included everything in connection with the qualifications in the Convention instead of having part of it in the Convention and part of it in the R.R.

"Paragraph 3.

"Here the English and Spanish text has been brought better into line with the French text and also made a little more positive by replacing the words "with a view of ensuring a balanced selection of the members" by "to ensure an equitable selection of the members".

"In this paragraph we have included more detailed rules for what must be done when a member leaves the service of the Board. It has been stressed that the election of a country to nominate a member on the Board is not only a right, but also an obligation to provide the Board with an effectively working member. And if this for any reason or other should not be done, then the right will be lost. This idea has to some extent been taken from the United Kingdom Proposal No. 663.

"If a member resigns, the Chairman will immediately take steps to have him replaced by another person from the same country. And this should be done within 3 months.

"And if a member, for reasons of his own, does not take part in the work of the Board for a period exceeding 3 months, then the Chairman will act as if the member actually had resigned. In this case the Board may of course be without a member for a period of up to 6 months as a maximum.

"Should the country not find it possible to provide a member, then the Chairman must get in contact with another country within the same area. And it is proposed that the request should first be addressed to the country which had obtained the second largest number of votes at the previous election.

"This method is different from the method given in 307 of the R.R. according to which the Administrative Council should appoint a new member. But by the new method we avoid time delay caused by waiting for the next session of the Council, and the procedure is made more precise.

"For paragraph 4 we have a corrected text in Document No.202. It is proposed that the internal regulations for the Board should be included in the General Regulations, just as we now have the General

Provisions for the C.C.I.'s. A point to be remembered by Committee 4.

"Paragraph 5.

"Here we have completed the section (3) dealing with the necessary financial independence of the members by including the footnote 302.1 from the R.R. By so doing we have got a complete text in the Convention covering all the relevant provisions.

"In this connection the sub-committee has carefully studied the proposal No. 93 of Argentina by which it is proposed to leave out sections 5.2 and 5.3. According to that proposal, this could be done by having a general clause, covering all persons in the service of the Union, included in Art. 9. The sub-committee found, however, that there was an important difference between the staff on one side and the elected members of I.F.R.B. on the other side. The staff is responsible to the Union, as stated in the proposal of Argentina, because they are responsible to the Secretary General and through him to the Administrative Council. But the members of the I.F.R.B. are not responsible to the Secretary General or to the Administrative Council, but only the Radio Conferences. For this reason it was found more correct to have a special paragraph dealing with the responsibility of the members of I.F.R.B.

"At the proposal of the Delegate of Brazil, the provisions in 371 of R.R. have been transferred to the Convention. The right of a country to send a technical representative to meetings of the Board when questions of direct interest to that country are under consideration, is an important right for all countries, also for those not having a national on the Board. In popular language it may be considered to be a safety valve for non-members. And for that reason it should be included in the Convention.

"A new provision stating that the Board must have a specialized secretariat has been introduced. This is quite brief, and the opinion of the sub-committee was that further details on the recruitment of staff could naturally be included under Art. 9 of the Convention.

"We have, in addition, transferred from Art. 7 of the Convention a provision for the termination of memberships in case a country ceases to be a Member of the Union. This takes care of Art. 7, par. 2. But we have not been able to take care of Art. 7, par. 1 as the question of ratification has not yet been settled by the Conference.

-----

"In addition to these provisions of Art. 6, the sub-committee recommends to include the text of Annex 2 in the Art. 9 dealing with the duties of the Secretary General.

"The decision of Committee 3 on the number of members on the Board has been included in a Resolution (Annex 3). This has been found most correct as the number only can be considered valid up to the time of the next Plenipotentiary Conference, and it should then be revised.

"In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the sub-committee considers that the task given to it has been terminated. We believe that that text of Art. 6 as presented in Document No. 184 is a definite improvement over the present text. And we recommend that Committee 3 should approve this text."

Mr. Dellamula, Chairman of the I.F.R.B., then indicated some drafting amendments to the Spanish text of Document No. 184.

-----

The Chairman opened the discussion on Document No. 184 paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 - sub-paragraph a)

The Chairman pointed out a drafting amendment which affected the French text only.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. made the following statement:

"The I.F.R.B. could only carry out its task of registering frequencies on the basis of Article 47 of the Radio Regulations, which provides that, until the effective date of the complete new International Frequency List, frequency registration shall be effected on the basis of the Cairo Regulations and within the framework of the provisions of the Radio Regulations in force. Consequently it is inadmissible that the Convention, in Article 6 (paragraph 1a), should contain references to decisions by "competent conferences", especially since, as everyone knows, the decisions of the E.A.R.C., for example, are contrary to the Radio Regulations.

"Only the Radio Regulations (Article 47) can constitute the basis of the work of the I.F.R.B.

"Consequently, the Soviet Delegation submits the following amendment to paragraph 1 a) : after the words 'in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Radio Regulations' delete the phrase containing a reference to the 'decisions which may be taken by competent Conferences of the Union.'

"Sub-paragraph a) of paragraph 1 should thus read as follows:

'a) to effect an orderly recording of frequency assignments made by the different countries so as to establish, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Radio Regulations, the date, purpose and technical characteristics of each of these assignments, with a view to ensuring formal international recognition thereof;'"

The proposal by the U.S.S.R. Delegate was seconded by the Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. Put to the vote, the proposal was rejected by 42 votes to 9 with 9 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph a) of paragraph 1 was then approved without amendment by 42 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 - sub-paragraph b)

The Delegate of Switzerland said that the Sub-Committee had not taken into account Swiss Proposal No. 85. That proposal reflected the spirit of E.A.R.C. Resolution No. 3, recognizing that the administrations of countries whose telecommunication systems were underdeveloped might require particular help, not only in cases where harmful interference was feared. He thought the I.F.R.B. should help such countries on a more generous scale - for example by assisting them to establish certain circuits on very high frequencies unlikely to create international interference.

The Chairman of Sub-Committee 3 A explained that the Sub-Committee had felt it should not adopt the Swiss proposal, since it considered that questions affecting only one country, where international interference was not involved, should not be the concern of an international body of the size of the I.F.R.B.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. pointed out that the Swiss proposal did not concern the essential tasks of the Board as outlined in the existing Article 6. It might more appropriately come under Nos. 292 and 294 of the Radio Regulations; the latter specifically stated that all general technical questions confronting the Board should be referred by it to the C.C.I.R.

The Delegate of Pakistan drew the Committee's attention to the question of the I.F.R.B.'s relations with the new countries. The Radio Regulations contained no specific reference to the matter, and the recent statements by Mr. Pedersen and Mr. Dellamula did not satisfy him as they contained nothing new. The I.F.R.B. should do more than act merely as a sort of manager of the frequencies belonging to certain favoured countries.

The Chairman pointed out that the question raised by the Delegate of Pakistan deviated from the Swiss proposal.

The proposal by Switzerland was then seconded by the Delegate of Israel, and the Chairman put it to the vote by a show of hands. There were 4 votes in favour of the proposal, 19 against, and 25 abstentions. In view of the number of abstentions the vote was invalid, so the Chairman submitted the Swiss proposal to a roll-call vote.

The Swiss proposal was rejected by 30 votes to 7, with 29 abstentions.

For the proposal : 7 delegations.

Austria, India, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Switzerland, Viet-Nam;

Against the proposal : 30 delegations.

Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Bielorussian S.S.R., Bolivia, Brazil, People's Republic of Bulgaria, Chilo, Vatican City, Colombia, Denmark, Spain, United States of America, Hungarian People's Republic, Ireland, Mexico, Norway, New Zealand, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian People's Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, United States Territories, Union of South Africa, U.S.S.R., Spanish Zone of Morocco.

Abstentions : 29 delegations

Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, China, Belgian Congo, Korea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, France, Greece, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Netherlands, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Syria, Oversea Territories of the French Republic, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

After the vote, the Delegate of Czechoslovakia said he had voted against the Swiss proposal because he thought that the expression "the decisions which may be taken by the competent Conferences of the Union", appearing in sub-paragraph a), already covered the substance of the proposal.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he reserved his opinion on sub-paragraph b) of paragraph 1).

The Delegate of Pakistan reserved the right to revert to the question he had previously raised.

There being no further proposals, the Chairman said that the existing sub-paragraph b) was retained without amendment.

Paragraph 1 - sub-paragraph b bis)

The Delegations of the U.S.S.R. and the Bielorussian S.S.R. asked for this sub-paragraph to be deleted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said:

"The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. considers it necessary to submit an amendment concerning sub-paragraph b bis) of paragraph 1. We consider that this sub-paragraph should be deleted in toto since the I.F.R.B. can only carry out the tasks for which it was created, i.e. the registration of frequencies on the basis of the provisions of the Radio Regulations (Article 47).

"Consequently sub-paragraph b bis) instructing the I.F.R.B. to perform 'any additional duties', apart from those assigned to it in the Regulations, is totally unacceptable and contrary to the Regulations.

"The I.F.R.B. can register the frequency assignments made by the countries Members of the Union only on the basis of the provisions appearing in Article 47 of the Regulations.

"It is particularly inadmissible that the Administrative Council which, as we all know, does not have to examine, in a general way, questions relating to radio technique, should meddle in any way whatsoever in the work of the I.F.R.B., assign it 'additional duties', etc. Hence the Soviet Delegation proposes that Committee 3 should delete the whole of sub-paragraph b bis) of paragraph 1 of the draft of Article 6 of the Convention. That is our amendment."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. said:

"The drafting of sub-paragraph b bis) as submitted by Sub-Committee 3 A is vague and does not clearly define the tasks of the I.F.R.B.

"In the opinion of our Delegation, the Conference should approve only clear, precise texts which define clearly and unambiguously the I.F.R.B.'s task. The proposal submitted by the sub-committee does not have these qualities.

"According to the text proposed, the I.F.R.B. is entrusted with functions that are exceptionally broad in scope, and even with unlimited rights in the sphere of frequency assignment and utilization, and our Delegation cannot agree to that.

"The Delegation of the Belorussian S.S.R. objects to sub-paragraph b bis). It entirely agrees with the Soviet proposal to delete this sub-paragraph."

The Delegate of Egypt pointed out that the Administrative Council had no authority in technical matters, and that consequently it should not be mentioned among those who could entrust the I.F.R.B. with tasks of a technical nature. The Chairman of Sub-Committee 3 replied that it was quite evident that before a conference took place, the Council was the only organ that could give the I.F.R.B. instructions for the preparation of that Conference; that was why the Sub-Committee had prepared the text proposed.

A discussion ensued between the Delegates of Egypt and France, the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. and the Chairman of Sub-Committee 3 A, from which it was evident that the text of sub-paragraph b bis) was not quite clear, so the Committee decided to ask the Editorial Committee to improve it.

The Delegate of Egypt was prepared to withdraw his objections after being assured that it was quite understood that the Administrative Council could not act on its own initiative and that, naturally, it must consult the Members of the Union as it had done, for example, when convening the E.A.R.C.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"The amendment we proposed consists of the elimination of sub-paragraph b bis) of paragraph 1, Article 6.

"The Delegate of Egypt was right to point out that the present draft gives the Administration Council exaggerated rights and powers. The task of the I.F.R.B. are purely technical. The Regulations and only the Regulations can direct the activities of the I.F.R.B. and not this or that Administrative Conference or the Administrative Council.

"Consequently the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. urges the adoption of its amendment to paragraph 1, namely: that sub-paragraph b bis) of this paragraph be deleted from the draft of Article 6 of the Convention."

The proposal to delete sub-paragraph b bis), submitted by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R., being the only point at issue, it was put to the vote by the Chairman.

This proposal was rejected by 41 votes to 7 with 4 abstentions.

The text of sub-paragraph b bis) was then approved by 45 votes to 7 with 6 abstentions, it being understood that the Editorial Committee would improve the wording of the sub-paragraph.

Paragraph 1, sub-paragraph b ter)

Sub-paragraph b ter) was adopted without comment or amendment.

Paragraph 2.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. made the following proposal:

"Paragraph 2 consists of three sub-paragraphs. The last two have been transferred from Article 10 of the Radio Regulations to the text at present under discussion. We consider that it is quite pointless and inadmissible to transfer the provisions of the Radio

Regulations to the Convention. For this reason we propose that the last two sub-paragraphs be deleted from paragraph 2 of Article 6."

This proposal was supported by the Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

The Chairman of Sub-Committee 3A said that the Sub-Committee had decided to include these two sub-paragraphs in the Conventions so that the important provisions they covered could not be amended by an Ordinary Radio Conference. The Chairman also pointed out that it was the Committee itself that decided, during its twelfth meeting, to insert the second sub-paragraph as proposed.

The proposal of the U.S.S.R. was then put to the vote and rejected by 43 votes to 8 with 6 abstentions.

Following a remark made by the Delegate of Pakistan, the Committee asked that the Editorial Committee, when it came to examine the paragraph under discussion, should not fail to use the expression "Member-Country" when referring to a country elected to the I.F.R.B., and the word "member" (with a small m) when referring to a person appointed to serve on the I.F.R.B.

Following this explanation, the proposed text for paragraph 2 was approved by 38 votes to 8 with 4 abstentions.

### Paragraph 3

Paragraph 3 gave rise to a long discussion during which the following points were brought out:

#### 1) Drafting Questions.

a) Following a remark by the Delegate of Egypt, the Chairman of Sub-Committee 3A explained that, in the English text, the word "balanced" had been replaced by "equitable" in order to bring the English and French texts into closer agreement.

b) The Delegates of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and of Pakistan considered that the English word "parts" was not an exact equivalent of the French word "régions", and they asked if it would not be better to replace "parts" by "regions" or "areas". However, after the Chairman had explained the matter, they accepted the retention of the word "parts" which appears in the present text of the Convention.

c) In reply to a query raised by the Delegate of the Netherlands, the Committee decided to replace, in the 5th sub-paragraph (4th line), the expression "for a period of three months" by "for a period exceeding three months".

d) The Delegate of Egypt considered that the 4th sub-paragraph of paragraph 3, relating to the date on which members of the I.F.R.B. would take up their duties, was not very clear, and he proposed that it should be amended. After the Chairman had pointed out that this sub-paragraph was almost equivalent to Number 304 of the Radio Regulations, the Delegate of Egypt did not insist upon the amendment.

e) The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia proposed a rearrangement of paragraph 3. He felt that the present sub-paragraph 4 should come immediately after sub-paragraph 1 and that the two should be merged to form a single sub-paragraph.

This suggestion was sent to the Editorial Committee for examination.

## 2) Other questions

a) The Delegate of Italy considered that paragraph 3 should contain a provision relating to the election of the Chairman of the Board. To this end, he proposed the following text: "The members of the I.F.R.B. shall elect from among themselves a Chairman and Vice-Chairman who shall carry out these duties for the period of one year or until their successors have been duly elected. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the I.F.R.B. shall always be eligible for re-election".

The Chairman said that it would be more convenient to examine this proposal at the end of Document No.184.

b) The Delegate of the United States of America asked what would happen if a Member-Country of the I.F.R.B. resigned.

The Chairman of Sub-Committee 3 A said that this case had not been envisaged by the Sub-Committee, but he thought that the clause applicable in a case of resignation, or of a member of the Board ceasing to carry out his duties, could also be applied in those circumstances.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. pointed out that this would be incompatible with the fact that members of the I.F.R.B. are "independent members".

The Delegate of the United States of America said that he shared this point of view.

c) The Delegate of Argentina considered that the 3rd sub-paragraph of paragraph 3, drafted as follows: "The countries entrusted with the task of nominating the members of the Board are eligible for re-election, and the same members may be nominated again.", was clumsy and could lead to confusion. He proposed to replace this sub-paragraph by the following sentence: "The Member-Countries of the Board are eligible for re-election."

This proposal was adopted by 38 votes to 6, with 11 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 as a whole was then put to the vote and adopted, taking into consideration the amendment suggested by the Delegate of Argentina and just adopted, by 52 votes to 0, with 8 abstentions.

#### Paragraph 4

In Document No.184, the Sub-Committee proposed the following text:

"4. The working arrangements of the Board are defined in the General Regulations, and the procedure for the treatment of frequency assignment notifications, in the Radio Regulations."

In Document No.202 the above draft was replaced by:

"4. The Rules of Procedure of the Board are defined in the General Regulations annexed to this Convention."

It was therefore the second proposal that was submitted to the Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said:

"The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. is categorically opposed to the inclusion of the text of paragraph 4 in Article 6, since Article 12 of the Radio Regulations entitled 'Internal Regulations of the I.F.R.B.' contained all the necessary instructions on this subject.

"It is therefore inadmissible that the provisions of the Internal Regulations of the I.F.R.B. be transferred to the General Regulations.

"Hence the amendment that I submit involves completely deleting paragraph 4 from the draft of Article 6 of the Convention."

The Delegates of France, Portugal, and Denmark, also considered that the Internal Regulations of the I.F.R.B. should remain in the Radio Regulations and not be transferred to the General Regulations.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, although he had made Proposal 662 (Doc.No.10), was prepared to support this opinion.

The Chairman, having proposed to retain the text of paragraph 4 as it appeared in the Atlantic City Convention, and the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. being in agreement on this point, the Committee decided that the text would be retained. Paragraph 4 of Article 6 would therefore read as follows:

"4. The working arrangements of the Board are defined in the Radio Regulations."

#### Paragraph 5

Sub-paragraphs 1 and 2 of this paragraph were identical with sub-paragraphs 5 (1) and 5 (2) of the text at present in force. Sub-paragraph 3 was nothing more than sub-paragraph 5 (3) to which had been added Radio Regulation Number 302.1.

The Delegate of Argentina reminded the Committee that Proposal 149, submitted by his country, envisaged uniting in the same Article provisions at present dispersed but which dealt with the duties and obligations of officials of the Union. He therefore considered that the parts of Articles 6 and 9 dealing with this question should be transferred to the new Article, and this led him to propose the deletion of sub-paragraphs 2 and 3 of paragraph 5, which would be incorporated in the new Article. This proposal would have the advantage of covering the case of officials of the C.C.I.'s who were not covered, owing to an obvious omission, by the provisions of Article 8.

The Chairman said that it would be more convenient for the Committee to adopt paragraph 5 such as it had been proposed in Document No.184, with the option of returning to the question when the time came to examine Proposal 149.

The meeting rose at 1940 hours.

Reporters:

R. V. Hatton  
E. Luraschi  
J. Revoy  
G. Terrac

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 250-E  
19 November 1952

                      
PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

CORRIGENDUM No. 1  
TO DOCUMENT No. 220

Concerns only the French text.

FOURTH REPORT

by

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

to

THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Subject: Text proposed for Article 6 of the Convention (International Frequency Registration Board).

Committee 3 hereby submits (Annex 1) a text designed to replace the present Article 6 of the Atlantic City Convention. The new draft was adopted at the Committee's 19th meeting, by 47 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

It also submits (Annex 2) a draft resolution adopted at its 19th meeting by 39 votes to 12 with 7 abstentions.

These texts embody the decisions on matters of principle in connection with the I.F.R.B. which were submitted to the Plenary Assembly by Committee 3, and adopted at the 7th Plenary Meeting (see the minutes thereof - Document No. 221).

Committee 3 draws the Editorial Committee's attention to the fact that some paragraphs of the new Article 6 were approved by the Committee subject to later stylistic improvements therein by the Editorial Committee, bearing in mind the remarks appearing in the summary records of the Committee's 18th and 19th meetings. Reference is made, more particularly, to paragraph 1, c) (formerly b bis), and to the 4th sub-paragraph of paragraph 3. In addition, it has been suggested that sub-paragraphs 1 and 4 of paragraph 3 be amalgamated.

Annexes: 2.

C. RIBEIRO

Chairman, Committee 3

ANNEX 1

ARTICLE 6 OF THE CONVENTION

(Text proposed by Committee 3)

INTERNATIONAL FREQUENCY REGISTRATION BOARD

1. The essential duties of the International Frequency Registration Board shall be:
  - a) to effect an orderly recording of frequency assignments made by the different countries so as to establish, in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Radio Regulations and in accordance with any decisions which may be taken by competent Conferences of the Union, the date, purpose and technical characteristics of each of these assignments, with a view to ensuring normal international recognition thereof;
  - b) to furnish advice to Members and Associate Members with a view to the operation of the maximum practicable number of radio channels in those portions of the spectrum where harmful interference may occur;
  - c) to perform any additional duties concerned with the assignment and utilization of frequencies prescribed by a competent Conference of the Union, or by the Administrative Council in preparation for or in pursuance of the decisions of such a Conference;
  - d) to maintain such essential records as may be related to the performance of its prescribed duties.

2. The International Frequency Registration Board shall be a body composed of independent members, all nationals of different countries, Members of the Union.

The members of the Board shall be thoroughly qualified by technical training in the field of radio and shall possess practical experience in the assignment and utilization of frequencies.

Moreover, for the more effective understanding of the problems coming before the Board under Article 6, para. 1 b), each member shall be familiar with geographic, economic and demographic conditions within a particular area of the world.

3. At each of its meetings, the ordinary administrative radio Conference shall elect the countries, Members of the Union, each of which is to nominate one of its nationals, qualified as provided above, to serve as an independent member of the Board.

The method of this election shall be established by the Conference itself, in such a way as to ensure an equitable selection of the members from various parts of the world.

The countries Members of the Board are eligible for re-election.

The members of the Board shall take up their duties on the date determined by the Ordinary Administrative Radio Conference which elected the countries entrusted with the task of nominating them. They shall normally remain in office until the members nominated by the countries elected by the following Conference have taken up their duties.

If in the period between two ordinary Administrative Radio Conferences, a member of the Board resigns or otherwise relinquishes his duties for a period exceeding three months, the Member of the Union which nominated him shall be asked by the Chairman of the Board to nominate a successor as soon as possible. If the Member of the Union concerned does not provide a replacement within a period of three months from the date of this request, it shall lose its right to nominate a person to serve on the Board. The Chairman of the Board shall then request the Member of the Union which had obtained, at the previous election, the largest number of votes among those not elected in the area concerned, to nominate a person to serve on the Board for the unexpired portion of the term.

4. The working arrangements of the Board are defined in the Radio Regulations.
5. (1) The members of the Board shall serve, not as representatives of their respective countries, or of a region, but as custodians of an international public trust.
- (2) No member of the Board shall request or receive instructions relating to the exercise of his duties from any Government or a member thereof, or from any public or private organization, or person.

Furthermore, each Member and Associate Member must respect the international character of the Board and of the duties of its members and shall refrain from any attempt to influence any of them in the exercise of their duties.

(3) No member of the Board or of its staff shall participate in any manner or have any financial interest whatsoever in any branch of telecommunication, apart from the work of the Board. The term "financial interest" is not to be construed as applying to the continuation of retirement benefits accruing in respect of previous employment or service.

6. Any person serving on the Board shall be presumed automatically to have resigned his duties from the moment when the country of which he is a national ceases to be a Member of the Union.

--5--  
(251-E)

A N N E X 2

DRAFT RESOLUTION

ON THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE I.F.R.B.

The I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires

Resolves :

that the I.F.R.B. shall continue to have eleven members.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

PROPOSAL No. 733

U. S. A.

General Regulations

Chapter 3, par. 2.(1)

Replace by the following :

2. (1) Each Delegation shall be duly accredited by the Government of the Member or Associate Member concerned to participate in the conferences of the Union.

(1 bis) Whenever the action of a conference requires the signature of any formal instrument by Delegates on behalf of their Governments, Delegates shall be provided with full powers for this purpose. For the signature of the Final Acts of a Plenipotentiary Conference, these full powers shall be signed by the Head of the State or the Head of the Government, or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Member of the Union concerned. For the signature of the Final Acts of an Administrative Conference, these full powers shall be signed :

- a) by the Head of the State or the Head of the Government, or by the Minister of Foreign Affairs; or
- b) by the Minister responsible for telecommunications or by other competent authorities; or
- c) by the Head of the Diplomatic Mission of the country accredited to the government of the country in which the conference meets.

REASONS

To provide a text which takes account of the proposals of several Delegations concerning credentials for Administrative Conferences and to distinguish between accreditation for participation in conferences and the full powers required for signature of the Final Acts of a conference.



RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE

BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE (1952)

(Text finally approved on 6 November 1952  
by the Plenary Assembly of the Conference)

Rule 1

INAUGURATION OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference shall be inaugurated by a person appointed  
by the inviting Government.

Rule 2

ORDER OF SEATING

At meetings of the Plenary Assembly, delegations shall be  
seated in the alphabetical order of the French names of the countries  
represented.

Rule 3

ELECTION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN  
CONSTITUTION OF THE SECRETARIAT

At the first meeting of the Plenary Assembly:

- 1) The Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Conference shall be  
elected;
- 2) the composition of the Conference Secretariat, made up of  
staff of the I.T.U. General Secretariat, and, in case of  
need, of staff supplied by the Administration of the inviting  
Government, shall be approved.

Rule 4

POWERS OF THE CHAIRMAN

1. The Chairman, besides the duties incumbent on him under these Rules of Procedure, shall open and close the meetings of the Plenary Assembly, direct its deliberations, ensure that the Rules of Procedure are applied, give the floor to speakers, put questions to the vote, and announce the decisions adopted.
2. He shall have the general direction of all the work of the Conference, and shall ensure that order is maintained at meetings of the Plenary Assembly. He shall give his ruling on points of order, and in particular, he shall be empowered to propose that discussion on a question be postponed or closed, or that a meeting be suspended or adjourned. He may also decide to postpone the convening of a Plenary Assembly or Meeting should he consider it necessary.
3. It shall be the duty of the Chairman to protect the right of each delegation to express its opinion freely and fully on the point at issue.
4. He shall ensure that discussion is limited to the point at issue, and he may interrupt any speaker who departs therefrom and request him to confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

Rule 5

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

The Plenary Assembly may appoint committees to consider matters referred to the Conference. These committees may in turn appoint sub-committees, and the sub-committees may set up sub-subcommittees. Committees and subcommittees may, if necessary, form working groups.

Rule 6

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES

Committees shall be composed of the delegates of Members and Associate Members which have made application or have been appointed by the Plenary Assembly.

CHAIRMEN, VICE-CHAIRMEN AND REPORTERS OF COMMITTEES

1. The Chairman of the Conference shall submit for the approval of the Plenary Assembly the choice of the Chairman, and of the Vice-Chairman or Vice-Chairmen of each committee.
2. The Chairman of each committee shall propose to his committee the nomination of the reporters and the choice of the chairmen, vice-chairmen, and reporters of the sub-committees which may be set up.

Rule 8

SUMMONS TO MEETINGS

Meetings of the Plenary Assembly, committees subcommittees and working groups shall be announced in good time in the meeting place of the Conference.

Rule 9

PROPOSALS PRESENTED BEFORE

THE OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE

Proposals presented before the opening of the Conference shall be allocated by the Plenary Assembly to the appropriate committees appointed in accordance with Rule 5 of these Rules of Procedure. Nevertheless the Plenary Assembly itself shall be entitled to deal directly with any proposal.

Rule 10

PROPOSALS AND AMENDMENTS PRESENTED

DURING THE CONFERENCE

1. Proposals or amendments presented after the opening of the Conference must be delivered to the Chairman of the Conference, or to the Chairman of the appropriate committee, as the case may be. They may also be handed to the Secretariat of the Conference for publication and distribution as Conference documents.
2. No proposal or amendment may be presented unless signed or approved by the Head of the Delegation concerned, or by his deputy.

3. Every proposal or amendment shall give, in its final form, the text to be considered.
4.
  - 1) The Chairman of the Conference, or, where appropriate, the Chairman of the appropriate committee, shall decide in each case whether the proposal or amendment shall be distributed to delegations in written form or shall be brought to their notice by oral statement.
  - 2) In general, the texts of all major proposals to be put to the vote at a meeting of the Plenary Assembly shall be distributed, in good time, in the working languages of the Conference, in order that they may be studied.
  - 3) In addition, the Chairman of the Conference on receiving proposals or amendments referred to in paragraph 1 of this Rule shall refer them to the appropriate Committee or to the Plenary Assembly as the case may be.
5. Any authorized person may read, or may ask to have read at a meeting of the Plenary Assembly, any proposal or amendment submitted by him during the Conference, and he shall be allowed to explain his reasons therefor.

Rule 11

CONDITIONS REQUIRED FOR DISCUSSION OF,  
AND VOTE ON, ANY PROPOSAL OR AMENDMENT

1. No proposal or amendment submitted prior to the opening of the Conference or during it may be discussed if, when it comes to be considered, it is not seconded by at least one other delegation.
2. Each proposal or amendment duly supported shall be submitted to a vote after discussion.

Rule 12

PROPOSALS PASSED OVER OR POSTPONED

When a proposal has been passed over or when its examination has been postponed, the delegation sponsoring it shall be responsible for seeing that it is considered later.

Rule 13

RULES FOR DEBATES OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

1. Quorum

For a valid vote to be taken at a meeting of the Plenary Assembly, more than half of the delegations accredited to the Conference, and having the right to vote, must be present or represented at the meeting..

2. Order of debates

1) Persons desiring to speak must first obtain the consent of the Chairman. As a general rule, they shall begin by announcing in what capacity they speak.

2) Any person speaking must express himself slowly and distinctly, separating his words and pausing in order that everybody may understand his meaning.

3. Motions of order and points of order

1) During debates, any delegation may, when it thinks fit, submit a motion of order or raise a point of order, which shall at once be settled by the Chairman in accordance with these Rules of Procedure. Any delegation may appeal against the Chairman's ruling, which shall, however, stand, unless a majority of the delegations present and voting are against it.

2) A delegation submitting a motion of order shall not, during its speech, discuss the substance of the matter in question.

4. Priority of motions of order and points of order

The motions and points of order mentioned in paragraph 3 of this Rule shall be dealt with in the following order: -

1) any point of order regarding the application of these Rules of Procedure

- 2) suspension of a meeting
- 3) adjournment of a meeting
- 4) postponement of debate on the matter under discussion
- 5) closure of debate on the matter under discussion
- 6) any other motions of order or points of order that may be submitted, in which case it shall be for the Chairman to decide the relative order in which they shall be considered.

5. Motion for suspension or adjournment, of a meeting

During discussion, any delegation may at any moment move that the meeting be suspended or adjourned. Such motions shall be put to the vote forthwith, without discussion.

6. Motion for postponement of debate

During discussion of any question, any delegation may propose that the debate be postponed for a stated period. Once such a proposal has been made, any discussion thereon shall be limited to no more than three speakers, not counting the person submitting the proposal; one for the motion, and two against.

7. Motion for closure of debate

Any delegation may at any time propose that discussion on the point at issue be closed when the list of speakers whose names have so far been recorded has been exhausted. In such cases, before a vote is taken on the proposal, the floor may be given to not more than two speakers opposing the motion.

8. Limitation of speeches

- 1) The Plenary Assembly may, if necessary, decide how many speeches any one delegation may make, on any particular point, and how long they may last.
- 2) However, as regards questions of procedure, the Chairman shall limit the time allowed for a speech to a maximum of five minutes.
- 3) When a speaker has exceeded the time allowed, the Chairman shall notify the assembly and request the speaker to conclude his remarks briefly.

9. Closing the list of speakers

1) During discussions, the Chairman may rule that the list of speakers wishing to take the floor be read. He shall add the names of other delegations who indicate that they wish to speak and he may then, with the assent of the Assembly, rule that the list be closed. Nevertheless, as an exceptional measure, the Chairman may rule, if he thinks fit, that a reply may be made to any previous statement, even after the list of speakers has been closed.

2) The list of speakers having been exhausted, the Chairman shall declare discussion on the matter closed.

10. Questions of competence

Any questions of competence that may arise shall be settled before a vote is taken on substance of the matter under discussion.

11. Withdrawal and re-submission of motions

The author of any motion may withdraw it before it is put to a vote. Any motion, whether it be amended or not, which has been withdrawn from debate may be re-submitted or taken up by the author of the amendment or by another delegation.

Rule 14

RIGHT TO VOTE

1. At all meetings of the Conference, the Delegation of a Member of the Union duly accredited by that Member to take part in the work of the Conference shall be entitled to one vote in accordance with Article 1 of the Convention.

2. The Delegation of a Member of the Union shall exercise the right to vote:

1) provisionally, from the moment it begins to participate in the work of the Conference;

2) as of right, from the moment the Plenary Assembly has found its credentials to be in order.

3. The Credentials Committee shall make known its conclusions within the time limit specified by the Plenary Assembly.

4. No Delegation shall be entitled to vote from the moment when the Plenary Assembly has found its credentials to be invalid and so long as this state of affairs continues.
5. Any duly accredited delegation may authorize another duly accredited delegation to represent it at one or more meetings which it is unable to attend, and to vote on its behalf, in which case the former delegation shall inform the Chairman of the Conference of its authorization.
6. In no circumstances may a delegation hold more than one proxy vote.

#### Rule 15

##### VOTES

#### 1. Definition of a majority

- 1)
  - a) A majority shall consist of one more than half the delegations present and voting.
  - b) In computing a majority, delegations abstaining shall not be taken into account.
  - c) In case of a tie, a proposal or amendment shall be considered rejected.
- 2) For the purpose of these Rules of Procedure, a "delegation present and voting" shall be a delegation voting for or against a proposal.
- 3) The delegations present which do not participate in a particular vote or which expressly declare their unwillingness to participate therein, shall not be considered absent for the purposes of determining the quorum, nor as abstaining for the purposes of paragraph 3 of this Rule.

#### 2. Special majority

In cases where Members of the Union are to be admitted, the majority described in Article 1 of the Convention shall apply.

#### 3. Abstentions of more than fifty per cent

Should the number of abstentions exceed half the number of votes cast (for, against, abstentions), consideration of the matter under discussion shall be postponed to a later meeting, at which time abstentions shall not be taken into account.

4. Voting Procedure

1) The following voting procedures shall be adopted except in the case provided for in paragraph 5 of this Rule:

- a) By a show of hands, as a general rule;
- b) by nominal roll if the above-mentioned procedure shows no clear majority, or if so requested by a delegation.

2) Votes by nominal roll shall be taken in the alphabetical order of the French names of the members represented.

5. Secret Ballot

Voting shall be by secret ballot when at least five of the delegations present and entitled to vote so request. In such cases, the Secretariat shall at once take steps to ensure the secrecy of the vote.

6. Prohibition of interruptions during votes

No delegation may interrupt once a vote has been begun, unless to raise a point of order in connection with the way in which the vote is being taken.

7. Reasons for votes

The Chairman shall authorize any delegations which so request to give the reasons for their vote, after the vote has been taken.

8. Voting on parts of a proposal

1) When the delegation author of a proposal so requests, or when the Assembly thinks fit, a proposal shall be sub-divided and its various sections put to the vote separately. The parts of the proposal which have been adopted shall then be put to the vote as a whole.

2) If all the sections of a proposal are rejected the proposal shall be regarded as rejected as a whole.

9. Order of voting on concurrent proposals

1) When there are two or more proposals on any one matter, they shall be put to the vote in the order in which they were presented, unless the Assembly decides to the contrary.

- 2) After each vote, a decision may be taken as to whether or not the following proposal shall be voted on.

10. Amendments

- 1) Any proposal for modification consisting merely of a deletion from, an addition to, or a change in a part of the original proposal shall be considered an amendment.
- 2) Any amendment accepted by the delegation submitting the original text shall at once be embodied in the original proposal.
- 3) No amendment shall be regarded as such if the Assembly considers it to be incompatible with the original proposal.
- 4)
  - a) When an amendment is submitted to a proposal, a vote shall first be taken on the amendment.
  - b) When two or more amendments are submitted, the amendment furthest from the original text shall be put to the vote first; of the remainder, that furthest from the proposal shall then be put to the vote and the same procedure shall be followed until all the amendments submitted have been considered.
  - c) If one or more amendments have been approved, the proposal thus amended shall then be put to the vote.
  - d) If no amendment is adopted, the original proposal shall be put to the vote.

Rule 16

COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES

RULES FOR DEBATES AND VOTING PROCEDURES

1. The chairmen of all committees and sub-committees shall have powers similar to those conferred by Rule 4 on the Chairman of the Plenary Assembly,
2. The provisions set forth in Rule 13 for the conduct in debates in the Plenary Assembly shall also apply to the discussions of committees and sub-committees, except in the matter of the quorum.
3. The provisions set forth in Rule 15 shall also apply to votes taken in committees and sub-committees, except as regards paragraph 2.

Rule 17

RESERVATIONS

1. As a general rule, any delegation whose views are not shared by the remaining delegations, shall endeavour, as far as possible, to conform to the opinion of the majority.
2. However, if any decision appears to a delegation to be of such a nature as to prevent its Government from ratifying the Convention and its Annexes, the delegation may make reservations final or provisional, regarding this decision.

Rule 18

MINUTES OF PLENARY ASSEMBLIES

1. The minutes of Plenary Assemblies shall be drawn up by the Secretariat of the Conference, which shall endeavour to ensure their distribution to delegations as soon as possible before the date on which they are to be considered.
2. Within the shortest possible time after the minutes have been distributed delegations may submit in writing, to the Secretariat of the Conference, the corrections they consider to be justified. This shall not prevent them from asking for amendments during the meeting at which the minutes are approved.
3. 1) As a general rule, the minutes shall contain proposals and conclusions, with the chief reasons for them, as succinctly as possible.  
2) However, any delegation shall have the right to require the insertion in the minutes, either summarized or in full, of any statement it has made during the debates. In this case, the delegation should, as a general rule, announce this at the beginning of its statement in order to facilitate the work of the minute-writers, and must itself hand in the text to the Secretariat of the Conference within two hours after the end of the meeting.

4. The right accorded in paragraph 3 2) regarding the insertion of statements in the minutes shall in all cases be used with the utmost discretion.

Rule 19

SUMMARY RECORDS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES

1. 1) The debates of committees and sub-committees shall be summarized, meeting by meeting, in summary records, in which shall be brought out the essential points of the discussion, and the various opinions of which note ought to be taken, together with any proposals or conclusions resulting from the debate as a whole.  
  
2) Nevertheless, any delegation shall be entitled to invoke Rule 18, paragraph 3.2).  
  
3) The right referred to above shall in all circumstances be used with the utmost discretion.
2. Committees and sub-committees may prepare any interim reports they deem necessary and, if circumstances warrant, they may submit, at the end of their work, a final report recapitulating in concise terms the proposals and conclusions resulting from the studies entrusted to them.

Rule 20

ADOPTION OF MINUTES, SUMMARY RECORDS AND REPORTS

1. 1) As a general rule, at the beginning of each meeting of the Plenary Assembly, Committee, or Sub-Committee, the Chairman shall inquire whether there are any comments on the minutes of the previous meeting, or, in the case of Committees or Sub-Committees, on the summary record of the previous meeting. These documents shall be considered approved if no amendments have been handed in to the Secretariat and no objection is made orally. Otherwise, the appropriate amendments shall be made in the minutes or summary record as the case may be.  
  
2) Any interim or final report must be approved by the Committee or Sub-Committee concerned.

2. 1) The summary record of the last meeting of committees or sub-committees shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the committee or sub-committee.
- 2) The minutes of the last Plenary Assembly shall be examined and approved by the Chairman of the Assembly.

Rule 21

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

1. The text of the Final Acts of the Conference, which shall be worded as far as practicable in their definitive form by the various committees, following the opinions expressed, shall be submitted to an editorial committee charged with perfecting their form without altering the sense and with combining them with those parts of former texts which have not been altered.
2. The whole of the revised text shall be submitted for the approval of the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, which shall decide on them, or refer them back to the appropriate committee for further examination.

Rule 22

NUMBERING

1. The numbers of the chapters, articles and paragraphs of the texts subjected to revision, shall be preserved until the first reading at the session of the Plenary Assembly. The passages added shall bear provisionally the numbers bis, ter, etc. and the numbers of deleted passages shall not be used.
2. The definitive numbering of the chapters, articles and paragraphs shall be entrusted to the editorial committee after their adoption at the first reading.

Rule 23

FINAL APPROVAL

Texts shall be considered final when they have been approved at the second reading in Plenary Assembly.

- 14 -  
(253-E)

Rule 24

SIGNATURE

1. The final text approved by the Conference shall be submitted for signature to the delegates provided with the necessary powers, in the alphabetical order of the French names of their countries.
2. The powers mentioned in this Rule must be full powers in good and due form signed by the Head of the State, the Head of the Government or the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Member of the Union concerned.

Rule 25

PRESS NOTICES

Official releases to the press about the work of the Conference, shall be issued only as authorized by the Chairman or a Vice-Chairman of the Conference.

Rule 26

FRANKING PRIVILEGES

During the conference, members of delegations, members of the Administrative Council, Senior officials of the permanent organs of the Union, and the staff of the Secretariat of the Union seconded to the Conference, shall be entitled to postal, telegraph and telephone franking privileges to the extent arranged by the inviting government in agreement with the other governments and recognized private operating agencies concerned.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 254-E  
20 November 1952

\_\_\_\_\_  
PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENTS Nos. 246 and 247

Concerns only the French text.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 255-E  
20 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

D R A F T

Paragraph 4 of Article 14 of the Buenos Aires Convention

4. For the purpose of apportioning expenses, Members and Associate Members shall be divided into 8 classes, each contributing on the basis of a fixed number of units, namely:

1st class:	units
2nd class:	units
3rd class:	units
4th class:	units
5th class:	units
6th class:	units
7th class:	units
8th class:	units

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

D R A F T   P R O T O C O L

Concerning the Procedure to be Followed by the Countries  
Wishing to Reduce Their Class of Contribution to  
the Expenditures of the Union

The International Telecommunication Conference of Buenos  
Aires,  
agrees as follows:

1. In derogation of the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention, the classification of units of contribution provided in Article 14, paragraph 4 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires shall go into effect as of January 1, 1953.
2. Each Member shall, prior to . . . . . ,  
notify the Secretary General of the Union of the class of contribution it has selected, from the classification table set forth in Article 14, paragraph 4 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Buenos Aires.
3. Members failing to make decision prior to . . . . .  
in accordance with the foregoing paragraph shall be bound to contribute in accordance with the number of units to which they have subscribed under the Atlantic City Convention.



International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 257-E  
20 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

APPLICATION BY THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF NEWSPAPER

PROPRIETORS AND EDITORS

I have the honour to submit to the Plenipotentiary Conference, for any action it may desire to take, a copy of the application addressed to the Secretary General of the Union by the International Federation of Newspaper Proprietors and Editors with a view to an eventual amendment of Article 29 of the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City.

Chairman  
of the Plenipotentiary Conference  
M. A. Andrada

Annex : 1

- 2 -  
(257-E)

A N N E X

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF NEWSPAPER PROPRIETORS AND EDITORS  
(INTERNATIONAL PRESS FEDERATION (FIEJ))

Headquarters and General Secretariat  
6 bis, rue Gabriel-Laumain  
PARIS (Xe)

Basle and Paris, 23 June 1952

L. MULATIER, Esq.,  
Secretary General of the I.T.U.,  
Palais Wilson,  
G e n e v a (Switzerland)

Conc. Press telecommunications

Sir,

On behalf of the International Federation of Newspaper Proprietors and Editors, we have the honour to inform the I.T.U. that the Fifth Congress of FIEJ, held in Brussels from 4 to 6 June 1952 studied the problem of press telecommunications as in previous years.

The Congress took note of the letter which you, Mr. Secretary General, were so good as to send to FIEJ in Paris on 7 July 1951 (D 2198/TT). You informed us that the I.T.U. Administrative Council, at its Fifth Session, had decided to postpone the International Telegraph and Telephone Conference - originally scheduled for 1952 in Buenos Aires - to 1954. You also invited us to consult you again towards the end of 1952 on any proposals we might wish to submit to the 1954 Conference.

o

o o

The Brussels Congress instructed the executive office of FIEJ and the undersigned, as telecommunication expert, to get into touch with you before the end of this year. We shall do so in the next few months.

o

o o

The Congress - attended by delegations from fifteen countries - also asked us to acquaint you with the following resolution adopted at Brussels on 6 June 1952 concerning the censorship of telegrams :

The Congress of FIEJ

deplores the broad authorization of censorship of news dispatches which is contained in the present International Telecommunication Convention;

requests its telecommunication expert Dr. Karl SARTORIUS to convey its views to the Secretariat of the I.T.U. in order that the clause may at the next Telecommunication Conference be rendered consistent with the principles of freedom of information and

further instructs Dr. SARTORIUS to communicate the text of his statements to the members of FIEJ so that they may also communicate their views to their respective governments.

Le Congrès de la FIEJ

déplore la large autorisation de censure des dépêches de presse incluse dans l'actuelle Convention internationale sur les télécommunications;

charge son expert en matière de télécommunications, le Docteur Karl SARTORIUS, de prendre contact avec le Secrétariat de l'Union Internationale des Télécommunications, de telle sorte que cette clause puisse être alignée, à la prochaine Conférence Internationale des Télécommunications, sur les principes de la liberté de l'information;

demande au Docteur SARTORIUS de communiquer aux membres de la FIEJ le texte de ses remarques, pour que ceux-ci puissent faire connaître ce point de vue à leurs gouvernements respectifs.

This resolution concerns Article 29 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947, which runs :

Article 29

Stoppage of telecommunications.

1. Members and Associate Members reserve the right to stop the transmission of any private telegram which may appear dangerous to the security of the state or contrary to their laws, to public order or to decency, provided that they immediately notify the office of origin of the stoppage of any such telegram or any part thereof, except when such notification may appear dangerous to the security of the state.

(Ann.to Doc. 257-E)

2. Members and Associate Members also reserve the right to cut off any private telephone or telegraph communication which may appear dangerous to the security of the state or contrary to their laws, to public order or to decency.
1. Les Membres et les Membres associés se réservent le droit d'arrêter la transmission de tout télégramme privé que paraîtrait dangereux pour la sûreté de l'Etat ou contraire à ses lois, à l'ordre public ou aux bonnes mœurs, à charge d'aviser immédiatement le bureau d'origine de l'arrêt total du télégramme ou d'une partie quelconque de celui-ci, sauf dans le cas où cette notification paraîtrait dangereuse pour la sûreté de l'Etat.
2. Les Membres et les Membres associés se réservent aussi le droit de couper toute communication télégraphique ou téléphonique privée que paraîtrait dangereuse pour la sûreté de l'Etat ou contraire à ses lois, à l'ordre public ou aux bonnes mœurs.

Since this article 29 is worded in general terms, it allows any government to censor telegrams as often as it likes. Convincing instances were quoted at the F.I.E.J. Congress by one of the representatives of United States publishers. For example, we were informed that the telegraph and telephone administrations of Argentine and Iran, on the basis of Article 29, had censored press telegrams or had failed to transmit them in time or even to transmit them at all.

Our International Federation is well aware that the security of the state sometimes necessitates protective measures. However, to prevent such arbitrary application by certain countries of the possibilities of censoring telegrams, we are taking the liberty of proposing for Article 29 a new text for submission to the next I.T.U. International Conference dealing with such matters. Here it is:

1. Members and Associate Members agree to encourage the unrestricted flow of information by telecommunications services. However, Members and Associate Members reserve the right to stop the transmission of any private telegram which may appear dangerous to the security of the State.
  2. Members and Associate Members also reserve the right to cut off any private telephone or telegraph communication which may appear dangerous to the security of the State.
- 
1. Les Membres et les Membres associés conviennent d'encourager la libre transmission des informations par les services de télécommunications. Toutefois, les Membres et les Membres associés se réservent le droit d'arrêter la transmission de tout télégramme privé qui peut paraître dangereux pour la sécurité de l'Etat.
  2. Les Membres et les Membres associés se réservent aussi le droit de couper toute communication téléphonique ou télégraphique privée qui peut paraître dangereuse pour la sécurité de l'Etat.

We would request you to be so good as to look into this matter. We also take the liberty of asking you on behalf of F.I.E.J. to let us know when it will be discussed.

We thank you in advance and have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

International Federation of Newspaper  
Proprietors and Editors:

(signed) Dr. Karl SARTORIUS	(signed) Claude
Vice-Chairman of F.I.E.J.,	BELLANGER
President of the Association	Secretary General of
Suisse des Editeurs de	F.I.E.J., Vice-
Journaux	President of the
	Fédération nationale
	de la Presse française

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 258-E  
20 November 1952

COMMITTEE 7

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The Secretary General of the Union has received the following letter (see Annex) from the Secretary General of the United Nations.

The Administrative Council, having acquainted itself with this communication at its special session (Buenos Aires, 1952), was of the opinion that the question of freedom of information raised therein might usefully be dealt with by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Hence I hereby submit the communication to the Conference, for any action it may see fit to take.

Chairman, Plenipotentiary  
Conference

M.A. ANDRADA

Annexes : 2

ANNEX 1

UNITED NATIONS

File No. SOA 112/07

New York, 14 August 1952

Mr. León Mulatier,  
Secretary General of the  
International Telecommunication Union,  
Palais Wilson,  
52 Rue des Paquis,  
Geneva.

Dear Sir,

Since the Sub-Committee for the Freedom of Information and of the Press has been abolished, the Economic and Social Council, at its fourteenth session, appointed Mr. Salvador P. López as rapporteur on matters relating to freedom of information. At his request, I have the honour to invite your attention to Resolution 4420 (XIV) which was adopted by the Council on 13 June 1952, concerning the substantive report that the rapporteur is requested to submit to the Council in 1953.

In this resolution, the Council requested the rapporteur, in cooperation with the Secretary General, the Specialized Agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the professional organizations concerned, both national and international, to prepare, for submission to the Council in 1953, "a substantive report covering major contemporary problems and developments in the field of freedom of information together with recommendations regarding practical action which might be taken by the Council in order to surmount those obstacles to the fuller enjoyment of freedom of information which can be surmounted at the present time". The Council also decided to include the question of freedom of information in its agenda for 1953 for the purpose of reviewing the problems of freedom of information in the light of the above-mentioned report and of taking appropriate action thereon.

I should like particularly to invite your attention to the cooperation with Specialized Agencies that is mentioned in the Council's resolution. The rapporteur would be grateful if you would send him the following information :

1. The views, opinions or proposals that you may have concerning contemporary developments and problems in this sphere and which the rapporteur should bear in mind when making the above-mentioned report;
2. The views, opinions or proposals that you might have concerning the general contents of the report;
3. The views, opinions or proposals that you might have concerning the importance, from the point of view of freedom of information, of international telecommunication agreements; and
4. Any other pertinent information that might facilitate the task of the rapporteur, particularly objective data on concrete situations.

Since the rapporteur will have to distribute his report well before the opening of the sixteenth session of the Economic and Social Council, scheduled for 30 June 1953, he would like to receive your views as soon as possible.

I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,

(signed) Hussein Asfahany  
Assistant Secretary General p.i.  
Department of Social Affairs

ANNEX 2

Resolution of 13 June 1952

The Economic and Social Council,

recalling

that the General Assembly has proclaimed that freedom of information is a fundamental human right and is the touchstone of all the freedoms to which the United Nations is consecrated,

bearing in mind

that this freedom has frequently proved to be the most vulnerable of the fundamental freedoms embodied in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

considering

that the media of information constitute powerful instruments for the moulding of public opinion and can thereby exercise a great influence on relations between peoples and on the future of mankind,

noting

the continuing need for study, inquiry and investigation in the general field of this problem, together with the number of practical tasks, including those relating to obstacles to the free flow of information, which remain to be undertaken

1. decides

to appoint, for an experimental period of one year, and in a personal capacity, a rapporteur on matters relating to freedom of information;

2. requests

the rapporteur designated by the Council, in co-operation with the Secretary-General, the specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and the professional organizations concerned, both national and international, to prepare, for submission to the Council in 1953, a substantive report covering major contemporary problems and developments in the field of freedom of information, together with recommendations regarding practical action which might be taken by the Council in order to surmount those obstacles to the fuller enjoyment of freedom of information which can be surmounted at the present time;

3. decides

to include in its agenda for 1953 an item on freedom of information, for the purpose of reviewing problems of freedom of information in the light of the report provided for above and of taking appropriate action thereon.

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 259-E  
20 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

UNESCO INTERESTS IN TELECOMMUNICATION

MATTERS

The Secretary General of the Union has transmitted to the Chairman of the Conference the letter annexed hereto received from the Director General of UNESCC, outlining the programme of action approved by the Executive Board of UNESCO with a view to the Plenipotentiary Conference at Buenos Aires.

I have the honour to submit this communication to the Conference for any action it may desire to take.

Chairman of the Plenipotentiary  
Conference

M.A. ANDRADA

Annex : 1

- 2 -  
(259-E)

A N N E X

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL  
ORGANIZATION

- - -

ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'EDUCATION  
LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

In your reply, please  
quote : MRO/3080/53

4 July 1952

The Secretary General,  
International Telecommunication Union,  
G e n e v a (Switzerland)

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Executive Board of UNESCO, at its 30th Session, approved a programme of action with a view to the forthcoming Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, to be held in Buenos Aires.

I am enclosing a copy of the document on which this decision was based.

In accordance with that decision, UNESCO will endeavour to have a recommendation adopted by the Conference inviting Administrative Conferences to take into account any proposals it might submit to them in favour of generalizing the use of telecommunications for the free circulation of ideas.

Further, Member States will be invited to support, at the Buenos Aires Conference, those draft amendments which might be conducive to the ends pursued by UNESCO.

I shall not fail to send you a copy of the communication I shall transmit to UNESCO Member States before the Plenipotentiary Conference, with a view to reminding them of how important the Conference is for our organization.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(signed)

Jaimo Torres Bodet  
Director-General

30 EX/15  
Paris, 15 May 1952

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Thirtieth Session

Item 7.6.1 of the Agenda

Submitted to  
EXECUTIVE BOARD  
For decision, see  
30 EX/Decisions

PROPOSED ACTION BY UNESCO AT THE PLENIPOTENTIARY  
CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

INTRODUCTION

The General Conference, at its Sixth Session, adopted the following resolution :

"The Director-General is authorized to cooperate with the United Nations, the Specialized Agencies and appropriate international organizations, with a view to promoting in their respective fields technical studies and practical measures designed to facilitate the removal of obstacles to the free flow of information." (6.25)

The work plan and budget attached to the above resolution provided, inter alia, that UNESCO would take action to promote the free flow of information at the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, meeting in Buenos Aires in October 1952. The present document seeks the approval of the Executive Board for the policy to be adopted by the Director-General in connection with the Buenos Aires Conference.

PAST ACTION BY UNESCO IN THE TELECOMMUNICATION FIELD

Since any action taken by UNESCO at the Buenos Aires Conference would form part of a continuing effort to promote a wider use of telecommunications for the free flow of information, the Board may wish first to have a brief review of the past activities of the Organization in this field.

(i) In 1947 the Director-General addressed a message to the last Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union in Atlantic City (USA), setting forth UNESCO's interest in the use of telecommunications for the free flow of ideas and as a link between peoples. Specifically, the Director-General presented to the Union the view that :

- 1) Radio frequencies for international broadcasting should be allocated in a manner which would give all nations and diverse cultures adequate facilities for expression.
- 2) Press messages should be accorded the lowest possible rates and the maximum possible priorities.
- 3) Political and administrative restrictions to the full use of telecommunication services should be reduced to a minimum.
- 4) Greater facilities should be granted for point-to-point broadcasting as an effective means of international communication.

(ii) Subsequent to the Atlantic City Conference, these objectives were pursued by UNESCO through the various Administrative Conferences of the Union charged with revision of the regulations governing telegraph, telephone and radio communication. The first occasion was the International High Frequency Broadcasting Conference, meeting in Mexico in 1948-1949. The Director-General submitted a document (ITU-120) to the Mexico Conference making the following principal points :

- 1) High Frequency, or short wave, broadcasting is by virtue of its range and speed an unrivalled instrument of communication between peoples; UNESCO, therefore, has an abiding interest in its use for promoting mutual knowledge and understanding.
- 2) Each nation's requests for frequencies should take into account the shortage of available facilities and the overriding necessity of reaching agreement on a planned, orderly system.
- 3) Frequency allocations should accord priority to international rather than to national broadcasting services.
- 4) Allocations among nations should not be based solely on considerations of wealth and power but on the right of all countries to be heard.

During the course of the Mexico Conference, UNESCO supported requests for frequencies submitted by the United Nations for its broadcasting services and by the International Red Cross for broadcasts in relief and disaster situations. The Conference took account of the requirements of those two Organizations by creating a new category of high frequency allocations for "Special Services".

In addition, the Conference adopted a resolution "inspired by the proposals made by UNESCO", in which it recommended that "the frequencies to be assigned by the Conference should not be used for purposes contrary to mutual understanding and tolerance".

(iii) As a sequel to the Atlantic City and Mexico Conferences, UNESCO was represented at meetings sponsored by the International Telecommunication Union at Copenhagen in September 1948 and at Washington, D.C. in April 1949, concerned respectively with broadcasting in the European and American regions. At both Conferences, UNESCO reiterated the view that agreement on frequency assignments was in the common interest and a prerequisite of the use of radio for the free flow of information.

The Washington Conference, in particular, adopted a number of resolutions, on the recommendation of UNESCO, pledging that the countries of the American region would utilize their broadcasting services to "increase international cooperation and mutual understanding among peoples" and to "reduce illiteracy and promote basic education".

(iv) In the matter of facilitating the international transmission of press messages, UNESCO's major effort was made at the International Telegraph and Telephone Conference in Paris in May-August 1949. The Director-General submitted a statement (Document DG/24) to the Conference, containing detailed proposals which may be summarized as follows:

- 1) Higher priority and more reduced rates should be granted to press telegrams.
- 2) The definition of press telegrams should be broadened.
- 3) Preferential treatment should be accorded to press messages communicated by telephone as well as by telegraph.
- 4) The "collect system" of payment at the receiving end should be extended to press messages communicated by telegraph or telephone, as a means of overcoming currency obstacles.

The Paris Conference resulted in the following gains for the free flow of information:

- 1) A new and more comprehensive definition of press messages was adopted.
- 2) A resolution was voted urging increased construction of telephone circuits as a means of facilitating the telephonic transmission of press messages.

- 3) A unified system of rate reduction was applied to press telegrams.

PROPOSED ACTION AT THE PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE OF BUENOS  
AIRES

The Director-General requests the approval of the Executive Board to pursue the following course of action in connection with the Plenipotentiary Conference of Buenos Aires:

1. Recommendation to the Administrative Conferences

The Plenipotentiary Conference, while it does not concern itself in detail with the regulations affecting telegraph, telephone and radio communications, may make recommendations to the subsequent Administrative Conferences which revise these regulations. It will be apparent from the foregoing that the Administrative Conferences offer an excellent opportunity for promoting the aim set forth in UNESCO's Constitution of "advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples through all means of mass communication".

It is hoped that future Administrative Conferences will enable UNESCO to extend the results already achieved. Thus, the Secretariat is now preparing a detailed study of rates for press messages throughout the world, with a view to the submission of concrete proposals at the next International Telegraph and Telephone Conference in 1954. Similarly, the next Radio Administrative Conference should provide an occasion for further reduction of obstacles to the full use of radio for the free flow of information.

Consequently, the Director-General requests the approval of the Board to propose to Member States that they support the adoption by the Buenos Aires Conference of a formal recommendation inviting the Administrative Conferences to give favourable consideration to proposals which UNESCO may submit to them with a view to promoting the widest possible use of telecommunication for the free flow of information and ideas.

2. Support of Amendments inspired by UNESCO's aims

It may be hoped that Member States will submit to the Buenos Aires Conference proposed amendments to the International Telecommunication Convention which are in conformity with the aims of UNESCO. Such action would be analogous to that recently taken by a number of Member States in submitting to the Brussels Congress of the Universal Postal Union proposed amendments to the Postal Convention directed towards the aims of UNESCO. In that instance, the Executive Board authorized the Director-General to recommend to Member States that they support the adoption of such proposals at the Brussels Congress.

The Director-General now requests the authorization of the Board to recommend in due course to Member States that they lend their support at the Buenos Aires Conference to such proposed amendments to the International Telecommunication Convention as are designed, in his view, to promote the objectives of UNESCO.

3. UNESCO Representation at the Conference.

Finally, the Director-General requests the authorization of the Board to recommend to Member States that the Buenos Aires Conference invite UNESCO to be represented by an observer.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

considering

that it is indispensable to allow the I.F.R.B. to carry on without interruption the duties resulting from the decisions of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference,

authorizes

the Secretary General, so long as the 1953 budget has not been finally adopted, to take all requisite action both as regards staff and equipment, within the limits of the budget estimates for 1953 prepared by the Administrative Council at its Seventh Session (see the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, pages 84 and 118 to 123), so that the work prescribed by the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference may suffer no interruption.

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 261-E

20 November 1952

COMMITTEE 6

REPORT BY WORKING GROUP

TO COMMITTEE 6

Subject: Use of the Russian Language at the Conference.

At the 5th meeting of the Plenary Assembly on 22 October, the proposal that Russian should be adopted at the Buenos Aires Conference as a full working language was rejected, and in consequence the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated that his Delegation would pay its share of the cost of oral translation of Russian but would take no share in paying for any other language except French. Declarations in similar terms were also made by the Delegates of the Bielorussian S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., the People's Republic of Albania, Czechoslovakia, Roumanian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Poland, the Hungarian People's Republic and the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Committee 6 was thereupon asked to examine briefly the financial repercussions of the above reservations.

This question has been studied by the Working Group with the following result.

The estimated cost of the linguistic services (for interpretation and translation) at this Conference is stated by the Secretary General to be 650,000 Swiss francs, which covers the salaries and cost of travel for the staff of interpreters, translators, proofreaders, typists and stenographers for the three working languages only. The cost of the simultaneous translation equipment is included in the general Conference expenses chargeable to all the Members, and as there is no additional cost whatever if a fourth language (i.e., Russian) is used, this item has therefore been excluded from the calculation.



The chief difficulty is to ascertain what is the cost of the French language.

Under the terms of the Atlantic City Convention (Art. 15, para. 5) each Member and Associate Member is to share expenses of the language service, with respect to one of the three working languages only. It is obvious that a conference conducted in only one language would incur no interpretation costs at all, such costs only commencing when a second language is added.

The Administrative Council has considered this problem and has adopted the only possible solution, deciding that so far as oral use of the three working languages is concerned the whole cost should be included in the general Conference expenses and be borne by all participants in proportion to their unit contributions. See the Administrative Council's Report, Chap. VII, Section 3.

The Working Group therefore decided that for the present purpose the cost of each working language must be taken as one-third of the whole, so that the cost of French must be assumed to be 216,666 Swiss francs, i.e.,  $\frac{650,000}{3} = 216,666$  Swiss francs).

Furthermore, the unit values are arrived at as follows:

Number of units of Members actually  
participating in this Conference . . . . . 755

Number of units of those Members  
using French and Russian . . . . . 86

Number of units of Members using  
French, English and Spanish . . . . . 669

The costs for each group are thus:

(a)	<u>French</u>		Per Unit
	All Members pay	$\frac{216,666}{755} =$	286.95 Swiss fr.

(b) English

			Per Unit
All Members pay	$\frac{216,666}{669}$	=	323.85 Swiss fr.
except group using Russian			

(c) Spanish

All Members pay	$\frac{216,666}{669}$	=	323.85 " "
except group using Russian			

According to the above figures therefore, those Members using Russian who have taken reservations in respect of the French language only, will pay for their use of French at the rate of 286.95 Swiss francs per unit. And each of the other participating Members (that is, those not making reservations) will pay a total share for all three languages of 934.65 Swiss francs ( $286.95 + 323.85 + 323.85 = 934.65$ ).

Had there been no reservations, the Members participating in the Conference would have paid in proportion to their contributory shares for the total costs of the three working languages. Their share of the total cost would have amounted to 860.85 Swiss francs per unit (i.e.  $\frac{650,000}{755} = 860.85$  or  $286.95 \times 3 = 860.85$ ).

Thus, as a result of the reservations, the share per unit for participants paying for all three languages will be increased by 73.80 Swiss francs per unit ( $934.65 - 860.85 = 73.80$ ).

The Working Group, in making the above calculations, recognizes that the general question of the use of the working languages and the incidence of their cost is a much wider one and outside its terms of reference.

Chairman  
Working Group I.

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 262-E  
20 November 1952

COMMITTEE 5

REQUESTS FOR A LOWER CONTRIBUTORY CLASS

Annexed will be found a copy of the letter in which Mr. Mohamed Reda Hamza, Head of the Delegation of Saudi Arabia, asks for Saudi Arabia to be included in the 8th Class (1 unit) for its contribution to the expenses of the Union.

Saudi Arabia is at present in the 7th Class (3 units).

---

NOTE: Other similar requests will be found in Documents Nos. 15, 84-Revised, 114, 122 and 168.

Annex: 1

- 2 -  
(262-E)

ANNEX

Buenos Aires, 18 November 1952

The Secretary General  
International Telecommunication Union  
Buenos Aires, Argentina

Subject : Change of class for  
contributions to the Union.

Dear Sir,

As the volume of telecommunication undertaken in Saudi Arabia is very small, to an extent that the I.T.U. expenditure represents a comparatively high figure in our Telecommunication budget, I shall be much obliged if you kindly submit our request to the Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U. to change the class of contributions of Saudi Arabia from class 7 to class 8, so that our future contribution to the expenses of the Union will be one point only.

I hope that this will be submitted to the Conference with your support, as it will be a great help to my country to fulfill its financial obligations towards the Union.

I remain, Sir,

Truly yours,  
(signed)

Mohamed Reda Hamza  
Head of Saudi Arabian  
Delegation

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952.

Document No. 263-E  
20 November 1952

COMMITTEE 5

REQUEST FOR A HIGHER CONTRIBUTORY CLASS

Annexed will be found a copy of the letter in which Mr. K. Hanaoka, Deputy Chief of the Delegation of Japan, asks for Japan to be included in the 1st Class (30 units) for its contribution to the expenses of the Union.

Japan is at present in the 8th Class (1 unit).

---

Note: Other requests for changes of class will be found in Documents Nos. 15, 84 revised, 114, 122, 168 and 262.

Annex: 1.

- 2 -  
(263-E)

ANNEX

Buenos Aires, 19 November, 1952.

Mr. Léon Mulatier  
Secretary General of the  
International Telecommunication Union  
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

I have the honour to inform you, on instruction from my Administration in Tokyo, and in accordance with the provision of Article 14 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947, that the Japanese Administration requests to be included in the first class (30 units) for the apportioning of the expenses of the Union from the coming period.

I wish that you will submit this change to the Plenipotentiary Conference.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours respectfully,

K. Hanaoka  
Deputy Chief  
Delegation of Japan

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3  
(Convention)

Summary Record of the 19th Meeting

Tuesday, 18 November, at 1600 hours

Chairman: Mr. F. Kroutl (Czechoslovakia), Vice-Chairman

The Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Ribeiro, was present, but being unwell asked the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Kroutl, to conduct the meeting.

The Chairman submitted the summary records of the 15th meeting (Document No. 208) and of the 16th meeting (Document No. 219) to the Committee, which approved them without amendment. However, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. reserved the right to propose amendments to Document No. 219 when it was studied in detail.

o  
o o

The Committee then resumed its study of the report by Sub-Committee 3 A (Document No. 184).

Paragraph 5

The Delegate of Argentina recalled that because of his country's Proposal No. 149 he had suggested, at the end of the last meeting, that sub-paragraphs 5 (2) and 5 (3) be deleted. However, he had agreed to the suggestion made by the Chairman at the last meeting that proposal No. 149 should only be considered later.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he was in favour of the regrouping of texts as suggested in Proposal No. 149, but he too thought that it should be studied later on, and that the paragraph under discussion should be approved without amendment.

There being no further proposals concerning paragraph 5, it was approved by 46 votes to 0, with 12 abstentions.

o  
o o

First "new paragraph"

The paragraph in question referred to the sending of technical representatives by countries wishing to express their views to the Board.

The Delegates of Portugal, the Union of South Africa and France thought it inadvisable to transfer these provisions from the Radio Regulations to the Convention.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia thought, moreover, that the provisions were not fair, in that they would enable the richer countries to have, virtually, a permanent representative on the Board. He reserved the right to propose its deletion when the Radio Regulations were revised by the next Ordinary Radio Conference.

There being no further proposals, the Committee decided, by 50 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions, not to include the paragraph in question in Article 6.

o  
o o

Second "new paragraph"

The paragraph referred to the specialized secretariat of the I.F.R.B. Since it mentioned the Chairman of the Board, the Delegate of Italy thought that the following proposal, which he had submitted at the previous meeting should now be considered:

"The members of the I.F.R.B. shall elect from among themselves a Chairman and Vice-Chairman, who will carry out their duties for one year or until their successors are duly elected. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall at any time be eligible for re-election."

The proposal was seconded by the Delegate of the United States of America.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said:

"My Delegation considers that the new paragraph now proposed for inclusion in Article 6 of the Convention should not be included there. A similar paragraph exists in the Radio Regulations (No. 308) and it must not be transferred to the Convention. As regards the question raised by the Delegates of Italy and the United States concerning the chairmanship of the I.F.R.B., we consider that this question is settled in Article 12 (No. 363) of the Radio Regulations. Here, we are not revising those Regulations, and we must not take any new decision on them. Nor must we repeat those provisions in the Convention.

"Consequently, my Delegation proposes that the new paragraph should not be included in the draft of Article 6 of the Convention."

The Chairman of Sub-Committee 3 A said that the Sub-Committee had introduced a reference to the specialized secretariat of the I.F.R.B. in the text it was proposing because of the similar reference to the specialized secretariats of the C.C.I's in Article 8.

The Delegate of France thought, for the same reason, that the proposed new paragraph should be retained.

The deletion of the new paragraph, as proposed by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R., was then put to the vote: 16 votes were in favour of its deletion, 16 were in favour of its retention, and 25 delegations abstained.

In view of the result, the Delegate of Argentina asked for a roll-call vote.

The deletion proposed by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. was then agreed to by 18 votes to 17, with 30 abstentions.

In favour of deletion: 18 delegations.

People's Republic of Albania, Bielorussian S.S.R., People's Republic of Bulgaria, Egypt, United States of America, Ethiopia, Hungarian People's Republic, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, People's Republic of Poland, Portugal, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian People's Republic, Syria, Czechoslovakia, United States Territories, U.S.S.R.

Against deletion: 17 delegations.

Brazil, Denmark, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Laos, Mexico, Netherlands, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Oversea Territories of the French Republic, Thailand, Turkey.

Abstentions: 30 delegations

Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Paraguay, Peru, Federal German Republic, Switzerland, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemon, Spanish Zone of Morocco.

The Chairman then opened the discussion on the proposal by the Delegate of Italy.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said:

"We consider that the proposal by the Delegate of Italy is incorrect. The system he proposes means, in practice, that the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. cannot be changed. It would inevitably lead to a monopoly of the Chair by one person, which is not right. According to the Italian proposal, there would have to be special reasons, obviously **unfavourable**, for changing the Chairman. It is unlikely that such reasons would be adduced in the I.F.R.B., and that would lead to a monopoly of the Chair by one person.

"Further, the provisions in the Radio Regulations governing this question must not be repeated in the Convention. We are against the proposal by the Delegate of Italy."

The Delegates of Pakistan, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Czechoslovakia were opposed to the proposal of Italy. They thought that the simultaneous replacement of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman of the Board would prejudice the continuity of their work and the Plenipotentiary Conference should not adopt the text which placed in doubt the aptitude of all the members of the I.F.R.B. to preside over the Board.

The Delegates of Argentina, Egypt, and India, considered that the methods of electing the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the I.F.R.B. were in their right place in the Regulations and not in the Convention.

The Delegates of Sweden and Portugal supported the proposal of Italy in principle, considering it preferable to the present system but they considered that a provision of that nature should appear in the Radio Regulations.

The Delegate of Italy considered that no valid argument against his proposal had been put forward and he asked the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. if he would be good enough to give his opinion.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. said that it was very difficult for him to express an opinion. The first sentence of Radio Regulation No. 363 did not seem to enforce a change in the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Board (in effect, it read as follows: "or until their successors are duly elected"), whereas the second sentence clearly envisaged an annual change. The Italian proposal therefore gave more flexibility, but it remained to be seen if the Committee wished to include such a provision in the Convention. He was sorry to have heard of "monopolization" of the Chair and he reminded the Committee that members of the I.F.R.B. were independent.

The proposal of the Delegate of Italy was then put to the vote and rejected by 52 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

o  
o o

### Third "new paragraph"

This paragraph gave rise to no comment and the Committee therefore decided to include it in Article 6.

Annex 2 to Document No. 184

This annex was approved without comment.

Annex 3 to Document 184

This annex was the draft resolution laying down that the I.F.R.B. would continue to have 11 members.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"On the subject of Annex 3 which contains the draft resolution under discussion, I must point out that the Soviet Delegation has on many occasions during this Conference expressed its opinion on the I.F.R.B. It must also be emphasized that the basis of the provision which is covered by this resolution already exists in the Radio Regulation.

"These questions must not be transferred to the Convention. We shall therefore vote against the resolution in Annex 3 to Document No. 184."

Annex 3 was put to the vote and adopted by 39 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.

o  
o o

The Chairman said, that as all of Document No. 184 had been examined, he was going to put it to the vote as a whole.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that during the examination of Document No. 184, the Soviet Delegation had proposed some amendments to the draft of Article 6 of the Convention. As those amendments had not been accepted by the Committee, the Soviet Delegation would vote against the approval of Document No. 184 and against the adoption of the draft Article 6 as a whole.

Document No. 184 was then adopted by 47 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

o  
o o

Having thus finished its study of Article 6 of the Convention, the Committee returned to Articles 10 and 11, and examined the draft terms of reference for the Working Group that it had decided to set up during its 17th meeting. (See Document No. 242, last page).

The draft terms of reference in question were approved without amendment as the terms of reference for Working Group 2. They are reproduced as an Annex to this Document.

During a discussion relating to the draft terms of reference, the Delegate of Italy asked that in paragraph 3 (drafting of paragraphs 3 for Articles 10 and 11), the wording should be: "...taking into consideration proposals submitted by Members of the Union and also the fact that the convening.....", since paragraphs 3 of Articles 10 and 11 had never been discussed by the Committee. Furthermore, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he considered the proposed terms of reference acceptable but that, since an amendment to paragraph 3 had been submitted, it must be indicated in that paragraph that the decisions of the Group must not be in contradiction with those already taken by the Committee. It was also necessary to indicate that the Working Group must keep as close as possible to the status quo.

Finally, and on the suggestion of the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the Committee decided to adopt without amendment the proposed terms of reference, it being understood that the Working Group would bear in mind the above remarks of the Delegates of Italy, and of the U.S.S.R.

Working Group 2 was constituted as follows:

Chair: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Members: Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, U.S.A., France, Italy,  
Mexico, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and the U.S.S.R.

o  
o o

The Committee then passed to the examination of the texts proposed by Working Group 1 (Document 203), namely, two draft resolutions and a draft protocol relating to the eventual merger of the C.C.I.T. and the C.C.I.F.

Dr. Metzler (Chairman, Working Group 1) presented Document No. 203 and thanked those delegates - also Messrs Valensi and Townshend - who had worked in the Group. It should be noted, incidentally, that in paragraph 3 of the draft protocol, the Group had seen fit to introduce a clause conferring on the Administrative Council the authority normally enjoyed by the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference, to make provision for that Conference being held sometime after 1954.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that after a careful perusal of Document No. 203, he wished to make a few comments:

"The Working Group has conscientiously performed its task. But Document No. 203 produces a queer impression. My Delegation has no special interest in this matter, and only for purely practical reasons did we associate ourselves with the proposals for amalgamation of the two C.C.I.s.

"Now in Document No. 203, it is proposed that the Convention should go on mentioning these two C.C.I.s. On the other hand, proposals are made in favour of altering the Convention after its approval. At the same time, it is suggested that the Convention might be modified by the Administrative Conference, and even by the Administrative Council. Such a procedure is unacceptable.

"Hence the Convention might usefully mention no more than one single amalgamated International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee. The amalgamation itself might in practice be effected not at once, but after a certain lapse of time. A resolution might be adopted, indicating how such amalgamation should take place and how long it should take, etc.

"It would seem that in the Committee there was no objection in principle to amalgamation of the two C.C.I.s. Hence that should be entered in the Convention.

"I beg you, Mr. Chairman, to enlighten us on this matter."

There followed some discussion as to the exact scope of the decision taken by Committee 3 at the meeting at which it had set up Working Group 1.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia explained that within the Working Group, of which he had been a member, opinion had been divided. Some had interpreted the Committee's decision as necessarily entailing amalgamation of the two C.C.I.s, their Plenary Assemblies being simply asked to consider in detail how that should be effected. Others had maintained that the intention of the Committee had been that the Conference should do no more than ask these Plenary Assemblies to consider whether amalgamation should take place.

After explanations offered by the Chairman of Working Group 1, and by the Delegates of the United States of America, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Sweden, and after reference to the summary record of the 14th meeting (Document No. 204, page 19 - summary of the Swiss proposal), the Committee recognized that the interpretation of the Working Group was correct. No decision as to whether amalgamation should take place or not, and the Committee should not revert to the substance of the matter, but merely consider the document - Document No. 203 - submitted to it.

The Delegate of Turkey agreed that the substance of the matter should not be discussed further by the Committee, but reserved his right to revert thereto in plenary assembly.

The Delegate of France remarked that, according to Article 8, paragraph 4 c) of the Convention, each International Consultative Committee had a Director, the C.C.I.R. being the only one to have a Vice-Director. The Telegraph and Telephone Conference might well decide that the joint C.C.I. should have both a Director and a Vice-Director. Now the existing text of the Convention stood in the way of such a decision.

The Chairman of the Working Group said that the Group might consider the question with a view to remedying the shortcoming referred to by the Delegate of France, if asked by the Committee so to do.

The Committee thereupon considered the draft Resolution A.

The Delegate of Pakistan proposed that to the end of the first paragraph in the preamble be added the words: "... and that, in principle, amalgamation of these two bodies is now desirable."

The amendment was seconded by the Delegate of Saudi Arabia, but the Delegates of France and of the United States of America were against it, on the grounds that its adoption would constitute a decision by the Conference which would leave the C.C.I. Plenary Assemblies, and the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference, no room for manoeuvre.

The Pakistan amendment was then rejected by 37 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.

The Delegate of Pakistan thereupon again submitted his amendment, but minus the word: "new" - "... and that, in principle, amalgamation of these two bodies is desirable."

This new amendment was rejected by 34 votes to 19, with 4 abstentions.

In connection with the second paragraph of the preamble, the Delegate of Italy, seconded by the Delegates of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia and the United States of America, proposed that "can be taken" should read: "should be taken".

This amendment was adopted by 49 votes to 4, with 3 abstentions.

There were no comments on the operative part of the Resolution. Hence Draft Resolution A was approved by the Committee. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics nevertheless said that in view of the considerations already adduced by him, his Delegation would abstain from voting on Document No. 203 and would reserve its attitude in regard to the provisions therein.

The meeting rose at 1930 hours.

Reporters:

R. V. Hatton - E. Luraschi  
J. Revoy - G. Terras

Chairman:

F. Kroutl

Annex: 1

ANNEX

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF WORKING GROUP 2

OF COMMITTEE 3

to draft Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention

1. The Working Group shall prepare the text of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 10 on the lines of the decisions reached by the Committee at its 15th and 16th meetings.
2. It shall also prepare the text of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 11 on the lines of the decisions reached by the Committee at its 17th meeting, and taking into consideration the proposals relating to Article 11 on all points where they are not in contradiction to the decisions of principle in question, in particular it shall study the proposals relating to the classification of administrative conferences.
3. The Working Group shall prepare paragraphs 3 of both Articles 10 and 11, bearing in mind the fact that the convening of a conference, as well as a change in the place or date, must have the approval of the majority of the Members of the Union.

---

Note: The Group shall also take account of the fact that the Ordinary Radio Conference elects the members of the I.F.R.B. and assesses the work of the Board.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 265-E  
21 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

D E S I D E R A T A  
OF THE I.T.U. STAFF ASSOCIATION

The I.T.U. Staff Association has asked me to submit to the Plenipotentiary Conference the desiderata which it presented to the Administrative Council (7th Session).

With the assent of the Council, I hereby submit the essential parts of the Staff Association memorandum, selected and brought up to date by the Staff Association representative at the Conference.

L. MULATIER  
Secretary General

Annex: 1

ANNEX

REPORT OF THE I.T.U. STAFF ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE

After the 6th Session of the Administrative Council, in 1951, the I.T.U. Staff Association undertook an inquiry into I.T.U. staff emoluments, with a view to acquainting the Administrative Council and the Buenos Aires Conference with such improvements as it might think fit, for the sake of equity, to suggest.

The staff of the I.T.U. is persuaded that at Buenos Aires the principle that there should be no basic differences between the remuneration accorded by governments to I.T.U. officials and that accorded by those same governments to the United Nations Specialized Agencies, will readily be admitted.

Since 1950, new salary scales, considerably superior to those of the I.T.U. have been granted to United Nations personnel, and these new salary scales have later been granted by governments to all the Specialized Agencies in Geneva, often with retroactive effect.

The result now is that I.T.U. officials are paid a good deal less than their colleagues in the other Specialized Agencies in Geneva.

The staff of the I.T.U. does not take the view that governments consider telecommunications to be a matter of subsidiary interest, nor does it feel that the Buenos Aires Conference can decide to keep the staff of the I.T.U. in its present inferior position. While aware of the financial problems with which many governments are beset, it would view with bewilderment any discrimination against the I.T.U.

Switzerland is an expensive country in which to live, and the standard of living is high in relation to that of other European countries, which have had to endure two major wars.

In support of this line of argument, the I.T.U. Staff Association has prepared a comparative study of the salaries and allowances now received by I.T.U. staff and those received by staff of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies in Geneva (Annex B).

These investigations unambiguously show:

- that salaries in the United Nations and Specialized Agencies are a good deal better adapted to the cost of living in Geneva than those of the I.T.U.
- that an I.T.U. official receives an appreciably smaller salary than an official of equal qualifications in the United Nations. This holds good more especially for I.T.U. officials in Classes 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and D (+);
- that allowances in the United Nations are much more equitable than in the I.T.U., and much more generously cover the expenses to which non-Swiss officials are put by reason of their expatriation.

The Staff Association therefore puts forward a Submission that the salaries and conditions granted to the staff of the I.T.U. should be no less favourable than those already granted by the majority of the governments of countries, Members of the Union, to the staff of the United Nations and nearly all the other Specialized Agencies of the U.N.

This Submission appears in detail at Annex A.

---

(+) N.B. The Association does not act on behalf of internationally-elected officials (Classes A and B), who, incidentally, are not entitled to membership of the Staff Association.

ANNEX A

SUBMISSION OF THE STAFF ASSOCIATION OF THE I.T.U.

1. Basic salaries (See also Annex B)

That remuneration equivalent to that accorded to the staff of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in Geneva be accorded to the staff of the I.T.U.

2. Cost of Living Adjustment (See also Annex C)

That the necessary flexibility to be given to the Administrative Council to keep the changes in cost of living under review and to make appropriate adjustments in the total remuneration paid to the staff.

3. Various Allowances or Grants (See also Annex D)

That Allowances and Grants be modelled on those of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies.

Apart from family allowance, which is already granted on a similar basis, these are :

A. Personal Allowances:

Installation grant and Repatriation Allowance in place of Expatriation Allowance  
Education Allowance (for children)  
Non-residence Allowance (for "General Services" staff recruited internationally)

B. Official Allowances:

- 1) Language Allowance (paid to "General Services" staff for knowledge of at least two official languages);
- 2) Allowance for acting rank (for carrying out the duties of a higher post for at least six months);
- 3) Allowances paid on an "hourly" or "meeting" basis for cases such as the following:

(Ann.A to Ann.to Doc.265-E)

- a) A secretary-stenographer or office assistant acting as an interpreter at occasional meetings;
- b) A stenographer acting as a minute writer or rapporteur.

(Interpreters and Minute Writers are usually highly paid officials. When such officials (in the "professional" class) are not available and the services of staff in the lower grades (in the "General Services" class) are utilized, it would seem only just to pay an allowance by way of compensation. This practice is followed in the International Labour Office.)

- 4) Representation Allowance (mentioned for the sake of completeness).

#### 4. Temporary Staff (See also Annex E)

That Temporary Staff employed for "indefinite" periods be given the possibility of qualifying for a pension or be paid a supplement to the salary to compensate for the lack of stability of employment and the insufficiency of the social security system.

ANNEX B

COMPARISON OF I.T.U. SALARIES WITH THOSE OF THE EUROPEAN OFFICE  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

1. INTRODUCTION

Contrary to what seems to be a widespread opinion, the remuneration of I.T.U. officials represented by the Association is not very satisfactory, being a good deal less than that accorded by governments to the staff of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies.

This is brought out in the comparison of I.T.U. salaries and allowances with those obtaining in the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies in Geneva.

The Association recognizes that for a general comparison to be valid, provisions for insurance in case of retirement and invalidity have to be borne in mind, and only actuaries are capable of doing this with any accuracy, particularly since there are no less than three systems in force in the I.T.U. - one for permanent staff appointed before 1 January 1949, one for permanent staff appointed after that date, and one for temporary staff. A general comparison made by the Association has shown appreciable divergences between these three systems.

The Association trusts that the report submitted by the actuaries commissioned to undertake a comparative study of the United Nations insurance scheme and that of the I.T.U. will enable a clear and accurate assessment to be made, for each I.T.U. insurance system, of the advantages and drawbacks offered by it in relation to the United Nations insurance scheme, and that it will, finally, enable justice to be done to all classes of I.T.U. staff.

The major claim advanced by the staff is that I.T.U. remuneration should be the same as in the other Specialized Agencies, account being taken, of course, of special circumstances peculiar to each. Thus, if it were found that the I.T.U. pension scheme was more advantageous than that in force elsewhere, then the I.T.U. staff would naturally expect allowance to be made for this factor.

2. COMPARISON

The United Nations and Specialized Agencies have divided their staff as follows :

- 7 classes in the General Service Category G (two of which are provisional);
- 5 classes in the Professional Category P;
- 3 classes for director D1, D2 and PD (the Secretary-General and Assistant Secretary-General being unclassified).

In the I.T.U. we have, to correspond to these classes, eight classes numbered 8 to 1, and classes D and C (for Counsellors).

To obtain a rule by which categories may be compared, three methods have been used :

- 1) Cases in which officials have been recruited from foreign government departments in which there are well defined correspondences between posts, have been carefully scrutinized.

For example, suppose a sous-chef de bureau is recruited by the I.L.O. from the French Ministry of Labour, while the I.T.U. recruits an ingénieur ordinaire from the French Ministry of P.T.T. In France, these two officials are of the same rank. Thus, if one is classed as P4 and the other in Class 1, then it is probable that I.L.O. P4 = I.T.U. Class 1.

- 2) Comparison of duties which are similar. For example, the duties of a translator, I.T.U. Class 2 are similar to those of a translator, U.N. P.3.
- 3) Consideration of the qualifications demanded for vacant posts.

Some idea of United Nations recruitment conditions in relation to those of the I.T.U. may be obtained by a comparison of the certificates and professional experience required, and the duties involved.

The following table has been drawn up on those lines.

( Ann.B to Ann. to Doc.265-E)

GENERAL COMPARISON OF EMOLUMENTS IN GENEVA

I. T. U.				U.N. and other Specialized Agencies	
Duties	Class	Salary Sw.fr.	Salary (1) Sw.fr.	Class	Duties
Senior Counsellor	C	38,000	45,844 to 50,845	D.2.	Director
Counsellor	D	32,000	41,676 to 50,012	D.1.	
			36,467 to 45,844	P.5.	Principal Officer
Secretary 1st Class, Interpreter, Reviser, Engineer	1	17,000 to 25,800	30,424 to 39,592	P.4.	Head of Section, Interpreter, Reviser
Secretary 2nd Class, Interpreter, Translator, Engineer	2	12,600 to 21,500	25,006 to 33,341	P.3.	Junior Interpreter, Translator, Accountant
Secretary 3rd Class, Technical Secretary	3	11,400 to 17,200	20,005 to 26,673	P.2.	Junior Translator, Stores Assistant, Documents Officer
Technical Assistant, Assistant Administrative Officer, Draughtsman	4	10,100 to 14,900	15,003 to 20,838	P.1.	Assistant to Head of Division, Proofreader, Statistician
			13,335 to 20,500	G.7.	Chief Clerk, Ad- ministrative Assistant, Assist- ant Statistician
Administrative Secretary Bilingual secretary Office Assistant I.	5	8,700 to 13,500	11,920 to 18,405	G.6.	Private Secretary, Assistant librarian
			10,655 to 16,495	G.5.	Bilingual Secy. Office Assistant
Stenographer, Office Assistant II	6	7,400 to 12,200	9,555 to 14,690	G.4.	Monolingual Secy. Office Assist- ant
			8,625 to 13,020	G.3.	Shorthand-typist Stenograph operator

Note (1) The United Nations salaries indicated are net, i.e., minus the contribution made to the United Nations joint tax reimbursement fund, and minus the 5% reduction effected in Geneva for internationally-recruited officials, in relation to New York scales.

(Ann.B to Ann. to Doc. 265-E) U.N. and other  
Specialized Agencies

I. T. U.

Duties	Class	Salary Sw.fr.	Salary (1) Sw.fr.	Class	Duties
Typist, Telephone operator Machine operator	7	6,500 to 10,800	7,725 to 10,975	G.2.	Typist, Telophonist Machine operator
Assistant clerk	8	4,500 to 8,500	6,925 to 9,555	G.1.	Asssemblers, Assist- ant clerk, Messenger Guardian

Note (1) The United Nations salaries indicated are net, i.e., minus the contribution made to the United Nations joint tax reimbursement fund, and minus the 5% reduction effected in Geneva for internationally-recruited officials, in relation to New York scales.

3. CONCLUSION.

The comparison shows I.T.U. salaries are inferior to the corresponding salaries in the other Specialized Agencies in a proportion of 40% for Class D, 51% for Class 1, 57% for Class 2, 50% for Class 3, 30% for Classes 4 and 5.

As regards I.T.U. Classes 6, 7 and 8, while the maximum salaries for these classes are not very much lower than those for the corresponding classes in the United Nations, the I.T.U. initial salary is lower than the corresponding initial salary in the United Nations, and is even lower than the vital minimum admitted for Geneva.

Further, it should be noted that in the United Nations salary scale the highest steps in each class overlap the lowest steps in the class immediately above. This is not the case in the I.T.U., except for Class 2 to 8, whereas in the other Specialized Agencies it applies right to the top of the tree, with the result that in the I.T.U. salaries fall off with extreme rapidity, bringing down the emoluments of middle-rank officials very sharply.

ANNEX C

GRANT OF A COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO I.T.U. STAFF

1. The present salary scales were laid down at Atlantic City (October, 1947), at a time when the cost-of-living index in Switzerland was 162.5.
2. This index retreated a little in 1949 and 1950, but by January 1952 had reached 170.5 - an increase of 8 points since the I.T.U. salary scales were evolved, or an increase of 4.9% in relation to October 1947.
3. These figures, taken from the monthly publications issued by the Swiss Department of Public Economy, apply to Switzerland as a whole and to Geneva in particular. For 1952, we may assume that the cost-of-living has actually increased by 5% in Switzerland since 1947.
4. The Staff Association, in view of this, felt thoroughly justified in asking the Council to make provision, in 1952, for a cost-of-living adjustment allowance. It was of the opinion that this cost-of-living allowance should be retroactive to 1 January 1952, since by that date the figures mentioned above had already been reached, and urged that, if the cost of living goes on increasing, the allowance should be embodied in the salary. In this case, the Union should be entirely responsible for any increase thereby entailed in contributions made to the Pension Fund.
5. The Staff made no definite proposal as regards the form which such an allowance might take. The allowance might take the form of a lump-sum payment, or of an increase in earnings, spread over a period of twelve months.

But, whichever solution were to be adopted, the staff was of the opinion that the allowance should amount to 5% of the nominal salary, with a minimum of 500 Swiss francs, and that there should be a parallel increase in dependents' allowances.

This figure had been put forward with an eye to the minimum salary required for existence in Geneva - a salary which the Staff Associations of the Specialized Agencies in Geneva propose should be increased to 8,250 Swiss francs, for a married official.

In support of this request, the I.T.U. Staff Association pointed out that a cost-of-living adjustment allowance had already been granted: (x)

A. Locally:

a) to Swiss Federal officials

- In 1951, 2% of salaries, with a minimum of 240 francs;
- In 1952, 4%, with a minimum of 300 francs for married officials and 270 francs for single ones.

b) to officials employed by the Republic and Canton of Geneva (in the same way as for Federal officials);

c) to staff employed by various private concerns in Geneva.  
This shows that there is a general rise in salaries.

B. Internationally:

a) to staff of the International Labour Office (5% of salaries, with a minimum of 425 francs and retroactive effect to 1 January 1952);

b) to staff of the International Red Cross (5% of salaries with retroactive effect to 1 October 1951).

6. The I.T.U. Staff Association felt the Council would not hesitate to grant a salary increase equal to that granted by governments and international organizations to their staff, in order that such staff (particularly the lower grades) might be better able to cope with the rising cost of living. It also seemed reasonable to expect this increase would apply to retired I.T.U. staff, who also feel the effects of rising prices.

---

(x) - 5% cost-of-living allowance has since been granted to the U.N. Staff with retroactive effect from 1 January 1952.

(Ann.C.to Ann.to Doc.265-E)

7. The Administrative Council, however, was unable to grant this request because it did not possess the requisite authority.

8. The Staff Association is seriously concerned by the reason for this refusal and accordingly submits that explicit authority should be given to the Council to grant cost-of-living adjustment allowances to I.T.U. staff, and to vary the amounts so granted in accordance with fluctuations in the cost of living.

ANNEX D

ALLOWANCES

A comparison between I.T.U. allowances and those granted by the European Office of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies in Geneva

Dependents' allowances

I.T.U. : 800 Swiss francs per dependent child, up to 22 years of age in certain cases.

Specialized Agencies : 856 Swiss francs per child up to the age of 21 in certain cases.

The two systems are thus roughly equivalent.

Expatriation allowances; education allowances; installation grant; home leave

I.T.U. system

The present system of expatriation allowances derives from that applied to non-Swiss staff in the old Berne Bureau. According to Article 20 of the Regulations governing the international bureaux under the supervision of the Swiss Government, this allowance amounted to 2,200 Swiss francs per year for Counsellors, varying, in each particular case, for officials of lower rank. In point of fact, no such special cases arose, the officials in question being all Swiss.

The Atlantic City Conference, in its Resolution on salaries and expatriation allowances, had decided that an allowance, based on Article 20 of the above-mentioned Regulations, should be paid (subject to such modifications as the Administrative Council might direct) to each person employed by the Union in a full-time capacity "who is not a national of the country in which he or she resides while so employed".

The new system of expatriation allowances (I.T.U. Staff Regulations, Article 16) differs somewhat from the old system (to which the Atlantic City Conference made reference) on the following points :

1) Among non-Swiss permanent officials, expatriation allowances are paid only to those who, at the time when they were recruited, were living outside Switzerland;

(Ann.D to Ann.to Doc.265-E)

2) The allowance has been reduced to 2,000 Swiss francs per year for Counsellors and figures have been set for officials in Classes 1 to 8;

3) Above all, the allowance stops after five years.

Permanent and (in certain circumstances) temporary officials recruited outside Geneva are entitled to a refund of their removal and travel expenses, for themselves and their families, from their place of residence to Geneva. They and their families are also entitled to paid home leave once every two years.

United Nations system:

Officials receive an education grant of 856 Swiss francs per year per child studying in the official's home country or per child less than 13 years old studying in an international school in Geneva. Such a child is entitled to a free trip home once a year.

Besides having their family's removal and travel expenses paid on appointment, United Nations officials get an installation grant equal to 30 days' travel allowance per person in the family, up to a maximum of four persons.

They also enjoy home leave every two years, without any additional leave. In the I.T.U., an extra 6 days are accorded.

Separation allowances; repatriation grant

These are the allowances which are paid to an official on leaving the organization. Here again the I.T.U. system is different from that followed in the other Specialized Agencies. To compare the two systems, we must distinguish between a voluntary departure (resignation) and an involuntary one (termination) for some reason unconnected with discipline, abolition of a post, for example.

Now in the I.T.U. a permanent official who resigns is entitled only to a refund of his removal expenses, and only on condition that he has spent more than five years in the service of the Union. It would appear that the temporary Official does not share these privileges, even after more than 5 years of service. No provision is made for a repatriation grant, either to a permanent or to a temporary official.

In the United Nations and other Specialized Agencies, the lot of an official who resigns is a good deal happier: removal expenses back home paid after one year's service, repatriation grant after two year's service, varying with the period of service and the family circumstances. It may reach as much as 21,400 Swiss francs.

In case of termination (but not in case of dismissal), the I.T.U. permanent official receives a separation allowance equal to three months' salary for every year of service, with a maximum of three years' salary. The temporary official may receive a separation allowance equal at the outside to one quarter of the salary he could have expected to receive under his contract. In the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies, the repatriation grant described above is paid. Thus, in this respect, an I.T.U. permanent official fares better than a permanent official in the United Nations. A temporary I.T.U. official does not fare so well as his temporary counterpart in the United Nations.

### Conclusion

The main expenses to which expatriated officials are put fall into three classes:

1) Installation expenses in Geneva. These considerably exceed travel and removal expenses (refunded by the I.T.U.), and include such items as provisional lodgings in a boarding-house or furnished flat, transformation of electrical apparatus, etc.

2) Expenses incurred when an official leaves the Union and returns home. These will also considerably exceed travel and removal expenses.

3) Meanwhile, expenses bearing a close relation to the circumstances in which the family is placed. Education of children will bulk large in these. Generally speaking, such children are not eligible for public education in Geneva, for a variety of reasons (age limits and programmes are different, for children who have begun their schooling in France, and for others, there are language

difficulties. For all children, a course of secondary schooling or higher instruction in their home countries is practically obligatory, if they are to find jobs there).

The Staff Association is of the opinion that the allowances system in force in the other Specialized Agencies to cope with the above three classes of expenditure is both more rational and more equitable than that of the I.T.U., which ignores differences in family circumstances and stops after five years, although expenses due to expatriation still continue. If, for the sake of simplicity, it were necessary to keep the present system of expatriation allowances, the Association would ask the Conference to consider continuing the allowance until retirement of the officials concerned, and that the allowance should make provision, not only for the position of the official in the hierarchy of rank (as is the case now), but also for his family circumstances and his children's schooling.

ANNEX E

THE TEMPORARY STAFF

General considerations

At 31 December, 1951, temporary officials constituted some 20% of the total staff of the I.T.U., and more than 25% of the staff engaged after 1 January 1949.

At 31 March, 1952, the majority of these temporary officials will have been employed for three or four years; some of them, even, for more than four years.

Since 1 July 1952 the number of temporary officials has increased considerably.

It would seem that this high proportion of temporary staff is due to the fact that posts of a permanent nature are at present filled by temporary officials. Hence the temporary staff earnestly trusts that the Secretary General will be able to speed up the rate at which appointments to permanent status are made, in order that a balance may once more be struck between the various categories of officials.

Pensions schemes

A comparative investigation into the various pension schemes (those applying in the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, that in force for I.T.U. staff engaged under the old system, and that in force for I.T.U. staff engaged under the new one) has clearly shown that while the Savings Fund, from which the temporary staff benefits, constitutes an excellent "temporary" system, i.e., for officials whose career is expected to be short, it is a good deal less favourable from a long-term point of view, considering the protection it affords to a family. In fact, the Savings Fund does not constitute a system of retirement and disability pensions, and that this is the case is confirmed by the fact that Swiss officials have to contribute to the Swiss Old-Age Pension Scheme both as employees and employers.

(Ann.E to Ann. to Doc. 265-E).

It would seem no more than reasonable that temporary staff employed over several years should aspire to a greater degree of stability - a stability in exchange for which it would contribute experience acquired in an organization which is of a markedly specialized nature.

The temporary staff does not underestimate the value of the Savings Fund as a transitional system designed to facilitate transition to the Pension Fund in case of appointment to permanent status.

Conclusion:

While appreciative of the efforts made to treat the temporary staff as generously as possible under the present regulations and budget restrictions, the Staff Association trusts that in future the following points will be borne in mind:

1. That before very long more appointments will be made to permanent status, in order that the great majority of staff who are for all practical purposes permanently employed by the I.T.U. may enjoy the advantages offered by the I.T.U. Pension Fund.
2. That any improvement made in the system of salaries, allowances, etc., enjoyed by the permanent staff, should be extended to personnel maintained on a "temporary" basis.
3. That a system should be brought into force, for staff maintained on a temporary basis, whereby the protection afforded by the Savings Fund in case of death or disability might be improved; failing this, appropriate compensation should be offered for the instability of "temporary" employment, in the spirit of the clauses included in the temporary contracts for 1948 and 1949. Such compensation would enable the staff concerned to incur the additional insurance required for family security.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 266-E  
21 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT

At the request of the Chairman of Committee 4, the  
attached communications are distributed as a conference  
document.

Annexes: 2

ANNEX 1

SWISS DELEGATION  
TO THE  
INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONFERENCE  
BUENOS AIRES 1952

Buenos Aires, 18.XI.1952

Mr. Tsingovatov  
Chairman of Committee 4  
Buenos Aires Conference

The Swiss Delegation, following the good example set by the Delegations of Argentina and Japan, and in order to expedite the work of the Conference, withdraws the following proposals concerning the Rules of Procedure, which appear in the Collected Proposals:

442 page 388

451 page 392

This is met by Rule 11, ch.1 of the new Rules of Procedure.

483 page 418

Concerns Rule 26 (franking privileges). Withdrawn in favour of Proposal 598 (New Zealand).

The Swiss Delegation:

A. Hockli

ANNEX 2

Chairman of Committee 4,

The following United Kingdom proposals relating to Rules of Procedure are now withdrawn:

419

440

441

446

453

461

467

468

in view of the fact that their substance has in the main been incorporated in Document No. 186 which, it is understood, will be taken as a basis for the Rules of Procedure to be annexed to the Convention.

A.H. Read

United Kingdom Delegation

19 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. finances)

Summary Record of the 9th Meeting

Thursday, 20th November 1952

Chairman: Mr. K. Prasada (India)

The Chairman, opening the meeting, submitted for the Committee's approval the summary record of the fifth meeting (Document No. 195).

The Delegate of Portugal observed that the summary record of the 6th meeting had already been approved. Now after perusal of these two summary records he had come to the conclusion that the arguments in favour of a consolidated budget had not been adequately expounded, and that some of the points stressed by him did not appear in the summary record. In order not to hold up the work of the Committee, he would draft a document unambiguously explaining his view-points.

He asked that the first paragraph on page 7 should read as follows:

"The Delegate of Portugal said that he attached great importance to the proposal. It had been said that the existing system worked well. On the contrary, in his opinion it worked badly. It led to a heavy outlay in the form of interest, and made it hard to decide whether expenses fell into the ordinary or the extraordinary category, for example the salaries of temporary staff engaged partly on conference work....."



Page 7, third line of the second paragraph, delete: "as at present". Line 6, delete: "or borrowed from the Swiss Government".

With this amendment, Document No. 195 was adopted.

The Chairman recalled that, when the publications budget was last discussed, the Committee had adopted paragraph 8 of French Proposal No. 227 (Collected Proposals, page 189). The Delegate of Lebanon had then suggested an addition, to which the Committee might usefully turn its attention.

The Delegate of Lebanon recalled that in paragraph d) of Document No. 969/CA, page 24, there was a suggestion that one copy at least of all publications should be sent free of charge to Members and Associate Members. The distribution might be effected as follows:

3 copies for countries in Classes 1, 2, and 3;  
2 copies for countries in Classes 4, 5, and 6;  
1 copy for countries in Classes 7 and 8.

Such a free distribution, which had been in force on a much greater scale under the Madrid Convention, would be of very considerable advantage to the smaller countries.

The Delegate of Yemen seconded the Lebanese proposal.

The Delegate of France recalled that when the consolidated budget had been discussed, he had spoken about shift of burden from the larger to the smaller countries. Some countries would be content with free distribution, while others would order additional copies; and it was probable that the latter countries would be paying for documents delivered to the former.

Under the existing system, the Union had an auxiliary printed matter budget, the accounts of which had to balance. If they could not be balanced, that budget had to be subsidized from the ordinary budget, and in that case all countries took their share in paying for the subsidy.

The Delegate of Portugal thought that the proposal would involve free distribution of some 150 copies of every publication. What could be done?

1) The price of publications sold might be increased - they were already expensive enough, almost prohibitively so, and any increase would be prejudicial to the Union. Or,

2) there might be a subsidy from the ordinary budget. From the accounting point of view, that would entail no difficulties, but would mean an increase in ordinary expenditure having an effect on the fiscal limit. However, that seemed to him the easiest way out, but before a decision was taken, an estimate of expenditure would have to be prepared.

The Chairman said that, according to the Secretary General, the number of copies to be distributed free would be less than 200.

The Delegate of Brazil found the proposal a reasonable one and considered that its approval would not unduly affect the sales price of publications. However, free distribution might be limited to one copy per Member or Associate Member.

The Delegate of Argentina supported the Lebanese proposal, considering that free distribution of one or more copies of service documents was exceedingly useful, in that it enabled all items of information to be known at once. Some countries limited their purchases of copies for reasons of a financial nature. As regards the method whereby such a distribution might be financed, he agreed with the suggestion made by the Delegate of Portugal, namely, that publications should be subsidized from the ordinary budget.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia supported the proposal and agreed that distribution should be limited to one copy.

The Chairman asked the Delegate of Lebanon whether he could accept the Brazilian amendment.

The Delegate of Lebanon said he would.

The Delegate of The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wished to have the matter clarified. If there was to be a free issue of all documents, then presumably that would include the Berne List and the Frequency List. Now each of those publications, he believed, cost about 100 Swiss francs per copy, and if so, a sum of

some 20,000 Swiss francs would be involved in each case. Circumspection was advisable if such facilities were to be extended. The best thing would be to have no free distribution; all should pay for what they had.

The Chairman said it made no difference whether a country bought a copy of a publication, or paid a slightly higher contribution in order to have it "free". It came to the same thing in the end. In view of the remarks made by the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, did the Delegate of Lebanon insist on his proposal?

The Delegate of Lebanon maintained his proposal, which, incidentally, had been seconded.

The Delegate of Portugal could not accept the Brazilian amendment, since it would mean an inequitable apportionment of expenses. The initial proposal had shared the burden more or less evenly. In any case, before any discussion on the matter, it would be advisable to have an estimate of expenditure. Free distribution of a Frequency List must account for some 15 to 20 thousand Swiss francs. Hence he would reserve his decision.

The Chairman said he had asked the Secretary General to ascertain the cost involved. It would take some little time, but a figure could be worked out. Some documents were not published in all the working languages, because, owing to the lack of demand, the cost of doing so would be high. The matter might perhaps be referred to a small working group.

The Director of the C.C.I.F. said that as regards C.C.I.F. documents, it was sometimes difficult to obtain adequate orders for Spanish editions, and in certain cases, for English ones. That might conceivably be due to the mistaken impression that the C.C.I.F. did most of its work for Europe, whereas in fact its technical literature was of the greatest assistance for all engineers interested in telephone problems. After each meeting, there was an inquiry, and there were not always enough orders in the above mentioned languages. Nevertheless, all countries would benefit from the literature in question.

The Delegate of Portugal thought that a decision could be taken without the creation of a working group. It would be sufficient to consider the figures over three financial years, to note what publications had been issued and what their prices had been. That would provide a good idea for the future.

The Secretary General reverted to the delicate problem raised by the Director of the C.C.I.F. The existing system, in accordance with an Administrative Council resolution, was for one copy of every publication to be sent, against payment, to all countries. If there was to be free distribution, the question of publishing documents in a language for which the volume of orders was inadequate arose. If three languages were used, it would lead to an increase in the cost price.

The Delegate of Argentina, referring to what had been said by Mr. Valensi and the Secretary General, said that the proposal favoured free distribution of one copy in the language in which publication was made, and that the problem of languages was something different. Too much stress should not be laid on the question of the languages in which documents were to be published. The problem was a simple one, and it would be enough to refer to the data already available.

The Delegate of Lebanon agreed with the preceding speaker. It would be enough merely to modify paragraph 3 of Administrative Council Resolution No. 191, independently of the question of the languages in which documents were published.

The Delegate of South Africa and the Territory of South West Africa thought that there was a very simple solution. There was no reason why each administration should not place an order for one copy of each document and pay for it. The effect of the proposal of Lebanon would be to transfer the sum required to cover the "free" distribution from the publications budget to the ordinary budget. He was not in favour of it.

The Delegate of Pakistan supported the Lebanese proposal. Every Member was entitled to some minimum gain from its subscription. A Member in Class VIII would get one copy, whereas a Member in Class I might want more than one copy, but not as many as 30. Now the object of the I.T.U. was to promote the spread of telecommunication all over the world, and if each Member got a copy of every publication, all would know what it contained. It was very important that the C.C.I.F. and C.C.I.T. should translate their documents into as many languages as possible. If prices were too high, the object for which the I.T.U. existed would be defeated. The cost incurred in "free" distribution could be debited to the ordinary budget.

The Secretary General said that, according to the information he had just received, the expense for one financial year would amount to some 107,000 Swiss francs, for a free distribution of 153 copies. There were certain documents which were exceedingly expensive, like the List of Telegraph Offices. A complete collection for one year would cost 709.40 Swiss francs.

In reply to the Delegate of Lebanon, he went on to say that he had been referring to service documents only, and that the List of Telegraph Offices came under that heading. If it were subtracted, the average annual expenditure would amount to 100,000 Swiss francs. If free distribution were limited to one copy, expenses would be no more than 65,000 Swiss francs.

The Delegate of France said it should be made clear that if free distribution was decided on, such a distribution should be made under existing conditions. It should be noted that the figures provided by the Secretary General were based on existing conditions of publications.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics thought that the matter was bound up with the question of publishing

documents in the working languages. Such publication took place only after inquiry of Members, in order that the number of copies to be printed might be determined. It was to be feared that with free distribution, documents which were not printed at present in certain languages because of inadequate orders, would be printed in those languages. The question might be considered again after Article 15 of the Convention had been considered.

The Delegate of Portugal had made some calculations on the assumption that no change was made in the existing publication procedure.

On the first assumption (a free distribution of one to three copies according to the contributory class) total expenditure would amount to 107,000 Swiss francs, or 135 Swiss francs per unit.

Thus a country in Class VIII would pay 135 Swiss francs for a set of documents estimated to cost 700 Swiss francs.

A country in Class IV would pay 2,025 Swiss francs for two sets of documents costing 1,400 Swiss francs.

A country in Class I would pay 4,050 Swiss francs for three sets of documents costing 2,100 Swiss francs.

With the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil (uniform free distribution of one copy), those figures would become:

Class VIII - the increase in contributions would be 80.50 Swiss francs for 700 Swiss francs' worth of documents;

Class IV - the increase in contributions would be 1,200 Swiss francs for 700 Swiss francs' worth of documents;

Class I - the increase in contributions would be 2,400 Swiss francs for 700 Swiss francs' worth of documents.

Hence, for the sake of international collaboration, he was prepared to accept the Lebanese proposal, but not the amendment proposed thereto by the Delegation of Brazil, since it would mean a marked disproportion between the sums paid by certain countries and what they received.

The Chairman intervening, pointed out that as the Delegate of Lebanon had accepted the Brazilian amendment, the original proposal had lapsed.

On a question by the Delegate of Iceland, there was discussion in which the Delegate of Lebanon, the Secretary General, and the Delegate of France spoke. This latter ended up by saying that free distribution would, of course, in no wise change the existing conditions under which service documents were published.

The Delegate of Pakistan thought that a vote should be taken on the principle involved. It would have no effect on the language question - that would remain just the same. But in the case of the C.C.I.F., which published most of its documents in French only, there should be a minimum of three working languages for publications. An exception might be made for technical documents, although those promoted the interests of telecommunication, and perhaps also for statistics, which might be supplied only on request. He urged that the principle should be accepted, and that the question should be referred to a working group for study.

The Delegate of South Africa and the Territory of South West Africa wished to revert to the suggestion made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., viz., that no decision should be taken on the proposal until the general question of languages had been dealt with. He supported that line of approach, which he considered the right one.

The Chairman again suggested that a working group should be set up to examine the proposal.

The Delegate of the United States of America thought that a vote on the principle should be taken first, since, if the working group made a detailed study and the Committee subsequently rejected the principle, their efforts would have been wasted.

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia recalled that the Committee was faced with a proposal duly seconded.

The Delegate of Pakistan said that the Working Group should have full liberty to consider all alternatives, quite apart from the original Lebanese proposal. Distribution need not be limited to one copy - there might be a sliding scale. The Group should try to find an acceptable solution.

The Delegate of Denmark agreed with the remarks made by the Delegate of the United States of America. He did not see how a Working Group could be set up if the principle had not been settled.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland shared the opinion of the Delegate of the United States of America, but said that the Committee was still somewhat confused as to a clear-cut proposal and its financial implication, and also as to the point about languages raised by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. He supported the formation of a Working Group to draft a proposal for free distribution and to ascertain its task.

The Chairman said that what was required was a factual report of the cost of the various alternatives. He proposed that the Working Group should consist of Delegates of Lebanon, (Chairman), Portugal, Argentina, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France and Brazil.

This proposal was adopted.

o

o o

The Committee thereupon proceeded to consider paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article 14 of the Convention.

The Chairman drew attention to Document No. 182, which gave

a list of 90 Members of the Union, with a total of 792 units. The existing value of one unit was thus some 5,000 Swiss francs. The estimated expenditure for 1953 (see page 117 of the Administrative Council's Report) was 5,433,000 Swiss francs. One unit therefore worked out at about 6,800 Swiss francs.

There was only one proposal for amending the existing scale of units, that of Italy (No. 228) which aimed at increasing the contribution of countries in Class I and II, and decreasing those of countries in Classes III to VIII. He recalled that prior to Atlantic City there had been only six Classes, ranging from 25 units in Class I to three units in Class VI. The ratio between the extremes was therefore:

Old basis.....	8.3-1
Present basis.....	30-1
Proposed basis.....	60-1

The Italian proposal shifted the balance of expenses in favour of the **countries** in the lower classes.

The Delegate of Portugal recalled that in withdrawing Proposal No. 230 he had reserved the right to revert to paragraph 6 (the existing paragraph 4). The Italian proposal offered an equitable solution, and he supported it. In view of the increase of expenditure, the number of contributory units would have to be increased, without thereby giving rise to numerous demands for lower contributory classes.

The Delegate of Italy, explaining his proposal, said that the contributions made by countries should bear some relation to their financial capacity, otherwise there would be difficulty in recovering sums due. The existing scale of contributions bore no relation to the resources of countries and the extent of their telecommunication systems.

The Delegate of Franco said that the question was exceedingly important. Reference had been made to the difficulties encountered in recovering sums due. But those had been experienced under the Madrid Convention, which was at least solidly based on seventy years of Union experience. At Atlantic City, the separation between top and bottom of the scale had been increased. That had been justified by inclusion in the ordinary budget of expenses which had not hitherto been included there. The Italian proposal was in harmony with the assumption of a consolidated budget. The idea of a Working Capital Fund had been rejected. Were there any new facts such as would justify a change in the scale of contributions? There would probably be some increase in expenditure due to a rise in the fiscal limit set at

Atlantic City, and due to E.A.R.C. expenses. It was to be feared that such a spread-cagling of the contributory scale would lead to demands for lower classes. Further, it would seem that there was a tendency to overlook the heavy burden which participation at all I.T.U. Conferences and meetings meant for certain administrations - a burden over and above their contributions. Before a decision was taken as to whether any change should be made in the scale of contributions, it would be well to consider the 1953 budget, and to decide on a fiscal limit for the next five years. It would then be seen whether the budget could be met by all with the existing scales, or whether those scales would have to be changed.

The Delegate of Portugal agreed. Spread-cagling of the contributory scale was justified by the relative importance of telecommunication systems alone. Why did his country pay a 15-unit contribution? Because, before Atlantic City, that had been its contribution towards the Radio Division. Portugal had taken the view that it would not be a very gracious gesture to reduce its contribution, but not all countries had been so scrupulous. There were countries larger than his own which were paying for a lesser number of units. Hence either the scale would have to be spread-cagled or applications for lower classes would have to be allowed.

The Delegate of Italy insisted on the principle of a change in contributions, but was very ready to consider modifications in the scale proposed by his country.

The Delegate of Iraq found the existing classification system unbalanced. Members should be classified in accordance with the benefits each derived from the Union. Many small countries did not get the maximum benefit. High rates of contribution should be paid by highly-developed countries, and low rates by the under-developed ones.

The Delegate of Japan stated:

"The Delegation of Japan regrets that it cannot agree to the proposal by Italy which aims at a drastic change in the classification of contribution of the expenses of the Union. If such a great change were made, there would be caused disturbance and confusion - disturbance in the structure of the finances of the International Union and also in the financial situation of each country. For example, my country is requesting to be included in the first class of the contribution, but this is based upon the assumption that the situation may remain the same as under the Atlantic City Convention. Therefore, the Delegation of Japan supports the views expressed by Mr. Laffay and is strongly opposed to the Italian proposal or any drastic change of classification of contribution."

The Delegate of Portugal said it would be easier to reach a decision when figures for future budgets were known.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated:

"My Delegation objects to the Italian proposal that there should be an increase in contributory units for Classes I to III. The existing system of apportioning expenditure between Members and Associate Members is more equitable."

The Delegate of Yemen supported the views expressed by the Delegate of Iraq. Payments should be in accordance with benefits received.

The Delegate of France repeated that the fiscal limit on future budgets must first be determined. Then delegations would have to be frankly consulted. If the result was numerous demands for a lower contributory class, then that would be the moment to decide whether a change in the scale was required.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland did not favour the Italian proposal, which would increase the payments of all countries in Classes I and II. Already the 14 countries in those two classes were bearing 50% of the total ordinary expenses of the Union, and under the Italian proposal that figure would be increased to 64%. The existing scale was out of balance, and the proposed change would make it worse. Its probable effect would be to make some countries move downwards in the scale, and when the new, and higher, ceiling was determined, the tendency would be accentuated. That would render budget estimates more difficult, and many delegations would have to seek fresh instructions from their governments.

The Delegate of Italy thought that the matter might be reconsidered when the new fiscal limit had been decided on.

The Delegate of Portugal supported the procedure advocated by the Delegate of France. He did not agree with the statement made by the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, namely, that Classes I and II bore 50% of Union expenditure. For example - the duties entrusted to the I.F.R.B. Reference to a Frequency List would show that those countries used the majority of frequencies. The smaller countries were bearing a proportion of the expenses incurred on machine-operation, perforation of cards, etc., which were debited to the I.F.R.B.

The Chairman said he did not want to put off a decision too long, as budget estimates might not be ready until a later stage. There were

sufficient indications in the Administrative Council Report of what the future level of expenditure would be; a decision on the unit scale of contribution could perhaps be taken forthwith.

The Delegate of Egypt said that adoption of the proposed scale was bound up with Members' freedom of choice. If everyone were free to choose, he saw no objection to the new scale. No country had to stay in Class I if it did not want to. Many countries were already in higher classes than they should be in.

The Delegate of Italy observed that the proposal for postponement having been seconded, the question should be considered later.

The Delegate of Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such said that the general feeling of the Committee seemed to be in favour of postponing consideration of the question. To save time, would it not be possible for a small group of financial experts to make a quick estimate of future expenditure ?

The Delegate of the United States of America said that Members already had enough information for a vote to be taken forthwith. He was not in favour of postponement.

The Delegate of Sweden agreed, but considered the most important point was the period within which Members would be free to make a change if they wished to do so - say, within the forthcoming year. The crucial issue was the date after which no change would be allowed.

The Delegate of France thought that accurate information on future budgets was required before a decision was taken.

The Chairman thereupon put the matter to a vote, and by 29 votes to 6, with 8 abstentions, it was decided to postpone a decision on contributory scales until later.

Reporters :

J.T. Arregui

R.A. Vargues

M. Caws

Chairman :

K. PRASADA

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE 5

to the

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

(By the Chairman)

Subjects:

1. Contributions in arrears - Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, paragraph 4.3 "Contributions in abeyance for various reasons".
2. Structure of the Budget: Consolidated Budget. Para. I of Chapter VI of the Report of the Administrative Council.
3. Working Capital Fund - Para. 2 of Chapter VI of the Report of the Administrative Council.

---.

1.1. In its 8th Meeting, Committee 5 examined the second report received from Working Group 3 of Committee 5 in document No. 229 and adopted, in the form appearing in Appendix A, the resolution which had been drafted by the Working Group. The Committee decided to recommend the Resolution as adopted by it to the Plenary Assembly for approval. The discussion which took place is recorded briefly in the minutes of the meeting, (document No. 244).

1.2. The Resolution submitted by Working Group 3 of Committee 5 was in 4 parts: the fourth part was subject to the approval of Committee 5. Committee 5 having decided, by 21 votes for, 4 against and 17 abstentions, that the fourth part of the Resolution be incorporated in the main Resolution without any conditional clause, it has accordingly been so incorporated in the Resolution appearing in Appendix "A".

1.3. U.S.S.R., Roumanian People's Republic, Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungarian People's Republic, Federal German Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic objected, for the reasons recorded in the minutes of the meeting to the acceptance from the Bonn Government of the debts due from the former Germany. Para. 2 of the Resolution on being put to the vote was retained by 29 votes to 7 with 8 abstentions.

1.4. The other paras. of the Resolution having not been objected to, the Resolution as a whole, without a qualifying clause governing para. 4, was adopted. The Committee decided to communicate its decision to the Plenary Assembly.

2.1. Committee 5 has considered another two important matters contained in Chapter VI of the Report of the Administrative Council which it had been called upon to study, namely, Consolidation of Budget and establishment of a Working Capital Fund. Several countries had submitted proposals in regard to them.

2.2. The proposals for Consolidation of the Budget were discussed comprehensively in the 5th and 6th meetings of the Committee, the minutes of which appear in documents Nos. 195 and 196 respectively. The Committee expressed itself against them by 28 votes to 18, with 2 abstentions.

3. The proposals for the establishment of a Working Capital Fund were discussed in the 7th meeting of the Committee, the minutes of which are recorded in document No. 217. The proposals were rejected, 12 voting for, 17 against and 2 abstentions.

4. A large number of countries participated in the discussions on the Consolidation of the Budget and the establishment of a Working Capital Fund. As the minutes will show, the merits of the proposals were widely recognized, but the majority of the countries felt that their acceptance would involve too big a financial outlay or that the time was not opportune for it.

Chairman:

K. Prasada

APPENDIX 'A'

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Contributions in abeyance because of events  
which occurred during the second world war

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

in view of

- 1) The Report by the Administrative Council of the Union to the Plenipotentiary Conference, Chapter VI, section 4.3. (Contributions in abeyance for various reasons), and the literature submitted by the Secretary General of the Union;
- 2) Administrative Council Resolutions 52/CA3 and 136/CA4, relative to the arrears of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
- 3) Administrative Council Resolution 52/CA3, relative to the arrears of the Italian Colonies;
- 4) Administrative Council Resolution 18/CA2, relative to the arrears of Germany and Japan;

considering :

- 1) that the accounts in question are in abeyance mainly because of events which occurred during the second world war;
- 2) that in the case of the former Italian Colonies the situation has varied in such a fashion that it is extremely difficult to determine whether the liability incurred under the Madrid Convention in respect of the Membership of the Union of these Colonies has passed to any other Member and, if so, to which;
- 3) that in the case of the South Sea Islands formerly under Japanese Mandate and the former Japanese dependencies, the legal position is extremely obscure;
- 4) that on account of 2) and 3) it is not possible to fix definitely upon any Member of the Union the responsibility for the debts in question; and

- 5) that it is inadvisable to carry over debts indefinitely in the account books of the Union

resolves

- 1) to write off :
  - a) the book debts shown against the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
  - b) the debts of the former Italian Colonies;
  - c) the debt of the South Sea Islands, formerly under Japanese Mandate;
  - d) the debts of the former Japanese Dependencies;
- 2) to accept the offer made by the Federal German Republic to settle German debts in their entirety on condition that, in accordance with the report of the London Conference on August 8th 1952 on German prewar debts, the interest due is reduced from 6% to 4%; and to write off the difference in the interest;
- 3) to grant the necessary credits, amounting to a sum in round figures of 366,210 Swiss francs, on December 31st to the Secretary General of the Union in order that the Profit and Loss Account, as regards the items mentioned in 1) and 2) above may be balanced; and
- 4) to post, however, the sums owed in respect of the former Japanese Dependencies to a special account, and to instruct the Secretary General to endeavour to obtain before the next Plenipotentiary Conference, payment of these sums from the Members of the Union administering the territories in question, such payments to be entered as special income.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE 5

to the

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

(By the Chairman)

Subjects:

1. Contributions in arrears - Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, paragraph 4.3 "Contributions in abeyance for various reasons".
2. Structure of the Budget: Consolidated Budget. Para. I of Chapter VI of the Report of the Administrative Council.
3. Working Capital Fund - Para. 2 of Chapter VI of the Report of the Administrative Council.

---

1.1. In its 8th Meeting, Committee 5 examined the second report received from Working Group 3 of Committee 5 in document No. 229 and adopted, in the form appearing in Appendix A, the resolution which had been drafted by the Working Group. The Committee decided to recommend the Resolution as adopted by it to the Plenary Assembly for approval. The discussion which took place is recorded briefly in the minutes of the meeting, (document No. 244).

1.2. The Resolution submitted by Working Group 3 of Committee 5 was in 4 parts: the fourth part was subject to the approval of Committee 5. Committee 5 having decided, by 21 votes for, 4 against and 17 abstentions, that the fourth part of the Resolution be incorporated in the main Resolution without any conditional clause, it has accordingly been so incorporated in the Resolution appearing in Appendix "A".

1.3. U.S.S.R., Roumanian People's Republic, Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungarian People's Republic, Federal German Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic objected, for the reasons recorded in the minutes of the meeting to the acceptance from the Bonn Government of the debts due from the former Germany. Para. 2 of the Resolution on being put to the vote was rejected by 29 votes to 7 with 8 abstentions.

1.4. The other paras. of the Resolution having not been objected to, the Resolution as a whole, without a qualifying clause governing para. 4, was adopted. The Committee decided to communicate its decision to the Plenary Assembly.

2.1. Committee 5 has considered another two important matters contained in Chapter VI of the Report of the Administrative Council which it had been called upon to study, namely, Consolidation of Budget and establishment of a Working Capital Fund. Several countries had submitted proposals in regard to them.

2.2. The proposals for Consolidation of the Budget were discussed comprehensively in the 5th and 6th meetings of the Committee, the minutes of which appear in documents Nos. 195 and 196 respectively. The Committee expressed itself against them by 28 votes to 18, with 2 abstentions.

3. The proposals for the establishment of a Working Capital Fund were discussed in the 7th meeting of the Committee, the minutes of which are recorded in document No. 217. The proposals were rejected, 12 voting for, 17 against and 2 abstentions.

4. A large number of countries participated in the discussions on the consolidation of the Budget and the establishment of a Working Capital Fund. As the minutes will show, the merits of the proposals were widely recognized, but the majority of the countries felt that their acceptance would involve too big a financial outlay or that the time was not opportune for it.

Chairman:

K. Prasada

APPENDIX 'A'

DRAFT RESOLUTION

Contributions in abeyance because of events  
which occurred during the second world war

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

in view of

- 1) The Report by the Administrative Council of the Union to the Plenipotentiary Conference, Chapter VI, section 4.3. (Contributions in abeyance for various reasons), and the literature submitted by the Secretary General of the Union;
- 2) Administrative Council Resolutions 52/CA3 and 136/CA4, relative to the arrears of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
- 3) Administrative Council Resolution 52/CA3, relative to the arrears of the Italian Colonies;
- 4) Administrative Council Resolution 18/CA2, relative to the arrears of Germany and Japan;

considering :

- 1) that the accounts in question are in abeyance mainly because of events which occurred during the second world war;
- 2) that in the case of the former Italian Colonies the situation has varied in such a fashion that it is extremely difficult to determine whether the liability incurred under the Madrid Convention in respect of the Membership of the Union of these Colonies has passed to any other Member and, if so, to which;
- 3) that in the case of the South Sea Islands formerly under Japanese Mandate and the former Japanese dependencies, the legal position is extremely obscure;
- 4) that on account of 2) and 3) it is not possible to fix definitely upon any Member of the Union the responsibility for the debts in question; and

5) that it is inadvisable to carry over debts indefinitely in the account books of the Union

resolves

- 1) to write off :
  - a) the book debts shown against the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
  - b) the debts of the former Italian Colonies;
  - c) the debt of the South Sea Islands, formerly under Japanese Mandate;
  - d) the debts of the former Japanese Dependencies;
- 2) to accept the offer made by the Federal German Republic to settle German debts in their entirety on condition that, in accordance with the report of the London Conference on August 8th 1952 on German prewar debts, the interest due is reduced from 6% to 4%; and to write off the difference in the interest;
- 3) to grant the necessary credits, amounting to a sum in round figures of 366,210 Swiss francs, on December 31st to the Secretary General of the Union in order that the Profit and Loss Account, as regards the items mentioned in 1) and 2) above may be balanced; and
- 4) to post, however, the sums owed in respect of the former Japanese Dependencies to a special account, and to instruct the Secretary General to endeavour to obtain before the next Plenipotentiary Conference, payment of these sums from the Members of the Union administering the territories in question, such payments to be entered as special income.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

FIRST REPORT OF COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies)

The following report on questions dealt with at the first four meetings of Committee 7 is submitted to the consideration of the Plenary Assembly. The observers of the United Nations and of the International Labour Organization reserve the right to advert to any of these questions in Plenary Assembly.

Definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls

The Committee was entrusted with the consideration of Proposal No. 658 - memorandum submitted by the United Nations on facilities and privileges for Specialized Agencies (Document No. 3). This proposal involved a review of the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls in Annex 2 to the Convention and the Chairman of Committee 4, to which the revision of Annex 2 had originally been allocated, agreed that this particular definition should be examined in Committee 7. The discussion is recorded in the minutes of the 2nd meeting of Committee 7 (Document No. 173). This discussion included also Document No. 155 which contains an extract on telecommunication facilities from the report of the Twelfth Report of the United Nations Administrative Committee on Coordination. This latter report is to be submitted to the Economic and Social Council and, for information, to the States Members of the United Nations and to the appropriate governing organs of the Specialized Agencies.

As a result of this discussion the Committee makes the recommendations set out below:

- 1) In par. f) of the existing definition the words "Heads of the principal organs of the United Nations" should be included. This point was adopted nemine contradicente.
- 2) In par. f) of the existing definition the reference to the "Heads of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations" should be retained. This recommendation was adopted by 18 votes in favour, 13 against and 7 abstentions.
- 3) The proposal of the United Nations to include in par. f) of the existing definition the words "Heads of the Specialized Agencies" should not be adopted. This proposal of the United Nations was rejected by 19 votes to 11 with 10 abstentions.
- 4) The existing paragraph g) - the International Court of Justice at the Hague- should be retained.

The representatives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and of the International Monetary Fund declared that those two organizations were in a different position from that of the other Specialized Agencies in that their Articles of Agreement obliged the Member Governments of those two organizations to accord governmental treatment to the official communications of the two organizations. The Committee agreed that a decision not to include the Heads of the Specialized Agencies in the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls would not prejudice the legal right of the Bank and Fund to require their Members to accord the telecommunication privileges set out in their Articles of Agreement.

The complete definition of Government telegrams and Government telephone calls as recommended by the Committee is set out in Annex I to the present report.

The Committee also considered a draft resolution submitted by France (Document No. 178) designed to provide machinery whereby the Administrative Council might consider and, if it saw fit, give effect to requests by specific Specialized Agencies for the priority envisaged

in Article 36 of the Convention to be accorded to certain of their telegrams and telephone calls. This draft resolution was discussed at the 4th meeting of the Committee and a slightly modified draft, adopted by 25 votes in favour, 7 against and 2 abstentions, is submitted in Annex 2 to the present report.

The Committee also began discussion, at its 4th meeting, of a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Document No. 177) concerning measures for the possible abrogation of Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. This matter will be dealt with in a subsequent report of the Committee.

## 2. Communication from the International Red Cross Committee

The Committee considered at its 4th meeting the communication from the International Red Cross Committee reproduced in Document No. 38 together with a draft resolution submitted by Switzerland (Proposal No. 685, Document No. 45). The Committee recommends the adoption of the modified version of this draft resolution which is reproduced in Annex No. 3 to the present report. It was agreed that Switzerland would submit to the Telegraph and Telephone Conference of 1954 a memorandum prepared in consultation with the International Red Cross Committee.

## 3. Expanded Programme of technical assistance

At its 3rd meeting (Document No. 199) the Committee considered the Proposal No. 704 of the United States (Document No. 103) to approve resolution No. 244 adopted by the Administrative Council at its 7th Session. The Committee approved this draft resolution in Document No. 103 with an amendment and the revised text as recommended for adoption by the Plenary Assembly is reproduced in Annex No. 4 to the present report.

The Committee agreed that a recommendation should be addressed to the Plenary Assembly that an official of the General Secretariat should, if necessary, be responsible for the secretarial work in connection with Technical Assistance and that the expense should be borne by the Technical Assistance Administration.

F.C. de Wolf

Annexes: 4

Chairman, Committee No. 7

ANNEX 1

REVISED DEFINITION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 7

Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls: These are telegrams or telephone calls originating with any of the authorities specified below:

- a) the Head of a State;
- b) the Head of a Government and members of a Government;
- c) the Head of a colony, protectorate, overseas territory or territory under suzerainty, authority, trusteeship or mandate of a Member or Associate Member or of the United Nations;
- d) Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air;
- e) diplomatic or consular agents;
- f) the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Heads of the principal organs and of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations;
- g) the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Replies to Government telegrams as defined herein shall also be regarded as Government telegrams.

ANNEX 2

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

APPLICATIONS BY SPECIALIZED AGENCIES FOR PRIORITY  
FOR TELEGRAMS AND TELEPHONE CALLS

The International Telecommunication Conference of Buenos Aires,

considering

1. that the priority envisaged in Article 36 of the Convention, in favour of Government telegrams, and Government telephone calls, could facilitate the work of certain Specialized Agencies of the United Nations,
2. that these Specialized Agencies are not mentioned in Annex 2 to the Convention which enumerates the authorities entitled to originate Government telegrams and Government telephone calls,

recommends

that if Specialized Agencies of the United Nations wishing to benefit from the provisions of Article 36 to the Convention inform the Administrative Council of their request, justifying the particular cases in which the priority envisaged in Article 36 is necessary, the Administrative Council

- (1) should inform Members and Associate Members of the Union of the requests which, in their opinion, should be accepted;
- (2) should take a definitive decision on these requests, bearing in mind the opinion of the majority of Members and Associate Members,

instructs

the Secretary General to notify Members and Associate Members of the decision taken by the Council.

ANNEX 3

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

GENEVA CONVENTIONS ON THE TREATMENT OF PRISONERS OF WAR

AND THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS IN WARTIME

The International Telecommunication Conference  
of Buenos Aires,

considering:

1. the provisions of Article 74, paragraph 5, and of Article 124 of the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War, dated 12 August 1949 (1) and of Articles 110, paragraph 5, and 141 of the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in Wartime, dated 12 August 1949 (1);
2. the provisions of Article 35 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947;

recommends:

that the next International Telegraph and Telephone Conference consider sympathetically whether, and if so, to what extent the telegraph franking privileges and the reductions in telegraph charges envisaged in the Geneva Conventions mentioned above could be accorded, and make any necessary modifications to the International Telegraph Regulations.

---

(1) See Annex.

ANNEX TO RESOLUTION ON THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS

a) Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War  
(12 August 1949):

ARTICLE 74, 5th PARAGRAPH

"The High Contracting Parties shall endeavour to reduce, so far as possible, the rates charged for telegrams sent by prisoners of war or addressed to them."

ARTICLE 124

The National Information Bureaux and the Central Information Agency shall enjoy free postage for mail, likewise all the exemptions provided for in Article 74, and further, so far as possible, ~~exemption from telegraph charges or, at least, greatly reduced rates.~~"

b) Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in Wartime  
(12 August 1949):

ARTICLE 110, 5th PARAGRAPH

"The High Contracting Parties shall endeavour to reduce, so far as possible, the charges for telegrams sent by internees or addressed to them."

ARTICLE 141

The National Information Bureaux and the Central Information Agency shall enjoy free postage for all mail, likewise the exemptions provided for in Article 110, and further, so far as possible, exemption from telegraphic charges or, at least, greatly reduced rates."

ANNEX 4

Resolution proposed by Committee 7

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNION

IN THE EXPANDED PROGRAMME OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The International Telecommunication Conference  
of Buenos Aires,

considering:

1. the report by the Administrative Council, 1952,  
Chapter VII, paragraph 1;
2. the Report by the Administrative Council, 1952,  
Chapter I, paragraph 3.5;

endorses

the action taken by the Administrative Council on the  
arrangements made for Technical Assistance by the I.T.U.; and,

resolves:

1. that the Administrative Council is authorized, for the time  
being, to continue to participate for the Union in the Expanded  
Programme of Technical Assistance according to the arrangements made  
in 1952, and to call on the various organs of the Union as appropriate  
to facilitate this participation; and,
2. that the Administrative Council shall review developments in  
this field each year and coordinate the work of the permanent organs  
of the Union in connection with its participation in this Programme.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

F R A N C E

Choice of class of contribution

The procedure set forth hereinafter is based on the following considerations:

1. The Buenos Aires Conference will be called upon to set a new fiscal limit on I.T.U. ordinary expenditure for the period 1954 - 1959. This may be estimated at some 6,000,000 Swiss francs.
2. The Conference is already confronted with some applications for lower contributory classes within the Atlantic City scale of contributions (the Convention, Article 14) - Applications arising from the fact that some countries find the burden represented by present Union expenditure excessive.
3. The new fiscal limit on expenditure, some 50% higher than that set at Atlantic City, may well give rise to fresh applications of this nature.
4. If the existing paragraph 5 of Article 14 of the Convention were applied for classification in the scale of contributions, countries could, up to the effective date of the Buenos Aires Convention, inform the General Secretariat of the new class chosen by them.
5. If the applications for lower contributory classes, referred to in paragraph 3 above, are somewhat numerous, then countries keeping their present class may find the contribution they are expected to make has considerably increased. Such countries might in turn ask for change of class, before expiration of the time limit.
6. This uncertainty as to the financial obligations of Members may lead to a real muddle in I.T.U. finances.



7. Hence it would appear essential for the countries represented in Buenos Aires to be reasonably certain, before the end of the Conference, what class they will choose for the period 1954 - 1959 (1)

Procedure to be followed

1. The delegations at the Buenos Aires Conference, in view of:
  - 1) The new fiscal limit on ordinary expenditure, assessed at some 6,000,000 Swiss francs;
  - 2) the scale of contributions appearing in Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention,may:

up to .....December, 1952, hand in reasoned applications for lower classes of contribution within this scale.
2. The Conference will consider the effects of these applications, at the same time as the effects of those applications already submitted to the Conference.
3. These delegations which by the above date have made no application for a lower class will be considered as accepting their present class under the new fiscal limit.
4. However, such delegations, after consideration of the consequences entailed, for their countries, by the applications mentioned in paragraph 2 above, shall be entitled, in their turn, to submit an immediate application for a lower class.
5. Having considered the situation described in paragraph 2 above (and possibly that described in paragraph 4), the Conference will have to decide in favour of one of the following two courses:
  - 1) Keeping the contributory scale as it is.

This course is advisable if transfers to lower classes entail no more than a slight change in the number of units between which Union expenses are apportioned.

- 
- (1) It is assumed that there will be no change in Article 14, paragraph 5, of the Convention, i.e., that during this period there can be no transfer to a lower class.

2) finding a scale better adapted to the new state of affairs.

On this assumption it would be advisable, before considering a new scale, to add flexibility to the existing one, as described below, in order :

- a) to limit variations in the total number of units;
- b) to enable countries desiring a lower class to choose their class in such a way that the contributions made would continue to bear some relation to the relative financial resources of countries.

The following new scale might be adopted :

Class I	30 units	8 members	240 units	30.23%
Class II	25 units	6 members	150 units	18.89%
Class III	20 units	3 members	60 units	7.56%
Class IV	18 units	(new)		
Class V	15 units	4 members	60 units	7.56%
Class VI	13 units	(new)		
Class VII	10 units	14 members	140 units	17.63%
Class VIII	8 units	(new)		
Class IX	5 units	11 members	55 units	66.93%
Class X	4 units	(new)		
Class XI	3 units	22 members	66 units	8.31%
Class XII	2 units	(new)		
Class XIII	1 unit	23 members	23 units	2.89%
Class XIV	0.5 unit	(new)		

6. Should the Conference be obliged to choose a new scale, and should the one above be considered acceptable, there should be a roll-call of delegations before the end of the Conference, and each delegation should state what class, in its opinion, its country ought to take.

7. Besides, even if the scale given in Article 14 of the Convention were kept, delegations at this Conference should be called upon, in accordance with paragraph 6 above, to choose the class in which their countries will contribute during the period 1954-1959.

8. The classes chosen in Buenos Aires would not of course be absolutely binding, but would merely constitute a sort of moral undertaking.

9. There would be a special protocol governing the 1953 budget. It would seem that the present scale appearing in Article 14 of the Convention ought to be maintained, as regards this budget, for all countries not requesting, before or during the Conference, transfer to a lower class.

CONFERENCIA PLENIPOTENCIARIA

Buenos Aires, 1952

PROGRAMA PARA LA SEMANA 24 AL 29 DE NOVIEMBRE

EMPLOI DU TEMPS POUR LA SEMAINE DU 24 AU 29 NOVEMBRE

SCHEDULE FOR WEEK 24 TO 29 NOVEMBER

	Lunes 24	Martes 25	Miércoles 26	Jueves 27	Viernes 28	Sábado 29
ASAMBLEA PLENARIA			16-20(PL)			
Jefe Delegación	20-21(A)					
Com. 1					20-21(B)	
Com. 3	16-20(PL)	11-13(PL)		16-20(PL)		16-20(PL)
Subcom. A		16-20(B)			10-13(A)	
GT 3/2			10-13(B)			10-13(B)
Com. 4	10-13(PL)	16-20(PL)		10-13(PL)	16-20(PL)	10-13(PL)
4 A	16-20(A)					
GT 4/1	16-20(B)	10-13(B)	10-13(A)		10-13(C)	16-20(A)
Com. 5		16-20(A)	10-13(PL)		10-13(A)	10-13(A)
GT 5/1	09-13(C)	09-13(C)		09-13(C)		
GT 5/2	09-11(B)			11-13(B)	16-20(B)	08-10(B)
GT 5/3	11-13(B)			09-11(B)		
GT 5/4			08-10		08-10	
Com. 6				16-20(B)		
GT 6/1	16-20	16-20(PL)				
Com. 7		10-11(PL)				
Com. 8				10-13(A)	16-20(A)	



International  
Telecommunication Union

---

Document No. 272-E  
21 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

A NOTE FROM THE SECRETARIAT

The attached communication is published for the information  
of the Conference.

Annex : 1

- 2 -  
(272-E)

ANNEX

Buenos Aires, 20 November, 1952

Mr. Léon MULATIER  
Secretary General,  
International  
Telecommunication Union

Sir,

For the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference, the Brazilian Delegation had prepared twenty-eight proposals, namely, nine relative to the Convention, one relative to Annex 2, and eighteen relative to the General Regulations. Hitherto, however, in order not to hold up the work of the Conference, it has submitted six proposals only relative to the Convention, and eleven relative to the General Regulations.

The Brazilian Delegation wholeheartedly supports the steps taken to speed up the activities of the Conference to the utmost possible extent, and wishes to collaborate with other delegations to that end. Hence the Brazilian Delegation is also withdrawing its proposals 713 (relative to the Convention), and 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, and 720 (relative to the General Regulations).

Would you be so good as to inform the Plenary Assembly of this decision?

I have the honour to be, Sir, etc.,

Libero Oswaldo de Miranda  
Head of the Brazilian Delegation

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE STEERING COMMITTEE  
TO THE CONFERENCE

At a meeting held on Thursday, 20 November, at 7.30 p.m., the Steering Committee considered the progress made in the work of the Conference, and the measures required to complete it, so that the closing meeting might be held on Saturday, 20 December 1952.

To this end, it recommended the Conference:

1. to concentrate its attention on the essential tasks, leaving aside the secondary proposals;
2. to set up a further Sub-Committee of Committee 3 (Convention), to study Articles 17 to 49 of the Convention;
3. to approve the following time-table;  
  
morning meetings : 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.  
afternoon meetings : 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.
4. to finish the committee stage by Saturday, 6 December;
5. to adopt the following procedure for the preparation of the final drafts by the Editorial Committee:

The texts prepared by:

Committees;

the Sub-Committee of Committee 3 set up to study Articles 17 to 49 of the Convention;

the Working Groups, when they are the outcome of a decision in principle taken by the committees that set up those Groups;

should be sent direct to the Editorial Committee, which would make any necessary drafting improvements without altering the sense and would forward them to the Plenary Assembly for a first reading.

The Chairman

M.A. Andrada



C O M M I T T E E 7

(Relations with the United Nations  
and Specialized Agencies)

Summary Record of the 5th meeting

Friday, 21 November 1952, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Francis Colt de Wolf (United States of America)

The Chairman, opening the meeting, recalled the agenda, and submitted for approval the summary records of the first three meetings (Documents Nos. 140, 173, and 199).

The summary record of the 1st meeting (Document No. 140) was approved.

The Chairman, before passing to the summary record of the 2nd meeting, read out a letter from the International Labour Office, thanking the Conference for having invited an I.L.O. representative to attend the meetings of the Committee, and stating that Mr. Esteban A. Garbarini-Islas had been appointed I.L.O. Observer (Mr. E.A. Garbarini-Islas was present at the meeting).

The summary record of the 2nd meeting (Document No. 173) was then approved.

The following comments were made in connection with the summary record of the 3rd meeting (Document No. 199):

Mr. Valensi (Director, C.C.I.F.) asked that the following addition be made to the speech attributed to him:

"It is in the Coordination Committee that all the real work in connection with the appointment of experts and the placing of scholars is done, the General Secretariat merely looking after typing, mimeograph, and correspondence - work which should, incidentally, be reduced as much as possible. In any case there could be no justification for a senior post in the General Secretariat, the occupant of which would supervise the administrative work undertaken in connection with Technical Assistance."

Mr. Townshend (Assistant Secretary General) supported this statement.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wanted the last paragraph on page 4 of the summary record to be amended as follows:

"That had thrown a great burden on the General Secretariat. If the work increased to any great extent, she would be prepared to agree to the secondment of an official of the General Secretariat to deal with Technical Assistance questions, the salary of that supernumerary official to be paid by the Union but charged to the Technical Assistance Administration on a reimbursement basis."

Mr. Townshend (Assistant Secretary General) asked Miss Perry to explain what she meant by "supernumerary".

Miss E.M. Perry (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that by "supernumerary" she meant a member of the I.T.U. General Secretariat staff whose salary, paid by the Union, would be reimbursed by the Technical Assistance Administration.

The summary record of the 3rd meeting was then approved, subject to the above amendments.

---

The Chairman, passing to the second item on the agenda, asked Mr. David (United Nations Observer) to comment on the memorandum submitted by the United Nations in connection with the routing of specialized agency telegraph traffic over the United Nations telecommunication network.

Mr. David (United Nations) thereupon made the following statement:

"You will see that apart from the New York - Geneva circuit, which at present is a rented circuit, the network is essentially ephemeral in character and will continue in its present form only as long as the stations are required for the missions concerned. As conditions change it may be possible to withdraw some of these stations and it may be necessary to establish others in other parts of the world.

"Now as regards the offer to the specialized agencies of the facilities of that part of the network owned and operated by the United Nations, the Secretary General of the United Nations has approached the matter with two important considerations in mind:

"a) the fact that the specialized agencies form part of the United Nations system as a whole, linked to the United Nations by a series of agreements as required by the Charter. Those agreements contain provisions for coordination of activities and services as far as possible, e.g. in the United Nations/I.T.U. Agreement Articles IV, paragraph 3 and X, paragraph 1.

"b) the General Assembly directives towards securing the largest measure of common service arrangements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Given the existence in any case of facilities already set up by the United Nations for its own use, there is, he believes, everything to be said for a commonsense approach to the question. He would not propose to extend the United Nations services to accommodate the specialized agencies; he does propose, however, that the fullest use of existing facilities be made on the grounds of economy and practical advantage.

"The policy of the General Assembly has been that in general the United Nations and the specialized agencies shall enjoy similar facilities and privileges as can be seen from the fact that the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations and the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies provide, roughly, for similar treatment.

"In offering the facilities of the United Nations network, where available, to the specialized agencies, the Secretary General is acting in accordance with the spirit of the General Assembly directives and he has accepted traffic for the specialized agencies so that the latter may participate indirectly and to some extent in this particular privilege which has been accorded to the United Nations.

"The Chairman of the United Nations Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which is a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, said in a statement which he made to the Administrative Committee on Coordination on 10 October last:

- (1) that in the opinion of the Advisory Committee, the action of the Secretary General of the United Nations in granting facilities to the specialized agencies to use the United Nations telecommunication network fully accords with the general principles of coordination affirmed by the General Assembly;
- (2) that the Administrative Council had noted the Secretary General of the United Nations' assurance that there is no intention of extending the United Nations services for the purpose of accommodating the specialized agencies;
- (3) that in the opinion of the Administrative Council it is inappropriate to make a distinction in this field as between the status of the United Nations on the one hand, and that of the specialized agencies on the other.

"In the use of the network both for United Nations purposes and for the benefit of the specialized agencies, the Secretary General is anxious to observe the letter and the spirit of the Telecommunications Convention and of the Regulations, as they apply to the network.

"In view of the objections expressed by the Administrative Council at its 7th session earlier this year to the method of charging the specialized agencies proposed by the Secretary General, he withdrew

this offer and does not propose to renew it. He feels, however, that there should be some budgetary adjustment for the cost of the traffic of specialized agencies carried over the United Nations network for the following reasons:

"a) Payment imposes some sort of check over the traffic sent;

"b) In view of the fact that membership and contributions by governments in the United Nations and the specialized agencies is not the same, it seems only fair to apportion the cost of the service offered by the United Nations.

"This is in fact the practice already adopted in respect of other "common services" shared between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

"The Secretary General of the United Nations accordingly proposes that the specialized agencies should pay a share of the cost of operation of that part of the United Nations network owned by the United Nations, in the proportion that the amount of traffic carried for each of them bears to the whole traffic. In effect, this would amount to a joint operation of the network.

"You will have noted that the specialized agency traffic is, in fact, a very small proportion of the whole. It amounts at this time to six percent of an estimated annual total of traffic over the whole network, including the New York - Geneva circuit, of 1,500,000 words, i.e., about 90,000 words a year.

"In cases of doubt whether the carriage of any particular traffic would involve a breach of the Convention or Regulations, the Secretary General of the United Nations is prepared to consult the Union and, in fact, has already done this in one case.

"Apart from the New York - Geneva circuit, which is not under discussion here, the points at present served by the United Nations

network are not of great interest to the specialized agencies. It is of course possible to contemplate circumstances involving, for example, great natural catastrophes such as plague, famine, earthquake, etc., in which the assistance of the United Nations would be invoked, where agencies such as the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization might be greatly interested in the carriage of their traffic over any emergency United Nations circuit set up. Such an occasion has not yet arisen.

"The Secretary General invites this Conference to agree that it would not be contrary to the policies of the Union to carry traffic of the specialized agencies over the United Nations network at a pro rata proportion of the cost of operation, in so far as the facilities set up by the United Nations have spare capacity."

The Chairman thanked Mr. David, and drew the attention of the Committee to the agreement between the I.T.U. and the United Nations, with particular reference to Article XV thereof (referred to on page 5 of Document No. 228). Would members of the Committee care to open the discussion?

The Delegate of Pakistan wished to obtain an assurance from the United Nations that the United Nations telecommunication network would not be used for ends other than those for which it was specifically intended. Otherwise existing networks would be faced with competition, with the result that the income normally enjoyed by the administrations of I.T.U. Members would be transferred to the pockets of the United Nations departments concerned. If, as an exceptional measure, such a course was contemplated, then, at least, the United Nations should keep the Secretary General of the Union informed.

Mr. David (United Nations Observer) offered assurances on this point.

The United Nations would never take such steps without the prior agreement of the local administration. Further, it would keep the I.T.U. informed of any new circuits it might use, and would record their frequencies with the I.F.R.B.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland :

"We have before us a proposal that this Conference should agree that telegraph traffic of the specialized agencies may be carried over the United Nations point-to-point telecommunication network at a charge equal to the prorata proportion of the costs of operating the particular service, according to the traffic carried.

"We have been told that this proposal is designed as a measure of economy and is in accordance with the principle of the maximum use of common services which is the policy of the General Assembly. At first sight there might appear to be advantages, at any rate to members of the United Nations, in the proposal, and my delegation has given it careful and sympathetic consideration. As a result, however, we find that we cannot give it our support. As the matter is such a small one in practice but a large one in principle, there seems to be no point in establishing a bad precedent.

"The arrangement proposed is of course contrary to the provisions of the International Telegraph Regulations which the United Nations, in Article XV of their agreement with the International Telecommunication Union, has undertaken to observe in operating the telecommunication services under its control. It introduces an entirely new conception of the method of calculating charges for telegrams in the international service and, in the view of my delegation, we should be very careful about sanctioning any departure from the International Telegraph Regulations which the Union has drawn up and which we have approved. Acceptance of a new principle such as that suggested would have very wide repercussions; it might even upset the generally accepted word rate structure for telegrams in the international service with unpredictable consequences for all telegraph administrations and operations. If this were the only objection this Conference might perhaps suggest that the next ordinary Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference might consider making special provisions in the Regulations to take account of the peculiar problems of the United Nations, but surely, Mr. Chairman, there is an even more fundamental objection than this - an objection of principle. All governments which are members of the United Nations are agreed that the temporary establishment of United Nations telecommunication circuits

for United Nations missions in the field constitutes an exceptional measure to meet exceptional political circumstances. The 5th Committee of the United Nations General Assembly at its 339th meeting on the 1st February 1952, however, accepted the view of the Advisory Committee that point-to-point telecommunication circuits should not be set up in competition with existing public telecommunication networks. We all look forward therefore to the day when the United Nations network can be done away with. Surely it is against the whole conception of this temporary service to use it for the transmission of messages which can be carried, and have been carried up to now, over the existing networks.

"This brings me, Mr. Chairman, to the question of economy. We are told that this proposal will result in some economy to the United Nations budget and possibly to the budgets of the Specialized Agencies concerned - but at whose expense is this economy? The Specialized Agencies traffic is at present carried over the public system which is owned and operated by Administrations of Government or by operating agencies. The public network will lose the traffic and tax payers will find that they have to take money out of one pocket to put it in the other. In other words, Members of the United Nations and Specialized Agencies will be saving indirectly on their contributions to these organizations at the expense of their telegraph budgets. As we all know, it is not always possible to secure that every international telegraph circuit is a remunerative one. Circuits have to be maintained even when they are not used to capacity. In this respect the United Nations is no worse off than other administrations or operating agencies. In fact it is better off because from the telecommunications point of view it has no responsibility to the public and so has the opportunity to close down these special point-to-point services as soon as the political circumstances which justify them no longer exist.

"My Delegation must therefore regretfully oppose this proposal since it is contrary to the accepted principle according to which the tariffs and the methods of exploitation of the international telecommunication services are decided by negotiation and agreement. Moreover, whatever may be its apparent advantages from the point of view of the United Nations budget, the economy is mainly illusory and the proposal is not in the best interest of either the United Nations or the Specialized Agencies."

The Delegation of Argentina supported the statement made by Miss Perry. The United Nations proposal was undesirable and was an infringement of Article 32 of the Telegraph Regulations.

The Delegate of India supported the statements by Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. He recalled that at its Sixth Session the Administrative Council of the Union had considered that the operation of the U.N. network in competition with the Administration's networks was an infringement of the existing Regulations, and had decided to refer the question to the Plenipotentiary Conference. He protested against the United Nations proposal; his Delegation would vote against it.

The Delegation of France also supported the views expressed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The provisions of the existing Convention and Regulations should in no circumstances be distorted for the sake of a principle.

The Chairman then gave the floor to Mr. David, who was surprised at the apparent misunderstanding on the part of the members of the Committee. There had never been any question of comparing the U.N. telecommunication network to a public network. The I.T.U. was unreasonable thus to oppose the proposals he was submitting. He recalled that some of the Specialized Agencies, like the U.N. itself, were doing rehabilitation work, and it was unjust to refuse them the privilege requested.

The Delegation of Switzerland asked for the floor to join in the opposition shown by the other delegations to the United Nations proposal. He feared that if the U.N. telecommunication network were put at the disposal of the Specialized Agencies, it would become a permanent network, and that was a thing to be avoided.

The Delegate of Canada supported the previous speakers, although prepared to allow special concessions in urgent cases.

The Chairman also thought the question of urgent cases should be considered. He well understood the feelings of the majority of the delegations, who feared annexation by the Specialized Agencies if such a privilege were granted. Nevertheless, he would like to see a compromise solution that would meet cases of distress, on the express

understanding that the network would be used only temporarily. The compromise proposal submitted by Mr. Coffey deserved closer study, and he therefore suggested that a Working Group be set up, composed of the representatives of Canada and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Mr. David, to prepare as soon as possible a draft resolution containing the Committee's views on the United Nations proposal as well as specific provisions covering emergency cases.

---

The Chairman then passed to item 3 of the agenda (Epidemiological Telegrams issued by W.H.O., and considered as Government Telegrams - Document No. 190).

He recalled that the Committee had not adopted the United Nations proposal to include, in paragraph f) of the existing definition of government telegrams and telephone calls, the words "Heads of the Specialized Agencies", but had approved a draft resolution, submitted by France and slightly amended, to provide a procedure whereby the Administrative Council could, if it deemed opportune, grant the priority referred to in Article 35 of the Convention to certain telegrams and telephone calls. He suggested that the draft resolution took care of the question.

The Delegate of Pakistan thought that the question under consideration was the province of the Administrative Council.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed with this view. It did not seem that the Plenipotentiary Conference was particularly fitted to take a stand on this rather technical point. Furthermore, the proposal submitted by W.H.O. was not quite clear, and it would seem advisable to have more details.

The Chairman agreed, and proposed that the Secretary General of the Union should send a letter to W.H.O. informing it that the matter would be considered by the next session of the Administrative Council, when a representative of W.H.O. would be invited to attend and supply all the information required by the Council.

The last item on the agenda (Document No. 233 - First Report by Committee 7 to the Plenary Assembly) was then discussed.

The Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland asked for the words "if necessary" to be added between "be provided" and "to deal" in the last paragraph on page 3 of Document No. 233.

Mr. Townshend, speaking of the same paragraph, suggested that the words "be provided, to deal with Technical Assistance" be replaced by "be responsible for the secretarial work connected with Technical Assistance".

The last paragraph would thus read :

"The Committee agreed that a recommendation should be addressed to the Plenary Assembly that an official of the General Secretariat should be responsible, if necessary, for the secretarial work connected with Technical Assistance and that the expense should be borne by the Technical Assistance Administration."

The Chairman agreed to the amendments requested, and gave the floor to Mr. David.

Mr. David stated that he reserved the right to refer to the report again when it was submitted to the Plenary Assembly.

Mr. Garbarini-Islas, speaking as Observer of the I.L.O, also reserved the right to take the floor at the plenary meeting.

The Delegate of Switzerland suggested adding the word "next" before "International Telegraph and Telephone Conference" in the last paragraph of Annex 3 (page 6 of Document No. 233).

The Chairman agreed, and regarded the report as approved by the Committee with the amendments proposed.

- 12 -  
(274-E)

As Mr. David was shortly leaving, and as Mr. Andrada, Executive Chairman of the Conference, had said that the next plenary meeting would be held on Wednesday, 26 November 1952, the next meeting of the Committee was arranged for Tuesday, 25 November.

Replying to a question by the Delegate of France, the Chairman said that to save time the resolutions approved in Committee 7 would be submitted to the Plenary Assembly before they were considered by the Editorial Committee.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

Reporters :

R. Lemoine  
J. Garrido Moreno

Chairman :

F. Colt de Wolf

D R A F T   R E S O L U T I O N

The Plenipotentiary Conference,

having examined the request of the United Nations in Document No. 228 that the International Telecommunication Union should sanction a proposal of the United Nations to carry the traffic of the Specialized Agencies over their point-to-point telecommunication network at a charge equal to the pro rata proportion of the cost of operating, according to the traffic carried,

considering

- (1) that the system of charging and method of operation proposed by the United Nations is out of harmony with the provisions of the International Telegraph Regulations and therefore contrary to Article XV of the U.N. - I.T.U. Agreement,
- (2) that it would be inadvisable to sanction any departure by the United Nations from the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and Regulations,
- (3) that the Fifth Committee, to whom the matter was referred by the General Assembly of the United Nations, has recommended by a substantial majority that the United Nations telecommunication network should not in normal circumstances be set up in competition with existing public channels of communication,

(4) that in cases of emergency however it may be desirable for the traffic of the Specialized Agencies to be carried over the United Nations point-to-point network either at a tariff composed as prescribed in Article 26 of the International Telegraph Regulations or free of charge,

expresses the opinion

(1) that in normal circumstances the United Nations point-to-point telecommunication network should not be used to carry the traffic of the Specialized Agencies in competition with existing commercial telecommunication networks,

(2) that the I.T.U. is not prepared to agree to any departure from the provisions of Article XV of the U.N. - I.T.U. Agreement in so far as the operation of the telecommunication services under the control of the United Nations is concerned,

(3) that some exception should be made in cases of emergency,

resolves

to instruct the Secretary General

(1) to convey to the Secretary General of the United Nations the opinion of this Conference and to invite him to withdraw at the earliest practicable moment his offer to the Specialized Agencies to carry their traffic over the United Nations network; and

(2) to convey to the Secretary General of the United Nations the opinion of this Conference that, in cases of emergency, there would be no objection if the traffic of the Specialized Agencies were carried over the United Nations point-to-point network at a tariff composed as prescribed in Article 26 of the International Telegraph Regulations or free of charge.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 7

COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS

WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

A G E N D A

For 6th meeting

Tuesday 25 November at 1000 hours

Plenary Hall.

1. Approval of minutes of 4th meeting (Doc. No. 245).
2. United Nations telecommunications - text prepared by working group (Doc. No. 275).
3. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies - Draft resolution by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Doc. No. 177 revised).
4. Freedom of Information (Doc. No. 258).

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 2

(Credentials Committee)

Summary Record of the fourth Meeting

held on Wednesday, 5th November 1952

at 1600 hours

Chairman: Sir Bertrand Jerram

Before opening the meeting the Chairman announced that Mr. Villegas, of the Delegation of Colombia and Vice-Chairman of the Committee, had been replaced by Mr. R. Arciniegas, also of the Delegation of Colombia. He welcomed Mr. Arciniegas to the Committee.

Mr. Arciniegas thanked the Chairman for his words of welcome.

The following Delegations asked to participate in the work of the Committee:

Australia  
Cambodia (Kingdom of)  
Egypt  
Laos  
Mexico  
French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia  
Portuguese Oversea Territories  
Turkey

The Chairman informed the Delegations concerned that their names would be included in the membership of the Committee and welcomed them.



The minutes of the Committee's first meeting (Document No. 148) were then approved without comment.

The minutes of the Committee's second meeting (Document No. 149) were then approved with the following amendments:

Page 4, para. 4 (Statement by the Delegato of the U.S.S.R.): Insert "of the representatives" after "credentials".

Page 4, para. 6 in the English text (Statement by the Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R.): Insert "of the representatives of the Bonn authorities" after "credentials".

The minutes of the Committee's third meeting (Document No. 150) were then approved with the following amendments:

Page 7, para. 6, delete and substitute by:

"The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. objected to such a procedure on the grounds that it was irregular. The voting had started, as the Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. had pointed out. The Delegate of France had no valid reason for interrupting it, and the Chairman should not have allowed the interruption.

"The French Delegate had intervened with the sole object of getting the vote postponed, (and since his motion had been submitted after the voting had already started and since it had not been submitted on the method of voting), his intervention was contrary to the Rules of Procedure. If the Committee intended to abide by the Rules of Procedure, the vote should be taken up again. The Delegate of France had submitted a proposal to postpone the discussion referring to the fact that not all Members of Committee 2 were present at the meeting. In the opinion of the Soviet Delegation such a proposal was groundless because the meeting of Committee 2 and its programme of work had been announced in good time and those Delegates who had been able and wished to participate in the work of the Committee did come to its meeting. At the present time the Committee was examining the credentials of the so-called Delegation of Viet-Nam, and the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. held that those credentials were not correct from the legal standpoint."

Page 11, para. 3 (Statement by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.): Delete the word "plenipotentiary" after "Kuomintang" in the English and Spanish texts and in the French text substitute the word "plenipotentiary" by "representatives".

The Chairman informed the Committee that the credentials of the following Delegations had been received since the last meeting:

Bolivia  
Belgian Congo  
Cuba  
Egypt  
Finland  
Greece  
Iraq  
Jordan  
Laos  
Mexico  
Monaco  
French Protectorate of Morocco and Tunisia

He suggested that their credentials should be examined and that the Committee should thereafter prepare a report to the Plenary Assembly for consideration at its meeting on the 6th November, 1952.

The credentials of the following Delegations were then read and accepted as being in due form:

Finland  
Iraq  
Mexico  
French Protectorate of Morocco and Tunisia  
Jordan (The credentials authorize the Delegate of Iraq to represent Jordan)  
Greece  
Belgian Congo (The Chairman having drawn the Committee's attention to para. 1, page 2 of Document No. 149)  
Laos  
Monaco  
Bolivia  
Egypt (In respect of the Head of the Delegation only.  
The credentials of the other Delegates had not yet been received).  
Cuba  
Australia (In respect of additional Delegates)  
Brazil ( " " " " " )

The Chairman then read the credentials, in the form of a telegram, in respect of the Delegation of Costa Rica and also a copy of a letter addressed to the Government of Costa Rica by the Secretary General, suggesting that the original signed credentials, in the usual form, should be submitted as early as possible.

The telegraphic credentials were accepted pending the arrival of the original document.

The Chairman stated that the credentials of the following delegations, known to be present at the Conference, had not yet been received:

Afghanistan  
Saudi Arabia  
Ethiopia  
Peru  
Syria  
Turkey

The Chairman invited attention to the working document containing a draft report to the Plenary Assembly and suggested that the Committee should go into recess in order that this report could be brought up to date to include information regarding the fourth meeting. The revised report could then be examined after the recess.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. invited attention to the fact that some delegations had been participating in the work of the Conference, which was already nearing its end, without having presented their credentials. He asked whether any information was available regarding their failure to present credentials and whether anything could be done to expedite matters as the Committee would have to report to the Plenary Assembly.

The Assistant Secretary General, replying to the Chairman, stated that no information was available in regard to the outstanding credentials.

The Delegate of India referred to the recent decision by the Plenary Assembly in regard to the representation of one country by the delegation of another country and stated that the authorities in Ethiopia had been asked to forward the required credentials as early as possible.

The Chairman, in reply to the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., suggested that a suitable paragraph inviting attention to the outstanding credentials, could be included in the report to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman, also stated that a list of those Delegates who are authorized to sign the Final Acts of the Conference would have to be drawn up before the end of the Conference and suggested that the Reporters of Committee 2, with the assistance of the Secretary General, might draw up such a list from the credentials which had been accepted by the Committee.

The Committee, having resumed work after a recess, then accepted the credentials of the Delegation of Afghanistan meanwhile received, as being in due form.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., referring to the draft report to the Plenary Assembly, stated that this was an important document as it indicated which delegates were authorized to attend the Conference and to sign the Final Acts, and persons whose credentials were not acceptable could not be allowed to sign the documents of the Conference. The report to the Plenary Assembly should indicate which delegations made statements in regard to the credentials of certain delegations as well as the nature of the statements. He asked that the draft report of the Chairman should be amended as follows: "All these credentials were accepted by the Committee subject to a number of reservations and statements made by the Delegations of the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., the Bielorussian S.S.R., the P.R. of Albania, the P.R. of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the P.R. of Poland, the P.R. of Hungary, the P.R. of Roumania, with regard to the credentials submitted in the name of the following I.T.U. Member countries:

China  
Korea  
Viet-Nam  
Germany

These Delegations have stated that "the credentials submitted by the representatives of the Kuomintang, Bao-Dai, Syngman Rhee, cannot be recognized as being legally valid since they do not in fact represent China, Viet-Nam and Korea."

As regards the credentials of the representatives of the German Federal Republic the above mentioned Delegations have stated that "the credentials of the representatives of the Bonn authorities cannot be recognized as being legally valid since these authorities do not represent the whole of Germany, and that the participation in this Conference of representatives of the Bonn authorities, in the absence of representatives of the German Democratic Republic, is illegal".

These reservations and statements are included in the minutes of the meetings of Committee 2 (Documents Nos. 148, 149 and 150)."

The Chairman did not think it wise to include this statement in the report to the Plenary Assembly because the delegations whose credentials had been objected to would then have a claim to have their counter-statements also included in the report.

The Delegate of Colombia agreed fully with the view of the Chairman. The report to the Plenary Assembly should be brief and factual as it was a report of the Committee as a whole and not of individual members. All the statements already appeared in the minutes of the meetings.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. supported the proposal made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. and stated that the report should reflect clearly the work of the Committee. The draft report did not give such a picture of the work and he asked that it should be amended.

The Delegates of France, United States of America, Australia, the People's Republic of Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Egypt, U.S.S.R. and China then took part in a prolonged discussion in regard to the form of the report to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman then stated that it was evident that unanimity regarding the form of the report would not be reached. He undertook to prepare a report as Chairman of the Committee and if delegates were not satisfied with his report, they could again raise the matter in the Plenary Assembly. His suggestion was approved by the Committee.

Referring to the amendment proposed by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., the Delegate of China asked the Chairman for a ruling in regard to the use of the word Kuomintang.

The Chairman stated that he was not competent to give such a ruling.

The Delegate of China was not satisfied with the Chairman's reply and asked that it should be recorded in the minutes that he did not agree therewith. He reserved the right to reply to the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. and stated that correct terms should be used.

The meeting closed at 7.10 p.m.

Reporters:

Adolfo Zatorre  
H. J. Dreyer  
J. de la Chevroliere

Chairman:

Sir Bertrand Jorram

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE 5

Buenos Aires, 1952

ESTIMATED CEILING OF THE UNION'S EXPENSES

The estimates which follow are based on the "Estimated Overall Expenditure 1953 Budget" adopted by the Administrative Council, and reproduced on pages 117 to 123 of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, and which amounts to 5,433,350 Swiss Francs.

To this estimated overall expenditure has been added :

1. The increases in ordinary expenses envisaged by the various organs of the Union for the period 1954 to 1957.
2. The supplementary increases resulting from the eventual decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Estimate of expenses by years						
	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	Notes
<u>Expenses</u>						
1. Overall estimates adopted by the Administrative Council which serve as a basis for the calculations . . . . .	5.433.350	5.433.350	5.433.350	5.433.350	5.433.350	
2. Normal increments in salary steps according to the present scale, and payments to the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds. . . . .		148.850	313.320	434.850	544.426	
<u>Normal increases in the expenses of the various organs :</u>						
3. General Secretariat . . . . .						
a. Family allowances . . . . .	-	5.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	A.
b. Survivors' insurance for retired staff. . .	+	5.000	15.000	15.000	20.000	B.
c. Rent . . . . .	-	-	-	60.000	60.000	C.
d. General Office overheads . . . . .	-	5.000	5.000	10.000	10.000	
e. Sickness Insurance . . . . .	-	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	D.
4. Staff and equipment for sections 4 to 7 of the I.F.R.B.'s work . . . . .		153.000	156.000	200.000	231.000)	E.
5. New request of the I.F.R.B. for a post, Class 3 (Section 4 of the I.F.R.B.'s work) . . . . .	22.470	23.270	25.370	25.370	27.470)	
6. I.F.R.B. . . . .	-	215.000	385.000	350.000	331.000)	F.
7. C.C.I.F. . . . .	-	23.000	18.000	28.000	32.000	
8. C.C.I.T. . . . .	-	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	
9. C.C.I.R. . . . .	-	21.000	20.000	4.000	33.000	
	5.455.820	6.010.470	6.401.040	6.590.570	6.752.246	



	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	Notes
<u>Supplementary Increases resulting from the Decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference:</u>						
10. Effects of the new scale of salaries proposed by Working Group 5/2	215.677	198.612	222.477	227.577	235.847	
10a. Salary increments of Classes A and B	?	?	?	?	?	
10b. Increase for the single contributions of Officials over 40 years of age	30.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	
11. 3% of salaries for reclassification of staff	100.000	-	-	-	-	G.
12. Temporary staff, eventual affiliation to the Pension Fund	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	H.
13. Cost of living allowance, 5% (eventual)	-	150.000	150.000	160.000	170.000	
14. Pension Fund (eventual rehabilitation)	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	
15. Subsidy to Publications Service for deficient documents	80.000	80.000	80.000	80.000	80.000	
16. Eventual free distribution of documents	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	
17. Settlement of accounts in suspense (10% of the sum of 366,210)	36.621	36.621	36.621	36.621	36.621	
17a. Interest on these amounts	13.000	12.000	11.000	9.000	7.000	
18. Contested accounts	?	?	?	?	?	
Receipts      Total of estimated expenditure under points 10a. and 18.	6.151.118	6.727.703	7.141.138	7.343.768	7.521.714	
19. Contribution of publications budget to ordinary budget	245.000	245.000	245.000	245.000	245.000	
20. Excess interest	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	20.000	I
Difference, under points 10a. and 18 (above) to be covered by contributions	5.886.118	6.462.703	6.876.138	7.078.768	7.256.714	
Estimate of contributory unit on the basis of 800 units	7.358.-	8.078.-	8.595.-	8.848.-	9.071.-	

Notes:

- A. Increase of 5,000 Francs in 1954 and of 10,000 Francs from 1955 to 1957, taking into consideration the children who will reach the age of 18 during these years.
- B. Due to the eventual increase in the number of officials on pension.
- C. Increase in rent, in conformity with Document 1252/CA-Sp., page 8, from 1956 onwards.
- D. Following the "step" increases and additional staff being covered by sickness insurance, the I.T.U. contributions are slightly higher.
- E. In conformity with what is envisaged by the I.F.R.B.: placing of temporary staff on establishment, new engagements and payments to the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds: and increase of approximately 80,000 Francs per year for "unforeseens".
- F. The I.F.R.B. has envisaged about 65,000 Francs for supplementary expenses from 1954 to 1957 for home leave. Furthermore it has allowed 114,700 Francs for new engagements in 1955 and has increased the "unforeseens" to about 120,000 Francs for the years 1954 to 1957, compared with 1953.
- G. Proposal of Working Group 5/2.
- H. The actuary-adviser to the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds evaluates at about 112,000 Francs the expenditure to be envisaged for the affiliation of temporary staff to the Pension Fund, after being members of the Savings Fund for one year. This redemption to be paid, (the I.T.U.'s part) could be spread over 5 years.
- I. Subject to the decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference relating to fixing the rate of interest on overdue payments (at present 3 and 6%). It has been admitted that the rate will be reduced to 4% which is the same as the I.T.U. pays to the Swiss Confederation. The surplus in receipts would therefore arise solely from the Union's own funds, either the Capital Reserve Account or the publications account (about 1 million less the liquid funds - generally 500,000 Francs at 4%).

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE  
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5  
(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 10th meeting  
21 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. K. Prasada (India)

The Chairman opened the meeting at 10:10 hours. He referred to the meeting of the Steering Committee on the previous day and said that it was hoped that the Conference would be able to finish its work on 20 December. If this was to be achieved, the first reading of the text of the new Convention should begin on 6 December and it had been decided that only matters of principle should be taken up in the main Committees. In order that all the principal questions might be disposed of by the date fixed, he appealed for the continued help and support of the Delegates. So far as the Budget was concerned, he had asked the Secretary General to prepare preliminary estimates of expenditure for 1953 and the following years, and he hoped that the document would be made available early next week in time for the next meeting.

The Secretary General said that it would be possible to prepare estimates for the period 1953 - 1957, but that those estimates would necessarily have several "items" in blank. The Committee had not yet adopted decisions on a number of important points: salaries, cost of living allowances, contributions in arrears which had been contested ..... all of which have influence on the Budget. All that could be done for the moment was to take the present position as a basis.

The Chairman said that so far as the salaries of the staff were concerned, Working Group 2 would supply a report on the scales proposed. He then drew attention to Document No. 260 (a draft Resolution relating to the I.F.R.B.), which was necessary in order to meet the situation described the other day by Mr. Dellamula, since, if something was not done quickly, the temporary staff now employed in Geneva would have to be discharged at the end of this year. The draft Resolution would authorize the Secretary General to provide funds for the I.F.R.B. until such time as the Budget was passed.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that his Delegation considered that there was no hurry to adopt the draft Resolution. One could not in effect decide upon a particular question which was a constituent part of the Budget. The Conference must first adopt the Budget. The Resolution was, in a way, a mortgage on the future and his Delegation would therefore vote against it.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he would like some more information to clarify the issue. He agreed with the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. that a decision on the future Budget was being anticipated, but the difficulty arose because of the temporary staff whose contracts were due to expire on 31 December, and who naturally wanted to know as soon as possible whether their contracts were to be renewed. The Budget must provide for that staff; the Resolution was merely a temporary arrangement. On that understanding he was prepared to accept it.

At the Chairman's request, the Secretary General reminded the Committee that the Administrative Council had drawn up a budget for 1953 in two parts: 1) a first part within the limits of the 4 million Swiss francs fixed at Atlantic City, 2) a second containing an estimate of supplementary expenditure to cover the expenses of the I.F.R.B. for work entrusted to it by the E.A.R.C. For this second part, it was the Conference that had to approve the credits. It would have been the best course to approve as soon as possible the whole Budget for 1953, but it would be impossible to wait any longer if the I.F.R.B.

was to continue its work. If a decision on the subject of Resolution No. 260 were not taken before 1 December, the staff engaged would undoubtedly look for appointments elsewhere. In the event of the credits being granted later, it would be necessary to draw up new engagements and this would be prejudicial to the work. The same situation would arise in respect of contracts for hired equipment. It should be pointed out that the arrangements mentioned in the Resolution would be made within the limits of the 1953 credits. If those credits were reduced by the Conference, the contracts would later be reduced in the same proportion.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. said that the Secretary General had already stated what he (the Chairman of the I.F.R.B.) was going to say. The Secretary General had to be authorized to renew contracts and undertakings, at least until a little later than 31 December 1952. If the staff had no guarantee of its position in the immediate future, it might withdraw from the organization. Finally, he emphasized that the Resolution did not imply any commitment for the 1953 Budget.

The Delegate of the Biolorussian S.S.R. considered that the examination of the Budget by the Conference would perhaps be finished within the space of about two weeks. There was therefore no need to discuss particular cases. The question of expenses should be examined as a whole and he was opposed to Document No. 260 being studied.

The Chairman said that the words "as long as the 1953 Budget has not been finally adopted" had been inserted deliberately. He hoped that the Budget would be approved in two or three weeks. The Resolution would only have force for this short period.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland pointed out that the report by the Administrative Council which was dealt with in the Document had not yet been approved. In addition, no figures had been provided on the financial repercussions of the proposal contained in Document No. 260.

The Chairman said that the only object of the Resolution was to enable the staff and office machines to be kept on, to avoid interruption in the work of the I.F.R.B.

The Delegate of Egypt said he wanted some further clarification. What harm would be done if the question were put off for 15 days, instead of being decided now?

At the Chairman's request the Chairman of the I.F.R.B., replying to what the Delegate of Egypt had said, pointed out that on 1 December next, namely, within eight days, the Secretary General would have to give one or two months' notice of dismissal to most of the I.F.R.B. staff if he were not authorized to renew contracts. In that case, the staff would look for other and better paid posts and it would be difficult to recover officials already experienced and recruited at such sacrifice on an international basis. The same was true of equipment. The Secretary General must renew the contracts for the hire of machines two months in advance - although persuasion had resulted in the reduction of this period to one month - and if that were not done, the supplying firms could undertake to hire this equipment to other parties. The estimates of staff and equipment necessary for the I.F.R.B. had been revised by a special investigating group of the Administrative Council and the group had approved the estimates as being in order and in conformity with the tasks to be performed, just as it had approved the establishment and necessity of the posts and duties of the staff in the specialized secretariat of the I.F.R.B.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. observed that it had been emphasized that the draft Resolution was only provisional and would be valid for only two or three weeks, until the adoption of the budget for 1953. But the result of this Resolution would be, as he had pointed out, to anticipate on that part of the 1953 budget concerning the I.F.R.B. If the contracts for staff and the hire of equipment were renewed from now, that partly solved the question of the I.F.R.B. It was therefore necessary to see the budget for 1953 as a whole, and this would permit the question to be definitely settled. It had been said that the contracts would expire on 31 December. If the question of the budget were settled within two weeks, or about 5 December, the Secretary General would still have the time to get in touch with Geneva to renew those contracts.

The Chairman said that he had been trying to put himself in the place of one of the temporary staff or of the firm which had supplied the office machinery on hire. The least that would be required would be one month's notice.

The Delegate of Argentina said, that bearing in mind that the Plenipotentiary Conference had confirmed the Resolutions of the E.A.R.C., which entrusted the I.F.R.B. with new tasks, and that it was very difficult to engage competent staff in Geneva, the Argentine Delegation was prepared to adopt the Resolution as it appeared in Document No. 260.

The Delegate of France considered that the draft proposal should be put to the vote as it was administratively sound. It had been submitted to prevent discontinuity in the work entrusted to the I.F.R.B. by the E.A.R.C. But the Administrations which approved the agreements of the E.A.R.C. were, in their majority, represented at this Conference and they could not reverse their decisions by refusing to grant the necessary credits.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. made the following statement:

"We object to adoption of the Resolution in Document No. 260 because the budget of the Union has not yet been considered by Committee 5, and we shall vote against it."

The Chairman then closed the discussion and proceeded to a vote by a show of hands. The result of the vote was as follows:

43 in favour of the Resolution

9 against

2 abstentions

The draft was therefore adopted in its present form and the Chairman was authorised to take the necessary action for its transmission to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman passed on to the examination of the proposals concerning paragraph 5 of Article 14 of the Convention. He said that, under the terms of the existing Convention Administrations were free to chose their class of contribution. Ethiopia and Yemen had asked some time ago to move into a lower class, but the Administrative Council had been unable to accodo to their requests and had refferred them to the Plenipotentiary Conference. Including these two, there had been oight applications for a lower classification - involving a loss of 21 units in all - but the balance had been redressed by Japan, which had made application to move from the bottom class to the top, a gain of 29 units. It was still open to countries to change, but a time-limit had to be set and the question of what date should be fixed was not yet settled. He thought all would like to know the final picture as soon as possible. On the previous occasion the Atlantic City Conference had drawn up Protocol X which fixed the last day for making a change as 1 September 1948, i.e., four months before the new Convention came into force.

A further point to consider was whether up-grading should be permitted at any time - see Portuguese Proposal No. 230. Then who should approve the change - the Plenipotentiary Conference, or the Administrative Council? He drew attention to Document No. 193, and suggested that the Committee should discuss the first point in that document, viz., "what principle should guide the Conference in dealing with applications for a change of classification?"

The Delegate of France said that it was premature to examine requests for changes of contributory class, as the Committee had decided the previous day to suspend decision on proposals to amend the scale of contributions. It was essential for every one to have a very clear idea of the position. Future budgets could be estimated at 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  or 7 million Swiss francs. On that basis delegations which had not received precise instructions should get in touch with their Governments to find out if, in view of these new expenses, they intended to remain in their present contributory classes. If there were many downward changes in contributory classes envisaged, after adopting the budget, it would perhaps be necessary to examine a new distribution of contributory classes, which would be an easier task since the intentions of delegations would then be known. The examination of requests already submitted should be deferred.

The Delegate of the Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories Administered as Such drew attention to the special application made by him. His Delegation had formerly represented Indochina : Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam. There had been a re-shuffle, and those three countries, as sovereign and independent States, had joined the I.T.U. and shared in defraying I.T.U. expenditure. He agreed with the previous speaker that applications for changes in contributory class should be considered later.

The Delegate of the United States of America thought that the voluntary system had proved fair and equitable so far, and should continue, unless requests for lower classes of contribution became so numerous as to involve grave financial repercussions.

The Delegate of France, in reply to a question from the Chairman, said he had asked for applications for change of class to be considered later. But Document No. 193 raised some matters of principle, and a decision on it might be taken forthwith.

The Delegate of Portugal had the previous day expressed his agreement with the Delegate of France, but as regards the question of principle, it should be possible, in a body such as the I.T.U., to apportion expenses before total expenditure was known. It had been suggested that Document No. 193 should be discussed paragraph by paragraph. That was one way out, but there was a simpler solution. What had the Committee to do? Firstly, it had to revise paragraph 5 of the existing Article 14, and then adopt special provisions similar to those embodied in Atlantic City Protocol X.

The first point could be settled by adopting sub-paragraphs (2) and (3) of Proposal No. 228 (Italy), paragraph 6. However, the Administrative Council should not be competent to pass judgement on applications for a lower class - that was something for the Plenipotentiary Conference alone. Hence the Italian proposal should be amended.

As regards the second point, (replacement of Protocol X), the Committee had before it Document No. 256.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa asked for the floor in order to inquire whether the moment was opportune to make a statement on the position of his country. There were many delegations which had some idea of the probable size of the budget, but had no definite instructions. He himself, however, had definite instructions about South Africa's future classification, if the Chairman considered it the proper time to make a statement.

The Committee reconvened after a short interval.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa made the following statement :

"The Delegation of the Union of South Africa declares that it intends to select a lower classification at the earliest possible date. What is the reason for this? The matter is simple and straightforward and can be explained briefly as follows :

"When South Africa first became a member of the I.T.U., it elected to contribute in the first class and continued to do so until 1949. One must remember that in the old days, prior to the war, the expenditure of the I.T.U. was relatively low. Therefore, the fact that my country placed itself on a level with the larger telecommunication countries was of no importance from a financial point of view.

"We all know that a change in the number of classes of contribution was made at Atlantic City. A new class was created, namely a new first class of 30 units. South Africa however, in good faith decided to retain its contribution at the rate of 25 units, thinking that many countries would also contribute on a similarly generous level. What happened, however? In due course my Government saw the selections which different countries had made and came to the conclusion that the retention of the 25 unit class would be far too generous in relation to the contributions made by most of the other members. Unfortunately, however, we did not act in time, because wishing to be fair, the matter was first referred to our financial expert on contributions in the United Nations

Organization. In due course, we received his considered opinion that South Africa would be fairly placed in class 5, viz at the rate of 10 units. Application for a change from class 2 to class 5 was submitted to the Administrative Council, but unfortunately the application was made after the closing date fixed at Atlantic City and although we made an appeal the Administrative Council was obliged to rule against us. Needless to say, my country accepted the decision of the Administrative Council without demur and has therefore continued to contribute at the rate of 25 units.

"During the past four years, that is to say, since 1948 when the matter was submitted to the Administrative Council, my Government has given careful consideration to the question of the rate of contribution towards the expenses of the I.T.U. As we all know, expenditure since Atlantic City has been on a scale approximately ten times greater than what it was before the war. This question of rising expenditure is one which has given anxiety to all administrations, especially as there is no prospect of any diminution in expenditure. The budget for 1953 and following years will be considerably higher than it has been during the past five years and taking this and other circumstances into consideration, my Government considers that, having regard to all possible aspects, for example, population, telecommunication statistics, services rendered, etc., it would be equitable if South Africa were to elect to contribute in class 5, that is at the rate of 10 units.

"Notwithstanding this carefully considered opinion, the Union of South Africa has decided that, in the interests of the I.T.U., it will continue to contribute on a generous scale and declares that, with a reservation which I shall make later, the South African Administration will at the earliest possible date elect to contribute in the present 4th class, viz. at the rate of 15 units. In selecting this class, the Government of the Union of South Africa considers, as I have mentioned before, that it will still be contributing on a generous scale and that it will be in very good company. Furthermore, South Africa will still be among the 21 members who contribute 64% of the total revenue of the I.T.U.

In other words, my country will still be in the minority of one-fourth of the members who contribute approximately two-thirds of the total revenue. I repeat Mr. Chairman. My country will still be in the minority of one-fourth of the members who contribute approximately two-thirds of the total revenue.

"The reservation to which I referred earlier is as follows :

"If the present position undergoes any appreciable change, South Africa may have to select a class lower than the present class 4. That is to say, if there are important declassifications by countries which we believe should at least stay where they are, even if they do not intend to select a higher class, then my Government will be compelled to review its present decision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic referred to Question 1 in Document No. 193. It might be divided into two parts. As regards the first (principles to be observed by the Conference) he would say nothing. As regards the second, he saw no reason for it. The question answered itself. Countries could increase their contributory class freely, and the change would take effect automatically. The Administrative Council would then take the necessary action. There should be neither restrictions nor time-limits on increases in contributory class.

The Delegate of Yemen agreed with the views expressed by the Delegate of South Africa. Article 14, paragraph 5, was quite clear. All Members had the right to choose their class of contribution, in order that there might be an equitable apportionment according to the financial circumstances of Members. If any asked to move into a lower class, they had a reason for so doing, and requests had to be given fair consideration. As far as his own country was concerned, telegraph traffic abroad was never more than 800 messages per month, and there was no international telephone circuit. Yemen's present contribution of three units was unduly high-hence its application to move into the lowest class (1 unit).

The Chairman drew attention to the Argentine proposal (224) paragraph 6, sub-paragraphs 2 and 4, on pages 178 and 179 of Volume I, and inquired whether those sub-paragraphs would meet the point.

The Delegate of Portugal, in reply to a question by the Chairman, said that these two sub-paragraphs reflected his own views on the matter, and he could accept them. If the Committee adopted them, together with the draft Protocol (Document No. 256), the following action might be taken: towards the middle of the following week, paragraph 4 of the existing Article 14 would have to be decided on, and a few days later (say about 1 December), applications for change of class would be considered. December the 1st was the date which should appear in the draft protocol.

The Delegate of Italy said his country had submitted Proposal No. 228 because Paragraph 5 as it stood seemed excessively rigid. The economic conditions of a country might vary. If a country was forced to cut expenditure to the minimum, would it have to wait, as regards the I.T.U., until the next Plenipotentiary Conference? That was why he had thought it possible to make the Administrative Council responsible - a body which was always concerned with the interests of the Union. The Portuguese amendment should be put to the vote. If it were approved, the Italian proposal as a whole should be voted on.

The Chairman said that the Delegate of Portugal had declared his willingness to accept Proposal No. 224.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he was not quite clear about item 1 of Document No. 193. The proposals made by Argentina, Italy and Portugal would require changes in classification to be approved by the Administrative Council or the Plenipotentiary Conference, but he saw no advantage in introducing the factor of approval, as that would only lead to complications. He agreed with the views of the Delegate of the United States of America, and would prefer to leave classification quite voluntary. New Members on entering the Union selected the class in which they wished to be placed, and that choice was not subject to approval. All that had to be done was to note the applications so far received, and to fix the latest date by which changes of class could be notified. If such applications became very numerous, it might be necessary to review the position, but he did not think the situation would arise.

The Delegate of the United States of America agreed; he preferred the status quo.

The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic said that the principle to be respected was that of voluntary association so well expressed in the existing paragraph 5. Countries had a sovereign right to choose their class of contribution. That was something which concerned neither the Administrative Council nor the Plenipotentiary Conference. From the budgetary point of view alone, if a stable budget was desired, the possibility of changes in the scale of contributions had to be limited. He agreed that the existing text had proved its worth and proposed that it be kept.

The Delegate of Pakistan was also in favour of the status quo. No alteration should be made in the present voluntary system. The only alternative would be to set up a standard by which contributions would be judged. The Conference could not work out such a standard, nor could it refuse permission to a country wishing to move into a lower contributory class.

The Delegate of the Overseas Territories of the French Republic and territories administered as such was against paragraph (4) of the Argentine Republic's proposal, for the Plenipotentiary Conference did not have the information required to enable it to judge applications for change. He was in favour of the status quo, and for a time-limit for the new classification.

The Delegate of Egypt asked whether, if the unit scale were changed, countries would be compelled to remain in their present class. They should be allowed to change if they desired to do so. It was better to retain the status quo.

The Delegate of Portugal said that the choice of class was an unilateral action which had repercussions on the payments made by other countries. No country could oblige other countries to pay more without first obtaining their assent. The fault of Atlantic City was that up to 1 September 1948 changes in class were rendered possible. Such a state of affairs should be put right. Further to what had been said he withdrew his support for the Argentine proposal and came out in favour of the status quo.

The Delegate of France thought that, all in all, maintenance of the status quo was the best way out, since that did not allow changes to be made between two Plenipotentiary Conferences, while maintaining the bases of the Union's budget.

The Delegate of Italy said that the Conference seemed fated to maintain the status quo, and withdrew sub-paragraphs 6 (2) and (3) of Proposal No. 228.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic said that, nevertheless, he was convinced that Proposal No. 224 was sound. Out of respect for the concordant views expressed to the contrary, he would withdraw that proposal, as far as the matter under discussion was concerned.

The Delegate of Japan withdrew the proposal on the subject contained in Proposition No. 229.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia was in favour of the status quo, but suggested that there should be a reference in paragraph 5 to the date of signature of the Convention rather than to the date on which it would come into force.

The Chairman said the matter was governed by the Protocol.

The Delegate of Canada said he was prepared to accept the status quo, provided there was nothing to prevent a Member moving into a higher class.

The Delegate of France was in favour of the suggestion made by the Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, which settled the matter once and for all.

The Delegate of the United States of America suggested that if the views of Yugoslavia and Canada were generally accepted, the rest of the problem could be turned over to a working group.

The Delegate of Portugal disagreed with the Yugoslav proposal, for paragraph 5 of the new Convention would be in force only from 1 January 1954. Only by a Protocol could the interim period be dealt with.

This view was supported by the Delegates of Egypt and Lebanon.

After further explanation by the Delegates of France, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, and Egypt, the Chairman said that it had been agreed, *nomine contradicente*, to maintain paragraph 5 as it stood.

The Chairman asked whether the draft protocol (Document No. 256) was acceptable. The Delegates of France and Portugal suggested, and the Committee agreed, that the discussion on the matter should be resumed later.

The meeting rose at 1320 hours.

Reporters:

J.T. Arregui

R.A. Vargues

M. Caws

Chairman:

K. Prasada

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No.280-E  
24 November 1952

COMMITTEE 4

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE A OF COMMITTEE 4  
TO COMMITTEE 4

1. MEMBERSHIP

At its 16th Plenary Meeting, Committee 4 decided to set up Sub-Committee A under the Chairmanship of Mr. Lázaro Barajas (Mexico), Vice-Chairman of Committee 4, composed of the representatives of the following countries:

Argentina  
Belgium  
Bulgaria  
Colombia  
United States of America  
France  
Hungary  
Italy  
Japan  
New Zealand  
Portugal  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland  
Sweden  
Switzerland  
U.S.S.R.

As decided by Committee 4, other delegations could subsequently join the Sub-Committee if they so desired.

At the first meeting of the Sub-Committee, the delegations of Brasil, the Bielorussian S.S.R. and the German Federal Republic asked to join the Sub-Committee.

## 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

- a) To examine the proposals by Members of the Union concerning Part II of the General Regulations (Annex 4 to the International Telecommunication Convention) on the basis of the present text, to be modified as little as possible;
- b) to submit to Committee 4 a revised text to be regarded as a draft for Part II of the General Regulations;
- c) to hand this text to the General Secretariat by 24 November, at the latest, for publication in the three working languages.

## 3. DURATION AND RESULT OF WORK

The Sub-Committee considered Chapters 7 to 17 inclusive, in meetings held on 18, 19, 20 and 21 November and a limited group devoted two more meetings to the examination of the report. In the course of its work it considered all the proposals submitted by the various Administrations, all of which were included in Volume 2 of the proposals published by the I.T.U. Secretariat.

In accordance with its terms of reference, the Sub-Committee approved modifications or new drafts only when they were considered indispensable as introducing substantial improvements or, for the purpose of taking into account resolutions adopted by various Committees of the Conference.

To this end, the Sub-Committee did not always approve a proposal en toto but endeavoured to merge the various points of several proposals dealing with the same subject in order to draft the final text which is submitted for approval.

In the circumstances, the report does not explain in detail how the decisions were reached by the Sub-Committee on each and every proposal.

The decisions in most cases were based on general agreement to the texts as finally approved and only in a few cases was it necessary to take a vote to determine a position. When the Sub-Committee was unable to reach a unanimous opinion, a vote was taken to have the various

tendencies on record. One of the latter cases referred to the right to be extended to representatives of recognized private operating agencies, in the absence of a delegation of the respective administration at any of the meetings of the C.C.I.s. The opinion of the Assembly in this particular case, is expressed in that part of the report dealing with Chapter 11, Section 2. The results of the work of the Sub-Committee appear in the Annex to the Report.

4. AVAILABLE INFORMATION

In addition to the proposals by Administrations referred to above, and to information from various Committees, the Sub-Committee also had before it information submitted by Mr. Valensi, Director of the C.C.I.F., and Mr. Townshend, Assistant Secretary General of the Union and Interim Director of the C.C.I.T., when they were able to attend the meetings.

Taking into account the above, Sub-Committee A recommends the adoption of the proposed revised text of Part II of the General Regulations.

Lázaro Barajas  
Chairman of Sub-Committee A

Annex: 1

A N N E X

SUB-COMMITTEE A  
OF COMMITTEE 4

DRAFT TEXT FOR PART II OF THE GENERAL REGULATIONS,  
ANNEXED TO THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION

PART II

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

CHAPTER 7

General Provisions

1. **No change.**
2. **No change.**

CHAPTER 8

Conditions for Participation

1. (1) The Membership of each International Consultative Committee shall comprise:
  - a) as of right, the administrations of all Members and Associate Members of the Union,
  - b) subject to the procedure prescribed below, any recognized private operating agency which, with the approval of the administration of the Member recognizing it, requests that one or more of its representatives may participate in the work of the Committee.

(2) Same text but adding the word "recognized" in the last sentence, which will read as follows: "A request from a recognized private operating agency must be approved by the Administration of the Government recognizing it."

(3) Deleted.

2. (1) No change.

(2) No change.

2 bis. The conditions under which any administration, recognized private operating agency or international organization may withdraw from participation in the work of a Consultative Committee are laid down in paragraph 4 of Chapter 17 of these Regulations.

3. (1) No change.

(Note: In the English text "manufacturing" should be replaced by "industrial").

(Note: Agreed to use "organisme" in French and "organization" in English and Spanish).

(2) No change.

(Note: In the English text "manufacturing" should be replaced by "industrial".)

## CHAPTER 9

### Duties of the Plenary Assembly

The text to be amended as follows:

"The Plenary Assembly shall:

"a) consider the reports of Study Groups and approve, modify or reject the draft recommendations contained in these reports;

- "b) decide new questions to be studied;
- "c) confirm existing Study Groups and, if necessary, set up new Study Groups, and allocate to Study Groups the questions which have to be studied;
- "d) consider and approve the Director's report on the activities of the Committee since the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly;
- "e) submit to the Administrative Council a report on the financial needs of the Committee until the next Plenary Assembly;
- "f) consider any other matters deemed necessary within the provisions of Article 8 of the Convention and Part II of the General Regulations."

## CHAPTER 10

### Meetings of the Plenary Assembly

1. The following text is adopted:

"The Plenary Assembly normally meets every            years."

2. The following text is adopted:

"The date of the meeting of the Plenary Assembly may be changed with the approval of the majority of the administrations which were represented at the previous Plenary Assembly or which have since declared their intention of taking part in the work of the Consultative Committee concerned."

3. The text is adopted as follows:

"Each meeting of the Plenary Assembly shall be held in a place fixed by the previous meeting of the Plenary Assembly. This place may be changed by application of the procedure described in paragraph 2 above."

4. No change.
5. No change.

## CHAPTER 11

### Languages and Method of Voting in Sessions of the Plenary Assemblies

1. No change.
2. The Sub-Committee could not reach unanimity on the rights of the representatives of the recognized private operating agencies as set forth in Proposals Nos. 602 (New Zealand), 520 (Argentine Republic) and that of Bulgaria, the Delegation of which re-submitted Proposal No. 521 (Switzerland) on its withdrawal by the Delegate of Switzerland.

For the information of the Committee, those three proposals were put to the vote with the following results:

Proposal No. 521:

3 in favour, 8 against, 2 abstentions.

Proposal No. 520:

3 in favour, 7 against, 2 abstentions.

Proposal No. 602:

7 in favour, 3 against, 3 abstentions.

(Note: The Argentine Republic Delegation stated that they will maintain their point of view in the Committee, and if necessary in the Plenary Assembly, and will even make reservations if paragraph 2 of Chapter 11 is not amended in accordance with Proposal No. 520 (last part)).

## CHAPTER 12

### Composition of Study Groups

The following text is adopted:

- "1. The Plenary Assembly shall set up the necessary Study Groups to deal with questions to be studied. The administrations, recognized private operating agencies and international organizations which wish to take part in the work of the Study Groups shall give in their names either at the meeting of the Plenary Assembly or, at a later date, to the Director of the Consultative Committee concerned.
- "2. In addition, and subject to the provisions of para. 3 of Chapter 8 of these Regulations, experts of scientific or industrial organizations may be admitted to take part in an advisory capacity in any meeting of any Study Group.
- "3. The Plenary Assembly shall appoint the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of each Study Group. If, in the interval between two meetings of the Plenary Assembly, a Study Group Chairman is unable to carry out his duties, the Vice-Chairman shall take his place, and the Study Group concerned shall elect, among its members, a new Vice-Chairman."

## CHAPTER 13

### Study Groups: Treatment of Business

1. The following text is adopted:

"Study Groups shall normally conduct their work by correspondence. However, the Plenary Assembly may give directives concerning any meetings of the Study Groups that may appear necessary to deal with large groups of questions. Moreover, if, after a Plenary Assembly, a Group Chairman considers it necessary for his Study Group to hold a meeting not provided for by the Plenary Assembly, to discuss orally questions which could not be solved by correspondence, he may,

with the approval of his Administration, and after consultation with the members of his Group, suggest a meeting at a convenient place."

2. No change.
3. The following text is adopted:

"The Director shall send the final reports of the Study Groups to the participating administrations, to the recognized private operating agencies of his Consultative Committee and, as occasion may demand, to such international organizations as have participated. These shall be sent as soon as possible and, in any event, in time for them to be received at least one month before the date of the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly. Questions which have not formed the subject of a report furnished in this way shall not appear in the agenda for the meeting of the Plenary Assembly."

#### CHAPTER 14

##### Duties of the Director. Specialized Secretariat

1. (1) It was agreed to adopt the following text:

"The Director of a Consultative Committee shall coordinate the work of the Consultative Committee, including its Plenary Assembly and Study Groups, and shall be generally responsible for the organization of the work of the Consultative Committee between meetings of the Plenary Assembly."

1. (2) Text to be changed as follows: (No change in French and Spanish texts)

"He shall be responsible for the documents of the Committee."

1. (3) No change.
1. (4) No change.

2. No change.
3. No change.
4. No change.
5. The following text is adopted:

"The Director shall submit to the Plenary Assembly a report on the activities of the Consultative Committee since the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly. After approval, this report shall be sent to the Secretary General for submission to the Administrative Council."

6. The following text is adopted:

"The Director shall submit for the approval of the Plenary Assembly a report on the financial needs of his International Consultative Committee up to the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly; this report, after approval by the Plenary Assembly, shall be sent to the Secretary General for appropriate action."

## CHAPTER 15

### Preparation of Proposals for Administrative Conferences

The present text remains unchanged, except for the addition of the following:

"If a meeting is to take place it shall, as far as possible, be held during or immediately after the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly which precedes the Administrative Conference."

## CHAPTER 16

### Relations of Consultative Committees between themselves and with other International Organizations

It is decided to substitute the following for the present text:

1. (1) "Plenary Assemblies of International Consultative Committees may form joint Study Groups to study and make recommendations on questions of common interest.  
  
(2) "The Directors of Consultative Committees may, in collaboration with the Group Chairmen, organize joint meetings of Study Groups of different Consultative Committees, to study and prepare draft recommendations on questions of common interest. Such draft recommendations shall be submitted to the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly of each Consultative Committee concerned."
2. The following text is adopted:  
  
"The Plenary Assembly of a Consultative Committee and/or the Director of one of these Committees may invite a representative of his C.C.I. to attend, in an advisory capacity, meetings of other committees of the Union or of other international organizations to which that Consultative Committee has been invited."
3. Unchanged.

## CHAPTER 17

### Finances of International Consultative Committees

(Note: The text of some parts of this Chapter may need modification: if the relative provisions of Article 14 of the Convention are changed.)

1. Unchanged.  
  
For the remainder of the Chapter, the following text was adopted:
2. "The totality of the extraordinary expenses of each Consultative Committee, which shall include the extraordinary expenses of the Directors, the Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee and of the whole of the Secretariat employed at

any meetings of the Study Groups or the meetings of the Plenary Assembly and the cost of all working documents of the Study Groups and the Plenary Assembly, shall be borne in the manner prescribed in Article 14, paragraphs 3 and 5, of the Convention by:

- a) the administrations which have advised the Secretary General that they wish to take an active part in the work of the Consultative Committee even if they have not attended the meeting of the Plenary Assembly;
  - b) the administrations which, while not having advised the Secretary General that they wished to take part in the work of the Consultative Committee, have nevertheless attended the meeting of the Plenary Assembly or a meeting of a Study Group;
  - c) the recognized private operating agencies which have, in accordance with Chapter 8 paragraph 1 (2), made a request to take part in the work of the Consultative Committee;
  - d) those International Organizations which have, in accordance with Chapter 8 paragraph 2 (2), been admitted to take part in the work of the Consultative Committee and which have not been excused payment in accordance with Article 14 paragraph 3 (2) of the Convention.
3. The expenses of Study Groups shall be included in the extraordinary expenses of the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly. However, where meetings of Study Groups take place more than one year before the date of the next meeting of the relative Plenary Assembly, the Secretary General shall render interim accounts in respect of the extraordinary expenditure incurred to the administrations, agencies and organizations concerned.
4. The Administrations, recognized private operating agencies and International Organizations referred to in sub-paragraphs a), b), c), and d) of paragraph 2 above shall be under an obligation to contribute to the extraordinary expenses as from the date of the close of the preceding meeting of the Plenary Assembly. This obligation shall remain in force until terminated by the administration, recognized private operating agency or International Organization concerned. Any notice

of termination shall take effect as from the close of the meeting of the Plenary Assembly following the date of such notice. An administration, recognized private operating agency or International Organization giving notice of termination shall, however, be entitled to receive all documents pertaining to the last meeting of the Plenary Assembly held during the period of validity of its undertaking.

5. The expenses incurred by the participation of the representative of the C.C.I. to which Section 2 of Chapter 16 refers shall be borne by his Committee.
6. Each administration, recognized private operating agency, international organization and scientific or industrial organization shall defray the personal expenses of its own participants.

---

The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. was unable to agree with the modifications of the structure of Chapter 17 and of some parts of its contents, and expressed its point of view in the following terms:

1. The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. and certain other delegations expressed their disagreement with Proposal No. 562 by the United Kingdom, because it covers certain important questions of principle on which decisions must be taken in the first place by the Committees concerned. For instance:

a) paragraph 2 a) of the text adopted states that all Administrations shall contribute to the extraordinary expenses even if they have not actually taken part in the meetings of the Union. This provision differs from that contained in Chapter 17, paragraph 2, of the General Regulations and, since it is a question of principle, it must be settled first by Committee 4.

b) The text adopted excuses, for no reason whatever, scientific and industrial organizations from contributions to the extraordinary expenses, which is contrary to Chapter 17, paragraphs 2, 4 (2) and 5 of the General Regulations and to Article 14 of the Convention. This question also must be settled in the first place by Committee 3.

2. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. reserves the right to submit Proposal No. 558 by the U.S.S.R. to Committee 4 direct.

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 281-E  
24 November 1952

COMMITTEE 4

NEW ZEALAND

Kindly note that the New Zealand Delegation has withdrawn  
the following proposals:

594

595

596

597

598

599

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 13th Meeting

Wednesday, 5 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. A. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman, opening the meeting, reminded the Committee that it was called upon to revise the General Regulations, and suggested that it proceed paragraph by paragraph, considering matters of principle only, and not drafting questions. A Working Group might appropriately be set up to draft precise texts, bearing in mind the views expressed during previous debate on the various points of issue. These texts would then be submitted to the Committee.

It was agreed that a working group should be set up, with Mr. Loyer (France) in the Chair. Members - Delegates of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Argentine Republic, the People's Republic of Poland, India, and Egypt.

The Chairman suggested that the Committee, in its discussions, follow the order of the existing General Regulations.

This suggestion was adopted.

There followed a brief discussion (participants: the Delegates of Brazil, Italy, and the Argentine Republic). The Chairman ruled that the Committee would have to follow a step behind Committee 3, which called upon to revise the Convention.



That was inevitable, although no more than a few points would be affected by the decisions of Committee 3.

It was likewise decided that discussion of Proposal No. 352 would be postponed until Committee 3 had come to a decision on Article 1.

The Committee thereupon proceeded to discuss Chapter 1, paragraph 1 (Proposals No. 353 and 349, Article 1, paragraph 1), and 347 (Chapter 1, paragraph 1).

There was a discussion (participants - the Delegates of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, the Argentine Republic, the United States of America, Brazil, Italy, and France). The Delegates of France and of the United States of America withdrew their proposals (349, Article 1, paragraph 1, and 347, Chapter 1, paragraph 1).

Proposal No. 353 (Italy) was put to the vote and rejected by 19 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions. In the absence of any other proposal, the Atlantic City text remained unchanged.

Chapter 1, paragraph 2 - Proposals Nos. 354, 590, and 349 (Article 1, paragraph 2).

The Delegate of France withdrew Proposal No. 349 (Article 1, paragraph 2) in favour of Proposal No. 354.

The Delegate of New Zealand withdrew Proposal No. 590.

Bearing in mind the proposals made by the Delegates of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of Mexico, the Committee adopted Proposal No. 354, worded as follows:

"2. One year before this date, the inviting government shall send an invitation to the government of each Member and Associate Member of the Union. It may send the invitation direct, or through the Secretary General of the Union, or through some other government."

In the absence of proposals relative to Chapter 1, paragraph 3, that paragraph was adopted in the version which appears already in the General Regulations.

Chapter 1, paragraph 4, proposals Nos. 355, 356 and 347 (Chapter 1, paragraph 4.).

Proposal No. 347 (Chapter 1, paragraph 4) gave rise to a discussion wherein the Delegates of France, Yugoslavia, U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Argentina, United States of America and Denmark took part. Some delegations favoured a purely provisional agenda, since it would represent the work of the Members previous to the Conference. However other delegations wondered whether in view of the statutes of the Plenipotentiary Conference an agenda other than that established by Article 10 of the Convention could be drawn up by anybody but the Conference itself. A certain amount of uncertainty seemed to exist concerning the meaning of the term "other recognized international organizations" as well as to their right to submit proposals. The Delegate of the United States, thereupon deleted the words "and other recognized international organizations" from his proposal.

In order to expedite discussion the Chairman put the following question to the vote:

"Did the Committee consider that the right to submit proposals to the Plenipotentiary Conference should only be extended to Members and Associate Members of the Union and, in accordance with the provisions of the agreement between the United Nations and the I.T.U., to the United Nations?"

The result of the vote was as follows:

in favour	:	33
against	:	1
abstentions	:	3

The Delegate of the United States of America said that his Delegation considered that the decision taken would not impede other organizations from submitting proposals.

The Chairman, in answer to the observations of the Delegate of the United States of America stated that the Committee had already answered that question: it had adopted a decision whereby the right to submit proposals to the Plenipotentiary Conference was reserved exclusively to Members and Associate Members of the Union and, in

exceptional cases, to the United Nations, in accordance with the provisions of the agreement between the United Nations and the I.T.U.

The Chairman divided Proposal No. 355, which was also submitted to the meeting, into three parts: 1) indication of chapters, articles, and paragraphs, - 2) submission of proposals at least three months before the opening of the Conference, and - 3) the transmission of proposals to other organizations, agencies, etc.

After a discussion in which the Delegates of Argentina, Italy, the U.S.A., and Egypt took part, the third paragraph of the Proposal was put to the vote with the following result:

In favour	:	5
Against	:	15
Abstentions	:	13

The Chairman said that, pursuant to the result of the vote, only Members and Associate Members, and no other organization, could send proposals.

The Committee decided to send the rest of Proposal No. 355, which also contained the essence of Proposal No. 356, to the working group with the collaboration of the Delegate of Italy.

Reporters:

S.J.M. Ponas  
C.R. Brandon  
A. Wolf

Chairman:

I. Tsingovarov

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the Fourteenth Meeting

Thursday, 6 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. Tsingovatov (U.R.S.S.)

The Chairman announced that the Argentine Delegation, acting in accordance with his general appeal to all delegations (at the twelfth meeting), had withdrawn its Proposals Nos. 409, 413, 415, 418, 420, 433, 436, 443, 452, 456, 462, and 478 in favour of Document No. 186. The Japanese Delegation had likewise withdrawn its Proposals Nos. 449, 457, 465, and 480. He trusted that other delegations would see their way to follow suit, thus facilitating the work of the Committee.

The Delegate of Brazil said he had been under the impression, when the working group had been set up at the previous meeting, that it would be called upon to do no more than improve the text of the General Regulations, Chapter 1. Since the working group had to deal with the General Regulations as a whole, he would propose that its strength be increased by a further two persons, to be chosen among the Latin American countries. The Delegate of the Argentine Republic seconding proposed that Brazil and Uruguay be added to the countries represented in the working group.



This proposal was adopted nemine contradicente.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic:

"The Argentine Delegation has carefully perused the report submitted by the Chairman of Committee 4 to the Plenary Assembly (Document No. 188 revised) - a report in which he submits for consideration the Rules of Procedure of the Conference, which themselves appear in Document No. 186. My Delegation regrets that it is obliged to object to that report, Mr. Chairman, and to ask, with all due deference, that its comments appear in the summary record of this meeting.

"In the last paragraph of his report, the Chairman of Committee 4 gave a list of delegations which had found the draft Rules of Procedure unacceptable on the grounds that some of the provisions therein tended to cut down debate, thus rendering it difficult for Members of the Union freely to participate in discussion of the questions at issue. Those delegations had, accordingly, voted against the Rules of Procedure and reserved their right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly. Although it may be true that those delegations expressed themselves thus, the report omits to mention that the Argentine Delegation specifically refuted those statements, in a speech which appears at length in the summary record of that particular meeting of the Committee.

"Hence, in order to render the report objective, my Delegation expressly confirms its comments, which we intend to repeat in Plenary Assembly, to wit:

"That as representing a Member of the Union which has proposed a set of Rules of Procedure for this Plenipotentiary Conference, the Argentine Delegation wishes expressly to state that Document No. 186 represents a working code amply safeguarding the right of all I.T.U. Members to express their views freely and fully.

"Document No. 186 contains a series of provisions which neither limit, contradict, nor restrict any right. On the contrary, those provisions provide every guarantee that debates will be both expeditious and orderly, to the advantage of all and in order that all may enjoy the same rights, without anybody being able to abuse them to the detriment of others."

The Chairman, in reply to the Delegate of the Argentine Republic, said that the Argentine Delegation had not asked to have its views included in the Chairman's report. Had that Delegation, in good time, asked for its opinion to be included, that would most certainly have been done.

In the Chairman's report, ~~he had~~ made mention of the views of delegations which at previous meetings had requested that he should do so. As regards the substance of the statement just made by the Delegate of the Argentine Republic, it was ~~his~~ (the Chairman's) personal opinion that the draft Rules of Procedure contained several provisions which tended to restrict discussion - provisions which not only did not facilitate discussion, but hampered it.

It was in the interests of the Members of the Union that such provisions should be omitted from the draft Rules of Procedure.

The Committee went on with its study of Chapter 1, paragraph 4 (Proposal No. 347).

There was a lengthy discussion (participants: the Delegates of New Zealand, Denmark, Italy, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Argentine Republic, France, and the Chairman). Some delegations were in favour of I.T.U. conferences, and organs of the Union, preparing strictly provisional agendas, together with proposals. Other delegations feared lest difficulties might arise if in the General Regulations a reference was included to a provisional agenda, without it being known in advance how that agenda would be prepared, and with no mention of it in the Convention. It was also stressed that if a permanent organ submitted a proposal, that proposal could only be an expression of the wishes of a small majority of Members of the permanent organ concerned, and might well run counter to the views of a large minority.

Finally, the Delegate of Denmark proposed (and was seconded by the Delegates of France, Italy and New Zealand) that all further consideration of Proposal No. 347 (Chapter 1, paragraph 4) should be postponed until Committee 3 had considered Proposal No. 706 (Document No. 109). This proposal was adopted. It was decided that the Working Group could draft the provisional text of Chapter 1, paragraph 4, of the General Regulations, without awaiting a decision on Proposal 347 (Chapter 1, paragraph 4).

#### Chapter 1, paragraph 5 - Proposals Nos. 357 - 359 - 360.

The Delegates of Australia, Colombia and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, supported Proposal No. 357. The whole discussion, in which the Delegates of Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Portugal, the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia also took part, was concerned with this proposal which summarized the essence of all other proposals.

A proposal by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. seconded by the Delegate of Czechoslovakia, to the effect that the word "notify" should be retained in place of the word "invite" was rejected by 30 votes to 8 with 6 abstentions.

A proposal by the Delegate of Egypt to retain a reference to Article 26 of the Convention, instead of referring to the Agreement between the United Nations and the I.T.U. (Article II), as had been proposed, was approved by 23 votes to 8 with 13 abstentions.

Proposal No. 357, thus amended, was then adopted by 46 votes to 0 with 7 abstentions.

Chapter I, paragraph 6, Proposals 361 - 362.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., supported by the Delegates of Australia, India, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, and Brazil, proposed that the existing text should be retained, observing its brevity and flexibility and because it contained the expression "in an advisory capacity".

The Delegate of Italy supported the idea of amending Proposal No. 361, which should read as follows: "... take part in its work in an advisory capacity", but he insisted on retaining the remainder of his proposal for reasons of economy and to avoid the absence from Geneva of the C.C.I. Directors unnecessarily and for excessively long periods.

The question gave rise to a discussion in which took part the Delegates of Argentina, France, Portuguese Overseas Territories, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Switzerland and Mexico.

Finally, all proposals having a bearing on this paragraph were withdrawn in favour of the following text, proposed by the Delegate of Argentina:

"Any permanent organ of the I.T.U. has the right to be represented, in an advisory capacity, at the Conference when questions within its competence are being discussed or when it is invited to attend by the Chairman".

This text was put to the vote and adopted by 40 votes to 2 with 5 abstentions.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. said he presumed that permanent organs would be allowed some latitude in deciding when they should be represented.

After a discussion in which the Delegates of Uruguay, Italy, Argentina, and Australia took part, the Chairman proposed that no interpretation should be given to this question which was within the competence of the Administrative Council and the permanent organs concerned.

The Committee accepted this proposal.

Chapter I, Paragraph 7, Proposals Nos. 363, 364, 365.

The Delegate of Argentina withdrew Proposal No. 363 in favour of Proposal No. 365.

After a short exchange of views between the Delegates of France, Italy, and Switzerland, the Chairman put to the vote the principle that these invitations should be made "with the assent of the Administrative Council or on the proposal of the latter".

This principle was admitted by 32 votes to 1 with 9 abstentions.

The principle that these invitations should be made only "with the assent of the Administrative Council" was then rejected by 27 votes to 9 with 1 abstention.

The Chairman then put to the vote Proposal No. 365 in its original form. It was adopted by 34 votes to 0 with 9 abstentions.

The Delegate of Italy insisted upon the adoption of the principle contained in Proposal No. 364 so that problems which arose between two Sessions of the Administrative Council could be solved. Consequently he proposed that the question should be studied by the Working Group with a view to drafting a compromise text.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia was opposed to the suggestion that any problem relating to invitations should be referred to the Secretary General.

The Chairman said it was getting late and postponed the examination of the question to the next meeting.

Reporters:

Chairman:

S. J. M. Penas  
A. Wolf  
G. R. Brandon

I. Tsingovatov

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 284-E

24 November 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 15th Meeting

7 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. Tsingovarov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman continued the examination of Proposal No. 364, made by Italy, which was left in abeyance at the end of the 14th meeting.

The Delegate of Italy said that the proposal aimed at filling the gap which could exist in the interval between two sessions of the Administrative Council.

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia asked if, for the present Conference, the Argentine Government had had occasion to apply the provisions relating to invitations to non-contracting governments.

The Chairman, on the basis of information provided by the Delegation of Argentina, replied that the case had not arisen and that the provision of the Atlantic City Convention had consequently not been applied in practice.

The Delegate of Italy therefore submitted a new proposal to meet urgent cases which could arise when a conference was convened in the interval between two sessions of the Administrative Council.

The Committee regarded this proposal as something new, having no relation with the question under discussion. The proposal was not seconded and went by default.



The Chairman put Proposal No. 365 as a whole to the vote and it was accepted by 36 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Chapter I, paragraph 8.

The Delegate of Italy reminded the Committee that provisions analogous to those contained in Proposal No. 366 had so far been included under paragraph 2 of Chapter 3 but they should be transferred to Chapters 1 and 2 respectively as they had a direct bearing on admission to conferences.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland pointed out that other proposals dealt with the same question and he suggested that Proposal No. 366 should be studied later when the Committee passed to Chapter 3.

The Delegations of Portugal and Brazil supported this suggestion to which the Delegation of Italy agreed.

The Delegate of France then invited the attention of the Committee to paragraph 8, Article 1 of Proposal No. 349. For additional clarity he proposed to re-draft the paragraph as follows:

"The Delegations of Members and Associate Members of the I.T.U., the observers of the United Nations, and eventually the observers of non-contracting Governments that have been invited, shall be admitted to the Conference."

A general discussion followed on the question of admission to Plenipotentiary Conferences, as observers, of international or inter-government organizations and the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

The Delegate of the United Nations, supported by the Delegates of the U.S.A. and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, suggested that a more satisfactory solution should be found to cover these organizations than that laid down in the Atlantic City Convention. Before the beginning of a Conference these organs should know whether or not they would be admitted to take part.

The Delegate of the U.S.A., seconded by the Delegate of Australia, suggested that the present paragraph 4 of Chapter 2, together with a text similar to paragraph 5, sub-paragraph c) of the same chapter, should be added to the end of Chapter 1.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland supported this suggestion but proposed to replace the words "international organizations" by "specialized agencies".

The Delegate of France, while supporting the United Kingdom proposal, was opposed to the principle of the proposal of the U.S.A.

The Delegate of the U.S.A. accepted, in principle, the United Kingdom amendment but proposed to say "inter-government organizations" instead of "specialized agencies".

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed that paragraph 8 of Chapter I should be adopted as it stood and that the question of admitting certain international organizations should be considered separately.

The Chairman put to the vote the proposal to retain paragraph 8 in its present form. The proposal was adopted by 39 votes to 0 with 1 abstention.

Paragraph 8 was therefore retained in its old form.

The Delegate of Argentina supported by the Delegates of Switzerland and Brazil, recommended that the Working Group should be instructed to examine the question of admitting certain international organizations to Plenipotentiary Conferences and to draft a text taking into consideration the opinions expressed by the Committee.

The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R. drew attention to the lack of precision in the texts under discussion. It would be necessary first to define the different names given to international organizations.

The Chairman treated the proposal of Argentina as a motion of order worthy of priority. He wished to add to the terms of reference suggested by Argentina the obligation to draft the definitions necessary to a clear understanding of the new text. These definitions would be included in Annex 2 to the Convention.

The Delegate of France, speaking as Chairman of the Working Group, was prepared to accept the terms of reference. Speaking as the Delegate of his country, he considered that the Working Group would have difficulty in reaching agreement as the Committee itself had not seriously attempted to resolve basic divergences of opinion.

The Chairman then put the proposal of Argentina to the vote. It was adopted by 33 votes to 0 with 5 abstentions.

The Chairman brought the meeting to an end, recommending Delegations that had taken part in the discussion to join in the debates of the Working Group.

Reporters:

A. Wolf  
G. R. Brandon  
S. J. M. Penas

Chairman:

I. Tsingovatov

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 16th Meeting

17 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman opened the meeting by thanking most warmly all members of the Argentine Delegation, and the Argentine Telecommunication Administration, for the splendid excursion to Mendoza. The sterling qualities of the Argentine people, and their prodigious hospitality, had been deeply impressive.

The Committee backed up the Chairman with prolonged applause.

The Delegate of Argentina thanked the Chairman for his kind words. The people of his country were honoured to be able to offer hospitality to representatives from all over the world and thus to contribute to many a scene of universal brotherhood.

The Chairman passed to matters concerning the work of the Committee, which would have to be finished in time for the Conference itself to close on the date fixed. He therefore recommended:

1. That the Committee aim at finishing its work by 5 December, so that it could then forward the texts to the Editorial Committee.
2. That it would be advisable for delegations, on their own initiative, to withdraw proposals that did not deal with matters of principle.
3. That the Committee should confine itself to discussions on questions of principle only, instructing the Working Group, which was still functioning, to prepare the final texts. It would be necessary for the Working Group to speed up its work.



4. That a Sub-Committee 4A be set up immediately to study proposals relating to the second part of the Regulations dealing with the C.C.I.s. First, however, two questions of principle would have to be settled by the Committee. Sub-Committee 4A should terminate its work on 24 November and submit the texts prepared, with a view to their being published.

The Committee unanimously accepted the working methods suggested by the Chairman.

The Chairman then passed to the consideration of the two questions of fundamental importance which had been raised concerning the second part of the Regulations: Proposal 521 (the right to vote at Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.s) and Proposals 564 to 567 (deletion of Chapter 17 relating to the finances of the C.C.I.s).

The Delegate of Switzerland withdrew Proposal 521.

The Delegate of France, supported by the Delegates of Italy, Portugal and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, did not think that the second question of principle raised by the Chairman could be settled until Committee 3 had reached certain decisions relating to Article 14 of the Convention.

The Chairman considered that any provision relating to the finances of the C.C.I.s was subject to the decisions of Committee 3, and suggested that Committee 3 should be asked what its intentions were.

The Committee agreed.

The Chairman then proposed the following membership for Sub-Committee 4A, it being understood that other countries might, if they wished, take part:

Chairman: Mr. Lázaro Barajas, Mexico

Members: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,  
U.S.S.R., United States of America, France, Belgium,  
Switzerland, Sweden, Argentina, Italy, P.R. of Bulgaria,  
Japan, Portugal, New Zealand, Hungarian P.R., Colombia.

The Committee agreed.

The Chairman proposed the following terms of reference for Sub-Committee 4A:

1. To study the proposals relating to the second part of the General Regulations, amending the existing text only where absolutely necessary.
2. To present the Committee with a draft revision of the text of the second part of the General Regulations by 24 November - care being taken to keep the General Regulations in line with the Convention.

The Committee agreed.

The Chairman then continued with the examination of the General Regulations.

Article 1, paragraph 9: Proposals Nos. 367, 369, 370, 371, 650, 591

By tacit consent, paragraph 9 was deleted.

Proposals Nos. 368 and 349.

The two proposals, which were substantially the same, raised no objections. They were thus approved in principle by the Committee and forwarded to the Working Group for final drafting, it being understood that the provision was to relate both to Administrative Conferences and to Plenipotentiary Conferences.

The Delegate of Italy tried several times to point out the need for a provision laying down the procedure to be followed in the interval between sessions of the Administrative Council concerning the invitations to a Conference and its place and date. It might be necessary for the inviting Government to take urgent decisions as the result of political events taking place after the invitations had been sent out. But if the Administrative Council were not in session, how could its assent be obtained? The Italian Delegation therefore proposed a new paragraph 10 on the following lines:

"If an urgent decision has to be taken concerning the exact date or place of, or the invitations to, a Conference, in the interval between two sessions of the Administrative Council, the agreements referred to in paragraphs 1 and 7 of the present Chapter shall be reached by the inviting Government with the Secretary General, who shall consult the Members of the I.T.U. and comply with the desires of the majority."

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland seconded this proposal.

The Delegate of France thought that the principle in the Italian Proposal should be kept, but that the provision should be made applicable both to Administrative Conferences and to Plenipotentiary Conferences.

During a lengthy discussion, doubts emerged as to whether the Italian proposal was really in line with the reasons advanced in support of it.

To end the discussion, the Chairman suggested that the Italian Delegation might publish its proposal, with the reasons justifying it, as a Conference document.

The Delegate of Italy agreed, and the matter was thus left in abeyance.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland suggested that the delegations which had made proposals concerning Chapter 4 should meet in a Working Group to coordinate their ideas and prepare a compromise text for the Committee.

The Chairman agreed, but thought that first of all the questions of principle raised in those proposals should be clarified. How great a majority would be required on a decision to change the place and date of a Conference ?

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland pointed out the necessity, when several proposals were forthcoming for the process of elimination by two successive votes, as suggested in Paragraph 4 a) of Proposal 405.

The Chairman did not share this view, and took a vote on the procedure suggested by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, with the following result:

In favour of the United Kingdom suggestion:	15
Against:	0
Abstentions:	26

The Chairman recalled that under the Rules of Procedure the veto was invalid in view of the large number of abstentions; the question could be reopened at a later meeting.

In an attempt to reconcile the conflicting views, the Delegate of France suggested that a simple majority be prescribed, not of the members voting, but of the total number of Members of the I.T.U.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia pointed out the need for avoiding any conflict with the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph 2, of the Convention.

The Delegate of Argentina recalled that paragraph 1 of Chapter 4 mentioned not only a change in the time and place of a Conference, but also the convening of an Extraordinary Administrative Conference. What, then, was the scope of Proposal No. 401?

The Delegate of Switzerland explained that Proposal No. 401 related solely to paragraph 2 of Chapter 4 - i.e. to a change in the place and date of a Conference.

The Chairman then asked the Committee to decide by a vote whether a two-thirds majority was required to change the place and date of a Conference. The result was as follows:

In favour:	25
Against:	8
Abstentions:	10

The principle of a two-thirds majority was thus approved.

The Chairman announced the questions to be dealt with at the next meeting, and closed the meeting.

Reporters:

A. Wolf  
S.J.M. Penas  
G.R. Brandon

Chairman:

I. Tsingovatov

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 286-E  
24 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

CORRIGENDUM No. 1

TO DOCUMENT No. 251

Concerns only the French text.

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE 5

TO THE

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

(by the Chairman)

Subjects:

1. Special authorization to the Secretary General to enable him to maintain continuity of the work of I.F.R.B.
2. Para. 5 of Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention.

The Administrative Council was not in a position to authorize for 1953 the additional expenditure occasioned by the decisions of the E.A.R.C. (see Chapter VI of the supplementary report of the Administrative Council - Document No. 191). The Plenipotentiary Conference will also not be able to pass the budget for 1953 before the end of November 1952. Meanwhile, it is imperative that the Secretary General should have authority to commit in advance the I.T.U. for the expenditure to be incurred in the beginning of 1953 so that there should be no dislocation in the work of the I.F.R.B. - the expenditure would be on the staff and equipment.

The Plenary Assembly has decided to retain the I.F.R.B. and also agreed that the Board should undertake the work assigned by the E.A.R.C. Committee 5, in its 10th meeting held on the 21st November, 1952, accordingly adopted a Resolution embodied in Document No. 260 by 43 votes for, 9 against and 2 abstentions. The Resolution is forwarded to the Plenary Assembly for approval.

In the same meeting, Committee 5 adopted unanimously para. 5 of Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention without any modification. This para. may accordingly be embodied in its present form in the Buenos Aires Convention.

K. Prasada

Chairman.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENT No. 268 - REVISED

(Second report of Committee 5 to the Plenary Assembly)

Page 2: Replace paragraph 1.3 by the following:

"1.3. U.S.S.R., Roumanian People's Republic, Bielorussia Soviet Socialist Republic, Czecho-slovakia, Hungarian People's Republic, People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic objected, for the reasons recorded in the minutes of the meeting, to the acceptance from the Bonn Government of the debts due from the former Germany. The Federal German Republic explained the reasons which motivated the offer. Paragraph 2 of the Resolution on being put to the vote was retained by 29 votes to 7 with 8 abstentions."

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 289-E  
25 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention Committee)

Minutes of the 20th meeting

Thursday, 20 November, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Committee resumed consideration of Document No. 203: drafts submitted by Working Group 1 concerning the possible amalgamation of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T.

As the Committee had approved Draft Resolution (A) at its 19th meeting, it passed on to consider the Draft Protocol (pages 2 and 3 of Document No. 203).

The Delegate of France considered that the expression "shall be guided by the recommendations on this subject of the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F.", as applied to the Telegraph and Telephone Conference, was too imperative. He wondered what would happen if those two Plenary Assemblies were to omit conflicting opinions on the proposed amalgamation and he therefore suggested that the words "shall be guided" be replaced by "shall consider".

The Chairman pointed out that the Telegraph and Telephone Conference was not bound to follow the recommendations of either of the Plenary Assemblies of the two C.C.I.'s. It would base its decision on the majority opinion of the participating delegations.

The amendment proposed by the Delegate of France was adopted without comment.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. requested that the following statement be included in the minutes of the meeting:

"The Soviet Delegation considers that a decision on the amalgamation of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F. can be taken by the present Conference. We consider that it is wrong to entrust the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference with the task of taking a decision concerning this question, that is to entrust that Conference with the task of modifying the structure of the Union.

"Consequently, the Soviet Delegation reserves its opinion on all the provisions contained in Document No. 203."

In the absence of further comments, the Draft Protocol was adopted as amended by the Delegate of France.

Draft Resolution (B) was then adopted without comment.

---

The Committee resumed consideration of Article 8 of the Convention: International Consultative Committees.

The Chairman pointed out that two points of principle had already been considered, namely, the amalgamation of the C.C.I.R. and I.F.R.B. and the amalgamation of the C.C.I.F. and C.C.I.T. There remained a third one: the United States proposal to place 3 Assistant Secretaries General at the head of the three C.C.I.'s. At the suggestion of the Chairman, the Committee decided to postpone that question until it should consider Article 9 (General Secretariat).

#### Article 8, Paragraph 2

That paragraph was the object of a proposal submitted by the Delegate of Egypt (575). The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. considered the text of Article 8 as it stood to be entirely satisfactory and therefore he opposed Proposal No. 575. In the circumstances, the Delegate of Egypt withdrew his proposal.

The Committee decided to refer paragraph 2 to Working Group 1 which would consider it only in relation with Proposals Nos. 107, 118 (para. 2) and 119 (para. 2) which merely concerned points of drafting.

#### Article 8, Paragraph 3

That paragraph read as follows:

"3. The International Consultative Committees shall have as members:

- a) administrations of Members and Associate Members of the Union;
- b) recognized private operating agencies which express a desire to have their experts participate in the work of these Committees."

All the proposals concerning the participation of the Members of the Union in the International Consultative Committees were identical.

With regard to the participation of recognized private operating agencies the Committee considered Proposal No. 113 of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland which dealt only with points of drafting and Proposal No. 118 - paragraph 3 of the United States which read as follows:

"3. The International Consultative Committees shall be composed of Members and Associate Members of the Union."

According to that last proposal, recognized private operating agencies would no longer be members of the C.C.I's.

The Delegate of the United States of America pointed out that, since Members of the Union were free to make up their delegations as they desired, they had enough latitude to include persons belonging to recognized private operating agencies.

The Delegate of India considered that the United States proposal lacked flexibility and therefore he opposed it. Under its provisions a Member of the Union who desired to be represented only by a private operating agency would not be able to do so whilst under the current system he could do so.

The Delegate of France preferred the current text of the Convention. The participation of recognized private operating agencies in the International Consultative Committees was essential in view of the important part they played in the telecommunication system of numerous countries. Even supposing that those agencies should be barred from Administrative Conferences, it was of the utmost importance that they should be admitted to the C.C.I's. The text proposed by the United States on the contrary, would enable a Member of the Union to bar the participation of any recognized private operating agency of his country in those Committees.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated:

"Proposal No. 118, paragraph 3, (United States of America) is not, we feel, entirely clear.

"It should be specified that the Members of the C.C.I's are not I.T.U. Members themselves, but the administration of I.T.U. Members.

"We have no objection to Article 8, paragraph 3 b) of the Convention being deleted. Any country can include representatives of private operating agencies in its delegation, if it sees fit to do so."

The Delegate of the United States of America accepted the U.S.S.R. amendment, so that his proposal became : "The International Consultative Committees shall have as Members the administrations of Members and Associate Members of the Union."

The Delegate of Egypt pointed out that recognized private operating agencies had to be regarded as Members of the C.C.I's, since according to Chapter 17 (paragraph 4) of the General Regulations, they shared in defraying C.C.I. expenditure.

The Chairman said that in fact the private operating agencies contributed, financially, very little. Indeed, they not infrequently declined to pay their shares.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was likewise of the opinion that the arguments adduced by the Delegate of Egypt were not convincing. If that line of reasoning were followed, then anybody agreeing to share in paying C.C.I. expenses would have to be admitted. Further, the financial contribution made by private agencies represented but a small percentage of the total.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wished it to be made clear that refusal to pay, on the part of recognized private operating agencies, had always been something entirely exceptional. He was in favour of all such bodies continuing to contribute their experience and their research for the benefit of the C.C.I's.

The Delegate of the United States of America wished it to be made quite clear that the American private operating agencies had always paid their contributions to the C.C.I.U. His proposal was advantageous from the financial point of view, for if a private operating agency represented the United States of America in a C.C.I., it contributed for one unit only while if that country were officially represented by a delegation, it would contribute 30 units.

The Chairman said it had never been his intention to affirm that the recognized private operating agencies never paid their debts to the Union.

The Delegate of France said it might well be that private operating agencies, like scientific and manufacturing organizations, would have interests different from those of delegations. Hence they might suffer were they to be represented only by the delegations of I.T.U. Members.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic was also in favour of maintaining the status quo, for the same reasons. He withdrew Proposal No. 108 (Argentine Republic) in favour of Proposal No. 113 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

The Chairman thereupon put to the vote the proposal submitted by the United States of America, amended by the U.S.S.R.

It was rejected by 24 votes to 21, with 13 abstentions.

The Delegate of the United States of America then presented his proposal afresh, in the following form:

"The C.C.I.'s shall have as Members the administrations of Members and Associate Members of the Union. If a Member is not represented by an official delegation, one or more private operating agencies recognized by it may participate in meetings of the C.C.I.'s, and shall enjoy the same rights, provided that the Member in question has approved such participation, and that those agencies together have no more than one vote."

The Delegate of Egypt observed that the latter provision already appeared in the General Regulations (Chapter 11, paragraph 2).

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that such provisions should not be transferred to the Convention. He was against the proposal of the United States. Recognized private operating agencies could not take part in C.C.I. meetings with the same rights as Members of the Union. Should a Member of the Union be absent, then the representatives of its recognized private operating agencies could only speak as a single representative, and in an advisory capacity.

The proposal submitted by the United States of America was seconded by the Delegates of the Argentine Republic and of the Philippines.

The Delegate of the United States of America emphasized how important his proposal was. It was not identical with the text appearing in the Regulations, since it further laid down that recognized private operating agencies should enjoy the same rights as Members of the Union. Such a provision might appropriately appear in the Convention, and not just in the General Regulations.

The Delegate of France was still in favour of the status quo, by which the recognized private operating agencies could take part in C.C.I. meetings, either in an advisory capacity, or with the right to vote, according as to whether their country's administration was represented or not. Would the C.C.I. Directors care to give their opinion?

Mr. Valensi (Director, C.C.I.F.) said that the C.C.I.'s were technical advisory bodies. They had to enjoy the intellectual collaboration of the greatest possible number, without being disturbed by political considerations. They had to be able to work in peace and quietness, and should not have to have recourse to the vote except in exceptional cases.

The new proposal submitted by the United States of America was then put to the vote and rejected by 29 votes to 14, with 16 abstentions.

Proposal No. 113 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), relative to the existing paragraph 3, was then referred for consideration to Working Group 1.

Article 8, paragraph 3 - additional sub-paragraph.

Italy (Proposal 110) and France (Proposal 723, paragraph 2 - see Document No. 143) proposed the insertion of an additional subparagraph after paragraph 3, in order to include, among C.C.I. participants, international organizations and scientific or manufacturing organizations.

The Delegate of Italy withdrew his proposal in favour of that of France.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics remarked that the matter was dealt with in Chapter 8 of the General Regulations, and urged that the provision should remain where it was. It would merely make the Convention clumsier than it would otherwise be.

The Delegate of France therefore withdrew his proposal.

Article 8, paragraph 4 a)

This lays down that the C.C.I. Plenary Assemblies shall normally meet every two years, a meeting to take place about a year before the administrative conference concerned.

The following proposals bore on this matter:

- No. 118 (paragraph 4a) - United States of America. The Delegate of the United States of America withdrew his proposal in favour of the status quo.
- No. 116 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) - for Plenary Assemblies to meet normally every two years, and at intervals of not more than three years.
- No. 119 (paragraph 4) - France. The Delegate of France withdrew this in favour of the proposal by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
- No. 115 (Italy) - Plenary Assembly meetings every three years.

Mr. Valensi, Director of the C.C.I.F., asked the Committee to compare the text under discussion with Chapter 15 of the General Regulations, which stated that: "One year before the appropriate Administrative Conference, representatives of the interested Study Groups of each Consultative Committee shall correspond with or meet with representatives of the General Secretariat in order to extract, from the recommendations issued by it since the preceding Administrative Conference, proposals for modification of the relative set of Regulations."

Quoting examples from recent meetings of the C.C.I.F. Study Groups, he showed that the above text was complied with in practice; however, the clause to the effect that the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I.'s should meet about one year previous to the relative administrative conference should be deleted from Article 8, paragraph 4 a) of the Convention.

Mr. Townshend, Interim Director of the C.C.I.T., said that experience in his Committee enabled him to share the opinion of Mr. Valensi. The primary task of the C.C.I.'s was to undertake studies of the Study Groups and to formulate recommendations in Plenary Assemblies and this work did not require a definite periodicity. A second task which was of less importance since it was not even mentioned in the Convention, was to help Members of the Union to draw up their proposals for changes in the Regulations. That work had to be completed about a year before the Administrative Conference, not in a Plenary Assembly but rather in meetings of various Study Groups of one or more C.C.I.'s. It only involved incidentally, about half of the Study Groups. He therefore supported Mr. Valensi's suggestion that a phrase should be deleted from Article 8, paragraph 4 a). He drew attention to the fact that the annual expenses of the C.C.I.T. were about 60 to 80,000 francs in years when there was no Plenary Assembly and about 250,000 francs in years when there was one.

Prof. Dr. van der Pol, Director of the C.C.I.R., also thought that the part of paragraph 4 a) which stated that the Plenary Assemblies must meet one year before the relative administrative conference should be deleted and that the C.C.I.'s should be allowed to arrange the spacing between their Plenary Assemblies to suit the volume and the urgency of the questions with which they had to deal.

The proposal to delete from paragraph 4 a) of Article 8, the words "a meeting should take place about one year previous to the relative Administrative Conference" was formally submitted by the delegate of Italy and supported by the delegate of the United Kingdom who, in accordance with the delegate of France, agreed to withdraw his Proposal No. 116

The proposal was adopted without comment.

It was understood that Chapter 15 of the General Regulations could be improved by Committee 4.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. declared that he supported the proposal that the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I's should meet regularly every three years.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. likewise supported the proposal.

The proposal that the Plenary Assemblies of the C.C.I's should meet regularly every three years was put to the vote and was adopted by 30 votes against 6 with 13 abstentions.

Sub-paragraph a) of paragraph 4 therefore remained as follows:

"a) Plenary Assembly, meeting regularly every three years; each meeting of the Plenary Assembly will normally take place at the place chosen by the preceding meeting."

Article 8, Paragraph 4, sub-paragraph c)

Consideration of the Indian proposal No. 676 (see Document No. 52) was postponed until such time as a decision should be taken on the United States proposals Nos. 118 and 120 concerning the Directors of the C.C.I's.

Article 8, Paragraph 5.

The Committee accepted the Chairman's suggestion to postpone consideration of that paragraph until Article 12 had been dealt with (Rules of Procedure of Conferences).

Article 8, Paragraph 6.

No proposals were submitted concerning that paragraph.

---

Consideration of two proposals (Nos. 119 of France and 656 of Turkey) to introduce supplementary provisions in Article 8.

Proposal No. 119 (Paragraph 6)

That proposal submitted by France read as follows:

"6. Directors of consultative committee and the vice-directors of the Radio Consultative Committee must resign their positions as soon as the country whereof they are nationals ceases to be a Member of the Union".

The proposal submitted by France concerning the Directors of the C.C.I.'s as well as the Secretary General and Assistant Secretary Generals was supported by the delegate of India.

The Delegates of Portugal, Egypt and Sweden objected to the proposal; high officials of the Union should carry out their duties as individuals, independently of their countries' relationship with the Union.

The Chairman explained to the Delegate of France that it was out of the question for a national of a country not a Member of the Union to be elected Director of a C.C.I.

The Delegate of France then withdrew his proposal.

Proposal No. 656 (Paragraph 1 (1) b)

The Delegate of Turkey, author of the proposal, said he proposed to submit it as a draft Resolution.

---

The Chairman then opened discussion on the United States proposal (see Proposals Nos. 118, para. 1 and 120, para. zero), which he introduced in the following form :

"Can the duties of the three Directors of the C.C.I.'s be entrusted to three Assistant Secretaries General?"

The Delegate of the United States of America , introducing Proposal 118, explained that the proposal was based on the experience of five years' service on the Council and an examination of the structure of other international organizations. Experience on the Administrative Council was that the Union was composed of five rather disjointed parts, the General Secretariat, the I.F.R.B. and the three C.C.I.'s. He had the greatest admiration for the work of the Directors of the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.R. and of the Interim Director of the C.C.I.T., but it was quite anomalous that the separate sections of the I.T.U. organization should owe no allegiance to a Head. At the same time, the

three sections could work quite independently, and there was no reason at all why Mr. Valensi, Mr. Townshend and Mr. van der Pol should not take over whatever technical telephone, telegraph and radio work existed in the General Secretariat, although the U.S.A. proposals were not predicated on persons. The Secretary General would, of course, be responsible for the general "housekeeping" work of the whole organization.

His Delegation's thought was that the Council should elect the Secretary General, who could then appoint his three assistants from candidates submitted by the three C.C.I. Plenary Assemblies, the appointments to be approved by the Council. Those appointments would thus enjoy the confidence of the C.C.I.'s, the Secretary General and the Council. There would then be a definite chain of authority, a streamlined organization similar to that of I.C.A.O. and the U.N., and harmony would be ensured. There would also be an economy in the higher staff of the Union, since the C.C.I. Directors would do the work of the Assistant Secretaries General.

The United States proposal was supported by the Delegate of Colombia.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said :

"We consider that Proposals Nos. 118 and 120 by the United States are unacceptable, and we cannot agree that the posts of the Directors of the C.C.I.'s should be abolished and their functions handed over to the Assistant Secretaries General.

"The Secretary General and his Assistants have quite different tasks, and they cannot direct the work of the scientific and technical organs of the I.T.U. Consequently we should only be prejudicing the work of the C.C.I.'s if we approved the United States proposal.

"The Director of a C.C.I. must be someone with high scientific qualifications. A Secretary General is first and foremost an administrator. The two posts call for totally different qualifications.

"For these reasons, the Soviet Delegation objects to Proposals Nos. 118 and 120 by the United States, and thinks that Committee 3 should reject them."

The Delegate of Denmark was also opposed to the United States proposal, although he recognized its virtue, in that it would tend to bring the structure of the Union more in line with that of the other international organizations. He thought that the concentration of technical and administrative functions in the hands of one person alone would not be a happy combination. In the work of a C.C.I. the Director played an essential role; to appoint him Assistant Secretary General would merely be to increase his responsibilities and there would be a risk of introducing a dangerous non-technical element in the work of the Committee.

The United States proposal would be acceptable if it provided for the administrative tasks of the C.C.I.'s to be transferred to the General Secretariat, but as it stood, it was not.

o  
o o

In view of the late hour, the Chairman interrupted the discussion on the United States proposal.

He announced that the Chairman of Committee 4 had asked him whether it was advisable to retain the present provisions of Chapter 17 of the General Regulations.

In view of the fact that the proposal to have a consolidated budget had been rejected, there seemed no reason to change the status quo.

There being no comments, the Chairman informed the Chairman of Committee 4, who was present at the meeting, that the reply of Committee 3 to his question was : Yes.

The meeting rose at 7.10 p.m.

Rapporteurs :

Chairman :

R.V. Hatton - E. Luraschi

C. Ribeiro

J. Revoy - G. Terras

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 290-E  
24 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

PLENARY MEETING

Buenos Aires, 1952

A G E N D A

8th. PLENARY MEETING

26 November 1952, at 16: hours

Plenary Assombly Hall

1. Approval of the minutes of the 6th and 7th Plenary Meetings  
(Documents Nos. 220, 221, 250)
2. First report by Committee 7 (Doc. No. 269)
3. Fourth report by Committee 3 (Docs. Nos. 251, 286)
4. Second and third reports by Committee 5 (Docs. Nos. 268  
revised, 287 and 288)
5. Method of electing Members of the Administrative Council  
by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference.
6. Other business

C O R R I G E N D U M

to Document No. 221

1) Page 12, para. 3.48., at the end of the sentence, after: "as a whole", add: "subject to the reservations made by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. (see para. 3.25.)."

2) Page 25, para. 5.7., read as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to you as Chairman of this Conference, I have to state that we are unable to accept your remarks. All of us, including you, Mr. Chairman, are perfectly well aware that China is not represented at this Conference. The Kuomintang representatives here endeavouring to play the part of "Chinese representatives", do not in fact represent China. We pointed this out when the question of Chinese representation was being considered by this Conference. Many other delegations at this Conference, and not only that of the Soviet Union, hold these views.

"Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that at this Conference there are no representatives of China. There is no Chinese Delegation. That is a fact which cannot be concealed.

"Incidentally, at a recent meeting of the Credentials Committee at the United Nations General Assembly, the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he was unable to recognize the Kuomintang credentials.

"The representatives of the Kuomintang Group can be called by no other name, since they do not represent any country."



3) Page 32, para. 5.43., read as follows:

"The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation did not submit any proposals in connection with the credentials presented by the representatives of the Bonn authorities. The statement made by my Delegation in connection with those credentials must be included in extenso in the minutes of this meeting."

"The Chairman thereupon ruled that the report by the Credentials Committee should be put to the vote as a whole."

International  
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No.292-E  
25 November 1952

F R A N C E

The French Delegation is withdrawing the following proposals:

271, 272, 273, 274, 278, 279, 281, 283, 286, 293, 302, 318, 319.

It is likewise withdrawing that part of Proposal 349 which deals with Rules of Procedure for Conferences (pages 309 to 317 of the Collected Proposals).

The French Delegation would also point out that Proposal 277 is a matter of drafting only, and will be considered by Committee 8.

Similarly, Proposals 282, 287, 290, 291, 297, 301, 303, 305, 309, 310, 311, and 317 are no more than a part of the general proposal for reclassification of articles which appears as No.3 (page 6 of the Collected Proposals).

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

FIRST REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 1 TO COMMITTEE 4

1. Working Group 1 has held four meetings. The following took part in the work of the Group: (a) The Delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, U.S.A., France, India, Poland, Switzerland, United Kingdom, U.S.S.R. and Uruguay; (b) the representatives of the United Nations and the International Labour Organization. In conformity with its terms of reference, received from the Committee, the Group now submits:
  - 1) A draft text for Chapter 1 of the General Regulations (Plenipotentiary Conferences), taking into consideration the decisions of the Committee;
  - 2) An additional draft text for Chapter 1 relating to the terms of admission of the Specialized Agencies to the Plenipotentiary Conferences;
  - 3) A draft wording for Chapter 2 (Administrative Conferences);
  - 4) A draft text for cases where there is no inviting government.
2. As regards Chapter 1, the Group makes the following observations:
  - 1) Paragraph 2, sub-paragraph 1):
    - The text submitted by the Group is in conformity with the decisions of Committee 4, namely: The inviting Government shall send invitations to the Government of each Member and Associate Member of the Union".



- However, the Delegations of the People's Republic of Poland and the U.S.S.R. pointed out that nowhere in the existing texts of the Convention and its Annexes is there any mention of the Government of a Member of the Union.  
They therefore suggested, for reasons of uniformity, that the present text of the General Regulations should be retained; that is to say, that the words underlined should be deleted.
- The Delegation of Argentina was opposed to this amendment, and based its stand on a Resolution of the Administrative Council.
- The other members of the group were prepared to accept either draft.

The Committee will therefore have to take the simple decision of whether or not to delete the underlined words "to the Government of".

2) Paragraph 3:

Paragraph 3 contains, in comparison with the corresponding paragraph of the present General Regulations, an addition in the form of a recommendation to the Members of the Union.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated that this addition was of no value and he was in consequence opposed to it.

3) Paragraph 6 (second sentence):

Committee 4, in principle, adopted the following text:

"If necessary, the Chairman may invite an organ. . ."

The Group considers that this invitation is rather the prerogative of the Conference. Eventually, the Group circumvented this difficulty by writing "The Chairman of the Conference" but it would prefer to see written simply "The Conference may invite. . .".

4) Paragraph 8:

The text of Paragraph 8 of the present General Regulations has been modified. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated that he was opposed to this modification.

5) After carefully examining the text of Chapter 1, the Group saw that it deals, somewhat confusedly, with 3 different questions:

- a) invitations to Conferences
- b) admissions to Conferences
- c) presentation of proposals.

The group therefore proposes:

1. - to change the order of the paragraphs.

In the new order, paragraphs

- 1., 2., (3), (4), (5), deal with invitations;

Paragraphs (7) and (8) deal with admission to Conferences.

2. - that paragraph 4 of Chapter 1 relating to the time limit for submitting proposals should form, with Chapter 5 of the General Regulations concerning the method of presentation of proposals, a single Chapter 2-bis entitled: Time limit and method of presentation to Conferences, applicable both to Plenipotentiary Conferences and to Administrative Conferences.

6) The text of Chapter 2-bis sub-paragraph 2) is substantially the same as that of Chapter 5 of the present General Regulations, except as regards the deletion of the part of the sentence "To be considered by the Conference". However, the Delegations of the U.S.S.R. and Poland stated that they could not accept the deletion of these words. In the absence of agreement, the opinion of the Members of the Group is indicated as follows:

- a) Text of Chapter 5 of the General Regulations at present in force:

For: 2

Against: 5

Abstentions: 3

- b) Text of Chapter 2-bis, sub-paragraph 2:

For: 6

Against: 2

Abstentions: 2

3. To draft text relating to the admission of the Specialized Agencies to Plenipotentiary Conferences gave rise to long discussions.

The differing views that were expressed did not permit of a solution acceptable to all being submitted.

1) First, the Delegations of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of Poland were opposed to the insertion in the General Regulations of any provision on this subject. The Delegation of Poland said that it was inopportune to study the problem, so long as Articles 26 and 27 of the Convention had not been examined by the Conference.

2) The other members of the Group were of the opposite opinion. Moreover, they considered that it was not possible to lay down conditions for the admission of Specialized Agencies which would be harsher than those of paragraph 7 concerning non-contracting Governments. Consequently these members propose the adoption of the draft text attached thereto.

It should be noted that this text envisages, exclusively, the admission of Specialized Agencies in relationship with the United Nations and that this admission is subject to reciprocal treatment being extended to the I.T.U.

3) In the assumption that the draft text prepared by the Group would be approved by Committee 4, all the alterations that would result have been explained immediately after the text.

4. With regard to Chapter 2 of the General Regulations, the Group tried to make a reference to Chapter 1 in every case where the provisions of the Regulations were applicable both to Administrative Conferences and to Plenipotentiary Conferences.

No difficulty was encountered in this respect - but with regard to the admission of international organizations to Administrative Conferences, the Group was confronted with a question of principle which remained unsettled:

1) The present General Regulations provide that, in order to be admitted to take part in Administrative Conferences, all international organizations must make application for admission according to a certain procedure and these requests are then submitted to a referendum of the Members of the Union. The Delegations of U.S.S.R. and Poland declared that it was necessary to adhere strictly to this procedure.

2) The other members of the Group considered that the referendum procedure should be avoided wherever possible. They considered that if, in accordance with the proposals of the Group, the Committee decides that the Specialized Agencies shall be invited to Administrative Conferences, the decision regarding the admission of all other international organizations could be taken by the Conference itself in the course of the first Plenary Assembly.

Consequently the Group has presented two complete versions of Chapter 2 on which the Committee will be able to take a decision.

- Version I provides for a referendum.

- Version II eliminates it. (This version is readily derived from Version I by the deletion of sub-paragraphs 2.3), 2.4), 3.2) and paragraph 4).

5. Chapter 2-tor relates to the procedure to be followed when Conferences meet at the headquarters of the Union, without an inviting government. Here no comment seems necessary.

CHAPTER 1

Invitation and Admission to  
Plenipotentiary Conferences

Order of paragraphs

Proposed      At present

- |     |    |   |
|-----|----|---|
|     | 1. | The inviting government, in agreement with the Administrative Council, shall fix the definitive date and the exact place of the Conference.   |
|     | 2. | 1) One year before this date, the inviting government shall send invitations to the government of each Member and Associate Member of the Union.<br><br>2) These invitations may be sent directly, or through the Secretary General, or through another government. |
| (5) | 3. | The replies of the Members and Associate Members must reach the inviting government not later than one month before the date of opening of the Conference, and should include whenever possible full information on the composition of the delegations.             |
|     | 4. | Paragraph 4 is transferred to Chapter 2 bis.  |
| (3) | 5. | The Secretary General shall send an invitation to the United Nations in accordance with Article 26 of the Convention.   |

Order of paragraphs

Proposed      At present

(7)              6.

Any permanent organ of the Union shall be entitled to be represented at the Conference in an advisory capacity when the Conference is discussing matters coming within its competence. In case of need, the Chairman of the Conference may invite an organ which has not seen fit to be represented.

(4)              7.

The inviting government, in agreement with, or on a proposal by, the Administrative Council, may invite non-contracting governments to send observers to take part in the Conference in an advisory capacity.

(6)              8.

The following shall be admitted to the Conference:

- Delegations as defined in Annex 2 to the Convention.
- United Nations observers.
- According to circumstances, the observers as defined in paragraph 7.

TEXT CONCERNING INVITATIONS TO  
THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The inviting government, in agreement with, or on a proposal by, the Administrative Council, may invite such Specialized Agencies in relationship with the United Nations as grant to the I.T.U. reciprocal representation at their conferences, to send observers to take part in the conferences in an advisory capacity.

---

Note: - Should Committee 4 approve the inclusion of the above text in Chapter 1, it would take its place as paragraph 5 bis (present order) and become paragraph (3 bis) of the proposed order.

Furthermore the following would have to be added to paragraph 8 (present order):

- Specialized Agencies observers in accordance with paragraph 5 bis.

- Similarly, the following amendments would have to be introduced in Chapter 2: (VERSION II).

Paragraph 1 bis shall read : "The provisions of paragraphs 3, 5, 5 bis and 7".

Paragraph 3. Insert between points b) and c):  
Specialized Agencies observers.

- Further it must be clearly understood in the text submitted for Chapter 2, that the term international organizations refers to all organizations other than the Specialized Agencies.

VERSION I

CHAPTER 2

Invitation and Admission to  
Administrative Conferences

1. 1) Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Chapter 1 above shall be applicable to Administrative Conferences.
- 2) However, as regards extraordinary Administrative Conferences, the time-limit for the despatch of invitations may be reduced to six months.
- 3) Members and Associate Members of the Union may inform the private operating agencies recognized by them of the invitation they have received.
- 1 bis Paragraphs 3, 5 and 7 of Chapter 1 above shall also be applicable to Administrative Conferences.
2. 1) The inviting government, in agreement with, or on a proposal by, the Administrative Council shall notify those international organizations which might be interested in sending observers to participate in the work of the Conference in an advisory capacity.
- 2) The interested international organizations shall make applications for admission to the inviting government within a period of two months from the date of the notification.
- 3) Four months before the meeting of the Conference, the inviting government shall forward to the Members the list of international organizations which have made applications for admission, inviting them to state, within a period of two months, whether or not these applications should be approved.
- 4) The inviting government shall notify the international organizations that their application has been approved, if at least half of the Members have replied favourably within the period prescribed in the preceding sub-paragraph.

3. 1) The international organizations which have not received the notification referred to in paragraph 2. 1) can request permission to **attend** in an advisory capacity. In this case, the inviting government shall assemble the requests and the Conference itself shall decide whether the organizations concerned are to be admitted or not.
- 2) The Conference shall also give a ruling on requests for admission not made within the period prescribed in paragraph 2. 2) or those in respect of which no decision has resulted from the consultation of the Members of the Union.
4. No request for admission rejected in accordance with paragraph 2.4) may be submitted again to the Conference.
5. The following shall be admitted to Administrative Conferences:
  - a) Delegations as defined in Annex 2 to the Convention.
  - b) United Nations observers.
  - c) Observers from International Organizations admitted in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 above.
  - d) According to circumstances, the observers from non-contracting governments.
  - e) Representatives of recognized private operating agencies, duly authorized by the Member-country to which they belong.
  - f) Permanent organs of the Union, subject to the conditions set forth in Chapter 1, paragraph 6.

VERSION II

CHAPTER 2

Invitation and Admission to  
Administrative Conferences

1.     1)         Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Chapter 1 above shall be applicable to Administrative Conferences.
- 2)         However, as regards extraordinary Administrative Conferences, the time-limit for the despatch of invitations may be reduced to six months.
- 3)         Members and Associate Members of the Union may inform the private operating agencies recognized by them of the invitation they have received.
- 1 bis         Paragraphs 3, 5 and 7 of Chapter 1 above shall also be applicable to Administrative Conferences.
2.     1)         The inviting government, in agreement with, or on a proposal by, the Administrative Council shall notify those international organizations which might be interested in sending observers to participate in the work of the Conference in an advisory capacity.
- 2)         The interested international organizations shall make applications for admission to the inviting government within a period of two months from the date of the notification.
- 3)         The inviting government shall assemble the requests and the Conference itself shall decide whether the organizations concerned are to be admitted or not.

3. The following shall be admitted to Administrative Conferences:

- a) Delegations as defined in Annex 2 to the Convention.
- b) United Nations observers.
- c) Observers from International Organizations admitted in accordance with paragraphs 2 and 3 above.
- d) Should circumstances warrant, observers from non-contracting governments.
- e) Representatives of recognized private operating agencies, duly authorized by the Member-country to which they belong.
- f) Permanent organs of the Union, subject to the conditions set forth in Chapter 1, paragraph 6.

CHAPTER 2 bis

Time-limits for presentation of proposals to Conferences  
and conditions of submission

1. Immediately after the inviting government has despatched invitations, the Secretary General shall ask Members and Associate Members to send him, within four months, their proposals for the work of the Conference.
2. Any proposal the adoption of which might entail revision either of the Convention and its Annexes, or of the Administrative Regulations, must indicate the numbers of the Chapters, Articles and paragraphs, to which it refers.
3. The Secretary General shall assemble and coordinate the proposals received, and shall communicate them, at least three months before the opening of the Conference, to all Members and Associate Members.

CHAPTER 2 ter

Special Provisions for Conferences meeting at the  
Seat of the Union

1.
  - 1) When a conference is to be convened without an inviting government, the Secretary General shall take the necessary steps to convene it at the seat of the Union, after agreement with the Government of the Swiss Confederation.
  - 2) In such cases, the Secretary General shall himself perform the tasks of organisation normally incumbent upon the inviting government.

International  
Telecommunication Union

---

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 294-E  
25 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

N E W   Z E A L A N D

Kindly note that the New Zealand Delegation has withdrawn the following proposals:

582

583

585

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 295-E  
25 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

I N D I A

Proposal No. 671 contained in Document No. 47  
and the consequential Proposal No. 672 contained in Document No. 48 are withdrawn.

International  
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 296-E  
25 November 1952

                      
PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 2

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENT No. 277

Concerns only the French text.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies)

At its 6th meeting on 25 November the Committee considered the draft resolution contained in Document No. 275. This draft resolution was adopted by the Committee subject to a modification of par. (3) of the "considerations" and on the understanding that the resolution did not apply to the telegraph circuit leased by the United Nations between Geneva and New York.

The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. placed on record that it reserved its opinion on the resolution.

The revised text of the resolution, as recommended for adoption by the Plenary Assembly, is reproduced in the annex to the present report.

F. Colt de Wolf

Chairman:  
Committee No. 7

Annex: 1

A N N E X

RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 7

USE OF THE UNITED NATIONS TELECOMMUNICATION NETWORK  
FOR THE TELEGRAPH TRAFFIC OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The Plenipotentiary Conference,

having examined the request of the United Nations in Document No. 228 that the International Telecommunication Union should sanction a proposal of the United Nations to carry the traffic of the Specialized Agencies over their point-to-point telecommunication network at a charge equal to the pro rata proportion of the cost of operating, according to the traffic carried;

considering

(1) that the system of charging and method of operation proposed by the United Nations is out of harmony with the provisions of the International Telegraph Regulations and therefore contrary to Article XV of the U.N. - I.T.U. Agreement;

(2) that it would be inadvisable to sanction any departure by the United Nations from the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and Regulations;

(3) that the United Nations telecommunication network should not in normal circumstances be set up in competition with existing public channels of communication;

(4) that in cases of emergency however it may be desirable for the traffic of the Specialized Agencies to be carried over the United Nations point-to-point network either at a tariff composed as proscribed in Article 26 of the International Telegraph Regulations or free of charge;

expresses the opinion

(1) that in normal circumstances the United Nations point-to-point telecommunication network should not be used to carry the traffic of the Specialized Agencies in competition with existing commercial telecommunication networks;

(2) that the I.T.U. is not prepared to agree to any departure from the provisions of Article XV of the U.N. - I.T.U. Agreement in so far as the operation of the telecommunication services under the control of the United Nations is concerned;

(3) that some exception should be made in cases of emergency;

resolves

to instruct the Secretary-General

(1) to convey to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the opinion of this Conference and to invite him to withdraw at the earliest practicable moment his offer to the Specialized Agencies to carry their traffic over the United Nations network; and

(2) to convey to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the opinion of this Conference that, in cases of emergency, there would be no objection if the traffic of the Specialized Agencies were carried over the United Nations point-to-point network at a tariff composed as proscribed in Article 26 of the International Telegraph Regulations or free of charge.

SECOND REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE 4

At its meeting on 20 November 1952, Committee 4 examined and unanimously approved the text of Annex 2 to the Convention attached hereto.

In conformity with the decision adopted by the Steering Committee to accelerate the work of the Conference, the attached text has been transmitted to the Editorial Committee for subsequent submission to the Plenary Assembly.

At its meeting on 24 November 1952, Committee 4 also studied Annex 3 to the Convention and decided to retain the existing text in its entirety.

Chairman of Committee 4

I.A. Tsingovatov

Annex: 1

A N N E X

ANNEX 2

Definition of terms used

in the International Telecommunication Convention and its Annexes

Administration - Any department of service of a government responsible for implementing the obligations undertaken in the International Telecommunication Convention and the Regulations annexed thereto.

Private operating agency - Any individual or company or corporation other than a governmental establishment or agency, which operates a telecommunication installation intended for an international telecommunication service or which is capable of causing harmful interference with such a service.

Recognized private operating agency - Any private operating agency, as defined above, which operates a service of public correspondence or of broadcasting and upon which the obligations provided for in Article 20 are imposed by the Member or Associate Member in whose territory the head office of the agency is situated.

Delegate - A person sent by the government of a Member or Associate Member of the Union to a Plenipotentiary Conference or a person representing a government or an administration of a Member or Associate Member of the Union at an Administrative Conference, or at a meeting of an International Consultative Committee.

Representative - A person representing a recognized private operating agency at an Administrative Conference, or at a meeting of an International Administrative Committee.

Expert - A person sent by a scientific or industrial organization authorised by the government or the administration of its country to attend meetings of study groups of an International Consultative Committee.

Observer - A person sent by:

- a) the United Nations in accordance with Article 26 of the Convention;
- b) the Government of a country not a party to the Convention;
- c) one of the international organizations invited in accordance with the provisions of the General Regulations to participate in the work of the Conference.

Delegation - The totality of the delegatos and of any representativos, attachés, or interpreters sent by the same country.

Each Member and Associate Member shall be free to make up its delegation as it wishes. In particular it may include in its delegation in the capacity of delegate, or adviser, persons belonging to private telecommunication operating agencies which it recognizes or belonging to other private enterprises interested in telecommunication.

International service - A telecommunication service between any combination of offices or fixed, land or mobile stations which are in different countries or are subject to different countries.

Mobile service - A service of radiocommunication between mobile and land stations or between mobile stations.

Broadcasting service - A radiocommunication service of transmissions to be received directly by the general public (1).

---

(1) This service may include transmissions of sounds or transmissions by television, facsimile or other means.

(Ann.to Doc. 298-E)

Telecommunication - Any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, visual or other electromagnetic systems.

Telegraphy - A system of telecommunication for the transmission of written matter by the use of a signal code.

Telephony - A system of telecommunication set up for the transmission of speech or, in some cases, other sounds.

Telegram - Written matter intended to be transmitted by telegraphy; this term also includes radiotelegram unless otherwise specified.

Government telegrams and government telephone calls - Those are telegrams or telephone calls originating with any of the authorities specified below:

- a) the Head of a State;
- b) the Head of a Government and members of a Government;
- c) the Head of a colony, protectorate, oversea territory or territory under suzerainty, authority, trusteeship or mandate of a Member or Associate Member or of the United Nations;
- d) Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air;
- e) diplomatic or consular agents;
- f) the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Heads of the principle organs and of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations;
- g) the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

Replies to Government telegrams as defined herein shall also be regarded as Government telegrams.

Service Telegrams - See the Telegraph Regulations for the time being in force.

Private telegrams - Telegrams other than service or Government telegrams.

Service telephone calls - See the Telephone Regulations for the time being in force.

Public correspondence - Any telecommunication which the offices and stations, by reason of their being at the disposal of the public, accept for transmission.

Radiocommunication - Any telecommunication by means of Hertzian waves.

Hertzian waves - Electromagnetic waves of frequencies between 10 kc/s and 3,000,000 Mc/s.

Radio - A general term applied to the use of Hertzian waves.

Harmful interference - Any radiation or any induction which endangers the functioning of a radionavigation service or of a safety service, (1) or obstructs or repeatedly interrupts a radio service operating in accordance with the Radio Regulations.

---

(1) Any radio service, the operation of which is directly related, whether permanently or temporarily, to the safety of human life and the safeguarding of property, shall be considered as a safety service.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 299-E  
25 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention Committee)

Summary Record of the 21st Meeting

Friday, 21 November 1952 at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Carlos Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted the summary record of the 17th meeting (Document No. 242). It was approved, with the following amendment, asked for by the Delegates of Egypt and Pakistan:

Page 3, fourth paragraph, read:

"The Delegates of Egypt and Pakistan also thought that the Convention should specify a five year interval, since the Regulations needed revision at about that interval. Further, it had to be possible to convene administrative conferences with restricted agendas (such as the E.A.R.C.) to revise part of a set of Regulations only. Also conferences of a special nature like the Aeronautical Radio and Broadcasting Conferences should come under the category of administrative conferences."

The Chairman thereupon announced the measures which the Steering Committee, at its meeting the day before, had decided to take, in order to speed up the work of the Conference.

1. Delegations were asked to withdraw those of their proposals they did not consider essential.



To this there were no objections.

2. The Working Groups on drafting questions only would transmit direct to the Editorial Committee the texts prepared by them.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said he had not understood that decision in the same way as the Chairman. As he understood it, the Working Groups, after having considered their texts, had to transmit them to Committee 3 for consideration and approval, and that Committee in turn would send them to the Editorial Committee. Otherwise much time would be lost, since the texts prepared by a small group would in all likelihood give rise to numerous comments and amendments on the part of delegations which had not taken part in the work of those groups.

The Chairman said that the meetings of Heads of Delegations would straighten things out. In the meantime, **the** matter was of no practical consequence, since there was no text on the point of being turned out by a Working Group.

3. Articles 18 to 49 of the Convention, for the study of which Committee 3 was responsible - articles in connection with which few proposals had been presented - would be considered, not by the Committee itself, but by a small Sub-Committee.

Twenty-five delegations thereupon applied for membership of this Sub-Committee, so that the Chairman was obliged to forego his proposal (with the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in favour also).

Lastly, the Committee accepted without comment the Chairman's proposal that the summary records of meetings should be cut to a minimum. Hence, as from the summary record of the 21st meeting, it was agreed that summary records should be limited to a statement of the proposals discussed and of the decisions taken by the Committee. Delegations would of course retain the right to require in-extenso insertion of declarations they considered important.

---

The Chairman then explained the work schedule he was proposing for the Committee, on the assumption that there would be four meetings the following week, and four the week after that. Articles in the Convention would be considered in the following order:

Present meetings:

Articles 9 and 5.

Week from 24 to 29 November:

2 first meetings:

Articles 15, 12 and 13.

2 last meetings:

Preamble and Articles 1, 16 and 17.

Week from 1 to 6 December:

2 or 3 first meetings:

Articles 18 to 49.

Last meetings:

All questions held in abeyance.

The above work programme was adopted.

---

The Committee thereupon reverted to Proposals Nos. 118 and 120 (United States of America), advocating that the duties of C.C.I. Directors should be taken over by Assistant Secretaries General.

Mr. Valensi, Director, C.C.I.F., outlined the sort of problems that arose in the Union, distinguishing between purely administrative matters, for which the General Secretariat was responsible, and telecommunication questions properly so called - which were dealt with by the C.C.I.'s, and to some extent by the I.F.R.B. Tribute should be paid to the wisdom displayed by previous conferences in endowing the Union with its existing structure; those conferences had decided that if work of the above two types was to be successfully performed, persons with different qualifications and aptitudes were required. He appealed to the Conference to let the C.C.I.'s go on working in an atmosphere of harmony and constructive work.

The Delegates of Pakistan, the Netherlands, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and India were likewise against the United States proposal.

Dr. van der Pol, Director, C.C.I.R., made a statement to the same effect as Mr. Valensi. He would provide the Secretariat, for publication as a document, with a short paper on the role and operations of the C.C.I.R.

The Delegate of China:

"My Delegation considers that the principle embodied in the U.S.A. proposal under discussion does have many conspicuous merits and deserves our most careful consideration. We think the greatest merit of that proposal is the introduction of a clearer line of responsibility and greater harmony in the whole set-up of the Union's Secretariats. From the viewpoint of good administration, no one of us can deny that such a line of responsibility and such internal harmony are of paramount importance.

"In our last meeting, an argument was put forth to the effect that the subordination of the C.C.I. Directors to the Secretary General would prejudice the independent character of the technical functions performed by the Directors. If I may use the same words as were used by Mr. Pedersen himself yesterday when he spoke against the U.S.A. proposal, I wish also to say that that argument looks very attractive at first sight, but upon closer examination does not hold water.

"Mr. Chairman, if we entrust the functions of the three Directors to three Assistant Secretaries General, that does not mean that these Assistant Secretaries General will be entirely dependent upon the Secretary General for the execution of their work. No, that will not be the case. In fact, my Delegation thinks that they will perform approximately the very same functions, and in much the same way, as they have been performing; that is to say, the three Assistant Secretaries General will be able to carry out their technical work no less independently than heretofore, and the Secretary General should be told to refrain from unduly interfering in their work, either by an explicit provision in the Convention, or by a directive from the Plenipotentiary Conference, or simply by instructions from the Administrative Council. This can be arranged without any difficulty at all. On the other hand, the Assistant Secretaries General, of course, should be allowed to continue their practice of delegating their administrative powers to their assistants. As for the general secretarial matters of the Union, the Secretary General can have the assistance of one or two executive assistants who are directly under, and responsible to, him, much as the Secretary General of the United Nations has so far been assisted. If such arrangements are made, we do not see any possibility at all of the technical work of the three C.C.I.'s being harmed.

"Therefore, my Delegation wishes to support the principle embodied in the U.S.A. proposal; that is to say, we completely agree that we should abolish the posts of the three C.C.I. Directors, and instead entrust their present functions to three Assistant Secretaries General, who should be appointed by, and be administratively responsible to, the Secretary General, with the proviso that the functions of the Secretary General and the three Assistant Secretaries General should be clearly and equitably defined and divided."

The Delegate of the United States of America, insisting on the advantages to be derived from his proposal, laid particular stress on the need for somebody who would take responsibility for the whole of the I.T.U.

The proposal submitted by the United States of America was put to the vote and rejected by 42 votes to 12, with 13 abstentions.

The only two proposals relative to Article 8 not yet considered were:

- No. 676 (India), referring to sub-paragraph 4 c) - this proposal was withdrawn by its author;
- No. 117 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) - consideration of this was postponed until the Committee had studied Article 12.

Study of Article 8 having been completed, the Committee decided to ask Working Group 1 (under Mr. Metzler) to draft the whole of Article 8.

---

The Delegate of Sweden made the following statement for inclusion in the summary record of the meeting:

"The Swedish Delegation believes that it is not necessary for the future to have two Assistant Secretaries General of the Union. This is only a remnant of the days of Madrid. We consider, however, that it evidently is essential to have a deputy for the Secretary General. This leads us to believe that the Secretariat could and should be organized with one Secretary General and one Deputy for him at the top without any influence whatsoever on the good functioning of the Union.

"At the present moment we do not want to make a formal proposal on this subject but confine ourselves to a recommendation to the Administrative Council to study this question and to forward a proposal on it to the next Plenipotentiary Conference in accordance with Proposal No. 706 to this conference by Norway, Denmark, Iceland and Sweden (Document No. 109)."

---

The Committee then passed to Article 9 of the Convention:  
The General Secretariat.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said he had found from careful examination of all the proposals relating to Article 9 that most of them favoured the status quo and dealt merely with drafting questions. He therefore proposed that the Committee should decide, in principle, to maintain the status quo with regard to Article 9 and submit the article, together with the proposals, to a Working Group, which could, if necessary, improve the wording.

The proposal was supported by the Delegates of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Pakistan. On the other hand, the Delegates of the United States of America, Italy, the Philippines and Egypt objected to it.

As his proposal was not unanimously supported, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. withdrew it.

Article 9, paragraph 1

This paragraph was the subject of two proposals that had no bearing on matters of principle: Proposal No. 147 (France) and Proposal No. 148 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Both proposals were withdrawn by their authors.

The Delegate of France proposed that the Editorial Committee should bear in mind the proposals to regroup the various paragraphs of an article, even if their authors had withdrawn them with a view to speeding up the debates.

This suggestion was approved by the Committee.

The only proposal on paragraph 1 that dealt with a matter of principle was Proposal No. 120 by the United States of America, to the effect that:

- the Secretary General should be appointed for five years,
- the Assistant Secretaries General should be appointed by the Secretary General, also for a period of five years.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. made the following statement:

"Proposal No. 120 by the United States of America changes the title of Article 9 and suggests that the General Secretariat should merely be called "Secretariat". We see no point in that.

"The clause specifying that the Secretary General shall be appointed by the Council already appears in Article 5, and therefore it need not be repeated in Article 9. The last sentence of Paragraph 1 of Proposal No. 120 is also incorrect, since we have already decided that the salaries of the Secretary General and all the high officials shall be fixed according to the scales adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference. We are therefore against paragraph 1.

"With regard to paragraph 1 bis, we are opposed to the Assistant Secretaries General being appointed by the Secretary General; we consider that it is more correct for them also to be appointed by the Council as Article 5 of the Convention envisages.

"Consequently we consider that proposal 120 as a whole should be rejected. We shall therefore vote against the proposal."

The limitation of five years placed upon the term of office of the Secretary General and Assistant Secretaries General in the proposal made by the United States of America and supported by the Delegations of China and India was opposed by the Delegates of France and Pakistan. Put to the vote, the proposal was rejected by 28 votes to 17 with 9 abstentions.

The proposal that Assistant Secretaries General should be appointed by the Secretary General was supported by the Delegates of China and Uruguay and opposed by the Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Put to the vote, the proposal was rejected by 31 votes to 15 with 11 abstentions.

The Delegate of India than said that he withdrew his proposal No. 686 (Document No. 56).

Article 9, paragraph 2.

Sub-paragraph a) There was no proposal on questions of principle.

Sub-paragraph b) The Committee agreed without comment to complete this sub-paragraph with the expression: "but the final decision regarding appointment or dismissal shall rest with the Secretary General", in conformity with proposal No. 148 (Paragraph 5) (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Sub-paragraphs c) to p) The Committee sent all proposals affecting these sub-paragraphs to the Working Group, including Proposal No. 586 of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Working Group should bear in mind the Annex to Document No. 184 which contained a supplementary sub-paragraph to paragraph 2 of Article 9 already adopted by the Committee.

Article 9, Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.

The Committee sent these paragraphs to the Working Group for study, inviting the Group's attention to paragraph 4 which also affected Article 10.

Article 9, Paragraph 6.

On the proposal of the Delegate of France, the Committee decided to delete the last words of sub-paragraph 6 (1), namely: "and shall be responsible solely to the Union

During the examination of this paragraph the Delegate of Argentina withdrew proposal No. 149 and said that his Administration would submit their suggestion to the Administrative Council as and when necessary.

The study of Article 9 being completed, Working Group 3 A was instructed to draw up the new draft.

The meeting rose at 20 minutes past 7 o'clock.

Rapporteurs :

R.V. Hatton - E. Luraschi  
J. Revoy - G. Terras

Chairman :

C. Ribeiro

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

The C.C.I.R.

What it is

What it does

How it does it

What it costs

- - - -

What it is :

The C.C.I.R. is one of the three technical advisory committees of the I.T.U. It was originally set up at Washington in 1927 and had its inaugural meeting at The Hague in 1929. It then had no permanent secretariat and its activities were confined to Plenary Meetings every 2 or 3 years. There was in fact no continuity of action. It was then technically an underdeveloped organization and it needed the "technical assistance" of a permanent secretariat to develop it. Such "technical assistance" was rendered at Atlantic City in 1947 when the C.C.I.R. was provided with a small permanent secretariat. It was already rather late and much time had been wasted in the twenty intervening years.

What it does :

The C.C.I.R. neither creates nor destroys frequencies but studies with the greatest care the conditions which underlie their use in order to point the way to their most efficient use by the different radio services so that the maximum number of stations can work in the finite radio spectrum and in the most efficient way. In order to do this a large number of technical and scientific questions have to be investigated and have to be kept up to date to keep pace with the rapid development of radio technique which is paralleled only in aviation.



Here are a few examples :

a) The propagation of radio waves

This is so large a subject that it has had to be divided into three parts - propagation of waves when they follow the surface of the earth, propagation of waves clear of the surface of the earth when it is controlled by the lower atmosphere where all the meteorological phenomena are manifest (tropospheric propagation) and finally propagation of waves clear of the surface of the earth when they penetrate the troposphere and their propagation is controlled by conditions existing between some 100 and 300 kilometres above the earth's surface in a region called the ionosphere where you cannot go but which the aurora borealis and australis make visible from time to time. And these aurorae considerably affect the propagation of radio waves and therefore have to be taken into account. While the bases of the theory underlying ground wave propagation had been firmly laid even 15 years ago, the theory is still being simplified and further developed. In the latter fields new phenomena have been discovered even during the past year which some think may have a direct influence on modern practical radio problems.

b) Sources of radio noise

An exact knowledge of radio propagation is however not sufficient to determine whether a radio circuit will work because the noise level at the receiver plays a dominant role and to this end the C.C.I.R. must also study the distribution of atmospheric radio noise over the whole surface of the globe. For this purpose the C.C.I.R. works in close contact with the World Meteorological Organization to ascertain the world distribution of thunderstorms - also taking into account their diurnal and seasonal occurrence. Apparatus to determine these data is now being designed.

A thorough and up to date knowledge of both propagation of waves and level of interference takes much of the guessing out of radio and enables the functioning of radio circuits to be predicted with reasonable accuracy thus avoiding much costly experiment.

c) Practical operating problems in radiocommunication

These problems concern questions such as telegraphic distortion, parasitic emissions, frequency stabilization of both transmitters and receivers, and the highly important question of the actual bandwidths necessary and sufficient to accomplish a given communication at a given speed. Other practical questions studied are the specification of an automatic alarm system for use on the maritime radio telephone distress frequency on small ships, modern radio direction and position-finding systems enabling ships and aircraft to determine their positions in a simple and accurate way, the linking up of radio and line telegraph, telephone and television systems.

Many of the fundamental problems underlying the study of the foregoing questions are considered from a unified point of view in the modern and recent theory of communication, the practical applications of which form the subject of another C.C.I.R. question in the study of which the other C.C.I.'s are collaborating. Fundamentally it involves such questions as avoidance of redundancy in language which induces a formulation of telegrams in as concise and yet clear a form as possible, the use of electrical as well as literal coding systems leading to what may be termed radio communication shorthand and cypher, the coding of speech and television signals in such a way that they occupy the least bandwidth and are still intelligible under variable conditions of radio noise. The communication system we each carry round with us in our human nervous system is an example which might well be followed. It generally conveys a lot of information in a relatively short time with a very restricted bandwidth.

The C.C.I.R. is also active in the practical field of broadcasting and television, many of the questions being studied having as their ultimate object the easier international exchange of broadcasting and television (black and white and in colour) programmes with the greatest possible economy in spectrum space consistent with the maintenance of good quality. Many practical results have already been obtained in both fields. Special attention is being given to problems met with specifically in broadcasting in tropical areas.

How it does it

43 Questions and 38 Study Programmes, only a few of which have been mentioned above, are being studied on a truly international basis by 14 C.C.I.R. Study Groups with chairmen of different nationalities. In the Study Groups we have the help of the best radio scientists and technicians in the world, both from administrations and private operating agencies. At present about half the administrations, members of the Union, and 10 private operating agencies take part in the active work of the C.C.I.R.

Study Groups work primarily by correspondence in order to save expense but meetings are occasionally necessary and are arranged at the request of the respective chairmen and are organized by the C.C.I.R. specialized secretariat. Much time is saved by very careful preparation, which makes it possible to get through the work and to arrive, generally at unanimous conclusions in a few days only.

All Study Groups meet immediately before and at the same place as, the Plenary Assemblies which are held normally every two years in conformity with Chapter 10, para. 1 of the General Regulations. The Plenary Assemblies issue C.C.I.R. Recommendations for sound international radio practice which are generally agreed unanimously.

To stimulate and coordinate the work of the Study Groups and the Plenary Assembly it is necessary to have a small whole time secretariat, which is primarily scientific and technical but which needs a minimum of secretarial and administrative help. In the C.C.I.R. specialized secretariat there are at present, on the technical side, the Director, the Vice-Director, three engineers - all specialized in different fields - and a technical operator, and on the administrative and secretarial side one administrative officer and five secretaries and typists who deal with documents and correspondence in the three working languages of the Union.

This small specialized secretariat has also been given several further technical tasks:

a) the preparation and publication of a book of antenna radiation diagrams to assist administrations and private operating agencies in the choice of the optimum type of antenna for different services;

b) the preparation of a complete and descriptive bibliography on the theory of communication and its practical application;

c) the application of a modern mathematical theorem to assist in the prediction of solar activity which determines the propagation characteristics of the ionosphere so that in future it will be easier to predict, six months ahead, which short waves will be most effective on each of the many radio circuits in use;

d) the experimental determination and statistical treatment of propagation data on the very short waves used, inter alia, for broadcasting and television.

From all the above it follows that the main tasks of the C.C.I.R. small specialized secretariat are primarily scientific and technical and that, to be efficiently carried out, they need efficient scientific and technical guidance. The administrative and secretarial part of the work, while important, is but auxiliary and should not be given greater prominence than necessary to ensure the smooth running and successful accomplishment of the specialized secretariat's main work.

#### What it costs

A reference to the figures given in Document No. 183 will show that the estimated ordinary expenditure for the specialized secretariat of the C.C.I.R. for the year 1953 is 9% only of the total estimated ordinary expenditure of the Union for that year.

v.d.P.  
L.W.H.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

L I S T   O F   D O C U M E N T S

No. 1 to No. 299

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
1	26 Sept.	General Secretariat	Organization of the Conference and Budget	
2	24 Sept.	General Secretariat	Distribution of Proposals	
3	25 Sept.	United Nations	Proposal No. 658	
4	25 Sept.	Japan	Proposal No. 659	
5	25 Sept.	Japan	Proposal No. 660	
6	25 Sept.	Switzerland	Proposal No. 661	
7	25 Sept.	General Secretariat	Communication from the Estonian S.S.R.	
8	25 Sept.	General Secretariat	Communication from the Lithuanian S.S.R.	
9	25 Sept.	General Secretariat	Communication from the Latvian S.S.R.	
10	26 Sept.	United Kingdom	Proposal No. 662	
11	26 Sept.	United Kingdom	Proposal No. 663	
12	1 Oct.	France	Proposal No. 664	
13	1 Oct.	France	Proposal No. 665	
14	1 Oct.	France	Proposal No. 666	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
15	1 Oct.	General Secretariat	Applications for Lower Class of Contributions: Ethiopia, Yemen, Viet-Nam	
16	1 Oct.	General Secretariat	Situation of the P.R. of Mongolia in Relation to the Union	
17	1 Oct.	General Secretariat	Situation of the P.R. of China in Relation to the Union	
18	1 Oct.	General Secretariat	Situation of the German Democratic Republic in Relation to the Union	
19	2 Oct.	General Secretariat	International Broadcasting Organization	
20	3 Oct.	U.S.S.R.	Proposal No. 667	See Corrigendum No. 31.
21	3 Oct.	Argentina	Rules of Procedure for the Plenipotentiary Conference	
22	3 Oct.	General Secretariat	Situation of Countries in Relation to the Atlantic City Convention	See Corrigendum No. 28 and Doc. No. 248
23	4 Oct.	General Secretariat	Meeting of Heads of Delegations : Agenda	
24	4 Oct.	U.S.S.R.	Proposal No. 668	
25	4 Oct.	U.S.S.R.	Proposal No. 669	
26	6 Oct.	General Secretariat	Corrigenda to the Report by the A.C. to the Plenipotentiary Conference	Applies to the English text only
27	6 Oct.	General Secretariat	Meeting of the Heads of Delegations - Minutes of the first Meeting	See Corrigendum No. 32

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
28	6 Oct.	General Secretariat	Corrigendum to Document No. 22	Applies to the English text only
29	6 Oct.	Secretariat	Agenda for the 1st Plenary Meeting	
30	6 Oct.	Secretariat	Proposed Distribution of Questions among the Organs of the Conference	
31	7 Oct.	U. S. S. R.	Corrigendum No.1 to Document No. 20	
32	7 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Document No. 27	
33	7 Oct.	India	Proposals Nos.670-671-672-673-674-675-676	See Docs. Nos. 45 to 52
34	8 Oct.	Chile	Proposals Nos.677-678-679	See Docs. Nos.80 to 82
35	8 Oct.	Chile	Proposals Nos. 680-681	
36	8 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 682	
37	7 Oct.	Secretariat	Agenda for the 2nd Plenary Meeting	
38	8 Oct.	Chairman	Communication from the International Red Cross Committee	
39	10 Oct.	U. S. S. R.	Statement by the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. on the Results of the E.A.R.C.	
40	8 Oct.	Hungarian People's Rep.	Proposal No. 683	
41	9 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 1st Plenary Meeting (1st Part)	See Doc. No.72 and Corrigendum Doc.Nos.92-125 and 198

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
42	8 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 1st Plenary Meeting (2nd Part)	See Corrigendum Docs.Nos.92 and 106
43	9 Oct.	Australia	Proposal No. 684	
44	9 Oct.	Secretariat	Schedule of Work for the 10th and 11th October	
45	10 Oct.	Switzerland	Proposal No. 685	
46	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 670	Replaces Doc.No.33
47	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 671	" " " "
48	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 672	" " " "
49	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 673	" " " "
50	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 674	" " " "
51	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 675	" " " "
52	10 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 676	" " " "
53	10 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 2nd Plenary Assembly (1st Part)	See Corrigendum Docs.Nos.87-92 and 125
54	10 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 2nd Plenary Assembly (2nd Part)	See Corrigendum Docs.Nos.106-107 and 125
55	11 Oct.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 1st Meeting	
56	13 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 686	
57	13 Oct.	India	Proposal No. 687	
58	11 Oct.	Secretariat	Schedule for Work for 13 to 18 October	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
59	11 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 3rd Plenary Assembly (1st Part)	See Corrigenda Nos.105 and 106
60	13 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 3rd Plenary Assembly (2nd Part)	See Corrigenda Nos 106, 125 and 198
61	11 Oct.	United Kingdom	Resolution regarding the work of the E.A.R.C.	See Corrigendum No. 73
62	13 Oct.	Sweden	Proposal No. 688	
63	13 Oct.	Committee 3	Report on the 2nd Meeting	
64 (revised)	21 Oct.	Committee 3	Report on the 3rd Meeting	
65	13 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 689	
66	13 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 690	
67	13 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 691	
68 (revised)	18 Oct.	Committee 6	Report on the 1st Meeting	
69	14 Oct.	United States	Proposal No. 692	
70	14 Oct.	United States	Proposal No. 693	
71	14 Oct.	United States	Proposal No. 694	
72	14 Oct.	Secretariat	Addendum No.1 to the Minutes of the 1st Plenary Meeting	See Minutes of 1st Meeting (Doc.No.41)
73	14 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc.No.61	
74	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 695	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
75	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 696	
76	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 697	
77	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 698	
78	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 699	
79	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 700	
80	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 677	Replaces Doc.No.34
81	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 678	Replaces Doc.No.34
82	14 Oct.	Chile	Proposal No. 679	Replaces Doc.No.34
83	14 Oct.	Committee 4	Report on the 1st Meeting	
84 (revised)	20 Oct.	General Secretariat	Philippine Request for Change of Class	
85	15 Oct.	Secretariat	Communications relative to the Representation of Countries at the Conference	See Doc. No. 97
86	15 Oct.	Portugal	Proposal No. 701	
87	15 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to the Minutes of the 2nd Meeting (Part 1)	
88	16 Oct.	Committee 3	Report on the 4th Meeting	
89	15 Oct.	Committee 3	1st Report by Committee 3	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
90	16 Oct.	Committee 1	Report on the 1st Meeting	
91	16 Oct.	General Secretariat	Schedule of Work for 20th to 25th October	
92	18 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Docs. Nos. 41, 42 and 53	
93	19 Oct.	Secretariat	Agenda for the 4th Plenary Meeting	
94	19 Oct.	General Secretariat	Situation of the I.T.U. Personnel	
95 (revised)	25 Oct.	Committee 4	Report on the 2nd Meeting	
96 (revised)	20 Oct.	Committee 4	Report on the 3rd Meeting	
97	20 Oct.	Secretariat	Communication concerning the Representation of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan.	
98	20 Oct.	Chairman of Committee 3	Number and Method of Electing Members of the I.F.R.B.	
99	20 Oct.	Committee 3	Report on the 5th Meeting	
100	21 Oct.	Secretariat	List of Documents 1 to 99	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
101	20 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 702	
102	20 Oct.	United States of America	Proposal No. 703	
103	20 Oct.	United States of America	Proposal No. 704	
104	20 Oct.	Committee 5	Report of the first Meeting	
105	20 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc.No. 59	
106	20 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Docs. Nos. 42, 54, 59, and 60	
107	20 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 2 to Doc. No. 54	
108	20 Oct.	Denmark	Proposal No. 705	
109	20 Oct.	(Norway (Denmark (Iceland (Sweden	Proposal No. 706	
110	21 Oct.	Committee 5	Agenda for the 2nd Meeting	
111	21 Oct.	Committee 3	Report of the 6th Meeting	
112	21 Oct.	United States of America	Proposal No. 707	
113	21 Oct.	United States of America	Proposal No. 708	
114	21 Oct.	General Secretariat	Request for Change of Class: Paraguay	
115	21 Oct.	Netherlands	Proposal No. 709	
116	22 Oct.	Secretariat	Language System of the Universal Postal Union	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
117 (Revised)	24 Oct.	Chairman of the I.F.R.B.	Statement by Mr. Dellamula to the 7th Meeting of Committee 3	
118	24 Oct.	Committee 4	Report on the 4th Meeting	
119	23 Oct.	United States of America	Proposal No. 710	
120	24 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 4th Meeting of the Plenary Assembly (1st part)	See Corri- gendum 198
121	27 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 4th Meeting of the Plenary Assembly (Part Two)	See Corri- gendum Docs. 164, 179 and 198
122	23 Oct.	General Secretariat	Application for a lower Class of Contribution: Oversea Terr- itories of the French Republic	
123	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 711	
124	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 712	
125	28 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Documents Nos. 41, 42, 53, 54 and 60	
126	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 713	
127	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 714	
128	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 715	
129	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 716	
130	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 717	
131	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 718	
132	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 719	
133	24 Oct.	Brazil	Proposal No. 720	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
134	23 Oct.	Committee 3	Report of the 7th Meeting	
135	24 Oct.	Switzerland	Proposal No. 721	
136	27 Oct.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 5th Meeting of the Plenary Assembly	See Corrigendum 198
137	25 Oct.	Secretariat	Schedule for week 28 Oct. to 2 Nov.	See amendment Docs. Nos. 152 and 153
138	24 Oct.	W.G. 3 of Committee 5	1st Report of W.G. 3 to Committee 5	
139	3 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 2nd Meeting	
140	28 Oct.	Committee 7	Minutes of the 1st Meeting	
141	27 Oct.	Committee 3	Report of the 8th Meeting	See Corrigendum Doc. No. 157
142	27 Oct.	Committee 3	2nd Report by Committee 3	
143	27 Oct.	France	Proposal No. 723	
144	27 Oct.	France	Proposal No. 724	
145	28 Oct.	Committee 3	Report on the 9th Meeting	
146	28 Oct.	General Secretariat	Report by the Chairman of the Management Board of the I.T.U. Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds	
147	28 Oct.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 5th Meeting	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
148	29 Oct.	Committee 2	Minutes of the 1st Meeting	
149	20 Oct.	Committee 2	Minutes of the 2nd Meeting	
150	29 Oct.	Committee 2	Minutes of the 3rd Meeting	
151	29 Oct.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 6th Meeting	
152 (Revised)	29 Oct.	Secretariat	Schedule for Thursday, 30 Oct.	
153	29 Oct.	Committee 3	Report on the 10th Meeting	
154	29 Oct.	Committee 3	3rd Report by Committee 3	
155	29 Oct.	General Secretariat	Facilities and Privileges granted to Specialized Agencies	See Corrigendum Doc. No. 156
156	30 Oct.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 155	
157	30 Oct.	Committee 3	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 141	
158	30 Oct.	Secretariat	Schedule for 31 Oct.	
159	30 Oct.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 7th Meeting	
160	30 Oct.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 8th Meeting	
161	30 Oct.	Committee 7	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 140	Concerns the Spanish Text only

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
162	30 Oct.	Committee 3	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 142	Concerns the Spanish text only
163	31 Oct.	Committee 7	Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance	
164	2 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 121	
165	31 Oct.	Committee 5	1st Report by Committee 5	See Doc. No. 185
166	31 Oct.	Secretariat	Schedule for Week 3 to 8 Nov.	See amendment Doc. No. 170
167	31 Oct.	Committee 3	Agenda for the 14th Meeting	
168	2 Nov.	Chairman	Request for a lower Contributory Class: Guatemala	
169	2 Nov.	Committee 5	Report of the 3rd Meeting	
170	2 Nov.	Secretariat	Schedule for 3 Nov.	
171	3 Nov.	Committee 4	Rules of Procedure of the Conference	
172	3 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 136	
173	3 Nov.	Committee 7	Summary Record of the 2nd Meeting	
174	3 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 11th Meeting	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
175	3 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 12th Meeting	
176	3 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 13th Meeting	
177 (Revised)	3 Nov.	United Kingdom	Draft Resolution	
178	3 Nov.	France	Draft Resolution	
179	3 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 2 to Doc. No. 121	
180	3 Nov.	Secretariat	Document 969/CA 6 of the Administrative Council	
181	3 Nov.	Secretariat	Agenda for the 6th Plenary Meeting	
182	4 Nov.	General Secretariat	Classification of Members of the Union for the Payment of Contributions	
183	3 Nov.	General Secretariat	Ordinary Budget - 1953	
184	4 Nov.	Sub-Committee 3 A	Report of Sub-Committee 3-A to Committee 3	See Corrigendum 202
185	4 Nov.	Committee 5	Note on the Question of Arrears	Supplement to Doc. No. 165
186	3 Nov.	Committee 4	Rules of Procedure of the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference	
187	4 Nov.	General Secretariat	Report by the Secretary General: I.T.U. Participation in the expanded Programme of Technical Assistance	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
188 (Revised)	4 Nov.	Committee 4	1st Report by Committee 4	
189	4 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 4th Meeting	
190	4 Nov.	W.H.O.	Epidemiological Telegrams issued by the W.H.O.	
191	5 Nov.	Administrative Council	Supplementary Report by the Administrative Council	
192	5 Nov.	General Secretariat	Comparison between the position of the I.T.U. Staff and that of the Staff of the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies.	
193	5 Nov.	Committee 5	Paragraph 5 of Article 14 of the Convention	
194	5 Nov.	Secretariat	Agenda for the 7th Plenary Meeting	
195	5 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 5th Meeting	
196	5 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 6th Meeting	
197	5 Nov.	Committee 2	1st Report by the Chairman of Committee 2	
198	5 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Docs. Nos. 60, 120, 121 and 136	
199	5 Nov.	Committee 7	Summary Record of the 3rd Meeting	
200	6 Nov.	Secretariat	List of Documents Nos. 1 to 199	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
201	6 Nov.	General Secretariat	Request by the World Federation of United Nations Associations	
202	6 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Document No.184	
203	6 Nov.	Working Group 3 / 1	Drafts of Resolutions and a Protocol	
204	6 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 14th Meeting	
205	7 Nov.	Working Group 4/2	Report to Committee	
206	6 Nov.	Argentina and Japan	Withdrawal of Proposals	
207	6 Nov.	Committee 7	Agenda for the 4th Meeting	
208	7 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 15th Meeting	
209	6 Nov.	Spain	Proposal No. 725	
210	6 Nov.	Spain	Proposal No. 726	
211	6 Nov.	Spain	Proposal No. 727	
212	6 Nov.	Secretariat	Budget and Expenditures of the Conference	
213	6 Nov.	Argentina United States France	Proposal concerning Article 10, paragraph 1 (f)	
214	7 Nov.	Secretariat	Schedule for week 17 to 22 November	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
215	7 Nov.	Secretariat	Minutes of the Plenary Assembly (Special Meeting)	
216	8 Nov.	Administrative Council	Examination of the Financial Management of the Union at the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference	
217	20 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 7th Meeting	
218 (Revised)	20 Nov.	Working Group 5/2	First report by the Group	
219	8 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 16th Meeting	
220	10 Nov.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 6th Meeting of the Plenary Assembly	See Corrigendum Doc.No.250
221	19 Nov.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 7th Meeting of the Plenary Assembly	See Corrigendum Doc.No.291
222	10 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc.No.210	
223	10 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc.No.211	
224	17 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 9th Meeting	
225	17 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 10th Meeting	
226	17 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 11th Meeting	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
227	17 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 12th Meeting	
228	17 Nov.	United Nations	Memorandum concerning tele- communications of the United Nations	
229	17 Nov.	Working Group 5/3	2nd Report by the Group	See Corrigendum Doc.No.238
230	17 Nov.	France	Proposal No. 728	
231	17 Nov.	France	Proposal No. 729	
232	17 Nov.	France	Proposal No. 730	
233	17 Nov.	Committee 7	Draft of first report of Committee 7	
234	17 Nov.	Committee 7	Agenda for the 5th Meeting	
235	18 Nov.	Committee 5	Sanctions	
236	18 Nov.	Committee 5	Article 14, paragraph 7 of the Convention	
237	18 Nov.	Sub-Working Group of Working Group 5/2	Report by Sub-Working Group	
238	18 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No.1 to Doc.No.229	
239	18 Nov.	Italy	Proposal No. 731	
240	18 Nov.	Administrative Council	Premises for the I.T.U. in Geneva	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
241	20 Nov.	U. R. S. S.	Proposal No.732	
242	18 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 17th Meeting	
243	18 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Document No. 196	
244	19 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 8th Meeting	
245	20 Nov.	Committee 7	Summary Record of the 4th Meeting	
246	19 Nov.	Italy	Replies to questions raised in Doc.No. 235	
247	19 Nov.	Italy	Replies to questions raised in Doc.No. 236	
248	19 Nov.	General Secretariat	Supplement to Documents Nos. 22 and 28	
249	20 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 18th Meeting	
250	19 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Document No. 220	
251	19 Nov.	Committee 3	4th report by Committee 3	See Corrigen- dum Doc.No.286
252	19 Nov.	United States	Proposal No. 733	
253	20 Nov.	Plenary Assembly	Rules of Procedure of the Conference	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
254	20 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Docs. Nos. 246 and 247	
255	20 Nov.	Committee 5	Article 14, paragraph 4 of the Convention	
256	20 Nov.	Committee 5	Draft Protocol	
257	20 Nov.	Chairman	Application by the International Federation of Newspaper Proprietors and Editors	
258	20 Nov.	United Nations	Freedom of Information	
259	20 Nov.	UNESCO	UNESCO Interests in Telecommunication Matters	
260	20 Nov.	Committee 5	Draft Resolution	
261	20 Nov.	Working Group 6/1	Report by the Group	
262	20 Nov.	General Secretariat	Request for a lower contributory class: Saudi Arabia	
263	20 Nov.	General Secretariat	Request for a higher contributory class: Japan	
264	20 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 19th Meeting	
265	21 Nov.	General Secretariat	Desiderata of the I.T.U. Staff Association	
266	21 Nov.	Switzerland	Withdrawal of Proposals	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
267	24 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of the 9th Meeting	
268 (Revised)	21 Nov.	Committee 5	2nd report by Committee 5	See Corrigendum Doc. No. 288
269	21 Nov.	Committee 7	First report by Committee 7	
270	21 Nov.	France	Choice of class of contribution	
271	21 Nov.	Secretariat	Schedule for week 24 to 29 November	
272	21 Nov.	Brazil	Withdrawal of Proposal	
273	22 Nov.	Committee 1	Recommendations by the Steering Committee	
274	24 Nov.	Committee 7	Summary Record of the 5th Meeting	
275	22 Nov.	Committee 7	Draft Resolution	
276	22 Nov.	Committee 7	Agenda for the 6th Meeting	
277	22 Nov.	Committee 2	Summary Record of the 4th Meeting	See Corrigendum Doc. No. 296
278	22 Nov.	Committee 5	Estimated ceiling of expenses	
279		Committee 5	Summary Record of the 10th Meeting	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
280	24 Nov.	Sub-Committee 4 A	Report by the Sub- Committee	
281	24 Nov.	New Zealand	Withdrawal of Pro- posals	
282	24 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 13th Meeting	
283	24 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 14th Meeting	
284	24 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 15th Meeting	
285	24 Nov.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 16th Meeting	
286	24 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Document No. 251	
287	24 Nov.	Committee 5	Third Report by Committee 5	
288	24 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Docu- ment No. 268-revised	
289	24 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 20th Meeting	
290	24 Nov.	Secretariat	Agenda for the 8th Meeting of the Plenary Assembly	
291	25 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Document No. 221	
292	25 Nov.	France	Withdrawal of Pro- posals	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
293	25 Nov.	Working Group 4/1	First Report by the Group	
294	25 Nov.	New Zealand	Withdrawal of Proposals	
295	25 Nov.	India	Withdrawal of Proposals	
296	25 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Document No. 277	
297	25 Nov.	Committee 7	Second Report by Committee 7	
298	25 Nov.	Committee 4	Second Report by Committee 4	
299	25 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of the 21st Meeting	