



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. 301-400
- The complete set of conference documents includes Document No. 1-537

DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

Considering:

that it is indispensable to maintain and extend international co-operation for the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds,

Further considering,

that every country, Member of the Union, which ensures the international transit of telephone and telegraph lines across its territory, assumes by so doing the responsibility of contributing to the efficient operation of the international telephone and telegraph network,

instructs the C.C.I.F. and the C.C.I.T., at the request of one or several countries, Members of the Union, to proceed as follows:

1. If one or more of the countries concerned sends them statistics or tables of technical disturbances to the international telephone or telegraph traffic passing through their respective territories, or any other relevant information or data, the C.C.I. concerned shall proceed to a careful study of these documents and shall assemble any other supplementary information required.
2. The C.C.I. concerned shall publish the result of its study of these documents, taking into consideration the information assembled, relating to the installation, maintenance and operation of the telecommunication channels in question.
3. The C.C.I. concerned shall propose to the Administrations concerned measures for re-establishing and maintaining the efficient operation of international telecommunications in the area in question.



Reasons:

In some parts of Europe, the international operation of telephone and telegraph services frequently suffers from interruptions of either long or short duration, which considerably reduces the attractiveness and the reliability of the telephone and telegraph services.

In spite of the provisions of paragraph 1 a) b) and c) of Article 3 of the Convention, the Union with its present organization does not appear to be in a position to deal with these matters officially and the result is that telecommunication services suffer.

PROPOSAL ADOPTED BY COMMITTEE 5

Committee 5 has adopted the proposal reproduced below :

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 a 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:

hand in, up to 29 November 1952, notifications of change of class within that scale.

2. The Conference will consider the effects of these notifications at the same time as the effects of those applications already submitted to the Conference.

3. The delegations which by the above date have not handed in notifications of change of class will be considered to have accepted their present class under the new fiscal limit.

4. However, such delegations, after consideration of the consequences entailed for their countries by the notifications of change of class mentioned in paragraph 2 above, shall be entitled, in their turn to submit an immediate application for a lower class, by midday of the 2nd December 1952.

Chairman of Committee 5

K. Prasada

(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.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 303-E

25 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

SECOND REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE 3-A

TO COMMITTEE 3

The Sub-Committee has held one meeting in order to study the questions referred to it by Committee 3 at its 21st meeting on November 21, 1952.

It submits to Committee 3 a draft revised text of Art. 9 of the Convention (annexed).

Chairman of Sub-Committee 3-A

Gunnar Pedersen

Annex: 1

A N N E X

SUB-COMMITTEE 3 A

DRAFT TEXT FOR ARTICLE 9

Paragraph 1

(1) The General Secretariat shall be directed by a Secretary General, assisted by two Assistant Secretaries General, who shall all be nationals of Member countries.

(2) The Secretary General shall be responsible to the Administrative Council for all duties entrusted to the General Secretariat.

(3) The Administrative Council shall decide on the numbers and grading of the staff of the General Secretariat, taking into account the general directives given by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Paragraph 2

The Secretary General shall:

a) appoint the staff of the General Secretariat in accordance with any directives of the Plenipotentiary Conference and the rules established by the Administrative Council; (unchanged)

b) organize the work of the General Secretariat and undertake administrative arrangements for the specialized secretariats of the permanent organs; and ensure that in those specialized secretariats the administrative and financial Regulations approved by the Administrative Council are applied.

These specialized secretariats, under the Secretary General's supervision for administrative purposes only, shall work directly under the orders of the Heads of the permanent organs.

The Secretary General shall appoint the staff of each specialized secretariat in agreement with the Head of the permanent organ concerned and on the basis of the latter's choice, but the final decision regarding appointment or dismissal shall rest with the Secretary General.

(Ann. to Doc. 303-E)

c) carry on secretarial work preparatory to, and following, Conferences of the Union; (unchanged)

d) provide, where appropriate in cooperation with the inviting Government, the secretariat of every conference of the Union, and when so requested, or provided in the Regulations annexed hereto, the Secretariat of meetings of the permanent organs of the Union or meetings placed under its auspices and may, when so requested, provide the secretariat of other telecommunication meetings on a contractual basis;

e) keep up to date the official lists other than the master registers and such other essential records as may be related to the duties of the I.F.R.B., compiled from data supplied for this purpose by the permanent organs of the Union or by Administrations;

f) publish the recommendations and principal reports of the permanent organs of the Union; (unchanged)

g) publish international and regional telecommunication agreements communicated to them by the parties thereto and keep up to date records of them; (unchanged)

g bis) publish such data concerning the assignment and utilization of frequencies as are prepared by the I.F.R.B. in the discharge of its duties;

h) prepare, publish and keep up to date with the assistance, where appropriate, of the other permanent organs of the Union;

1. a record of the composition and structure of the Union; (unchanged)

2. the general statistics and the official service documents of the Union as proscribed by the Regulations annexed hereto; (unchanged)

3. such other documents as the conferences or the Administrative Council may direct; (unchanged)

i) distribute the published documents; (unchanged)

j) collect and publish, in suitable form, data both national and international regarding telecommunication throughout the world; (unchanged)

k) collect and publish such information as would be of assistance to Members and Associate Members regarding the development of technical methods with a view to achieving the most efficient operation of telecommunication services and especially the best possible use of radio frequencies so as to diminish interference; (unchanged)

l) publish periodically, with the help of information put at his disposal or which he may collect, including that which he may obtain from other international organizations, a journal of general information and documentation concerning telecommunication; (unchanged)

m) prepare an annual budget for submission to the Administrative Council which, after approval by the Council, shall be transmitted for information to all Members and Associate Members; (unchanged)

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 be submitted to the next plenipotentiary conference for examination and final approval; (unchanged)

o) prepare an annual report on the activities of the Union which, after approval by the Administrative Council, shall be transmitted to all Members and Associate Members;

p) perform all other secretarial functions of the Union (unchanged).

Paragraph 3.

The Secretary General or one of the two Assistant Secretaries General shall participate, in a consultative capacity, in Plenary Assemblies of International Consultative Committees and may so participate in all conferences of the Union; the Secretary General or his designated representative may participate in a consultative capacity in all other meetings of the Union.

Paragraph 4.

Delete

Paragraph 5.

The paramount consideration in the recruitment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing for the Union the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard must be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible. (unchanged)

Paragraph 6.

(1) In the performance of their duties the Secretary General, the Assistant Secretaries General and the staff must not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Union. They must refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials.

(2) Each Member and Associate Member undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General, the Assistant Secretaries General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities. (unchanged)

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

METHOD OF ELECTING MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

BY THE BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

1. The election of the Administrative Council by the Buenos Aires Conference can be envisaged in two different ways:

- a procedure similar to that adopted by the Atlantic City Conference and which involves elections by two counts,
- a procedure by a single count as suggested in Proposal No. 725 (Document No. 209).

2. In both cases the need to take into consideration that the election must take place on a geographical basis results in the Members of the Union being divided into several regions.

To this end, the annex attached hereto gives the distribution in four regions adopted by the Atlantic City Conference. To the countries listed in the Atlantic City Document have been added those countries which have become Members of the Union since 1948.

o
o o

3. First solution: procedure adopted at Atlantic City

The election would be carried out in the following way:

First, the countries in the same region would meet to nominate candidates with a view to the subsequent general election. Following the method adopted at Atlantic City, the number of candidates proposed for each of the regions, A, B, and D, should not be less than seven or more than eight. For Region C, the number should not be less than four or more than five.

4. The procedure to be adopted for regional elections could be as follows:

- a) Each meeting would be presided over by the Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Conference;
- b) A secret vote on the rostrum with a view to nominating candidate countries (seven or eight countries for regions A, B and D, and four or five for region C), each country exclusively possessing the right to propose its own candidature;
- c) Each delegation marks on its voting slip the names of, at the most, eight countries for regions A, B, and D, and at the most, five for region C, as nominations to the Administrative Council;
- d) The seven or eight countries (four or five for region C) which receive the greatest number of votes, are declared to have been chosen for inclusion in the list. When the elections result in regional lists of more than eight or five candidates, as the case may be, owing to a tie between countries at the end of the list, a new vote will be taken to select from the countries which tied, one or more which should be included in the list for transmission to the Plenary Assembly. Subsequently, the remaining country or countries which tied shall be mentioned in the minutes of the vote in the order given by the first count. These minutes shall be communicated to the Plenary Assembly at the same time as the list drawn up in accordance with the above procedure.

5. At the second stage, the Plenary Assembly will subsequently hold a general election as follows:

- a) Each delegation will receive four voting slips of different colours (each colour corresponding to a region) listing, respectively, the names of countries proposed as candidates by the different regions;
- b) For regions A, B, and D, each Delegation may vote for at least five countries, and in region C, for at least 3 countries. Any voting slip containing more than 5 names for regions A, B, and D, or more than three names for Region C will be invalid. Each Delegation will be requested, by nominal roll, to place its four voting slips in the urn;

c) The following will be declared elected Members of the Administrative Council:

- the five countries which obtain most votes for regions A, B and D;
- the three countries which obtain most votes for region C.

6. Second solution: Procedure using a single count.

This procedure assumes that countries have previously been grouped into a certain number of regions, as for the procedure adopted at Atlantic City.

7. Candidatures will be sent in writing to the Chairman of the Conference.

8. The election will take place as follows:

a) Each Delegation will receive a single voting slip bearing the names of candidates, grouped by regions;

b) ~~Each~~ ^{Each} country should delete from its voting slip all except a maximum of five names for each of the regions A, B and D, and three names as a maximum for region C. Voting slips bearing respectively for each region more than five or more than three names will be considered invalid;

c) After the count a list will be drawn up of candidate countries in each region, in decreasing order of the number of votes obtained;

d) If several countries tie for the fifth position or the third position, as the case may be, a special vote will be taken to decide between the countries concerned;

e) The following will be declared elected members of the Administrative Council:

- the five countries which obtained most votes for regions A, B and D and the three countries which obtained most votes for region C.

9. The submission of the two solutions above is made solely to facilitate discussion in the Plenary Assembly which has, of course, to decide upon the method of election to adopt.

Chairman of the Conference:

M. A. Andrada

Annex: 1

A N N E X

REGION A - AMERICAN REGION

Argentina (Republic of)
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
Colombia (Republic of)
Costa Rica
Cuba
Ecuador
El Salvador (Republic of)
United States of America

Guatemala
Haiti (Republic of)
Honduras (Republic of)
Mexico
Nicaragua
Panama
Peru
Uruguay (Oriental Republic of)
Venezuela (United States of)
Territories of the United States
of America.

REGION B - WESTERN EUROPE AND AFRICAN REGION

Austria
Belgium
Vatican City State
Colonies, Protectorates, Oversea Territories and
Territories under mandate or trusteeship of the
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern
Ireland
Belgium Congo and Territories of Ruanda Urundi
Denmark
Spain
France
Greece
Ireland
Iceland
Italy
Liberia
Luxembourg

Monaco
Norway
Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands
Antilles, New Guinea
French Protectorates of Morocco
and Tunisia
German Federal Republic
Southern Rhodesia
United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
Sweden
Switzerland (Confederation)
Oversea Territories of the French
Republic and Territories
administered as such
Portuguese Oversea Territories
Union of South Africa and
Territory of South Africa
Spanish Zone of Morocco and
totality of Spanish Possessions.

REGION C - EASTERN EUROPE AND NORTHERN ASIA

Albania (People's Republic of)	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist
Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	Republic
Bulgaria (People's Republic of)	Roumanian People's Republic
Finland	Czechoslovakia
Hungarian People's Republic	Union of Soviet Socialist
Poland (People's Republic of)	Republics
Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia	

REGION D - OTHER COUNTRIES

Afghanistan	Philippines (Republic of the)
Saudi Arabia (Kingdom of)	Syrian Republic
Australia (Commonwealth of)	Thailand
Burma	Turkey
Cambodia (Kingdom of)	Viet-Nam (State of)
Ceylon	Yemen
China	
Korea (Republic of)	
Egypt	
Ethiopia	
India	
Indonesia (Republic of)	
Iran	
Iraq	
Israel (State of)	
Japan	
Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of the)	
Laos (Kingdom of)	
Lebanon	
New Zealand	
Pakistan	

Note : At Atlantic City, Iceland was included in Region A but has since requested to be included in Region B.

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 305-E
26 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 8

AGENDA FOR THE MEETING TO BE HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 1952

Consideration of texts drawn up by the
Plenary Assembly at its meeting on 26 November.

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No.306-E
26 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

CORRIGENDUM No.1 TO DOCUMENT No.304-E

(Method of electing Members of
the Administrative Council)

Page 3, paragraph 8, sub-paragraph b) :

For "No country", read: "Each country".

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 6

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP TO COMMITTEE 6

1. Organization and Work of the Working Group

The Working Group was set up at the first meeting of Committee 6 on October 10, 1952 in accordance with the spirit of Resolution 83 of the Administrative Council to review the budget of the Conference.

The Group held an organizational meeting on October 30, 1952 and subsequently held six meetings, in which representatives of Argentina, Brazil, the United Kingdom, the United States Territories and Yugoslavia participated. The Group was assisted by Mr. Jean Millot and Mr. René Prélaz as representatives of the Secretary General and is grateful to them for their wholehearted cooperation and their patience in furnishing the information needed by the group in the accomplishment of its task.

In determining the scope of its work, the Group formed the opinion that its terms of reference should extend beyond a mere examination of the budget expenditures, in view of the facts that no action had been taken by the Conference as yet to approve Resolution No. 83 of the Administrative Council and that the agreement between the Secretary General and the Argentine Administration had merely been "noted" by the Council in connection with the adoption of the extraordinary budget for 1952. It was felt that it would be helpful to Committee 6 to have the benefit of any comments which might serve the Conference in approving the work of the Administrative Council and in establishing guidance for both the Secretariat and the Council in making arrangements for future conferences or meetings of the Union. The Group agreed to approach its tasks from this viewpoint, subject to the approval of Committee 6.

In addition to the foregoing, the Group took the task, at the request of the Chairman of Committee 6, of studying the financial repercussions of the reservations made by certain countries at the Fifth Plenary Meeting with regard to paying the costs for more than one language.

The Group therefore organized its work as follows:

- a) Study of the financial repercussions of the language reservations.
- b) Study and examination of the budget items for the Conference.
- c) Review of the agreement between the Secretary General and the Argentine Administration.
- d) Examination of the expenditures of the Conference.

The results of the Group's study of the language question are included in Document No. 261 of November 20 which was submitted separately to Committee 6.

The results of the Group's work thus far on its other tasks are included in this report which was adopted at its 6th meeting.

2. Background

The agreement between the Secretary General and the Argentine Administration (Document No. 1) was negotiated and signed September 25, 1951 at Buenos Aires, and a draft budget for the Conference was prepared on the basis of that agreement.

Paragraph B (5) of Resolution No. 83 specified that the agreement reached with the inviting government and the draft budget shall be submitted for approval to the Administrative Council if the latter holds a Session prior to the conference or meeting. In connection with the adoption of the extraordinary budget for 1952 in which the budget for this Conference was included, the Administrative Council at its 7th Session considered certain parts of the agreement and "took note" of those parts it had considered. (Documents Nos. 1139, 1173 and 1185 CA/7).

It is assumed that the Council expected the full agreement would require the formal approval of the Plenipotentiary Conference, as would its action in formulating Resolution No. 83 in the first instance.

3. Resolution No. 83

In view of the organizational difficulties resulting from the action of certain conferences in extending their duration or in scheduling additional sessions, and the financial effects thereof, the action of the Administrative Council in adopting Resolution No. 83 is felt to be completely justified and should have the full approval of the Plenipotentiary Conference. The Resolution provides guidance and directives for the Secretariat in dealing with the affairs of the conference or meeting as well as for the conference or meeting itself and its usefulness and worth is demonstrated in the history of the activities of the Union since its adoption. The Group therefore recommends that Committee 6 approve the resolution attached as Annex 1 to this report and forward it to the Plenary Assembly for adoption.

4. Agreement between the Secretary General and the Argentine Administration

In examining the agreement, the Group noted the following points which it is believed should be brought to the attention of the Conference:

- a. Resolution No. 83 states with respect to expenses covered by advances of the inviting administration:

"B.2. These expenses shall be refunded to the inviting administration by the Secretary General of the Union, as soon as the latter has decided upon the shares to be allocated to those taking part in the conferences or meetings."

The terms of the present agreement specify in this connection:

"2c) In accordance with the conditions specified in Administrative Council Resolution No. 83 for the reimbursement of advances, the Secretary General shall credit the Argentine Administration with the funds advanced by that Administration under sub-paragraph a)."

Although it is understood that the intent of the provisions of Resolution No. 83, in admitting the possibility of advances by the inviting administration, is to facilitate for Members their payment of their share of the costs of the conference or meeting by permitting them to pay part of their share of the costs in the currency of the funds advanced by the inviting administration; in this instance, the agreement contemplates the repayment of the funds advanced in Swiss francs to accrue to the credit of the Argentine Administration. The costs of this Conference, therefore, will be payable by Members only in Swiss francs.

- b. The terms of the agreement further specify:

"2a

The funds advanced by the Argentine Administration shall be free of interest."

According to the provisions of the quoted paragraphs in (a) above, the credit at the disposal of the Argentine Administration is subject to claim as soon as the contributory shares for the Conference are decided and the accounts sent out. If the Argentine Administration does not claim its credit immediately on the date it will become payable (i.e. the date when the accounts are sent out) then the Union will benefit to the extent of any payment of interest on contributory shares by Members.

- c. In his report on the advances to finance the Conference at the first meeting of Committee 6 (Document No.68), the Secretary General expressed the hope that there might be an improvement favourable to the Conference in the rate of exchange of 1 Swiss franc to 3.2405 Argentine pesos which is the rate set by the Central Bank of Argentina for the exchange between Argentine currency and Swiss francs.

The agreement specifies that the exchange of Swiss francs for Argentine pesos and vice versa shall be at the rate set by the Central Bank. However, the rate of exchange

at the headquarters of the Union is 4.80 pesos to 1 Swiss franc. Since the funds for the Conference costs in Buenos Aires can be used at the rate of only 3.2405 pesos to 1 Swiss franc and since the accounts for the Conference are kept in one single account in Swiss francs, the effect in terms of the cost to the Union for the Conference is that the Conference expenses are increased proportionately by the difference in the exchange ratio between 4.80 and 3.25 pesos.

- d. Regarding the staff of the Conference Secretariat, it was noted that two lists of personnel were prepared, one list for those persons to be recruited with the assistance of the Argentine Administration, and the other for those to be sent from or recruited by the Secretariat at Geneva. These two lists created some confusion in analysis, especially since the numbers of persons involved were altered as between the two lists after the agreement was signed. It is noted that the total numbers of personnel listed were not in every case hired and the Chief of the Secretariat is to be commended for his action in reducing the total numbers where possible and employing only those persons necessary for the tasks. For future guidance, however, in drafting similar agreements, the personnel requirements could more desirably be listed as an annex and the Secretariat given certain flexibility in determining the final list dependent upon changing circumstances, within the budget limit for the purpose. The Group noted exceptionally that the list of persons required included that of a liaison officer (who receives a remuneration of 90 Swiss francs per day). The functions of this officer have no connection with the substantive work of the Conference but deal merely with organization matters. The group is of the opinion that this expense is extraneous and could not occur if, for instance, the conference were held at the seat of the Union. It is understood that such an expense was incurred at only one other previous conference of the Union - that of the Telephone and Telegraph Conference in Paris. That instance and the present one should not be used as a precedent in organizing the staff of the Secretariat for any future conferences or meetings of the Union.
- e. With regard to the installations, services and equipment, it is noted here too that circumstances regarding requirements for and the availability of space changed considerably between the time the agreement was drawn up and the time when space was prepared for the Conference. The space available to this conference is considered of course to be more than adequate and it is only desired to suggest in

this connection that future agreements need not be so rigid in detailed specifications which could more properly be left the subject of correspondence and arrangement between the Secretariat and the inviting administration within the limits of the budget for the purpose.

On the subject of the budget for premises, it is noted that the agreement specifies a sum of 75,000 Swiss francs to accrue to the credit of the Argentine Administration as the Union's contribution to the expenses incurred by the Argentine Administration in the preparation of the premises for the conference. The Argentine Administration has undoubtedly been faced with a far greater expenditure than the sum mentioned in the preparation of these premises for the comfort and convenience of the delegates and the conference should be grateful for its generosity. However, it would ease the financial burden to the Union and to the inviting administration concerned if, whenever possible in the future, efforts are made to select adequate available space which will not require extensive alteration.

- f. Just as personnel and space requirements may alter, so may the needs for equipment and these requirements could similarly be listed in an annex in future agreements and adjusted as circumstances warrant, within the budget. With particular reference to the typewriters which are in use by the conference, the agreement included conditional arrangements to rent this equipment if it could not be supplied by the inviting administration. It would have been easier to estimate more accurately the expenses involved if a definite commitment had been possible, and while the uncertainty of the availability of the equipment at the time the agreement was drawn up is appreciated, it would be helpful if in the future more definite information, not regarding the exact numbers of machines involved, but the source of them can be supplied. The Group desires to stress however, that the generosity of the Argentine Administration in providing the essential equipment in this instance has resulted in a saving of about 6000 pesos.
- g. It would have been helpful also, in making more accurate estimates, if definite information had been obtainable at the time the agreement was drawn up as to the space for installation and the requirements for the use of simultaneous interpretation equipment. Because of alterations in space requirements after the negotiation of the agreement, the provisions regarding the installation and renting of simultaneous interpretation equipment could not be followed.

The I.T.U. Siemens equipment was found to be unusable because of the layout of the Plenary Hall and I.B.M. equipment was therefore installed at a rental of approximately 2000 Swiss francs per week.

As an incidental note, that part of the Siemens equipment which was shipped to Buenos Aires and not used for this conference, was rented to a meeting of the International Society of Hematologists held at Mar del Plata and the remuneration therefrom will be used against the expenses of this conference.

In consequence of its study of the agreement between the Secretary General and the Argentine Administration, the Group is of the opinion that the agreement should be approved by the Conference, provided the above comments receive appropriate attention by the Secretary General and study by the Administrative Council in connection with arrangements for any future conference. Annex II attached hereto is a recommendation that the agreement be approved.

5. Budget of the Conference

Comments have already been made in the preceding paragraphs which relate to the drawing up of the budget for the Conference. The following additional points are believed to be of interest to the Conference and the Group recommends that the Secretary General be requested to take special note of these points in drafting budgets and making arrangements for any future conferences or meetings and be guided accordingly.

a. I.F.R.B. and C.C.I. Representation

The budget included provision for participation of representatives of the I.F.R.B. and the C.C.I.F. and C.C.I.R. in the Conference. The agenda of the Conference clearly indicated that its work with regard to the C.C.I's. would be concerned primarily with the structure and organization of these organs as they fit into the overall structure of the Union. It was clearly not anticipated that their substantive work was to be considered. Any information regarding the structure and organization could have been supplied by the Secretary General or by the Asst. Sec. Gen. who is also Director of the C.C.I.T. This same situation applies to the

I.F.R.B. It is recognized that the Administrative Council in adopting the extraordinary budget for 1952 gave tacit approval to this representation and participation. However, the Group is of the view that the Council and the Secretary General should give careful attention to this point in the future in order to ensure that Conferences are attended only by those high officials of the Union whose technical services are essential to their work.

b. Conference Preparatory Work

The budget included an item for the preparatory work of the Conference. The budgeted sums amounted to 60,000 Swiss francs for the publication and distribution of proposals and 17,500 for the trip to Buenos Aires of two officials of the Union to make initial arrangements for the Conference. The item of 60,000 s.f. has been exceeded and a total expense of 95,083.70 s.f. has been incurred. Additionally, salaries of personnel who were engaged in Geneva in preparatory work have been charged against the Conference costs. This additional sum is approximately 20,000 s.f.

A further point is that the proposals were prepared for and distributed to all Members of the Union. According to the accounting procedure followed, only those Members will pay these costs who are participating in this Conference. Those Members who are not participating but who have already benefited from the preparatory work, will be spared their share of this cost.

It is appreciated that the ceiling for ordinary expenses is at present too low to permit such charges as are incurred by conference preparatory work to be included in the ordinary budget. The foregoing information may therefore be of interest to that Committee of the Conference which is studying the budget ceiling. At the same time, the Secretary General should be requested to take special note of these comments so that, in the future, if an adequate ceiling for ordinary expenses is established there can be no question about the charges for the preparatory work for conferences, or meetings of the Union.

c. Salaries and Other Remuneration for the Conference Staff

The Group noted that the salaries paid to locally hired personnel are comparatively higher by about 30% than the scale usually used by the I.T.U. for conference work. The usual I.T.U. salary scale for conferences was used as a basis in drawing up the Conference Budget and was later revised on the advice of the Argentine Administration in order to attract efficient and specialized personnel under the special conditions of temporary employment. In the circumstances, the Group is of the opinion that the action of the Secretary General in allowing higher remuneration is justified.

It was brought to the attention of the Group that an inequitable arrangement exists with regard to the interpreters' remuneration as compared with that of the regular Secretariat personnel from the Geneva office. The interpreters are not permanent employees but serve each conference on a contractual basis. They have contributed greatly to the work of the Union and their services should be recognized. The basic salary for the interpreters, according to the interorganization agreement relating to their compensation, is 108 Swiss francs a day. They are under contract here at 140 Swiss francs a day which includes their per diem allowance. The regular Geneva office personnel are reimbursed for their per diem in pesos here but may collect their full salaries in Geneva in Swiss francs. The interpreters on the other hand, except for the first month's salary which was paid in Swiss francs in Geneva, have been paid one half of the 140 Swiss francs in pesos (70 Swiss francs in pesos) with the remaining 70 Swiss francs payable in Swiss francs in Geneva. This represents a loss per day to the interpreters, considering the exchange rate of pesos for Swiss francs, of about 5.50 Swiss francs per day. The Group is of the opinion that the interpreters should receive the same treatment as the Geneva office personnel and recommends that, retroactive to the beginning of their contracts, they be permitted to claim up to 108 Swiss francs per day (their basic salary) payable in Swiss francs in Geneva. The total added cost to the Conference will be approximately 6,000 Swiss francs for the whole period involved.

6. Expenditures of the Conference and Recommendations for their Limitations

a. Arrival and Departure of Geneva Secretariat Personnel

It was noted that three members of the Secretariat, one official and two stenographers were dispatched from Geneva and arrived in Buenos Aires in August. It is recognized that

certain final arrangements and recruitment required the presence of a representative of the Secretariat at this early date. However, inasmuch as the Argentine Administration had undertaken to arrange the premises and to recruit personnel, the Group is of the opinion that the services of one official and one stenographer would have been sufficient and recommends that the Secretary General be requested to take note of this point in order that this situation may not be repeated in the future. In this connection, the Group recommends that the Secretary General be instructed to arrange the return of Geneva personnel to their headquarters at the earliest practicable date, preferably on a staggered basis as soon as their services are no longer needed.

b. Supernumerary Personnel

The Group noted especially that the services of the liaison officer (mentioned in paragraph 3(d) of this report) should be terminated at the earliest opportunity. Arrangements should also be made to release supernumerary personnel (hired locally both in Geneva and in Buenos Aires) as soon as practicable.

c. Representatives of Permanent Organs of the I.T.U.

The Group noted that the Vice-Director of the C.C.I.R. travelled to London enroute to Buenos Aires. It is understood that this trip was for the purpose of making preliminary arrangements for the Seventh Plenary Assembly of the C.C.I.R. to be held in England in 1953. This added cost would not have been properly chargeable to this Conference; however, it is noted that in so doing, the Vice-Director was enabled to take a faster means of transportation to Buenos Aires thus saving a number of days per diem allowance. In these circumstances, the Group decided not to request the transfer of the added cost for the trip to London.

The Group noted also that the Director of the C.C.I.R. did not travel directly to Buenos Aires from Geneva but rather came to the Conference from another international meeting. It is understood that the costs involved in that travel and representation at this Conference will be pro-rated against the expenses of this Conference and against another fund. In any event, no more than the cost of travel to and from Geneva by fast available transportation and the per diem allowance involved should be charged against this conference.

d. Overtime

The Group noted that the costs for overtime for October amounted to 3,267.95 Swiss francs for the reproduction and document distribution service. The principal reason for this large overtime payment is that the services of the Secretariat have been taxed by delegates requirements for the immediate, sometimes within a 12 hour overnight period, translation, reproduction and distribution of documents. It has been sometimes necessary to hold personnel in one section in reserve while waiting for the previous step to be completed. This has resulted in a disruption of routine and caused, in the long run, more time to be spent than would otherwise be necessary in the ordinary processing of documents. The Group considers that the flow of the work of the Conference would be speeded up considerably if the Conference would accept a rule that documents for publication must be turned over to the Secretariat 48 hours before the publication and distribution hour requested. The Group recommends that the Secretary General be requested to take steps in this direction in order to alleviate the burdens of the Secretariat and to control the costs of the Conference.

In studying the overtime charges, the Group noted that in at least one instance there is a claim for 100 hours overtime in the month of October. Roughly, this means 4 hours overtime each day for a month and represents the limit of 12 hours per day consecutive work permitted under the staff regulations. Furthermore, this claim does not come from a section which is excessively burdened with work, such as the financial service or the typing services, but rather represents ordinary stenographic service in the Secretariat. The Group is of the opinion that such excessive overtime will operate to the physical detriment of the staff, and, if such long hours are necessary, then the overtime work should be apportioned among the other stenographers in the Secretariat. The Group strongly recommends that the Secretary General be requested to take immediate steps to assure that this type of overtime work is controlled.

Further in connection with overtime, the Group is advised that the staff regulations require Secretariat personnel to work only 40 hours a week, even when attending conferences. Taking into account the uncertain working conditions and the long hours which are associated with conferences and which the

Delegations and their staffs undertake as a matter of course, it seems reasonable to expect that the staff of the Secretariat from Geneva, whose main functions after all are to deal with conferences, should work longer hours when necessary in the course of the conference's work, without claiming full overtime. It is noted that, in this particular instance, while overtime is charged against the conference here, it will be payable in Geneva. It seems that some system could be instituted to allow compensatory time off for such overtime work while at conferences, such time to be taken at the site of the Conference if convenient or at Geneva after the Conference closes and the Group strongly recommends that the Administrative Council be requested to study these comments.

e. Postage

The costs for postage are quite high. This is occasioned by the fact that postage expenses from Geneva to Buenos Aires, as well as those from Buenos Aires to Geneva, are charged against the Conference accounts. For instance, as only one item in October there is a charge of 944 Swiss Francs from Geneva to Buenos Aires. There are no details of what these charges applied to but it seemed doubtful to the Group that so much correspondence involved solely the work of the Conference - on the other hand, since undoubtedly the ordinary work of the Union must certainly be handled by the Assistant Secretary General who has remained behind in Geneva, the Group found the charges inexplicable. It is therefore recommended that the Secretary General be requested to exercise more care in the despatch of correspondence using air facilities only when necessary.

f. Equipment

The Group found a charge of 1,404.55 Swiss Francs in the expenses of the Conference for a recording machine. This constitutes capital equipment of the Union and, as such, its purchase cost is not properly chargeable against the Conference. It was recalled that similar instances of the purchase of capital equipment against conference costs have occurred in the past and have been the subject of criticism.

In view of this, the present instance should not have occurred. There is no objection to charging a sum comparable to rent for the equipment against the conference but the purchase cost of the equipment should be transferred against the ordinary expenses of the Union and the Group recommends that this be done.

7. Present Status of the Budget

The Group published in Document No. 212 as information for the Conference, the Conference expenses prepared by the Secretariat as of Oct. 31, 1952. Attached hereto as Annex III is a statement of the actual expenditures as of November 15, 1952, the expenses committed but not paid as of that date, the expected expenditures as of December 20, 1952 (the date specified for the close of the Conference), expenses expected after December 20 irrespective of the duration of the Conference and the expected balance available after that date. It is considered important to give the Conference this information in view of the fact that the budget as originally drawn up anticipated the closing date of the Conference as December 15, 1952.

In submitting this report, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the representatives of the Secretariat for their willing assistance with the work and most specially to the delegates who participated in the work for their constant attention, cooperation and support.

Florence A. Trail
Chairman
Working Group

Annexes: 3

ANNEX 1

RESOLUTION REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

RESOLUTION 83

The Plenipotentiary Conference

considering :

1. the organization and financial difficulties which arose as a result of the action of certain conferences of the Union in extending their duration and in scheduling additional sessions
2. the desirability of establishing directives for the guidance of the Secretary General and administrations in assuring the uniform organization of conferences and meetings
3. the need for limiting in so far as possible the costs to Members of conferences and meetings

resolves :

1. that the action of the Administrative Council in adopting Resolution 83 is approved
2. that arrangements for all future conferences and meetings of the Union be made in accordance with the intent of the provisions of the Resolution
3. that any agreement drawn up with the inviting administration should be clear and specific in its terms regarding financial arrangements for advances and the reimbursement thereof
4. that, at the appropriate time, provisions be included in the General Regulations to this effect and, until that time, the provisions herein should be observed.

ANNEX II

RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SECRETARY GENERAL
AND THE ARGENTINE ADMINISTRATION FOR THE PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

The Plenipotentiary Conference

considering :

1. that Resolution 83 of the Administrative Council (paragraph E 5) contemplates the approval by the Council of agreements with inviting governments for conferences, and
2. that the Seventh Session of the Administrative Council in considering the agreement between the Argentine Administration and the Secretary General for the Plenipotentiary Conference at Buenos Aires, did not state its approval but merely "took note" of the parts of the agreement with it studied, decides :

decides :

that the agreement is approved.

**COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE BUDGET APPROVED BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL AND THE EXPENSES INCURRED
UP TO 15 NOVEMBER, 1952, WITH ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE
(Closure of Conference: 20.12.1952)**

Sub-heads and articles	Budget approved by the Council	Expenses up to 15.11.52	Budget Balance	Expenses Chargeable and to be included in estimates up to 20.12.52	Estimate of expenses after 20.12.52 independent of duration	GRAND TOTAL	Estimated Budget Balance	Excess of Expenses over Credit
Sub-Head I. Staff expenses								
1. Administration	466.000.-	206.535.-	259.465.-	87.270.-	74.195.- ¹⁾	368.000.-	98.000.-	
2. Languages	650.000.-	331.641,90	318.358,10	187.770.-	120.104.-	639.515,90	10.500.-	4.500.-
3. Roneo	40.500.-	21.410,40	19.089,60	19.650.-	3.900.-	44.960,40		
4. Insurance	35.000.-	15.637,30	19.362,70	537.-	1.830.-	18.004,30	17.000.-	4.500.-
	1,191.500.-	575.224,60	616.275,40	295.227.-	200.029.-	1,070.480,60	125.500.-	
Sub-Head II. Premises and Equipment								
5. Premises, furniture machines	90.000.-	78.106,30	11.893,70	2.250.-		80.356,30	9.600.-	
6. Documents	85.500.-	35.558,95	48.941,05	35.390.-	6.920.-	77.868,95	7.600.-	
7. Supplies & Office overheads	65.000.-	48.204,30	16.795,70	15.000.-	25.000.-	88.204,30		23.200.-
8. Simult. interpret. & other techn. install.	90.000.-	8.000.-	82.000.-	63.200.- ²⁾	8.000.-	79.200.-	10.800.-	
9. Unforeseen	31.000.-	3.909,55	27.090,45	2.500.-	500.-	6.909,55	24.000.-	
	361.500.-	173.779,10	187.720,90	118.340.-	40.420.-	332.539,10	52.000.-	23.200.-
Sub-Head III. Accounting Expenses								
10. Interest on advances	20.800.-	666,55	20.133,45	12.500.-	6.000.-	19.166,55	1.600.-	
Sub-Head IV. Preparatory work								
11. Public. & Distrib. of Proposals	60.000.-	95.083,70	-35.083,70	-	-	95.083,70		35.083,70
12. Journey to Bs.As. for prep. of Confer.	17.500.-	17.312,70	187,30	-	-	17.312,70		
Sub-Head V. Sundry								
13. Part. of IFRB in BA	28.700.-	12.992,35	15.707,65	5.425.-	7.150.- ¹⁾	25.567,35	3.000.-	
14. Part. of CCIF in BA	15.000.-	6.798.-	8.202.-	2.800.-	3.800.- ¹⁾	13.398.-	1.600.-	
15. Part. of CCIT in BA	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
16. Part. of CCIR in BA	25.000.-	3.742,60	21.257,40	11.360.-	9.500.- ¹⁾	24.602,60	500.-	
Total: Swiss francs	1,720.000.-	885.599,60	834.400,40	445.652.-	266.899.-	1,598.150,60	Balance 120.000.-	

1) Including travelling expenses for the return journey.

2) Including the sum of 29.250.- for the installation of the simultaneous interpretation system.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

REQUEST FOR CHANGE OF CLASS FOR

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNION

Attached hereto is a copy of a letter in which Mr. Juan Bautista Carrión, Head of the Delegation of the Dominican Republic, asks for the Dominican Republic to be included in the VIth class (5 units) for its share in defraying the expenses of the Union.

At the present time the Dominican Republic is in the Vth class (10 units).

N. B. For other requests for a change of class see Documents Nos. 15, 84 revised, 114, 122, 168, 262 and 263

Annex: 1

- 2 -
(308-E)

A N N E X

Embassy of the
Dominican Republic

International Telecommunication Union
Plenipotentiary Conference

Delegation of the Dominican Republic

Buenos Aires, 22 November 1952

Mr. L. Mulatier,
Secretary General of the I.T.U.,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Dominican Republic wishes to be included in the VIth Class (5 units) for its share in defraying the expenses of the Union, a fact to be borne in mind when the budget for the I.T.U. is established at the present Conference.

This notification is made in accordance with Article 14 of the existing Convention.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed)

for the DELEGATION OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Juan Bautista Carrión,

Chairman

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 309-E
26 November 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 8

FIRST SERIES
of texts transmitted
to the Editorial Committee

(See Annex to Document No. 298-E)

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 310-E
26 November 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

CORRIGENDUM No. 2
TO DOCUMENT No. 304-E

(Method of electing Members of the Administrative
Council by the Buenos Aires
Plenipotentiary Conference)

Page 5 Region A - American Region.

Add the following countries :

Dominican Republic
Paraguay

Page 5 Region B - Western Europe and African Region.

Add the following country:

Portugal

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

REPORT No. 2

BY WORKING GROUP 1

OF COMMITTEE 4

Working Group No. 1 of Committee 4, set up as indicated in Report No. 1 and joined by the Delegation of the Roumanian People's Republic, has studied the texts of Chapters 3 and 4 of the General Regulations, in accordance with its terms of reference.

It submits below its findings:

I. The text of Chapter 3, "Credentials for Conferences" was unanimously adopted.

1. Paragraphs 1 and 2, in a new drafting, have been prepared in accordance with the Committee's decisions.

2. Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 repeat the existing provisions of the present General Regulations or of Document No. 253 containing the Rules of Procedure for the present Conference (Article 14).

3. Paragraph 7 is a new text adopted by the Committee, whereby a Member of the Union may accredit to a conference the delegation of another Member.

4. Paragraph 8 is the result of the adoption of paragraph 7.

II. The text of Chapter 4 of the present General Regulations: "Procedure for Calling Extraordinary Administrative Conferences or for Changing the Time or Place of a Conference" was discussed at great length.

1. The Group thought that as it stood the Chapter left much to be desired; it contained two ideas, very much mixed up:



- a) the convening of Extraordinary Administrative Conferences;
- b) the method for changing the place or date of a conference, applicable to all conferences.

The Group therefore proposed splitting Chapter 4 into two parts, as follows:

Chapter 4 relating to point a)
Chapter 4 bis relating to point b)

2. In drafting those Chapters, the Group bore in mind the decisions of principle reached by the Committee:

- a) one, modified by the Swiss Proposal No. 470, according to which a change in the date or place of a conference could not be made unless two-thirds of the Members of the Union were in favour of such a change.
- b) the other, relating to Proposal No. 731 by Italy, according to which, in the interval between two sessions of the Administrative Council, the Secretary General of the Union should settle all urgent questions concerning the convening of a conference, or a change in the date or place, direct with the Members of the Union.

3. During the discussions on point 2 a), three different views were expressed:

- 1) The Delegations of the U.S.S.R., the P.R. of Poland and the Roumanian P.R. said it was clear that the Swiss proposal concerned not only a change in the date and place of a conference, but also the convening of Extraordinary Administrative Conferences, that idea being the one they had supported in the Committee.
- 2) The Delegations of Argentina and Uruguay thought that Committee 4 was not competent to deal with the problem and that by adopting the principle of the Swiss proposal, the Committee had acted contrary to the provisions of Article 11 of the Convention.

The opinion of the Argentine Delegation on this question appears as an Annex to this report.

- 3) Other Delegations, including the Swiss Delegation, author of Proposal No. 470, thought that as the proposal concerned only the procedure for changing the date or place of a conference, it contained nothing contrary to Article 11 of the Convention, which referred solely to the method for convening Extraordinary Administrative Conferences.
 - 4) In presenting Chapter 4 bis, the Group draws the Committee's attention to the fact that it will have to be modified:
 - a) if Article 2 of the Convention is itself modified by the appropriate Committee.
 - b) if Committee 4 changes its decision.
4. Discussion on point 2 b)
- 1) as Committee 4 had already decided that the inviting Government shall deal with the problem of invitations with the Administrative Council and not the Secretary General, part of Proposal No. 711 automatically falls.
 - 2) Chapter 4, as it stands, also provides that all procedure concerning a change in the date or place of a conference shall be the province of the Secretary General. The suggestions contained in Proposal No. 711 are thus more than satisfied.
 - 3) However, the Group draws the Committee's attention to the reference in Article 11, paragraph 3 b) of the Convention to the Administrative Council.
- Consequently, if the proposals by the Group are retained, it will be necessary to replace the words underlined by "Secretary General" in the Convention.
- Otherwise, Chapter 4 will have to include a special paragraph to take account of the Italian Proposal.
5. Reverting to Chapter 2 bis at the request of the U.S.S.R. Delegation, the Group adopted, this time unanimously, the following wording for paragraph 2 of the Chapter:

"Any proposal submitted, the adoption of which entails a revision of the text of the Convention or the Regulations, must contain references identifying the number of the Chapter, Article or paragraph which will have to be revised".

The corresponding parts of Report No. 1 showing a divergence of opinion should thus be deleted.

6. The Members of the Group asked the Chairman to draft the present record on their behalf, and they did not wish to meet for the purpose of approving it. If, therefore, it does not accurately reflect the views of the Members, the Chairman apologizes to them.

C H A P T E R 3

Credentials for Conferences

1. Delegations sent by Members of the Union to take part in a Conference must be duly accredited to exercise their right to vote and must be equipped with the powers required for the signing of the Final Acts.
2. For the Plenipotentiary Conferences,
 - 1) Delegations shall be accredited by instruments signed:
 - a - by the Chief of State
 - b - or by the Head of the Government
 - c - or by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

However, they may be provisionally accredited by the Head of the diplomatic mission with the government of the country in which the Conference is held.

 - 2) In order to sign the Final Acts of the Conference, delegations must be equipped with full powers signed by the Authorities mentioned under a, b, or c above.
3. For Administrative Conferences,
 - 1) The provisions of paragraph 2 above are applicable.
 - 2) In addition, a delegation may be accredited and equipped with full powers signed by the Minister responsible for the matters dealt with at the Conference.
4. A special Committee shall be entrusted with the verification of the credentials of each delegation; this Committee shall reach its conclusions within the period specified by the Plenary Assembly.
5. The delegation of a Member of the Union shall exercise its right to vote:
 - 1) on a provisional basis, from the time that it begins to participate in the work of the Conference;
 - 2) on a definitive basis, from the time that the Plenary Assembly decides that its credentials are in order.

6. A delegation shall no longer have the right to vote from the time that the Plenary Assembly decides that its credentials are not in order and until this state of affairs has been rectified.
7. As a general rule, Member countries should endeavour to send their own delegations to the Conferences of the Union. Nevertheless, if, for exceptional reasons, a Member is unable to send its own delegation it may accredit the delegation of another Member of the Union and give this delegation powers to act and sign on its behalf.
8. A duly accredited delegation may give a mandate to another duly accredited delegation to exercise its vote at one or more sessions at which it is unable to be present.
9. In no case provided for in paragraphs 7 and 8 above may a delegation exercise more than one proxy vote.

- 7 -
(311-E)
C H A P T E R 4

Procedure for calling Extraordinary Administrative
Conferences at the request of Members of the Union
or on a proposal of the Administrative Council

1. Any Members of the Union wishing to have an Extraordinary Administrative Conference convened shall inform the Secretary General of the proposed agenda, place and date of the conference.
2. On receipt of 20 concordant requests, the Secretary General shall inform all Members and Associate Members thereof by telegram, asking them to indicate, within six weeks, whether or not they agree to the proposal.
3. If the majority of the Members agree to the proposal as a whole, that is to say, if they accept the agenda, date and place of the proposed meeting, the Secretary General shall so inform the Members of the Union by circular telegram.
4.
 - 1) If the proposal accepted is for a conference elsewhere than at the seat of the Union, the Secretary General shall ask the government of the country concerned whether it agrees to act as inviting government.
 - 2) If the answer is in the affirmative, the Secretary General, with the assent of the government concerned, shall take the necessary steps to convene the conference.
 - 3) If the answer is in the negative, the Secretary General shall request the Members desiring the conference to make alternative suggestions for the place of the conference.
5. In cases where the proposal accepted is for a conference at the seat of the Union, the provisions of Chapter 2nd shall apply.
6.
 - 1) If the majority of the Members do not accept the proposal as a whole (agenda, time and place), the Secretary General shall inform the Members of the Union of the replies received, requesting them to give a final reply on the point or points under dispute.

2) Such points shall be regarded as adopted when they have been approved by a majority of the Members.

7. The procedure indicated above shall be applicable when the proposal to convene an extraordinary administrative conference emanates from the Administrative Council

C H A P T E R 4 bis

Provisions common to all Conferences

Change in the time or place of a conference.

- 1) The provisions of Article 4 above shall apply, by analogy, in the case of a change in the time or place of a conference, upon the request of Members of the Union or on a proposal of the Administrative Council. However, such changes shall only be made if two-thirds of the Members have pronounced themselves in favour.
- 2) Where the issue arises, the Secretary General shall indicate, in the communication referred to in Chapter 4, paragraph 2, the probable financial consequences of a change in the time or place. When, for example, there has been an outlay of expenditure in preparing for the Conference at the place initially chosen.

Annex: 1

A N N E X

The Delegation of Argentina, as Member of the Working Group, has collaborated in the drafting of the text of Chapter 4 bis, thus complying with the terms of reference of the Committee. As a country Member of the Union, however, Argentina must, expressly, make a reservation of principle concerning the text in question. In fact, Committee 4 is not competent to amend the Convention. Its specific task is to deal with the General Regulations without encroaching on the terms of reference of Committee 3, which is dealing with the Convention. Committee 4, acting beyond its competence, has resolved that a majority of two-thirds will be necessary to change the time and place of a conference already convened, and this is in flagrant contradiction of the Convention, Article 11, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph 2. The Convention does not make any difference on this point, and the Delegation of Argentina considers that Committee 4 is not competent to change the Convention or to regulate matters not authorized by the Convention.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 11th Meeting
Tuesday, 25 November 1952

Chairman : Mr. K. Prasada (India)

1. Approval of the Summary Record of the 7th Meeting (Document No. 217).

The Chairman submitted Document No. 217 to the Committee.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked that the remarks attributed to his Delegation appearing in the penultimate paragraph on page 3 be deleted and replaced by the statement shown at the bottom of page 4 and the beginning of page 5.

Subject to this correction the Summary Record was approved.

2. Approval of the Summary Record of the 8th Meeting (Document No. 244).

The Chairman submitted Document No. 244 to the Committee.

The Delegate of Egypt referring to the second paragraph on page 1, asked that specific mention be made of the correction to Document No. 196 which he had asked for. This correction should read as follows: page 7, paragraph 2, second sentence, read : "that the employees and officials of the permanent organs should be financed by all".

The Delegate of Pakistan asked that his statement, appearing in the second paragraph of page 11, should read as follows :

"The Delegate of Pakistan said that his country would accept no obligation for debts contracted at a time when Pakistan was not a Member of the Union. He asked that no account covering such debts be sent to Pakistan".

An exchange of views followed on the basic question raised by this statement and by the third paragraph of the statement made by the Chairman in his capacity as Delegate of India. The Chairman pointed out that the sentence appearing in the minutes and referring to the statement made by him as a Delegate of India was a faithful record of what he had said.

After the Delegates of Sweden, France, India, and the Chairman had spoken, the amendment requested by the Delegate of Pakistan was noted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked that the English text should be brought into line with the French (page 4): at the end of paragraph 5, read: "...no all-German Government which may be the legal successor to the German State".

Paragraph 8 "... the decisions taken at this Conference are unilateral and illegal".

The Delegate of Portugal asked that his remarks on page 8 should read as follows :

"..... closing them as at 31 December 1952, and not allowing them to produce interest. Interest in favour of the Swiss Government would continue to accrue but would be borne by all Members".

Subject to the above corrections, Document No. 244 was approved.

3. The Chairman suggested that, as in the other committees, the summary records should be brief. This was approved.

4. The Chairman asked for the Committee's views on the rest of the work : did it first wish to examine the draft budget (Document No. 278) or the proposal by France contained in Document No. 270 ?

The Delegate of Portugal emphasized the need for bearing in mind that an expenditure of about 6 million francs was involved, and he thought that priority should be given to Document No. 270.

This view was shared by the Delegates of Egypt, Yemen, Belgium and the United States of America.

The Delegate of Canada did not agree to the procedure suggested.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa suggested that, to remain in line with Article 14 of the Convention, the term "Notification of Class" should be used and not "Application". This drafting amendment was approved by the Delegate of France, who with the Delegate of Portugal, hoped that notifications of change of class would be accompanied by reasons. The Delegate of Portugal pointed out, in this respect, that the words "Application for lower contributory classes" should be replaced by "Notification of change of class", for he hoped that some countries might choose a higher class than their present one.

After further explanations, paragraphs 1 to 4 on page 2 of Document No. 270, amended as indicated above, were approved in a vote by a show of hands, which gave the following result:

For	22
Against	10
Abstentions	12

The Committee then considered the date to be inserted at the end of paragraph 1; the Delegate of Portugal had on a previous occasion suggested 29 November 1952. After observations by the Delegates of the United States of America, Oversea France and Canada, this date was approved.

On the matter of procedure, and after statements by the Chairman and the Delegates of Portugal and France, it was agreed that a document concerning paragraphs 1 to 4 would be submitted to the Plenary Assembly for consideration at its meeting on the following day, Wednesday, 26 November.

A discussion followed on the date of subsequent notifications of change of class referred to in paragraph 4.

The Delegate of France thought that the procedure should be as follows: after 29 November the Secretary General should be able to prepare immediately a document showing the total number of contributory units and the approximate amount of the unit of contribution in Swiss francs. Delegations would thus have an opportunity to consider the financial implications (see paragraph 4) and, if necessary, make a notification of change of class themselves.

A reference was then made to the time limit for those new changes. After statements by the Delegates of Oversea France, the U.S.S.R., the United States of America and Belgium, midday on 2 December 1952 was adopted.

The Committee then considered the budget situation for the next five years (Document No. 278).

The Secretary General said that the document had been prepared on the basis of the Council's estimates for expenditure in 1953, to which had been added: 1) an estimate of normal increases if the existing situation regarding staff and publications remained unchanged, and 2) expenses that might result from any decisions by Working Groups that might be adopted by the Conference. As it stood, the document contained estimates that might, perhaps, be reduced, but not appreciably.

The Delegate of Portugal said he found the document useful for calculating the coiling of expenses, but certain items (No. 2 for example) should be given in more detail.

There was a short discussion in which the Delegates of France, Czechoslovakia, Portugal and Belgium participated; questions were raised concerning salaries, the Pension Fund, the Provident Fund and the advisability of a fiscal limit of annual expenditure.

- 5 -
(312-E)

The Secretary General cautioned against the danger of having too low a fiscal limit. He recalled the circumstances in which the Atlantic City limit had been fixed. Small reductions might be possible, but it would be difficult, for the end of the five-year period, to have a limit much below Sr.Frs. 6,800.000.

The Chairman said that a Working Group would need to be set up for study of Document No. 278. The matter would be discussed at the next meeting.

Reporters:

P. Collins

H. Bouchon

Chairman:

K. Prasada

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the Twelfth Meeting

Wednesday, 26 November, at 1000 hours

Chairman : Mr. Krishna Prasada (India)

The Chairman asked the Committee to approve the summary record of the ninth meeting on 20 November (Document No. 267).

1. The Delegate of France asked for a change in the French text on Page 11 (for "monture" read "ouverture") which was acceded to.

There being no further observations, the summary record was approved.

Document No. 278

2. The Chairman recalled the discussion of the previous day, during which the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. had proposed that a Working Group be set up; he thought it an excellent idea and asked Mr. Busak, of the Czechoslovak Delegation, if he would agree to preside over the Group, in view of his competence in financial matters.

Working Group 5 was thus set up, and the following delegations agreed to take part :

Chairman : Mr. Busak (Czechoslovakia)

Members : Argentina
U.S.S.R.

United States of America

Switzerland

Yugoslavia

Canada

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

3. The Delegate of Yemen drew the Committee's attention to the need for economy and ~~the~~ setting a limit on expenditure.

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

"My Delegation emphatically objects to the extraordinarily inflated estimates of I.T.U. ordinary expenses - up to 6,000,000 Swiss francs in 1953, with further increases in subsequent years. We think it is impossible to set such a limit, and insist on maintenance of the existing limit on ordinary expenses, namely 4,000,000 Swiss francs a year.

"Hence we propose that an appropriate group should be set up by the Committee, to make an urgent review of these estimates and to present within three days its proposals for reducing them to the utmost."

The Delegate of Sweden asked whether the estimated overall expenditure approved by the Administrative Council - i.e. Sw. fr. 5,433,350 - for the 1953 budget, would be taken as a basis, and whether it would be possible for Group 4 (Colonel Read's) to express the fiscal limit as a percentage - 5% for example - so that the Administrative Council could have a certain amount of freedom in its actions.

The Delegate of Argentina supported the views expressed by the U.S.S.R.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. said :

"My Delegation emphatically objects to the inflated estimates appearing in Document No. 278, to the increase of I.T.U. expenses up to 6,000,000 Swiss francs in 1953, and to further increases in expenditures in later years.

"We insist on maintenance of the existing limit on I.T.U. ordinary expenses, namely :

"4,000,000 Swiss francs a year.

"We support the Soviet Union proposal that the appropriate group should make an urgent review of the estimates appearing in Document No. 278 and should submit proposals for reducing I.T.U. expenses to the utmost."

The Delegate of France thought that the budget contained in Document No. 278 should be split into two parts :

- a) the information on page 1 should be the chief concern of Group 5, which would have to verify it item by item, asking for justifications whenever necessary ;
- b) the information on page 2 fell within the province of Group 2.

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

"We find it somewhat hard to make a detailed statement at this juncture on the separate items in Document No. 278, but we would take the liberty of making a few comments on the proposed draft of the budgets for 1953-1957 as a whole.

"First of all, one is struck by the extraordinary increase in expenditure in comparison with the existing budget.

"My Delegation emphatically objects to this proposed increase in expenditure. The existing limit for I.T.U. ordinary expenses must be maintained.

"The Delegation of the Soviet Union, seconded by others, has submitted an extremely judicious proposal to the effect that an expert study of expenditure should be made with a view to reducing it to the utmost. That proposal we support."

4. The Delegate of Portugal would support any proposal to reduce expenditure, but pointed out that the recently created Working Group 5 could not do useful work until Group 2 had made known its findings.

Replying to the remark by the Swedish Delegate, he pointed out that the basic figure of 5,433,350 francs in the 1953 budget should not be regarded as sacrosanct. It might be possible to reduce some of the expenditure, but first of all it would be necessary to know Group 2's decisions on personnel.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia agreed that there should be the strictest economy in the Union's expenditure. His Delegation regretted, however, that so far every proposal aimed at economy had been rejected, even by those who advocated a reduction in the expenses of the Union.

5. The Yugoslav Delegation had supported every proposal to cut down expenditure : for example, the proposals to reduce the number of members of the I.F.R.B. and to merge the various permanent organs. He regretted that those proposals had been rejected, and agreed with Mr. Ribeiro that economies should be sought in the matter of expenditure on personnel, which was tending to increase. Every proposal involving an increase in staff expenditure should, as a rule, be followed by an indication of the amount involved. He reserved the right to revert to questions of detail. He thought that practical solutions were possible. For example, the money in the Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds could be invested in a building, the rent of which could be used to pay the pensions of I.T.U. officials.

6. The Chairman said that several delegations had referred to the fiscal limit of 4,000,000 Swiss francs. It would be exceedingly gratifying if it proved possible to keep to that limit. Nevertheless, the decisions already taken - in connection with the I.F.R.B., for example - should not be overlooked. Nor should it be forgotten that the Union had to be provided with the wherewithal to pay for the posts created.

The Delegate of India supported Mr. Laffay's proposal, and asked that the Working Group should thoroughly examine the estimates on page 1, which provided for the heaviest outlay. The basic figure given - 5,433,350 Swiss francs - should be explained in detail, in order that the Committee might pass judgement thereon.

The Delegate of Brazil was in favour of reducing expenditure, but thought it would be impossible to reduce the amounts shown on page 1 to any considerable extent or to reduce estimates to 4,000,000 Swiss francs.

7. The Chairman of the I.F.R.B., confirming what the Secretary General had said the day before, recalled the circumstances in which the Atlantic City fiscal limit had been decided on, and the drastic reduction - 800,000 Swiss francs - that had been made. If the I.F.R.B. had operated from 1949, the estimates for expenditure would have had to be increased. The I.F.R.B. was at work, and the necessary expenses had to be provided for. That body was costing 800,000 Swiss francs. Those estimates had been thoroughly reviewed by the Administrative Council. If any reduction in the I.F.R.B. budget were voted, then the duties being performed by that body would inevitably have to be reduced.

8. The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic:

"My Delegation supports all proposals for reducing the fiscal limit on the Union budget, and does not like to see a considerable increase in contributory shares, which have already proved a heavy burden for all countries, especially for those which have suffered a great deal because of the war and therefore are put to heavy expense for reconstruction.

"If the fiscal limit goes on increasing at this rate from year to year, it will have reached twice the Atlantic City figure by the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

"Hence we entirely support the views expressed by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, namely, that the Working Group just set up should consider all possible means of reducing the sums mentioned in Document No. 278."

The Delegate of Portugal said that nothing useful could be done until a decision had been reached on staff matters. The Council estimates had been based on the existing system only, since the Council could not anticipate the decisions to be taken by the Conference.

It had been said by some Delegations that the fiscal limit of 4,000,000 Swiss francs should be maintained. In that case, then, the decisions taken in regard to the I.F.R.B. would have to be reversed.

Having received some information from the Belgian Delegation on the progress made by Working Group 2, the Committee apportioned the items of Document No. 278 as follows:

Page 1 Working Group 5.

Page 2 Items 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 - Working Group 2.

Items 9, 15, 19 and 20 - the Committee.

Item 16 - Group under the Head of the Lebanese Delegation.

Items 17 and 18 - Working Group 3 (Mr. Sterky).

The Delegate of Sweden, speaking as Chairman of Working Group 3, said that in point 17 there was talk of staggering arrears over 10 years. The original sum would be very slightly increased, ~~reaching~~ perhaps 400,000 Swiss francs. The Group had come to no decision as regards the time to be taken to pay off the debts.

No objection being made, it was agreed that the period should be 10 years.

Secretary General's emoluments.

9. (At this stage, the Secretary General and the other officers of the Secretariat withdrew from the room.)

The Chairman asked the Committee to consider the question of the Secretary General's salary. In Working Group 2, some Delegations had expressed themselves in favour of a slight increase in the salary for the Secretary General above that of the other Class A officers. The Group however had not taken any decision.

The Delegate of the United States of America recalled that his proposal for reorganizing the General Secretariat had not been adopted by the competent committee. He nevertheless thought that the emoluments of the Secretary General should be greater than those of other Class A officers.

This opinion was shared by the Delegate of the Argentine Republic, who said that the difference in salary would tend to emphasize that it was indeed the Secretary General who was head of the Bureau.

These views were supported by the Delegates of Italy, Brazil, and Colombia.

The Delegate of Mexico thought that administrative and technical duties should be kept on an equal footing. He was against the proposal.

The Delegate of France believed that the matter would be examined within the general framework of the salary question. Hence he would have preferred to know, first of all, what decisions had been taken by Working Group 2. He would vote for the status quo.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia said that the question of raising the Secretary General's salary could not be bound up with the question of subordination of other I.T.U. organs.

There was a vote. Results: For a slight increase in the Secretary General's salary - 10; against - 12; abstentions - 18.

The meeting rose at 1330 hours.

Reporters:

J.T. Arroqui

Bouchon

M. Caws

Chairman:

K. Prasada

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 314-E
29 November 1952

COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations
and Specialized Agencies)

Summary Record of the 6th Meeting

Tuesday, 25 November 1952, at 1000 hours

Chairman: Mr. Francis C. de Wolf (United States of America)

The Chairman, opening the meeting, submitted the summary record of the 4th meeting (Document No. 245) for approval.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation has no comments to make on Document No. 245, but I should like it recorded in the minutes that we objected to adoption of the resolution appearing in Annex 2 to that document, on the grounds that it was entirely superfluous."

Mr. A. David (United Nations Observer) wanted the words "United Nations" in paragraph 2.1. replaced by: "specialized agencies", and asked that the following should be added to the end of the paragraph: "He pointed out that there were a number of government privileges in addition to the priority mentioned in Article 36, for which the specialized agencies might wish to ask."

The Chairman thereupon passed to the draft resolution appearing in Document No. 275, concerning use of the United Nations telecommunication network by the specialized agencies. The draft had been evolved by a Working Group made up of Mr. David, the Delegate of Canada, and the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Were there any comments?

The Delegate of France said he had nothing to say about the text submitted. Nevertheless, it should be made very clear that hitherto the United Nations telecommunication network had not been used by the specialized agencies, except, of course, for the circuit between Geneva and Lake Success, which had been leased to the United Nations by the Swiss Administration. The Telegraph and Telephone Conference (Paris, 1949) had in fact decreed that radio circuits might be made available to the public or to non-public organizations, in the extra-European system. That seemed to apply in the case of the Geneva-Lake Success circuit.

The Delegate of Switzerland confirmed what the previous speaker had said about the conditions in which the circuit Geneva-New York was operated. No claim or complaint about that circuit had ever been received. The Swiss Administration was responsible for the technical side, the circuit being operated by United Nations staff.

Mr. David (United Nations Observer) said he was not entirely satisfied with the way in which paragraph 3 of the preamble was drafted. The views expressed by the United Nations Fifth Committee, which the Committee had heard, had originally arisen out of a report by the Advisory Committee on administrative and budgetary questions which had stated that in normal circumstances there should be no competition between the United Nations network and the public networks. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee had recently stated (on 10 October) that while his Committee still upheld the view previously expressed, it supported the action taken by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in granting facilities to the specialized agencies to use the United Nations network, and was of opinion that such action was fully in accordance with the general principle of coordination affirmed by the General Assembly. He (Mr. David) thought it likely that the Fifth Committee would confirm those views at the General Assembly then in session. The reference, therefore, might well be out of date before the resolution was adopted by the Plenipotentiary Conference and passed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Since there might well be developments before the matter came before the next Assembly, he would propose that paragraph 3 be deleted.

The Delegate of India said his Delegation would vote in favour of the resolution.

The Chairman thereupon asked the Delegates of Canada and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland whether they could agree to deletion of paragraph 3, as proposed by the United Nations Observer.

The Delegate of Canada and the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed, provided the whole Committee accepted the United Nations Observer's proposal.

The Delegate of France was against it. The paragraph was most important, both for the present and for the future, since the principle that there should be no competition had been enunciated by the United Nations Fifth Committee itself, i.e., by that very authority which might compete with the general telecommunication network.

The Delegate of Pakistan agreed with the previous speaker. Paragraph 3 should be kept. In order that account might be taken of what Mr. David had said in proposing that the paragraph should be deleted, it would be sufficient to include in the text the date on which the Fifth Committee had issued its recommendation.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that a reference in that paragraph to a committee of the United Nations General Assembly seemed misplaced. Hence he would propose that reference should be made merely to the principle enunciated. Otherwise, he was in favour of deleting the paragraph completely.

The Delegate of Denmark entirely agreed with the Delegates of France and of the United States of America, as regards the suggestion that no reference should be made to the Fifth Committee.

Mr. David (United Nations Observer) had two remarks to make:

When the Fifth Committee had supported the view expressed by the Advisory Committee, it had not given any thought to the conditions in which the United Nations network would be used.

If, now, the reference in paragraph 3 to the Fifth Committee's recommendation were deleted, a reference would have to be made to the views expressed by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, if the paragraph were to be justified.

He urged that paragraph 3 be deleted.

The Delegate of Italy, supporting what the Delegate of France had said, wanted the paragraph maintained.

The Delegate of France then proposed the following wording for paragraph 3 - a wording which might be submitted to the Committee for approval:

"that the United Nations telecommunication network should never, in normal circumstances, compete with the existing public communication systems;"

The Chairman asked Mr. David (United Nations Observer) if he could accept that wording.

Mr. David (United Nations Observer) said he could.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that as he understood it, paragraph 4 said, in other words, what the Delegate of France had just proposed. However, he saw no objection to a vote being taken on the French proposal.

The Chairman said that in paragraph 3 the language used was very general, while in paragraph 4 the special conditions were described in which an exception could be made in the principle enunciated in the resolution. Hence the French amendment might, he felt, be accepted.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic asked why, in paragraph 4, free use of the United Nations network by the specialized agencies was envisaged.

The Chairman asked the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for elucidation on this point.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland explained that if free use of the network had been envisaged for really urgent cases, that was because, in such cases, it would not be possible in time to determine what tariff should be used. Hence an exception was not, he felt, being made to the basic principle.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic was dissatisfied with the above explanation. The cases in which free use of the network would be allowed ought to have been specified.

The Chairman said that the terms: "in cases of emergency" seemed adequate. Could the Committee now agree to the resolution as a whole ?

The resolution was adopted nemine contradicente.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., thereupon:

"Mr. Chairman, I would ask that in the minutes it be noted that my Delegation abstained when a decision was taken on the draft resolution in Document No.275."

The Chairman then submitted Document No.177 (revised) - a draft resolution by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, relative to the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies.

The Delegate of France thought that on page 2, second line, the words: "to maintain the existing definition" might be replaced by: "not to mention the Heads of the Specialized Agencies in the existing definition".

The Chairman heartily approved of the amendment suggested.

The Delegate of the United States of America wondered whether it was necessary for all Members of the I.T.U. to take uniform action with regard to the treatment they accorded to the specialized agencies. The United States of America was not a party to the Convention on Privileges and Immunities, but legislation did exist which applied both to the specialized agencies and to other organizations, such as the Pan-American Union.

The Delegate of Belgium regretted he could not support, as it stood, the draft resolution presented by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

There could be no doubt that the Conference was competent to instruct the Secretary General of the I.T.U. to make contact with the Secretary General of the United Nations with a view to the possible abrogation of Article 4, section 11, of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies.

That much seemed to him reasonable. If Document No.177 (revised) stopped after the first paragraph on page 2, it was probable that a large majority would be prepared to vote for it.

But he could not agree with the last two paragraphs. The I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference would be going beyond its terms of reference in making the recommendations contained in the last two paragraphs.

Now the Convention on Privileges and Immunities was essentially of a political character. It was not for individual delegations to take the initiative in that field, but for the Plenipotentiary Conference as a whole.

The foreign policy of a State was one and indivisible. It would be illogical for the delegation of a country to vote white at Lake Success and black at Buenos Aires.

The draft resolution in question could not be accepted by those Members of the Union which were parties to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies.

Because his Delegation was convinced that in that very special field the delegations attending the Plenipotentiary Conference were not competent, it could accept the draft resolution only if the last two paragraphs were deleted.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic vigorously defended the last paragraph of Document No.177, recalling that it owed its origin to a statement made by his Delegation.

The Delegate of France confessed he had been impressed by what the Delegate of Belgium had said, It would be wise to act as that Delegate had suggested, and to delete the last two paragraphs of the resolution.

Mr. Garbarini-Islas (I.L.O. Observer):

"On behalf of the I.L.O., I must make a specific reservation as regards the rights enjoyed by the I.L.O. under the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. The I.L.O. is of course in favour of telecommunication facilities and privileges being extended to the specialized agencies. Hence I am against the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland."

The Chairman remarked that this latter statement would have to be considered not as a reservation but as comment, since the I.L.O. was represented at the Conference only by an Observer.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic disagreed with the attitude taken up by the French Delegation. Why could not the Conference reach a decision? It was called upon to draft the invitation appearing at the end of the resolution. To do that did not involve going beyond its terms of reference. His Delegation strongly supported the draft resolution. It had accepted the amendments proposed by the United Nations Observer and by the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Mr. David (United Nations Observer) said that the difficulties evoked could easily be overcome if, in Annex 2 of the Convention, the specialized agencies were included in the list of those enjoying government telegram privileges. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee had stressed the advantages to be gained from making no distinction between the position of the specialized agencies and that of the United Nations, as far as the grant of privileges and immunities was concerned.

The Chairman put to the vote the Belgian amendment, namely, that the paragraphs "recommends" and "invites" should be deleted. Results, by show of hands:

For	15
Against	6
Abstentions ..	15

The Amendment was thus adopted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R., thereupon:

"The Soviet Union is not a party to the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Hence I would ask you to note that my Delegation abstained during the vote on the resolution appearing in Document No.177."

The Delegate of Australia, raising a point of order, asked that the resolution as amended should be put to the vote as a whole. Results,

For 12
Against 4
Abstentions ... 17

The Chairman ruled that in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the Committee would have to revert to the matter at the next meeting, the vote being invalid.

As it was getting late, the last point on the agenda (Doc.No.258) could not be considered.

The Chairman, before closing the meeting, announced that Mr. David (United Nations Observer) was shortly to depart. Hence (if the Committee had no objection) he would, at the next meeting of the Plenary Assembly (Wednesday, 26 November, 1952) make an oral report on the question of United Nations telecommunications, in connection with which the Committee had adopted a draft resolution.

There were no objections.

The meeting rose at 1110 hours.

Reporters:

R. Lemoine
J. Garrido Moreno

Chairman:

Francis Colt de Wolf

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

Summary record of the 22nd meeting

Monday 24 November 1952, at 1600 hours

Chairman: Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted for the approval of the Committee the Summary Record of the 18th Meeting (Document No. 249), which was approved subject to the following amendment requested by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.

- Page 10, 4th sub-paragraph of the statement made by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., replace "in a general way" by "at all".

The Committee passed to the study of Article 5 of the Convention, Administrative Council:

Article 5, sub-paragraph 1.(1)

1. The question of the strength of the Council had been definitively decided (vide Document No. 220, Minutes of the 6th Plenary Assembly).

2. The expression "with due regard to the need for equitable representation of all parts of the world" was retained in its present form, Proposals Nos. 37 (the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 84, paragraph 1 (France) having been withdrawn.



3. The sentence "The Members of the Council shall hold office until the election of their successors" was replaced by "The Members of the Council shall hold office until the date on which the Plenary Conference elects a new Council". (Proposal No. 84, paragraph 1 (2) of Franco).

4. As to the re-election of Members of the Administrative Council, the Committee had before it two proposals:

- Proposal No. 673 (India) which went by default owing to lack of support.

- Proposal No. 726 (Spain) supported by the Delegate of Cuba.

This proposal envisaged the re-election of, at the most, 3 Members each for 3 of the regions and only two in the fourth.

The Delegate of the United States of America was of the opinion that a proposal of that nature should be examined by the Plenary Assembly and only at the time of the forthcoming election.

The Delegate of Spain accepted this suggestion. He considered and the Delegate of India was of the same opinion, that the principle of his proposal should be included in the Convention.

The Delegate of France said he was absolutely opposed to a provision of that nature.

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

"Since the Committee is studying paragraph 1 of Article 5, my Delegation considers that all proposals relating to this paragraph should be examined now.

"We do not agree with the Delegation of the United States of America that Proposal No. 726 should be examined simultaneously with the question of the Council's election. The two questions are not connected.

"The election of the Council is carried out according to the Convention in force. Until the new Convention is ratified, the existing one remains in force. Therefore, elections to the Council have no connection with Proposal No. 726.

"As far as the basis of this proposal is concerned, my Delegation considers that the text of paragraph 1 of Article 5 is satisfactory, and sees no reason to revise it. The text allows for the desired possibilities for the renewal of the Council. We are therefore opposed to Proposal No. 726 and shall vote against it."

A long discussion showed that the text proposed by the Delegation of Spain was in some respects obscure, and the Chairman interrupted the discussion to ask the Delegation of Spain to submit a new text at the next meeting.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 1 (2)

Proposal No. 39 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) was withdrawn because of the withdrawal of Proposal No. 37, from which it arose.

Sub-paragraph 1 (2) therefore remained unchanged.

Article 5, paragraph 2

The proposals before the Committee were as follows:
Proposals Nos. 40 (Belgium, Belgian Congo), 42 (Switzerland), 84, paragraph 2 (France) and 707, Document No. 112 (U.S.A.)

The Delegate of France withdrew his proposal.

The Chairman opened the discussion on Proposals Nos. 40 and 42. The former envisages that: "The Administrative Council may ask a Member of the Union to replace any person appointed by that Member to sit in the Council, if it is of the opinion that the person in question does not possess the requisite qualifications."

The latter envisages that any person nominated to sit in the Council "shall be authorized by his Government to act in the interests of the Union".

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

"Proposal No. 40 is unacceptable because Members of the Union are sovereign states and only they are competent to choose and nominate their representatives. The Administrative Council can in no way question the qualifications of representatives of Members of the Union who sit in the Council. We therefore oppose Proposal No. 40.

"Proposal No. 42 is likewise unacceptable. The international status of the Administrative Council is established in the Convention which gives all the guidance necessary to Members of the Council which, during the study of this or that question, must always take into consideration the interests of the Union as a whole.

"This position is self-evident, and there is no need to add to the Convention the text of proposal No. 42. It is equally evident that in no case can Members of the Union grant 'powers' such as those mentioned in Proposal No. 42."

The Delegates of the United States of America and Portugal said they were also opposed to proposal No. 40 of Belgium.

Proposal No. 40 was rejected by 55 votes to 4 with 6 abstentions.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia said he was opposed to proposal No. 42 of Switzerland which was supported by Pakistan and the Netherlands.

Proposal No. 42 was accepted by 26 votes to 17 with 20 abstentions.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that he had voted against proposal No. 42 and he considered it impossible to include a provision of that nature in the Convention. He reserved the right to return to the question in Plenary Assembly.

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

"Bearing in mind that the election of a country as Member of the Administrative Council is, in itself, a mark of international confidence, and that this confidence demands no supplementary power from the Government which sends its representative to the Council, the Delegation of the Bielorussian S.S.R. voted against proposal No. 42 of Switzerland.

"Considerations of a practical nature on the granting of the powers proposed by Switzerland, their verification and recognition, emphasise once again the fact that this proposal is quite unacceptable to my Delegation.

"We reserve the right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly."

The Delegates of Mexico and Lebanon said they abstained from voting because they considered the proposal of Switzerland to be without foundation.

The Delegate of France said that the text adopted was not admissible. The representatives who sat in the Council had an international mandate and it could not be suggested that they might be guided in their decisions by the interests of their own countries. He reserved the right to return to the question in Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman passed to a discussion of proposal No. 707 of the U.S.A. which was submitted in the form of a draft resolution (Document No. 112) and pursuant to which the Conference would ask Members of the Union to nominate permanent representatives to sit in the Council during the term of office.

The Delegate of the United States of America accepted, in conformity with an amendment proposed by the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, to add the words, "as far as possible".

On the other hand, he was against an amendment proposed by the Delegate of Cuba, namely, that after the words : "qualified in the field of telecommunications", the words : "by more than ten years' experience" should be added. The Delegate of Cuba withdrew his amendment.

The Delegates of the Argentine Republic, Canada, China, Japan, Spain, Mexico, and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia supported the proposal submitted by the United States of America, as amended by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said it was unnecessary to adopt the resolution submitted as Proposal No. 707.

"The statement made by the Delegation of the United States of America, that most representatives of Members have attended no more than one session of the Council, is incorrect. On the contrary, the Report by the Administrative Council shows that there has been little variation in the composition of the Council. Hence there is no point in raising this question.

"As regards the substance of the matter, approval of the draft resolution would signify interference in the domestic affairs of I.T.U. Member-Countries. Countries, and countries alone, are entitled to nominate and to recall their representatives. The Union has no right to interfere in these matters.

"The I.T.U. Members elected to the Council certainly have an interest in ensuring that their representatives on the Council are permanent and duly qualified persons, but the question of their nomination and (in case of need) their replacement, is something which concerns Members of the Union only.

"Hence we are against Proposal No. 707, and shall vote against it."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic expressed himself in similar terms.

Finally, the United States draft Resolution, as amended by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, was approved by 52 votes to 9, it being understood that the Editorial Committee would bear in mind two proposals, one by Argentina and the other by the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, in favour of replacing: "calls upon" by "invites" or "decides to invite".

Article 5, paragraph 3 (1)

There were no proposals.

Article 5, paragraph 3 (2)

Proposals Nos. 43 (Argentina), 44 (United States of America), 46 (Portugal), 47 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), and 571 (New Zealand) having been withdrawn, there remained only Proposal No. 45 (Italy).

That Proposal was seconded by the Delegates of France, Pakistan, Portugal, and the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the old wording should be preserved, so that conferences and permanent organs might all operate under the same conditions. The old text said that the Council had to abide by the General Regulations annexed to the Convention, and that, in cases not provided for in the General Regulations, the Council should draw up its own Rules of Procedure. Hence he would propose that the old text be maintained. He was against Proposal No. 45.

Proposal No. 45 (Italy) was then adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions.

Article 5, paragraph 4

Proposals Nos. 52 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), and 84, paragraph 7 (France) were withdrawn. Proposals Nos. 50 (Italy) and 51 (Portugal) were withdrawn in favour of Proposal No. 692 (United States of America), which remained for the Committee's consideration, with Proposal No. 48 (Argentine Republic).

According to Proposal No. 692, the Council would elect its Chairman and Vice-Chairman at the beginning of each annual session, instead of electing five Vice-Chairmen to take the Chair one after the other.

The Delegates of the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and Pakistan seconded the proposal by the United States of America, while considering that it would be better if the Council regularly changed its Chairman as was done in the I.F.R.B. The Delegates of France, Lebanon, and Portugal also supported the proposal.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation considers that Proposal No. 692 is democratic in appearance only. The Proposal clearly says that the Members of the Council shall be re-eligible. Election still depends on the vote. It will be readily seen that in this way certain countries, with the assistance of a clear majority, will be able to elect the same Chairman and Vice-Chairman. In substance, that would signify monopolization of the posts of Chairman and Vice-Chairman by certain countries. That is wrong and unjust.

"There should be a definite system of rotation for those posts. The Council is elected for five years, and holds one session a year. There should therefore be a new Chairman every year. Among the 18 Members of the Council, the most competent and best qualified five persons can always be chosen.

"We therefore propose that the status quo be maintained, i.e., the procedure laid down in the Convention. We are against Proposal No. 692 and shall vote against it."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation is against Proposal No. 692, since that proposal does away with the system whereby the Chair in the Administrative Council is occupied in rotation, and may remain all the time in the hands of one and the same person. Hence we favour the old text of the Convention, which lays down that the Chair shall be occupied in rotation.

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia:

"My Delegation considers that both proposals, Nos. 48 (Argentina) and 692 (United States of America) would represent a decided advance over the existing system. The rotation system specified in Proposal No. 48 is not, we feel, of major importance, since it does not prevent the Chairman from being elected Vice-Chairman at the end of his term of office. In advocating adoption of Proposal No. 692, we would lay stress on the need

for a system of rotation, even if the Chairman going out of office is exceedingly capable, for exceptional capacities are not always beneficial to the Union as a whole. Lastly, every Member of the Union must be given the chance to display initiative in favour of the Union."

The Delegate of the U. S. S. R., observing that there were two main schools of thought, asked that a vote should first be taken on the question of whether or not the posts of Chairman and Vice-Chairman should be occupied in rotation.

United States of America Proposal No. 692 was thereupon approved by 35 votes to 20, with 11 abstentions.

Article 5, paragraph 5

The Committee had already considered this paragraph at its 4th meeting, and had adopted in principle the text annexed to Document No.88.

The Delegate of the U. S. S. R. proposed that the words "as a general rule", in the last sentence of the annex, should be deleted. The Delegates of France, the Argentine Republic, the United States of America and Pakistan were against the deletion.

The text annexed to Document No. 88 was approved without change, by 50 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

Article 5, paragraph 6

In the existing text of this paragraph, the Secretary General and Assistant Secretaries General had been omitted from the list of senior officials entitled to attend Council meetings, as full participants.

The Working Group was asked to redraft the text in consequence.

Article 5, paragraph 7

There were no proposals.

Article 5, paragraph 8

The following proposals had been submitted :

Nos. 59 (Argentine Republic), 60 (Italy), 61 (Portugal), and 62 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Those proposals contained a major provision which aroused no objection, namely, that : "the Council shall function only during its sessions" (Proposal No. 59), and : "the Council shall act only corporately and in formal session" (Proposal No. 62).

The Chairman asked for discussion of another matter of principle in Proposal No. 59, namely that : "its (the Council's) decisions shall be binding on all conferences and meetings of the Union, except for the Plenipotentiary Conference".

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. :

"We are not against the principle that the Council should act only corporately and in formal session. But Proposal No. 59 lays down that its decisions are binding on Union conferences and meetings.

"This interpretation is in flagrant contradiction to the general structure of the Union. The Convention unambiguously lays down what the structure of the Union is to be, together with the duties of permanent organs and conferences and the relations between them, as regards administrative conferences in Article 11, as regards the C.C.I.s in Article 8, and as regards the Council in Article 5.

"Now each of these organs performs its duties independently and abides by the decisions taken by other organs in connection with matters outside its terms of reference. The present text must be maintained. We cannot entirely change the structure of the Union. Hence we are against Proposal No. 59, and we propose that it be rejected and that the present text in the Convention be kept."

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia :

"The Plenipotentiary Conference is the supreme organ of the I.T.U., but it has never imposed obligations on administrative conferences and has respected their autonomy, as proved by this very Conference. The Council holds a mandate from the Plenipotentiary Conference, which cannot confer on it more rights than it possesses. Hence my Delegation is against the Argentine proposal, which goes too far."

The Delegate of France, seconded by the Delegate of India thought it would be better to abide by the status quo and to make no mention of the discussion in the minutes.

The Delegate of the United States of America supported Proposal No. 59.

The Delegate of Pakistan proposed a compromise solution :
".... but its decisions, especially on administrative and financial matters, must be obeyed by all Union conferences and meetings."

The Chairman asked the Delegates of Argentina and Pakistan to join in evolving a text for discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 2000 hours.

Reporters :

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

Chairman :

C. Ribeiro

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 4

TO COMMITTEE 5

Free Distribution of Documents

During its 9th Meeting on 20 November 1952 (Document No. 267), Committee 5 set up a Working Group to study the financial effects of a possible free distribution of documents published by the Union, taking into consideration the proposal submitted by the Lebanon as amended by Brasil.

Working Group 5/4 was constituted as follows:

The Delegate of the Lebanon (Chairman), the Delegates of Portugal, Argentina, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France and Brazil.

The proposal of the Delegate of the Lebanon envisaged a free distribution of publications to Members and Associate Members as follows:

3 copies to countries in Classes 1, 2, and 3;

2 copies to countries in Classes 4, 5, and 6;

1 copy to countries in Classes 7 and 8.

The amendment proposed by Brazil entailed limiting the number of free copies distributed to one for each Member and Associate Member of the Union.

The object of these proposals was to amend Resolution No.191/CA5 of the Administrative Council (Distribution of Service Documents, the Telecommunication Journal, Notifications and Circulars), particularly paragraph 3 which reads:

....."a copy of all publications which it produces shall be despatched automatically, and subject to payment, to each non-subscribing country".....

in the sense that automatic despatch, instead of being subject to payment, and applying only to non-subscribing countries, shall be free to all Members and Associate Members.

At its meeting on 26 November 1952 the Working Group studied the above proposals and also a counter-proposal submitted by the Chairman of the Working Group which envisaged the following free distribution:

- 3 copies to countries in Classes 1 and 2;
- 2 copies to countries in Classes 3, 4, and 5;
- 1 copy to countries in Classes 6, 7, and 8.

This proposal was accepted by the Working Group.

The financial effects would be as follows:

1. Approximate cost of a collection of documents as listed in Annex 1:
715 Swiss francs.

<u>Classes</u>	<u>Free Distribution</u>	<u>Number of beneficiary countries</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 & 2	3 copies	14	42
3, 4, & 5	2 copies	21	42
6, 7, & 8	1 copy	57	<u>57</u>
			Total 141 copies

2. Effects on the Budget of the Union:

141 copies at 715.-- = 100,000 Swiss Francs (in round figures)

Increase per unit: $\frac{100,000}{794} = 125$ Swiss Francs (in round figures)
(794 units)

<u>Classes and Units</u> (At Present)	<u>Increase in</u> <u>contribution</u>	<u>Value of</u> <u>Free Distribution</u>	<u>Difference</u>
1st Class, 30 units	3,750	2,145	- 1,605
2nd Class, 25 units	3,125	2,145	- 980
3rd Class, 20 units	2,500	1,430	- 1,070
4th Class, 15 units	1,875	1,430	- 445
5th Class, 10 units	1,250	1,430	+ 180
6th Class, 5 units	625	715	+ 90
7th Class, 3 units	375	715	+ 340
8th Class, 1 unit	125	715	+ 590

From the foregoing it will be seen that countries in Classes 5 to 8 (present classification) benefit from the proposal whereas countries in classes 1 to 4 (present classification) would not be compensated for the supplementary increase in their contributions.

It was understood that Members of the Union would have the choice of receiving the relevant documents in any one of the languages in which they are published.

The Working Group recommends the Committee on I.T.U. Finances to adopt the Resolution given in Annex 2.

Chairman of Working Group 5/4

Nicolas Kayata

Annexes: 2

A N N E X 1

POSSIBLE FREE DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED BY THE UNION

In calculating the value of any free distribution, the following documents have been taken into account:

	<u>Issued in:</u>		
	<u>French</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>Spanish</u>
<u>Service Documents mentioned in the</u> <u>Telegraph and Telephone Regulations</u>			
General Telegraph Statistics, 1950	5.80	5.80	15.45
General Telephone Statistics, 1950	10.20	10.20	24.--
Official List of Telegraph Offices	46.30	46.30	46.30
List of Point-to-Point Radio Circuits	9.30	9.30	9.30
Table A	10.25	10.25	
Table B	37.--	37.--	
Table C	1.--	1.--	
Green Table	9.80	9.80	9.80
Red Table	10.--	10.--	10.--
List of Cables in the World Submarine Cable Network	6.80	6.80	6.80
List of International Telegraph Channels	12.50	12.50	12.50
<u>Service Documents mentioned in the Radio</u> <u>Regulations</u>			
International Frequency List	130.--		
Provisional List of Frequencies above 27,500 kcs	54.35	54.35	54.35
List of Fixed Stations	30.--		
List of Broadcasting Stations	21.85	21.85	21.85
List of Coast and Ship Stations	12.90	12.90	12.90
Special List of Coast and Ship Stations For Region 2	1.--	1.--	1.--
Special List of Coast and Ship Stations for Region 3	1.--	1.--	1.--
List of Aeronautical and Aircraft Stations	15.70	15.70	15.70
List of Radiolocation Stations	15.75	11.--	
List of Special Service Stations	8.--	8.--	15.90
Alphabetical List of Call Signs	17.50	17.50	17.50

	<u>French</u>	<u>English</u>	<u>Spanish</u>
Map of Coast Stations open to Public			
Correspondence	3.60		
Map of Land Stations open to Public			
Correspondence with Aircraft	9.60	9.60	9.60
Map of Radionavigation Land Stations	12.75	12.75	12.75
Coloured Chart showing International and			
Regional Frequency Allocations	3.70	3.70	3.70
General Radio Statistics 1950	4.60	3.90	

Sundry

Collection of Notifications	40.--	40.--	40.--
Collection of Circulars	5.--	5.--	5.--
Diagram showing International Telegraph			
Channels	4.--		
Atlas showing International Long-Distance			
Telecommunication Circuits	11.50		
List of International Telegraph Circuits	14.50		
List of miscellaneous abbreviations			
and signs	2.--	2.--	2.--
Preliminary List of International			
Monitoring Stations	5.50	5.50	5.50
Telecommunication Journal	10.--	10.--	10.--
First Draft Vocabulary	16.50	16.50	16.50

C.C.I.F. Publications

Yellow Book	85.75		
Instructions for International Telephone			
Operators	2.15		
Instructions for Staff Supervising and			
Charging for Radiotelephone Transmissions			
in the European System	1.10		
Recommendations concerning the Protection			
of Underground Cables against corrosion	4.25		
General Switching Programme in Europe and			
the Mediterranean Basin	11.40		
Maintenance Instructions for International			
Circuits	2.--		
<hr/>			
Total	716.90	711.45	742.80
<hr/>			

To which might be added:

The Telegraph Regulations The Telephone Regulations The Radio Regulations	}	When they are revised
---	---	-----------------------

The Documents or Final Acts of the Conferences
C.C.I. Recommendations.

The cost of these publications might vary between 20 and 50
Swiss Francs.

ANNEX 2

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE FREE DISTRIBUTION OF
PUBLICATIONS AND SERVICE DOCUMENTS

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference:

considering

the provisions of Article 14, paragraph 2 of the Convention relating to the free distribution of service publications and documents,

resolves

1) that free distribution of service publications and documents shall be effected as follows:

3 copies to countries in contributory Classes 1 and 2

2 " " " " " Classes 3, 4, and 5

1 copy " " " " " Classes 6, 7, and 8

2) the copies shall be despatched in the language chosen by the Member or Associate Member for service publications and documents.

3) However, should the orders received for an edition in any one of the languages envisaged in Article 15 be so few that the edition in that language is abandoned in order to avoid the excessive cost, free distribution shall be made in one of the languages used.

Article 14, paragraph 2 of the Convention would read as follows:

2. "The ordinary expenses of the Union (no change down to the end of the second sentence, and then :)created by the Union and the free distribution of service publications and documents. These ordinary expenses shall be borne by all Members and Associate Members."

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 317-E
26 November 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

P A K I S T A N

Proposed Amendment to

Document No. 251-E (Annex 1)

Article 6 of the Convention

New Paragraph 1(b) proposed by Pakistan Delegation in place of paragraph in Document No. 251:

"1(b) to furnish advice to Members and Associate Members (a) with a view to the operation of the maximum practicable number of Radio Channels in the Spectrum, and (b) particularly in cases where harmful interference may occur."

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

TEXTS APPROVED BY THE

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 26 November at 4 p.m.

I. First Report of Committee 7 (Document No. 269)

ANNEX 1

REVISED DEFINITION PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE 7

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, 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 right to make use of the telecommunication privileges envisaged in favour of the Specialized Agencies may facilitate the work of certain of them,

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

1. that the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations wishing to avail themselves of the telecommunication privileges recognized by the International Telecommunication Convention and by the Articles of the Telegraph Regulations covering the use of secret language and free collation, justifying the cases in which these privileges are necessary.

2. that 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.

II. Second Report of Committee 7 (Document No. 297)

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 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.

III. Choice of Class of Contribution (Document No. 302)

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:

hand in, up to 29 November 1952, notifications of change of class within that scale.

2. The Conference will consider the effects of these notifications at the same time as the effects of those applications already submitted to the Conference.

3. The delegations which by the above date have not handed in notifications of change of class will be considered to have accepted their present class under the new fiscal limit.

4. However, such delegations, after consideration of the consequences entailed for their countries by the notifications of change of class mentioned in paragraph 2 above, shall be entitled, in their turn to submit an immediate application for a lower class, by midday of the 2nd December 1952.

Union internationale
des télécommunications

Document N° 319-F-E-S
26 novembre 1952

CONFERENCE DE PLENIPOTENTIAIRES

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMISSION 8

2ème SERIE

De textes transmis à la
Commission de rédaction

(Voir Document N° 318-F)

---oOo---

SECOND SERIES

Of texts transmitted
to the Editorial Committee

(See Document No. 318-E)

---oOo---

2a. SERIE

De textos comunicados
a la Comisión de Redacción

(Véase Documento Núm. 318-S)

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

PROPOSAL No. 722

DENMARK

Add to Article 6 of the Convention, in a place to be determined by the Editorial Committee, the following sentence:

"A country, having nominated one of its nationals to serve on the Board, cannot withdraw or replace the nominated person during his normal term of office except under the conditions laid down in paragraph 3 of this Article."

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE OBSERVER OF THE
UNITED NATIONS AT THE REQUEST OF THE
PLENARY ASSEMBLY

The Plenipotentiary Conference,

considering

1. that the Specialized Agencies are not mentioned in Annex 2 to the Convention, which enumerates the authorities entitled to originate Government telegrams and Government telephone calls;
2. that there may be circumstances in which the urgency or importance of the Telecommunications of the Specialized Agencies warrants special treatment for their telegrams or telephone calls,

states

that if Specialized Agencies of the United Nations wishing to obtain special privileges for their telecommunications inform the Administrative Council, justifying the particular cases in which special treatment 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.



APPLICATIONS FOR LOWER CONTRIBUTORY CLASSES

Attached is a copy of a letter in which Mr. W.A. Borland, Head of the Delegation of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa, asks that the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa be placed in Class IV (15 units) for its share in defraying Union expenses.

At the present time, the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa is in Class II (25 units).

N. B. : for other applications of this nature, see Documents Nos. 15, 84-revised, 114, 122, 168, 262, 263, and 308.

Annex : 1

A N N E X

at

Alvear Palace Hotel
Av. Alvear 1891
Buenos Aires

26th November, 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Dear Sir,

CLASS OF CONTRIBUTION

Article 14 - Atlantic City Convention

I shall be glad if you will note that the Administration of the Union of South Africa has decided to change its class of contribution from class 2 (25 units) to class 4 (15 units) at the earliest possible date.

The reasons for this decision are contained in the statement which I made in Committee 5 on 21st November 1952. It was agreed that the full text of the statement would be included in the Minutes of the relative meeting.

Yours faithfully.

(signed)

W. A. Borland

HEAD OF DELEGATION

UNION SOUTH AFRICA & TERRITORY OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA

PROPOSAL No. 734

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Associate Members: Definition

Art. 1, para. 4. Add a new sub-para. (zero):

" 4. An Associate Member shall be:

zero) any country, territory or group of territories
listed in Annex 1 bis upon signature and
ratification of, or accession to, this
Convention, by it or on its behalf; "

(Annex 1 bis will contain a list of existing Associate Members.)

Reasons:

In order to clarify the position of the two existing
Associate Members in relation to signature and ratification of, or
accession to, the Buenos Aires Convention.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 2

DRAFT OF SECOND REPORT OF

COMMITTEE No. 2

CREDENTIALS

The first report of the Committee (Document No. 197), adopted by the Plenary Assembly on 6 November 1952 (Document No. 221), indicated in Annex 2 that the credentials of the following six Members of the Union, participating directly or by proxy in the Conference, were awaited:

Saudi Arabia	Peru
Costa Rica	Syria
Ethiopia	Turkey

In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, the Secretary General duly addressed reminders to the six delegates concerned and at its 5th meeting on . . . December, the credentials of the following Members were available:

Syria (proxy to the Egyptian Delegation)
Turkey
Peru
Ethiopia (proxy to Shri Krishna Prasada of the Indian Delegation).

The credentials of the above-mentioned four countries were examined by the Committee and were found to be (here report the findings of the Committee).

Thus the only credentials still awaited are those of Saudi Arabia and of Costa Rica. As mentioned in Annex 2 to Document No. 197 a telegram from Costa Rica was provisionally accepted by the Committee pending presentation of full powers. The Committee recommends that the Secretary General be asked to address further reminders to the Delegations of Saudi Arabia and Costa Rica urging them to deposit powers in proper form at the earliest possible moment.

At its 5th meeting the Committee also examined (here report the findings of the Committee) credentials deposited by Cuba, Colombia and Egypt in respect of additional delegates.

In accordance with the proposal contained in the last paragraph of the First Report of the Committee, the rapporteurs of the Committee, assisted by a representative of the Secretary General, have drawn up a list of delegates empowered to sign the Final Acts of the Conference. It is proposed to complete this list after the approval of the present report and to circulate it as a Conference document.

Chairman

Union internationale
des télécommunications

Document N° 325-FES-

27 novembre 1952

CONFERENCE DE PLENIPOTENTIAIRES

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMISSION 8

COMMITTEE 8

COMISION 8

CORRIGENDUM AU DOCUMENT 318-F

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENT 318-E

CORRIGENDUM AL DOCUMENTO 318-S

Pages 2 et 3

Páginas 2 y 3

Supprimer tout le texte qui figure sous ANNEXE 2.

Delete the whole of the text under ANNEX 2.

Suprímase todo el texto que figura bajo el ANEXO 2.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 326-E
27 November 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

Summary Record of the 23rd Meeting

Tuesday 25 November, 1130 hours

Chairman: Mr. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted for approval the Summary Record of the 19th meeting (Document No. 264) which was approved subject to the following corrections requested by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

- page 4, first sub-paragraph of the statement by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., lines 5-6, replace: "unfavourable" by "dishonourable" and "for changing the Chairman" by "for electing a new Chairman",
- page 8, last line on the page, bring the English text into line with the French.

During the examination of Document No. 264, the Delegate of France asked if the question he had raised during the 19th meeting had been followed up (the case of the C.C.I. resulting from the merger of the C.C.I.T. and C.C.I.F. deciding to appoint a Vice-Director as well as a Director). Mr. Metzler, Chairman of Working Group 1, replied that he had received no instructions in the matter. The Chairman said that it would not be too late for the next Plenipotentiary Conference to amend the text of the Convention, if the Telegraph and Telephone Conference decided to create a post of Vice-Director in the joint Consultative Committee envisaged.

The Chairman informed the Committee of the steps taken by the Heads of Delegations at a meeting the previous day to accelerate the work of the Conference. These were as follows:

- 1) It was imperative that the Committee work of the Conference should be finished by 6 December. Texts that had not been revised by that date would be retained in their existing form; proposals that had not been examined would be abandoned.
- 2) Working Groups would continue to send to the Committee the texts drafted and the latter would examine them and send them to the Editorial Committee.
- 3) Chairmen of Committees must, during the examination of any question, first put to the vote the maintenance of the status quo.
- 4) Committee 3 was requested to set up a Sub-Committee to revise Articles 18 to 49 of the Convention.

The Chairman proposed that this Sub-Committee should be set up. A considerable number of Delegations asked to take part in its work and the Chairman therefore definitively decided against its constitution.

The Committee returned to the examination of Article 5:
Administrative Council.

Article 5, paragraph 8 (Cont'd)

The question under discussion was contained in Proposal No. 59 of Argentina, namely: "The decisions of the Council shall be binding on all conferences and meetings of the Union."

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

"The Delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. is opposed to the proposal, according to which the decisions of the Council shall be binding on all conferences and meetings of the Union. Administrative

and other conferences are meetings of a greater number of Members of the Union and consequently, the sovereign right of these representatives to adopt independent decisions must be respected.

"We are opposed to the second part of Proposal No. 59."

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia proposed the following amendment:

"The decisions arising from the performance of its duties shall be binding...."

The Delegate of India preferred the following text:

"The decisions arising from the performance of its duties shall be respected...."

With the approval of the Committee the Chairman first put to the vote the present text.

The maintenance of the status quo was approved by 39 votes to 10 with 7 abstentions.

Paragraph 8 of Article 5 was therefore sent to Working Group 2 for redrafting, taking into consideration the parts of Proposals Nos. 59 and 62 which amounted, in substance, to stating that the Council shall only act collectively in official session.

Article 5, paragraph 9

This paragraph was dealt with during the 4th meeting (Document No. 88).

Article 5, sub-paragraph 10 (1)

Several proposals envisaged the addition to this sub-paragraph of the words: "and Administrative Conferences, and Conferences or meetings of the Union", or something similar. The proposals concerned were Nos. 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, and 572.

The Dologato of Franco and Portugal expressed their agreement with those proposals. The Dologato of the U.S.S.R. saw no need to change the existing text.

The Chairman put the maintenance of the status quo to the vote. The result of the vote by a raise of hands being in doubt (27 in favour and 26 against) a vote by roll-call was taken.

The maintenance of the status quo was rejected by 35 to 20 with 10 abstentions.

The following voted in favour of maintaining the status quo :
20 Dologations, Afghanistan, Peoplo's Republic of Albania, Austria, Biolorussian S.S.R., Peoplo's Republic of Bulgaria, Ceylon, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Hungarian Peoplo's Republic, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peoplo's Republic of Poland, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian Peoplo's Republic, Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R.

The following voted against retaining the present text : 35 Dologations.

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Vatican City, Colombia, Belgian Congo, Korea, Egypt, United States of America, Franco, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Monaco, Norway, New Zealand, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Federal German Republic, Federal Peoplo's Republic of Yugoslavia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Syria, United States Territories, French Oversea Territories, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Turkey, Uruguay.

The following abstained : 10 Dologations.

Chile, Spain, Iraq, Iceland, Jordan, Switzerland, Thailand, Viet-Nam, Yemen, Spanish Morocco.

Working Group 2 was instructed to draft sub-paragraph 10 (1) bearing in mind the above vote.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 10(2) and 11 (a)

No proposal concerning these had been submitted.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 11 (b)

This sub-paragraph formed the subject of proposal 728 of France (Document No. 230). It dealt with provisional agreements concluded by the Administrative Council with international organizations; the principle had already been adopted by the Committee during its examination of the Article relating to Plenipotentiary Conferences (Document No. 219, Summary Record of the 16th Meeting, pages 3 to 6).

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

"When proposal 728 was discussed, my Delegation pointed out that it was opposed to granting the Council the right to conclude provisional agreements in the name of the Union, as such agreements might very possibly contain provisions to which the majority of the Members of the Union would not give their consent.

"Consequently, we consider that the Council should only draw up draft agreements and these should be directly approved by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

"We consider that this question should be reviewed. If you feel that it is necessary to revert to it now, we shall submit our considerations, but if the question is examined in Plenary Assembly we shall submit our considerations to the Plenary Assembly".

The Committee decided by 45 votes to 5 not to re-open the discussion.

Working Group 2 was instructed to draft sub-paragraph 11 (b) taking into consideration proposals 71 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 84, paragraph 13 (2) France and 728 (France).

Article 5, Sub-paragraph (c)

The following proposals referred to this sub-paragraph : Proposal No. 72 (United States of America) which had no further bearing on the question as Proposal No. 120 had been rejected, proposal 75 (United Kingdom

of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) which was withdrawn, and proposal 76 (Switzerland) which was supported by the Delegates of Egypt and Pakistan.

By 43 votes to 4, the Committee decided not to change the present text.

Proposals relating to the addition of a sub-paragraph concerning the competence of the Council in Staff salary matters were not examined since they were not within the jurisdiction of Committee 5.

Proposal No. 73 (Italy) suggesting the addition of a sub-paragraph c ter) was sent to the Working Group.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 11 (d) (e) and (f)

Proposals relating to this sub-paragraph only raised questions of drafting. They were sent to the Working Group.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 11 (g)

The following proposals affected this sub-paragraph : 80 (U.S.A.), 81 (Switzerland) and 84, paragraph 13 (8) (France).

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. pointed out that proposal 80 no longer existed; he had no objection to proposal 81.

The Chairman said that the Working Group could use proposal 81 if, in the text that it had to draft for Article 11, it introduced the idea of Special Conferences.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 11 (g-bis)

The Delegations of Norway, Denmark, Iceland and Sweden had submitted proposal 706 (Document No. 109) which entailed the addition of a new sub-paragraph as follows :

"g-bis) submit to Plenipotentiary and Administrative Conferences of the Union the proposals it considers useful."

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

"My Delegation has carefully studied Proposal No. 706 and considers it unacceptable. We consider that the right to submit proposals for the examination of Conferences is reserved for countries, Members and Associate Members of the Union. We cannot accept that this right should be extended to the permanent organs of the Union because this is, in principle, incorrect.

"What is the Administrative Council?

"Eighteen countries are represented in the Council. It is known that, in practice, when it is examining any question, the Council comes to a decision by a vote. It can, for example arrive at a decision by a vote of 7 to 5 with 6 abstentions. What does a decision of this nature mean? It is not the opinion of the Council, but a point of view of 7 countries which have voted in favour of the decision. This means that the authority of the Council would be used to present a proposal which is essentially a proposal of a few countries and not at all a proposal of the Council.

"We consider this to be incorrect.

"Even if the Council were completely unanimous, that would represent only the opinion of 18 countries. We consider that this procedure places in a position of inequality the countries which submit this proposal in the name of the Council and the countries which are not Members of the Council, since the latter intervene individually while a certain number of the Members of the Council would use the Council's authority to submit their individual proposals. This is an essential difference.

"There is no doubt that, if one or several countries wished to submit proposals, there is nothing to prevent them doing so in their own name. A procedure of this nature places all countries on an equal footing. It would, in principle, be incorrect to use the authority of the Council to submit the proposals of individual countries.

"Consequently, my Delegation is opposed to granting the permanent organs the right to submit proposals.

"Speaking in my capacity as Chairman of Committee 4, I wish to remind the Committee that Committee 4 has already clearly confirmed that the right to submit proposals to the Plenipotentiary Conference

is reserved for countries, Members and Associate Members of the Union.

"We consider that Proposal No. 706 should be rejected."

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

"The Delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. is opposed to an extension of the functions of the Administrative Council and, for this reason, opposed to Proposal No. 706, pursuant to which the Council is instructed to submit proposals to Plenipotentiary and Administrative Conferences.

"Only countries, Members of the Union, can submit proposals, and not the permanent organs of the Union. The Administrative Council must not submit proposals because this right is reserved for countries, Members of the Union.

"A question of principle is involved and we shall vote against Proposal No. 706."

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he was in favour of Proposal No. 706 but he asked that the Summary Record of the meeting should make it clear that suggestions emanating from the Council did not necessarily bind the Members of the Council who must be completely free to submit different proposals or suggestions.

Proposal No. 706 was supported by the Delegates of Argentina, Portugal and Pakistan.

After the Delegates of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Switzerland and France had spoken, the text under discussion was modified as follows:

"g-bis) submit to Plenipotentiary Conferences of the Union opinions ~~at~~ considers useful."

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

"We do not see any considerable difference between the text of Proposal No. 706 as originally submitted and after amendment. The

amendments do modify to some extent Proposal No. 706, but basically it changes little as, in expressing 'opinions' or 'recommendations', the Council will, de facto, try to influence the decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

"We are opposed to the granting of powers of this nature to the Council. We consider that only Members and Associate Members of the Union have the right to submit proposals, not the permanent organs; and we include the Council in this term.

"The Union is composed only of Members and Associate Members. The permanent organs are not Members of the Union; therefore they have not the right to submit proposals in their own name and they cannot give 'advice'. A question of principle is involved.

"The principle must be maintained according to which the right to submit proposals is granted solely to Members and Associate Members of the Union. We are therefore opposed to the amended version of Proposal No. 706."

Proposal No. 706, amended as above, was adopted by 40 votes to 9 with 5 abstentions.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 11 (h)

This sub-paragraph was the subject of Proposals Nos. 82 (U.S.A.) and 84, paragraph 13 (9 and 10) (France).

Drafting was entrusted to the Working Group which will decide if the words : "as prescribed in the Regulations" shall be retained or deleted.

Article 5 sub-paragraph 11 (i)

Proposal No. 83 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) was withdrawn.

Proposal No. 573 (New Zealand) was sent to the Working Group. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he had no objection to this proposal.

Article 5, sub-paragraph 1 (1)

The Committee returned to the question of re-election of Members of the Council which had been left in abeyance at the end of the preceding meeting when a proposal of Spain on the subject had been discussed.

At the request of the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. the Chairman first put to the vote the present provision, namely the sentence: "They are eligible for re-election".

It was decided to retain this text by 45 votes to 10 with 2 abstentions.

The Spanish proposal was therefore rejected.

The study of Article 5 being finished, Working Group 2, presided over by Colonel Read (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) was instructed to re-draft the Article.

The meeting rose at 1315 hours.

Reporters :

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

Chairman :

C. Ribeiro.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND

NORTHERN IRELAND

NOTIFICATION OF WITHDRAWAL OF PROPOSALS

1. In order to expedite the work of the Conference, the Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland withdraws the following proposals. Some of these proposals are already being withdrawn in Committee.

Nos.	21	148	298
	29	155	299
	37	172	308
	39	189	312
	47	202	
	52	209	
	67	212	
	71	213	
	75	214	
	78	215	
	83	263	
	107	266	
	117		

2. This list supplements that contained in Annex 2 to Document No. 266.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 328-E
27 November 1952

COMMITTEE 6

CONFERENCE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Agenda for the 2nd Meeting

Saturday 29 November at 4 p.m.

ROOM B

-
1. Approval of the Summary Record of the 1st Meeting (Doc. No. 68).
 2. Report by Working Group (Doc. No. 261).
 3. Second Report by Working Group (Doc. No. 307).

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 329-E
27 November 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

C U B A

Draft amendment to the Second Solution which appears in
Document No. 304.

1. Delete Paragraph 7.
2. Add to Paragraph 8 (which will become Paragraph 7),
a sub-paragraph f) to read as follows:

f) If one or more of the countries elected does not accept nomination, another country from the same region, which is prepared to serve, shall be nominated. The country nominated shall be that which follows next in decreasing order of votes obtained.

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 330-E
28 November, 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

CORRIGENDUM No. 1

TO DOCUMENT No. 298-E

(English text only)

Page 2. Administration

Amend to read:

"Any department or service of a"

Representative

Amend the final line to read:

"..... meeting of an International Consultative Committee."

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE 5

SECOND REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 2 TO COMMITTEE 5

Subject: Decision as to a new basic salary scale (Report by the Administrative Council, Chapter V, item 1.2).

At its meetings on 8, 19 and 22 November 1952, the Working Group made as detailed a study as was possible of the above question.

Its findings are as follows:

1. A complete assimilation of I.T.U. staff salaries to those of the United Nations and of the other specialized agencies, based on prior comparison of staff duties, would be exceedingly difficult to effect. Such a comparison is relatively easy for the lower categories of staff, but as regards I.T.U. Class 3 and above, inquiry shows considerable differences in the nature of the duties themselves, as also in the qualifications required of persons occupying the posts, with respect to general culture, special knowledge, degrees and diplomas. In general it may be said that, as regards Class 3 and above, and excepting the engineering posts, the I.T.U. official is concerned above all with administration, whereas the United Nations official tends to have responsibilities of an economic, industrial, financial or political character. (See also report by Sub-Working Group, Document No. 237).

Further, the Working Group observed that complete assimilation of I.T.U. salaries to those of the United Nations, as proposed in the Expert Report (Document No. 94, pages 32 to 35) would increase expenditure in the 1953 budget (for salaries and contributions to the I.T.U. Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds) by some 350.000 Swiss francs. That increase would grow steadily year by year, because of the increase in step, and would reach 965.000 Swiss francs in 1957 (Document No. 192).

U.N.
GENEVE

The Working Group was unanimously of the opinion that so large an increase in Union expenditure could not possibly be envisaged.

The Working Group then tried to draw up a new salary scale for Class D and Classes 1 to 8, by means of a rough comparison of I.T.U. duties with those of the United Nations, neglecting the more generous pension scheme obtaining in the I.T.U. This scale appears in Annex 1 hereinafter.

Application of this scale would give rise to the following increases in expenditure:

1953 budget ... 112,920 Swiss francs for salaries properly so called;
102,757 Swiss francs for contributions to the Staff
_____ Superannuation and Benevolent Funds;
215,677 Swiss francs.

1957 budget ... because of increases in step between 1953 and 1957:
123,480 Swiss francs for salaries properly so called;
112,367 Swiss francs for contributions to the Staff
_____ Superannuation and Benevolent Funds;
235,847 Swiss francs.

The increase of 112,920 Swiss francs on salaries properly so called represents 3.4% of the total amount allocated for salaries in the 1953 budget, which has been drawn up on the basis of the existing scale.

Although adoption of this scale would have less considerable financial repercussions, the Working Group does not feel able to recommend that the Finance Committee should approve it, having lacked both the time and the necessary material to make a really thorough comparison of duties. Such a comparison is imperatively required before any assimilation of salaries.

The Working Group was of the opinion that the matter is one which ought to be considered by the Coordination Committee, which would refer its findings to the Administrative Council. The Council would then make the appropriate proposals to the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

2. Nevertheless, since under the existing scale Class 8 salaries are notoriously inadequate, there is no reason why the minimum for this Class should not be set at 6,200 Swiss francs and the maximum at 9,000 Swiss francs. This increase would entail an annual supplementary budget charge of 6,000 Swiss francs. (Salaries and contributions Superannuation and Provident Funds).

No other change in the existing salary scale would be made, although some members of the Group expressed the view that some slight increase in the Secretary General's emoluments would be desirable.

3. The Working Group unanimously considered that the qualifications required for certain posts ought to be reclassified, in order to bring about a better and more rational apportionment of duties between the various classes in the salary scale. Duties could be reclassified equally well in lower as in higher classes.

A recommendation should be made to the Administrative Council that such a reclassification be effected, after the Coordination Committee has been duly sounded. To this effect, a credit of 100,000 Swiss francs would be posted in the 1953 budget: 52,556 Swiss francs for salaries and 47,644 Swiss francs for Superannuation and Provident Funds. For the years 1954 to 1957, a credit of 65,000 Swiss francs would be posted. (Salaries and Superannuation and Provident Funds).

In addition, the Group felt that such a reclassification should be effected before any action is taken towards an adjustment in salaries, and that it should take effect from 1 January 1953.

4. Since it is at this time impossible to draw up an entirely new basic salary scale, and being of the opinion, in addition, that the 5% increase in the cost of living in Switzerland since 1947 justifies a provisional adjustment in salaries, the Group considered that a temporary allowance should be granted to Classes 1 to 8, with retroactive effect from 1 January 1953. Details would be worked out by the Administrative Council, and the credits available would amount to 3% of the total expenditure on salaries properly so called for Classes 1 to 8, or some 66,000 Swiss francs. This temporary allowance would not be subject to deductions for the Superannuation and Provident Funds.

It must be understood that this 3% would not be applied uniformly to the salaries of the above classes. It would decrease in size from the bottom to the top of the scale.

Some members of the Group however, were of the opinion that it would be preferable to adjust salaries by modifying salary scales rather than by granting a temporary allowance.

5. Simply and solely to render possible a subsequent salary adjustment by means of a temporary allowance not subject to deductions for the Super-annuation and Provident Funds, if such adjustment were considered necessary before the next Plenipotentiary Conference, a credit of 200,000 Swiss Francs would be provided for within the fiscal limit on I.T.U. ordinary expenditure. It must be understood that this credit could not be used except within strictly indispensable limits.
6. Lastly, the Group considered that only posts in Class 3 and above should be considered as having an international character, i.e., that in case of need, those posts alone must be recruited internationally.

Financial conclusions.

The measures proposed above would result in the following increases:

1) 1953 ordinary budget:

Item 2	6,000 Swiss francs
Item 3	100,000 Swiss francs
Item 4	<u>66,000 Swiss francs</u>
	172,000 Swiss francs

2) Increase in the fiscal limit on ordinary expenditure:

Item 5	200,000 Swiss francs
--------	----------------------

Methods of implementation

1. The draft resolution (A or B) annexed to Document No. 218-Revised should be completed and amended to bring it into line with whatever decisions are taken by Committee 5 in connection with the matters dealt with in this report.
2. After Committee 5 has come to a decision on the principle involved, a draft resolution on paragraphs 3 and 6 of this report will be submitted.

R. Vandonhove
Chairman, Working Group 2

Annex: 1.

- 6 -
(331-E)

ANNEX

Scale and steps of annual salaries

Swiss francs

New Scale

<u>Class</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Step</u> <u>Increases</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>I</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>II</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>III</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>IV</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>V</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>VI</u>	<u>STEP</u> <u>VII</u>
C	26.500	34.500	2.000	26.500	28.500	30.500	32.500	34.500		
1	18.200	27.700	1.900	28.200	20.100	22.000	23.900	25.800	27.700	
2	13.500	23.100	1.600	13.500	15.100	16.700	18.300	19.900	21.500	23.100
3	12.000	18.600	1.100	12.000	13.100	14.200	15.300	16.400	17.500	18.600
4	10.700	16.100	900	10.700	11.600	12.500	13.400	14.300	15.200	16.100
5	9.600	14.400	800	9.600	10.400	11.200	12.000	12.800	13.600	14.400
6	8.700	12.900	700	8.700	9.400	10.100	10.800	11.500	12.200	12.900
7	7.800	11.400	600	7.800	8.400	9.000	9.600	10.200	10.800	11.400
8	7.000	9.400	400	7.000	7.400	7.800	8.200	8.600	9.000	9.400

Old Scale

C	38.000	-	38.000							
D	32.000	-	32.000							
1	17.000	25.800	1.760	17.000	18.760	20.520	22.280	24.040	25.800	
2	12.600	21.500	1.780	12.600	14.380	16.160	17.940	19.720	21.500	
3	11.400	17.200	1.160	11.400	12.560	13.720	14.880	16.040	17.200	
4	10.100	14.900	960	10.100	11.060	12.020	12.980	13.940	14.900	
5	8.700	13.500	960	8.700	9.660	10.620	11.580	12.540	13.500	
6	7.400	12.200	960	7.400	8.360	9.320	10.280	11.240	12.200	
7	6.500	10.800	860	6.500	7.360	8.220	9.080	9.940	10.800	
8	4.500	8.500	800	4.500	5.300	6.100	6.900	7.700	8.500	

Union internationale
des télécommunications

Do ment N° 332-FES
28 mbre 1952

CONFERENCE DE PLENIPOTENTIAIRES

Buenos Aires, 1952

CORRIGENDUM AU DOCUMENT N° 292-F

Dans la liste des propositions retirées, supprimer la proposition N° 281.

CORRIGENDUM TO DOCUMENT No. 292-E

Delete proposal No. 281 from the list of proposals withdrawn.

CORRIGENDUM AL DOCUMENTO NUM. 292-S

En la lista de proposiciones retiradas, suprimase la proposición Núm. 281.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL
BY THE BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Following the decisions adopted by the Plenary Assembly at its meetings on 27 and 28 November 1952, the election of members of the Administrative Council by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference will be carried out as follows:

1. As the election must take place on a geographical basis, Members of the Union are grouped into four regions: A, B, C, D, as shown in Annex 1.
2. Each of the regions A, B, and D shall be represented in the Administrative Council by five members. Region C shall be represented by three members.
3. Delegations of countries wishing to sit in the Administrative Council should send their candidatures, in writing, to the Chairman of the Conference (in conformity with the decision adopted by the Plenary Assembly on 28 November 1952, the final date for depositing candidatures was fixed for noon, 29 November 1952).
4. Annex 2 attached hereto gives the list of candidatures received within the specified time limit.
5. The election - by secret ballot - will take place at the Plenary Assembly at 9 a.m. on 3 December 1952.
6. Each Delegation will receive single voting slip bearing the name of candidates grouped into regions.

7. Each country should delete on its voting slip all except a maximum of 5 names for each of the regions A, B, and D, and all except a maximum of 3 names for region C. The voting slips bearing, respectively for each region, more than five or three names will be considered invalid.
8. After the count a list will be drawn up of candidate countries in each region in decreasing order of the number of votes obtained.
9. If several countries tie for the fifth position or the third position, as the case may be, a special vote will be taken to decide between the countries concerned.
10. The following will be declared elected members of the Administrative Council:
 - the five countries which obtained most votes for regions A, B, and D;
 - the three countries which obtained most votes for region C.

Annexes: 2

ANNEX 1

GROUPING OF MEMBERS OF THE UNION FOR THE ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL BY THE BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE.

Region A - American Region

Argentina (Republic of)	Guatemala
Bolivia	Haiti (Republic of)
Brazil	Honduras (Republic of)
Canada	Mexico
Chile	Nicaragua
Colombia (Republic of)	Panama
Costa Rica	Paraguay
Cuba	Peru
Dominican Republic	Territories of the United
Ecuador	States of America
El Salvador (Republic of)	Uruguay (Oriental Republic of)
United States of America	Venezuela (United States of)

Region B - Western Europe and African Region

Austria	Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands
Belgium	Antilles, New Guinea
Vatican City State	Portugal
Colonies, Protectorates, Oversea	French Protectorates of Morocco
Territories and Territories under	and Tunisia
mandate or trusteeship of the United	German Federal Republic
Kingdom of Great Britain and	Southern Rhodesia
Northern Ireland	United Kingdom of Great Britain
Belgian Congo and Territories of	and Northern Ireland
Ruanda Urundi	Sweden
Denmark	Switzerland (Confederation)
Spain	Oversea Territories of the French
France	Republic and Territories admini-
Greece	stered as such
Ireland	Portuguese Oversea Territories
Iceland	Union of South Africa and
Italy	Territory of South Africa
Liberia	Spanish Zone of Morocco and
Luxembourg	totality of Spanish Possessions.
Monaco	
Norway	

Region C - Eastern Europe and Northern Asia

Albania (People's Republic of)	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist
Biclorussian Soviet Socialist	Republic
Republic	Roumanian People's Republic
Bulgaria (People's Republic of)	Czechoslovakia
Finland	Union of Soviet Socialist
Hungarian People's Republic	Republics
Poland (People's Republic of)	
Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia	

Region D - Other countries

Afghanistan	Lebanon
Saudi Arabia (Kingdom of)	New Zealand
Australia (Commonwealth of)	Pakistan
Burma	Philippines (Republic of the)
Cambodia (Kingdom of)	Syrian Republic
Ceylon	Thailand
China	Turkey
Korea (Republic of)	Viet-Nam (State of)
Egypt	Yemen
Ethiopia	
India	
Indonesia (Republic of)	
Iran	
Iraq	
Israel (State of)	
Japan	
Jordan (Hashemite Kingdom of)	
Laos (Kingdom of)	

A N N E X 2

CANDIDATURES SUBMITTED WITH A VIEW TO THE ELECTION
OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL BY THE
BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Region A - American Region

Argentina (Republic of)
Brazil
Canada
Colombia (Republic of)
United States of America
Mexico
Venezuela (United States of)

Region B - Western Europe and African Region

Spain
France
Greece
Italy
Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea
Portugal
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Sweden
Switzerland (Confederation)

Region C - Eastern Europe and Northern Asia

Poland (People's Republic of)
Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia
Czechoslovakia
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Region D - Other Countries

Ceylon
China
Egypt
India
Indonesia (Republic of)
Japan
Lebanon
New Zealand
Pakistan
Turkey

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

MEETING OF THE HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

2nd meeting

Monday, 24 November, 1952 at 2000 hours

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

The Chairman said he had called the meeting in order to explain to Heads of Delegations what the Steering Committee had done to speed up the Conference, to acquaint himself with their views, and to ask them for suggestions.

At its last meeting, on 20 November, the Steering Committee had considered the progress so far made. As the final date of 10 December, originally set, was getting nearer, certain Chairmen of Committees had been of opinion that the Conference could finish by that date only by reducing to their bare essentials the questions it still had to consider. Others had declared that the Conference could and should consider the entire Convention and General Regulations. As the result of the discussions which had taken place in the Steering Committee, the recommendations in Document No. 273 had been evolved, and the date of 10 December 1952 had been replaced by that of 20 December.

He then explained each of the five measures proposed by the Steering Committee.

First recommendation

The Conference should concentrate on the study of essential questions, leaving aside those of secondary importance.

Some Heads of Delegation thereupon said they had already withdrawn those of their proposals which they considered of minor importance; others, that they intended to follow suit.

Second recommendation

Committee 3 was asked to set up a Sub-Committee to consider Articles 18 to 49 of the Convention.

The Head of the Delegation of Portugal, Chairman of Committee 3, said that he had proposed to his Committee that a Sub-Committee be set up as recommended; but too many Delegations wished to serve on the Sub-Committee and the idea had had to be abandoned.

The Heads of the Delegations of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. said they were opposed, on grounds of principle, to setting up the Sub-Committee; Committee 3 should itself examine the text of Articles 18 to 49 of the Convention as it had examined the other Articles of the Convention.

The Delegate of India said that he had asked to take part in the work of the Sub-Committee but that he would withdraw his request if other Delegations were prepared to do the same.

It was decided that the Sub-Committee in question would be set up if the occasion arose.

Third recommendation

Afternoon meetings should go on until 2000 hours.

No objections.

Fourth recommendation

Committee Work must be finished by Saturday 6 December.

(334-E)

A number of Heads of Delegations, in particular those of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukrainian S.S.R. considered this date acceptable as the final date for Committee Work.

Speaking as Chairman of Committee 4, the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that his Committee would finish at the required time.

The Head of the Delegation of Portugal, Chairman of Committee 3, wondered what would happen if the work of his Committee was not concluded by 6 December. He asked the Meeting of the Heads of Delegations what should be done in that case.

The Head of the Delegation of the Netherlands proposed that all proposals that had not been examined before the 6 December should be left on one side. This proposal was supported by the Heads of the Delegations of Switzerland and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Consequently it was decided that 6 December should be the final date for Committee work and that no proposal would be examined in Committee after that date.

Fifth recommendation

The Steering Committee recommended that in order to accelerate work, texts drafted by Working Groups entrusted with purely drafting duties should be sent direct to the Editorial Committee by the Working Groups without being again referred to the Committee concerned.

The Head of the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. said he was opposed to this procedure which was contrary to usual practice and was also basically unacceptable. Generally, Working Groups consisted of about a dozen Members and it was inevitable that when Committees, comprising a far greater number of Delegations, examined the texts drafted by the Working Groups, numerous remarks were made and amendments submitted.

It would therefore be a waste of time to send these texts direct to the Editorial Committee. The Plenary Assembly would then have to do the work that normally devolved on Committees.

The Head of the Delegation of France, speaking as Chairman of the Editorial Committee, said that if his Committee was to work efficiently it must receive almost definitive texts; namely texts emanating from Committees and not from Working Groups.

The Delegates of Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian S.S.R. and Portugal also felt that the usual procedure was preferable to the step proposed and that little time would be saved by the latter.

It was therefore decided that the Fifth Recommendation of the Steering Committee could not be accepted; texts sent to the Editorial Committee would therefore have been examined previously by the Committees concerned.

---o---

The Chairman of Committee 3 said the question of maintaining the status quo in existing texts had often come before his Committee. He therefore asked the Meeting of Heads of Delegations to give a reply to the following question: when several proposals are submitted, must normal procedure be followed and the proposal furthest from the text in force be discussed first or, if so requested by a Delegation, can a decision first be taken on maintaining the status quo?

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia thought that it should always be possible to begin by taking a vote on maintaining the status quo if the Delegation which had submitted the proposal furthest removed from the text in force accepted this procedure.

The Delegate of China also said that he was, generally, in favour of maintaining the status quo.

Finally it was decided that, contrary to normal practice, Chairmen of Committees could open discussion first on maintaining the status quo relating to texts being examined by their Committees.

The Delegate of Denmark enumerated the essential matters that had been already settled and those that remained to be dealt with: election of the Members of the Administrative Council, fiscal limit on expenses, staff salaries. He considered that these questions could be settled by 20 December; the less important questions could be ignored.

The Delegate of Switzerland said that Document No. 969 of the Administrative Council contained a list of points dealt with in the Atlantic City Convention which had given rise to difficulties of interpretation since the Convention came into force. He asked therefore, that only proposals relating to these questions should be examined, and proposed that the Secretary General should draw up a list based on Document No. 969 of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference including the relevant proposals submitted to the Conference.

The meeting rose at 21.45 hours.

Reporter:

J. Revoy

Secretary General

L. Mulatier

Chairman

M.A. Andrada

Unión internacional
de telecomunicaciones

Documento N° 335-FES
28 de noviembre, 1952

CONFERENCIA PLENIPOTENCIARIA

Buenos Aires, 1952

PROGRAMA PARA LA SEMANA 1 AL 6 DE DICIEMBRE

EMPLOI DU TEMPS POUR LA SEMAINE DU 1 AU 6 DECEMBRE

SCHEDULE FOR WEEK 1 TO 6 DECEMBER

	Lunes 1	Martes 2	Miércoles 3	Jueves 4	Viernes 5	Sábado 6
ASAMBLEA PLENARIA			09-10(PL)			
Com. 1					20-21(A)	
Com. 2				10-12(B)		
Com. 3 3/1 3/2	10-13(PL) 08-10(B)	16-20(C)	16-20(PL) 10-13(C)	16-20(A)	16-20(PL) 10-13(B) 08-10(B)	16-20(PL)
Com. 4	16-20(PL)	10-13(PL)		10-13(PL)		10-11(PL)
Com. 5 5/2 5/3 5/5 5/6	16-20(A) 10-13(B)	09-13(A) 16-20(B) 08-09(B)	10-13(B) 16-20(B)	09-13(A) 16-20(B) 08-09(C)	10-13(A) 08-10(A) 16-20(B)	09-13(A) 16-20(B) 08-09(B)
Com. 6				16-20(PL)		
Com. 7			10-12(PL)			
Com. 8	16-20(C)	10-13(C)			10-13(C)	16-20(C)



PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

5th⁺ REPORT OF COMMITTEE 5

to the

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SUBJECT: I.T.U. Premises in Geneva

1. In accordance with the mandate issued by the Plenary Assembly, Committee 5 studied the question of the premises for the I.T.U. in Geneva at its second meeting held on 23 October 1952. After a detailed exchange of opinions, the Committee unanimously agreed to refer the problem to the Administrative Council which was due to meet shortly for further study and for submission of recommendation.
2. The Council studied the problem at its Buenos Aires Session and its recommendation is contained in Document No. 240.
3. The report was studied by Committee 5 in its 13th meeting held on 28 November 1952, and it was unanimously decided to recommend to the Plenary Assembly that the course suggested by the Administrative Council be adopted and that the Council be authorized to give effect to its decision.
4. A draft resolution for the consideration of the Plenary Assembly, approved by Committee 5, is appended herewith.
5. Necessary provision for the additional expenditure which will be incurred as a result of the implementation of the decision will be in the budget estimates for 1956 and 1957.

Krishna Prasada

Chairman, Committee 5

+This is the fifth report of Committee 5. Document No. 302 dated 25 November 1952 may be treated as the fourth report.

Annex: 1

A N N E X

DRAFT RESOLUTION

The International Telecommunications Conference of Buenos Aires

Considering:

That the present premises at Geneva occupied by the International Telecommunications Union are inadequate to meet the needs of the Union,

instructs the Administrative Council to pursue the studies now being made and to reach a speedy conclusion on the basis of the 2 following considerations, and to give effect to it:

- 1) The solution to be adopted must be satisfactory as regards the facilities which should be enjoyed by the services of the Union; and
- 2) Under appreciably equal conditions in this connection, the Administrative Council will choose the most economical solution.

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 7th meeting

Wednesday 3 December at 1000 hours

Plenary Hall

-
1. Approval of minutes of 5th and 6th meetings (Documents Nos. 274 and 314).
 2. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies - Draft resolution by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Document No. 177 revised). Discussion resumed.
 3. Freedom of Information (Document No. 258).

FINAL CORRIGENDUM

TO THE MINUTES OF THE 6th AND 7th MEETINGS

(Documents Nos. 220 and 221-E)

Minutes of the 6th Meeting (Doc.No.220-E)

Page 6, 5th paragraph: Replace the second sentence by: "It was thererore essential that the number of Members be increased to twenty to allow for uniform representation of the four regions of the world."

Page 15, 3rd paragraph: In the second line, for "inadequate" read "adequate".

Minutes of the 7th Meeting (Doc.No.221-E)

Page 1 and Page 4, item 3: The title should be changed to read: "THIRD REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3 TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY (Doc.No.154, paragraphs 3 to 5)."

Page 7, item 3.16: In the last line but one replace "already made heavier by the I.F.R.B." by "already made heavier by the E.A.R.C.".

item 3.18: In the 3rd line, for "ration" read "ratio".

Page 10: Replace the summary of the intervention by the Delegate of Brazil by the following verbatim text:

"Mr. Chairman, when the Delegation of Brazil submitted its proposal for increasing the number of Members of the I.F.R.B. from 11 to 15, its aim was to improve the standing of that body, by strengthening its geographical basis and fitting it to carry out the new tasks entrusted to it by the E.A.R.C. or perhaps by the present Conference.

"For us the increase in the number of the Members of the Board is founded on a question of principle concerning more equitable representation of the regions, on the basis established at Atlantic City. As we have shown, we thought that 15 was the minimum acceptable figure for this purpose, since such an increase would create no problem in the



distribution advocated of one Member for each of those regions; we also refuted the arguments in favour of 11 as the most satisfactory number of Members for carrying out the tasks of the Board. Why not 10 or 12 ? How can the number of Members be so accurately determined, as has been done, on the basis of the work of the I.F.R.B. ?

"The Delegate of Pakistan has just proposed that the number of Members should be 13, and not 11 or 15.

"The distribution of these two new Members, on the Atlantic City basis, would be very easy in our opinion and would merely mean the election of two new countries.

"Pakistan justifies its position by the acknowledged necessity of better geographical representation and, at the same time, by the intention of unifying the wishes of the Members of the Union which, as we have seen, fall into two not very opposing camps.

"In a high spirit of cooperation, the Brazilian Delegation is prepared to withdraw its original proposal in favour of the proposal presented by Pakistan.

"But it is clear that our proposal does not belong to us alone, since it has been warmly supported by a good many delegations, whose opinion would have to be sought on this point.

"The proposal of Pakistan will, in such a case, have the support of our Delegation, for we think, it is fair and equitable and well worthy of support and that it will allow us to reach a point of contact with the Delegations which were opposed to our suggestion.

"The Delegation of Brazil believes that if the Pakistan proposal is accepted by this Assembly, this will mean a real progress in the question which has been raised, especially since it is based on that high spirit of cooperation which must exist between all nations and especially among the Members of the I.T.U., which will also enable Brazil to remove the reservation which it would have been obliged to make to the Convention in view of the course taken by the I.F.R.B. problem in this Conference.

"This problem, Mr. Chairman, necessitates, and the present circumstances require, that a firm solution be found in agreement with the opinion of the absolute majority of this Assembly, bearing in mind that the extension of this important organ of the I.T.U. has been proposed in this Conference.

"We, who desire that the I.F.R.B. should continue its existence, cannot we reach agreement on the number of its Members ?

"This is precisely what the Brazilian Delegation wishes to ask at this moment, requesting the honourable Delegates who have voted in favour of the continued existence of the I.F.R.B. to give their attention to the problem.

"Firm support for the proposal now presented, with such good intention, by the honourable Delegate of Pakistan must be forthcoming, so that we may, at last, in this Conference go on to deal with the other questions which require our attention.

"That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman."

Page 29, item 5.28: Replace paragraph 2) by: "2) Our Delegation has queried the credentials submitted by the so-called Chinese Delegation, on the grounds that they are not signed by the Government of the P.R. of China, the only Government competent to send a Delegation to the Plenipotentiary Conference of the I.T.U. Hence we demand that these credentials be not accepted."

In paragraph 3), replace "Republic of Korea" by "Delegation of Korea".

In paragraph 4), replace the first sentence by: "We have queried the credentials of the Delegates of Viet-Nam because we regard them as illegal and invalid."

Page 31, item 5.34: For "Committee 4" read "Committee 2".

Page 35, item 5.58: In the last line but one, for "must have been" read "may have been".

Page 34, item 5.51: replace the existing text by the following: "5.51 The Delegate of Iraq said that his Government and that of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan did not recognize "Israel" and that the participation of his Delegation in the votes in favour of the Credentials Committee's report, Document No.197, did not in any way imply a recognition."

Page 28, item 5.25: Replace by:

"The Delegate of the P.R. 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, Bao-Dai Viet-Nam and Western Germany should not be recognized."

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 8

3rd. SERIES

OF TEXTS TRANSMITTED TO THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

(Texts approved by the Plenary Assembly 27 - 28 November)

I 4th report by Committee 3 (Document No. 251)

ANNEX 1

Article 6 of the Convention

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.

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.

II. Second Report by Committee 5 (Document No. 268 rev.)

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 to the Membership of the Union of those 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 Dependancies 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.

III. Draft Resolution submitted by the observer of the United Nations at the request of the Plenary Assembly

(Document No. 321, replacing Annex 2 to Document No. 269)

The Plenipotentiary Conference,

considering

1. that the Specialized Agencies are not mentioned in Annex 2 to the Convention, which enumerates the authorities entitled to originate Government teleggrams and Government telephone calls;

2. that there may be circumstances in which the urgency or importance of the Telecommunications of the Specialized Agencies warrants special treatment for their teleggrams or telephone calls,

states

that if Specialized Agencies of the United Nations wishing to obtain special privileges for their telecommunications inform the Administrative Council, justifying the particular cases in which special treatment 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 those 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.

IV. Draft Resolution (Document No. 260)

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.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. finances)

13th meeting

Friday, 28 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. Krishna Prasada (India)

The meeting opened at 1900 hours, after the meeting of the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman said it was getting late, and it would therefore be desirable to consider relatively non-contentious matters. He would propose that the Committee considered the resolution adopted by the Administrative Council at its Buenos Aires session (Document No. 240). The Conference had neither the time nor sufficient data to make a thorough study of the question of a building for the I.T.U. The suggestions made by the Administrative Council might suitably be embodied in a draft resolution which he had drafted.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland briefly summarized the various proposals considered by the Council. It would be well to await further data. The wisest course would be to let the Administrative Council decide on the best solution.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics thought that discussion on a matter already considered by the Council need not begin all over again. It would be enough if a decision were taken on Document No. 240, which should be approved. In his draft resolution, the Chairman had spoken about premises being inadequate. It would be better to talk about the provision of suitable premises.

The Delegate of Canada recalled that a scheme for a building to be shared between the W.M.O. and the I.T.U. had been mooted. The United Nations had also considered the possibility of housing the I.T.U. within the precincts of the Palais des Nations, Geneva.

The Director of the C.C.I.F. commented on the various solutions submitted to the Council as regards I.T.U. premises.

The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. said that certain departments could not go on working under the existing conditions.

The Delegate of France said that the matter had already been debated at very considerable length, and he did not want to see it thrashed out again. The best course would be to leave the Administrative Council free to decide whether anything could be done before the next Plenipotentiary Conference. Whether a new building was put up by the Genevese authorities or the existing premises were refitted, it would lead to an increase in rent. If the new rent remained less than the credits available for that purpose in the budgets for the following five years, the Council might reach a final decision.

The United Nations Observer said that there was a possibility of the W.M.O. reconsidering its decision not to share a building with the I.T.U. The executive Committee on economic and financial questions had issued a recommendation to the effect that the possibility of offering premises within the Palais des Nations should be considered.

The Delegate of the French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia thought it would be well, in the draft resolution, to emphasize how urgently a decision was required.

The Delegates of Belgium and of Czechoslovakia supported the draft resolution.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia recalled the conditions in which the U.P.U. building in Berne had been erected. The funds required had been withdrawn from the assets of the U.P.U. Provident Fund. I suggested that the I.T.U. might follow a similar course.

The Delegate of Canada wanted the Council to consider all possible solutions.

The Chairman said, and the Delegate of the United States of America agreed, that the resolution was drafted in very general terms, and excluded none of the solutions possible.

The resolution was adopted nemine contradicente, and the Chairman undertook to transmit it to the Plenary Assembly.

The Chairman of Working Groups 1 and 5 (Dr. J. Busak) gave some information about the progress made by Working Group 1 and about the launching of Working Group 5 (see Annex 1).

The Chairman of Working Group 2 (Mr. Vandenhove) described the progress made by his Group.

The Chairman of Working Group 6 (Col. A. H. Read) gave some information about questions in relation to Article 14, which his Group was called upon to draft.

The meeting rose at 2020 hours.

Reporters:

J. Arregui
H. Bouchon
M. Caws

Chairman:

K. PRASADA

Annex: 1

A N N E X

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF WORKING GROUPS 1 AND 5

(Dr. J. Busak)

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia, speaking as Chairman of Working Groups 1 and 5, said he had agreed to become Chairman of Working Group 5 (I.T.U. budget), although his Delegation was not large, and although it was obliged to assist in the work of other committees and working groups. He had accepted that additional task because his country wished to make its contribution to the cause of international cooperation. The task confronting the Group was, he knew, no easy one, but with the collaboration of the members of the Group and of the General Secretariat, he would do everything that could possibly be done.

He asked those delegations which were not members of the Working Group, but had suggested that the fiscal limit on expenditure should be kept to the minimum, to help by submitting specific proposals for decreasing expenditure. That would speed up the work of the Group.

It had even been suggested that the Group should get down to work at once. He, for his part, was prepared to begin on Saturday, the 29th of November, after Working Group 5/1 had finished its work (its final report would be distributed on Monday or Tuesday). However, the Plenary Assembly had somewhat delayed the work of committees and working groups, and the Working Group could not begin before Monday, 1 December. In view of the concentrated schedule of work, and the fact that there was to be a meeting of the Plenary Assembly the following week, only four meetings could be held during that week, especially if there were meetings of other groups requiring the presence of the Secretary General and of the staff of the General Secretariat Finance Section.

He would draw the attention of Committee 5 to the above-mentioned facts, while assuring it that the Working Group would do its utmost to complete the task assigned to it.

The Delegations of Switzerland and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had, incidentally, expressed a wish to take part in the activities of Working Group 5/5.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 341-E

3 December 1952

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 14th Meeting

Saturday 29 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. Krishna Prasada (India)

The meeting opened at 1000 hours.

The Chairman submitted for approval the Summary Record of the 10th Meeting (Document No. 279).

1. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that the last sentence of paragraph 2, page 2 should be amended as follows: "The resolution anticipated a future decision concerning the budget and his Delegation would therefore vote against it."

Page 4, paragraph 4, the seventh line should be amended as follows: ".... that partially solved the question of the budget of the I.F.R.B."

The Delegation of the Belorussian S.S.R. asked that line 2 of paragraph 2, page 12, be amended as follows: instead of "association" read "voluntary choice of contributory class".

The Delegate of Portugal asked that approval of Document No. 279 be postponed as it had been distributed that same morning.

2. The Chairman opened the discussion on the questions of interest (paragraphs 15 and 19 of the Report by Working Group 5/5) and sanctions.

Proposal No. 730 of France was withdrawn and the Delegate of France said that if he was elected to the Administrative Council he would make a definitive proposal to that body.



Interest - Article 14, paragraph 7 of the Convention, Document No. 236.

The Delegate of Portugal was of the opinion that the status quo should be maintained and that the substance of paragraph 7 should not be changed. Nevertheless a delay of 30 days should be allowed to Administrations for the settlement of extraordinary expenses without interest. Further, it would be advisable to delete the words "and for documents supplied" since the Administrative Council had decided to include interest in the price.

3. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia informed the Committee of the proposal that Working Group 5/5 was going to make.

- a) A resolution designed to introduce a period of time for the payment of extraordinary expenses.
- b) Deletion of the words "and for documents supplied" from paragraph 7.

He was of the opinion that it could be mentioned that accounts were subject to interest at a rate to be fixed by the Administrative Council, without linking the rate to that which was paid to Switzerland for advances to the I.T.U.

The Delegates of Egypt, Tunisia and Sweden supported the proposal of Portugal.

There being no further objections, paragraph 7 of Article 14 was adopted.

4. Following a remark by the Chairman concerning Proposal No.221 of Morocco, the Delegate of Portugal pointed out that every Administration could deposit funds at Geneva against which the cost of publications supplied would be charged. Thus the sending of accounts and interest charges would be avoided. He did not think, bearing in mind a remark of the Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, that there was any need to draw up a resolution to standardize that practice. Following a remark by the Secretary General, the Chairman felt that a brief notice indicating the advantages of opening a deposit account could be attached to invoices for publications.

5. Points 15 and 19 of Document No. 278.

The Delegate of Portugal was of the opinion that the estimates

should be retained in conformity with industrial accounting practice although the Delegates of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland felt that the two budget items could be deleted. But nothing should be done to raise the fiscal limit on expenses.

The Delegate of France and the Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia agreed.

The Delegate of Canada, referring to item 19, said that publications should not be regarded as a source of profits.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was against a separate publication budget and was likewise of the opinion that publications should not be regarded as a source of income.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia asked what proportion of publications was sold to Administrations and to private enterprises respectively. The Secretary General said that the proportion was roughly half-and-half. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia said he would not object to an increase in price for publications supplied to individuals and private concerns.

The Delegates of Portugal, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Canada again spoke. The consensus of opinion was that the previous decision leaving it to the Administrative Council to determine the price of such publications was a sound one.

The Committee thereupon proceeded to consider Document No.316 (Report by Working Group 5/4).

6. The Delegate of Portugal said that he had asked what the financial effects would be before any agreement was reached. Those effects were indicated in the report. But in the meantime, the Committee had raised the question of the fiscal limit and that of changes in class. That being so, he could not agree; 100,000 Swiss francs seemed to him too much. Further, it did not seem to have been very equitably apportioned.

The Delegates of Sweden and Canada supported these views.

The Delegate of Lebanon observed that the outlay involved was not very considerable, and that the question was one involving international cooperation. The Delegate of Yemen agreed with the preceding speaker.

7. The Delegate of France said that a decision might be postponed, the credit of 100,000 Swiss francs being left provisionally in Document No. 278.

The Delegate of Denmark, agreeing, thought that, nevertheless, the Committee should settle the question of principle.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa thought it was only just that Members should pay for supplies received. The Committee should also decide on the principle involved.

The Chairman put the following question to the vote: "Does the Committee favour free distribution of documents?"

Free distribution was rejected by 23 votes to 13, with 4 abstentions.

8. The Committee proceeded to the consideration of proposals limiting the rights of Members who owed considerable sums.

The Chairman said he had drafted a questionnaire (Document No. 235) for the Committee.

The Delegate of France said that the question was exceedingly delicate, and recalled what the Council had done to remind debtors of their obligations.

The Delegate of Portugal thought that the situation with regard to debts was not such as to give cause for extreme alarm, and recalled how it had developed between 1948 and 1952. The situation was evolving in no unfavourable way, and, were the level of the expenses to be maintained, he would be in favour of the status quo. He would be diffident about introducing the restrictions proposed.

The Delegate of Cuba was against Members being deprived of their right to vote. The payment of interest constituted adequate sanctions.

9. The Delegates of the Argentine Republic, Colombia, China, and of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia were also against limitation of Members' rights.

The Delegate of France said that the financial situation had improved. The Union should have confidence in the good will of Members. For the time being, he was against any restriction.

The Delegate of Portugal suggested a draft resolution on the following lines:

- 1) Certain countries paid recent debts, but did not pay all the debts. Something should be done to put a stop to that.
- 2) As regards expenditure for publications, not bearing interest, the Council would consider the major debts and might impose interest if the delay exceeded two years.
- 3) Debts in connection with publications were also considerable, and the Council should be able to take action.

10. The Delegate of Egypt proposed that a vote should first be taken on the question of whether Members' rights should be restricted or not. He was seconded by the Delegate of Cuba.

By 18 votes to 4, with 19 abstentions, it was decided that the rights of Members owing considerable sums should not be restricted.

The meeting rose at 1320 hours.

Reporters:

J. Arregui

H. Bouchon

M. Caws

Chairman:

K. Prasada

FINAL REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 5/1

TO COMMITTEE 5

SUBJECT : Examination of accounts for the years 1947 to 1951.

Working Group 5/1 was set up following a decision by Committee 5 on 16 October 1952 (Document No. 104), with instructions (see Annex to Document No. 139) to :

1. examine the accounts of the Union for the years 1947 to 1948, with the exception of accounts for the Telegraph and Telephone Division, which had been considered and approved by the Telegraph and Telephone Conference of Paris (1949);
2. examine the accounts of the Union for the years 1949 to 1951 approved, from the arithmetical and accounting points of view, by the Administrative Council;
3. prepare a report for Committee 5.

The documents considered by the Working Group appear as Annex 1 to the present report.

The Working Group held 9 meetings (on 22, 27 and 30 October, and 7, 17, 22, 24, 25 and 29 November 1952).

The Working Group examined Chapter IV of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Conference, and Document No. 216, the Financial Operating Reports for the years 1947 to 1951, and the Administrative Council Resolutions on the audit and approval of the accounts and financial operations, with all the pertinent documents; the Working Group also checked, by sampling, the accounting system of the Union and the accountancy records (with the relevant vouchers).



The delegations attending the Conference were asked to submit to the Chairman of the Working Group, in writing, their comments on the financial management (see summary record of the 2nd meeting of Committee 5 - Document No. 139), to facilitate examination of the accounts; however, no comments were submitted.

The General Secretariat was represented at the meetings of the Working Group by Mr. Weber and Mr. Prélaz, both of whom gave the Working Group detailed information on the accounts of the Union.

The Working Group came to the following conclusions :

1. The accounts of the Union for the years 1947 to 1951 have to be submitted to the Plenary Assembly of the Plenipotentiary Conference for the definitive approval in accordance with Article 10, paragraph 1 c) of the Convention;
2. the Conference should express its thanks to the Swiss Government for the advance of funds, the flat rate of interest and the auditing of accounts;
3. the Conference should also express its thanks to the Government of the Netherlands for the advance of funds (without interest) for the preparatory work before the postponed Extraordinary Radio Conference at The Hague, bearing in mind that quotas were paid in cheques drawn up in Dutch florins and made payable to the Dutch Administration, either directly or through the General Secretariat.

The relevant draft resolutions are given in Annexes 3, 4, and 5 to the present report. The attention of the Committee is invited to the note at the bottom of the Draft Resolution in Annex 3; the amendment to the Resolution proposed by the Working Group depends upon the decisions taken by Committee 5 on the budget after the year 1953.

The remarks and suggestions of the Working Group will be found in Annex 2 to this report.

Annexes : 5

Chairman,
Working Group 1

ANNEX 1

DOCUMENTS

RELATING TO THE APPROVAL OF FINANCIAL OPERATING

REPORTS AND THE ACCOUNTS OF THE UNION

FOR THE YEARS 1947 TO 1951

- I. Chapter IV of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference (Buenos Aires, 1952) - pages 63 to 76 - with Document No. 216 (Report by the Administrative Council on the financial management of the Union).
- II. Financial management of the Union for the year 1947 and the financial operating reports for the years 1948 to 1951.
- III. Administrative Council Resolutions with the Documents relevant thereto :
 1. Year 1947/1948: resolution No. 129 and documents Nos. 323/CA4, 420/CA4, 456/CA4, and 505/CA4;
 2. Year 1949 : resolution No. 182 and documents Nos. 619/CA5, 641/CA5, 792/CA5, and 806/CA5;
 3. Year 1950 : resolutions Nos. 219 and 220 and documents Nos. 853/CA6, 857/CA6, 899/CA6, 912/CA6, 944/CA6, and 949/CA6;
 4. Year 1951 : resolutions Nos. 239 and 240 and documents Nos. 1036/CA7, 1094/CA7, 1101/CA7, 1123/CA7, 1154/CA7, 1170/CA7, 1210/CA7, and 1212/CA7.
- IV. Accounting documents placed at the disposal of the Working Group by the Secretary General :
 1. Accounting 1948: Collection of accounts T.T.
Collection of accounts R.
Comparison budget/accounts T.T.
Comparison budget/accounts R.

2. Accounting 1949: Register of accounting sheets
11 volumes of accounting documents
3. Accounting 1950: Register of accounting sheets
8 volumes of accounting documents
4. Accounting 1951: Register of accounting sheets
11 volumes of accounting documents
5. Extraordinary Expenses:
 - 1948: Administrative Council, 1 volume of accounting documents
 - I.F.R.B. 1 " " "
 - P.F.B. 3 " " "
 - Aeronautical 1 " " "
 - Conferences and meetings:
 - C.C.I.T. Brussels 1 volume of accounting documents
 - C.C.I.R. Stockholm 1 " " "
 - E.B.C. Copenhagen 2 " " "
 - H.F.B. Mexico 1 " " "
 - H.F.B. Mexico several volumes of accounts
 - 1949: P.F.B. 1 volume of accounting documents
 - T.T. Paris 1 " " "
 - C.C.I.F. Paris 1 " " "
 - C.C.I.F. Scheveningen 1 " " "
 - Region 1 1 " " "
 - Region 2 1 " " "
 - Region 3 1 " " "
 - Aeronautical II 1 " " "
 - T.P.C. Paris)
 - Narba Washington)
 - Comm.11 C.C.I.R. Zurich) 1 volume of accounting
 - Loran) documents
 - C.C.I.F. Paris)
 - C.C.I.F. Scheveningen)
 - Narba Washington accounts
 - Region 3, Washington "
 - 1950: P.F.B. 1 volume of accounting documents
 - T.P.C./CIRAF Florence/rapl " " "
 - 1951: VI Plenary Assembly
 - C.C.I.R. accounts
 - E.A.R.C. 2 files of accounting documents

A N N E X 2

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

BY WORKING GROUP 5/1

1. Fiscal limit on expenditure.

When the Atlantic City Conference laid down a fiscal limit for expenditure during the period 1949 to 1952, it prescribed no method for calculating I.T.U. ordinary expenditure (see Additional Protocol VI and the resolution relative thereto on pages 97 and 108-109 of the Atlantic City Final Acts). Hence the Administrative Council was itself obliged to lay down a procedure for calculation of the fiscal limit (see Article 9, paragraph 3, of the Financial Regulations). The Working Group draws Committee 5's attention to this fact, since it should not be overlooked that such a procedure must be described in the resolution prescribing what the fiscal limit shall be for the period from 1953 (possibly 1954) onwards (see, also, the Administrative Council Report to this Conference, Chapter VI, 3 - pages 80 - 81).

2. Credit balance and Reserve Account.

From 1949 onwards, the credit balance of accounts is carried forward to income of the following year. In this manner a more complicated procedure - apportioning the balance between Members of the Union in accordance with their class of contribution, and crediting them with the amounts in question at the end of the financial year, thus reducing their future contributions, has been avoided. This system has proved its value.

From 1950, the Administrative Council introduced a Reserve Account, as part of the Union's financial machinery (see the Financial Regulations, Article 17). This Account is fed as follows :

1. by the difference between total ordinary expenditure covered by contributions, and the fiscal limit on expenditure;
2. by posting to it some proportion of the liquid assets available in the Publications Account.

During 1950 and 1951, the Reserve Account attained 518,433.20 Swiss francs. It was used to finance day-to-day operations, thus diminishing advances from the Swiss Government and the interest accruing thereon.

(Ann.2 to Doc.342-E)

It should be carefully noted that the credit balance of the Reserve Account can be used only to meet the day-to-day financial requirements of the Union. In general, it cannot be used for any other purpose whatever. If, for very exceptional reasons, the Administrative Council wanted to use that balance to meet ordinary expenses, that would have to be considered as an increase in expenditure over and above the fiscal limit laid down by the Plenipotentiary Conference, and as such would require the approval of the majority of I.T.U. Members, as specified in the resolution relative thereto. The same procedure would have to be followed if the credit balance of the Reserve Account were used, exceptionally, to meet extraordinary expenses.

This is the interpretation which ought to be put on Article 17, paragraph 3, of the Financial Regulations.

3. Supplementary Publications Account

Experience has shown the value of having a supplementary publications account (see the Administrative Council Report to this Conference, Chapter IV, paragraph 4.2., page 74) and the Group shares the views expressed by the Council.

4. Interest in connection with the Sale of Publications

Article 14, paragraph 7, of the Convention, on interest in connection with the sale of publications, has given rise to a good many queries, and calculation of interest for trivial sums has meant difficulties for the Accounts Section.

Hence the Administrative Council at its 5th Session decided that from 1951 onwards, interest was to be included in the sales price of documents (see Administrative Council Resolution No. 181, later replaced by Resolution No. 221, and the annex to the Financial Regulations, pages 12 and 13, under 3. "Overheads"). This decision derogates from Article 14, paragraph 7, of the Convention. The Group recommends :

- a) that the Conference should give formal approval to that decision;
- b) that Article 14, paragraph 7, of the Convention should be amended by deleting from it mention of publications.

5. Interest on overdue payments

Article 14, paragraph 7, relative to interest on overdue payments in connection with extraordinary expenditure, complicates the keeping of accounts by the General Secretariat, and its application gives rise to queries, since it obliges Members of the Union to pay interest before they know what their share in defraying extraordinary expenses will be.

Hence a change should be made in Article 14, paragraph 7, of the Convention, by laying down a period during which shares in defraying extraordinary expenses - for which accounts are issued - would not bear interest.

6. Budget of the Administrative Council

Every year the amount allotted to Administrative Council has been exceeded (in 1949, by 20%, in 1950, by 35% and in 1951, by 15%). Such increases are attributable to the importance of the items on the Council's agenda, resulting in a prolongation of Council sessions. Nevertheless, the Council, called upon as it is to supervise the finances of the Union, ought to abide by the limits set by its own budget, bearing in mind the fact that by going beyond it, it thereby imposes certain restrictions on other Union organs.

7. C.C.I.R. Extraordinary Expenditure

During 1950, C.C.I.R. extraordinary expenditure reached rather a high level, due to the various study group meetings held in different places. Although the Working Group is in no sense qualified to pass judgement on the way those meetings were organized from the technical point of view, it does seem that they could have been more economically convened had account been taken of Chapter 13, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the General Regulations, and had they been convened in places more convenient for members of the study groups and for the specialized secretariat itself.

Accordingly, the Group recommends that C.C.I. study group meetings be convened as set forth in the General Regulations, and that such meetings should be organized in such a way as to reduce as far as possible the expenses borne by the study group members and by the C.C.I.R. secretariat itself. Any savings made should not, of course, be at the expense of the technical activities undertaken by the C.C.I.R.

8. Travelling Expenses

C.C.I.R. travelling expenses, from 1949 to 1951, seem to be somewhat high in comparison with those of other Union organs. The Working Group has been unable to consider whether C.C.I.R. representation at meetings held by various international organizations (for example, at the meeting held by the International Union of Theoretical and Practical Mechanics, Island of Porquerolles, 1951, etc.) was essential for the work of the C.C.I.R., or whether those international organizations required C.C.I.R. representation. The Group is of opinion that this particular journey ought not to have been paid for by the C.C.I.R., if the I.T.U.P.M. was the only body to benefit thereby.

It may well be that these journeys are called for by the extent of C.C.I.R. technical activities, and by the connection existing between such activities and those of other international organizations interested in radio problems. Nevertheless, Members of the C.C.I.R., meeting in Plenary Assembly, are recommended to consider to what extent the tasks entrusted to the C.C.I.R. make such foreign travel necessary. In suitable cases, the C.C.I.R. might be represented, not by an official from its Secretariat, but by a representative of the administration of the country in which the meeting is held in accordance with C.C.I.T. practice.

Simultaneous journeys by two or more officials from one and the same I.T.U. organ ought to be reduced to the indispensable minimum. It is for the Council to supervise foreign travel expenditure and the question is one which should be borne in mind when the Council is preparing the budget and drawing up accounts.

9. Travel Expense Accounts

In certain cases (1949), the Group has found that Union officials have omitted to indicate in the accounts submitted by them for travelling expenses what the journey was for. The situation has been improved by the introduction of special forms. However, in order that it may be more easily be seen whether the journey was undertaken by the official alone or in the company of other officials, it is recommended that the names of the other officials submitting accounts for the same journey should be included in these forms.

10. Provident fund

The Atlantic City Conference, in the resolution appearing on page 108 of the Final Acts, made provision for rehabilitation of the Provident Fund (during 1948 to 1952). At Atlantic City, the deficit had been estimated at 670,000 Swiss francs.

From 1948 to 1951, the following sums were entered in the I.T.U. budget and paid into the Provident Fund:

1948	150,000 Swiss francs
1949 :	200,000 " "
1950	100,000 " "
1951	100,000 " "
	<hr/>
	550,000 Swiss francs

It should not be overlooked that this question of rehabilitating the Provident Fund has to be solved at this Conference, in view of the fact that for 1952, the budget provided for no more than a symbolic payment of 1,000 Swiss francs (see Document No. 146),

11. Pensions for officials of the Union

The Administrative Council, by its Resolution No. 160 (vide also Financial Operating Report for the year 1951 - page 62) introduced a different system for the Pensions of two officials of the Union by affiliating them to the Provident Fund, although as regards other officials who entered the service of the Union under the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention, different action has been taken. The Working Group is of the opinion that the decision of the Council was not in conformity with the principle that officials of the Union who entered its service under the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention should all enjoy equal treatment. Observing that a question of principle, outside its terms of reference, is involved, the Working Group submits this question to Committee 5.

12. Conference Budgets

In 1947 and 1948, several conferences arbitrarily prolonged their work, thus considerably exceeding their initial budgets, or decided to hold another session, thus giving rise to fresh expenditure. The measures taken

by the Administrative Council (Resolution No. 83) - providing for control of the Conference budget by the Conference itself, through a special committee - have proved their worth, as the Group, in examining the accounts for later conferences, has found.

Nevertheless, budget estimates for Union conferences and meetings are not always precise or detailed enough, and expenditure on certain items frequently exceeds budget estimates. Hence it is recommended that such estimates should be made in greater detail, and that conference budgets should be drawn up under the direction of the General Secretariat, in order that the budgets of conferences and meetings may all be prepared in the same way.

To facilitate consultation of financial management reports, it is recommended that the duration of conferences (estimated and actual) should be indicated therein.

13. Advances from the Swiss Government

It should be noted that the Union's debts to the Swiss Government which by 31 December 1949 had reached 14,615,727.50 Swiss francs, had by 31 December 1951 been reduced to 5,700,000 Swiss francs (by 15 November 1952, to 3,800,000 Swiss francs).

Interest paid by the Union to the Swiss Government:

1949	334,799.30 Swiss francs
1950	559,905.50 Swiss francs
1951	315,138.85 Swiss francs

The agreement reached between the Union and the Swiss Government in connection with the introduction of a flat rate of interest as from 1 July 1951 has meant a saving of 40,000 Swiss francs for the second half of 1951.

The attention of I.T.U. Members is drawn to the amounts paid to the Swiss Government in the form of interest. These payments are due to the fact that in many cases Members pay their bills very late.

14. Advances by the Administration of the Netherlands

The Dutch Administration undertook responsibility for advances required for the preparatory work relative to the International Radio Conference which was to have been convened in The Hague in 1950 but did not take place. The Dutch Administration has forgone its right to interest on such advances.

Payment of quotas has been made in Dutch florins, either directly or through the Secretary General. These expenses do not, therefore, appear in the I.T.U. balance-sheet.

15. Buying-in fees for entry into the Pension Fund

I.T.U. contributions (50% of the total) amounted from 1949 to 1951 to 252,019.65 Swiss francs. The C.C.I.F. has paid, in addition, 316,055 Swiss francs (100%, withdrawn from its Provident Fund).

Working Group 5/2 should consider whether, in future, such expenses might not be reduced, and make recommendations to the Administrative Council.

16. Audit of Union Accounts

I.T.U. accounts have been scrupulously audited, from the actuarial point of view, by the Federal Finance Control Authorities of the Swiss Government, which have audited them about once a quarter. The Group has noted that the check made was exceedingly detailed, and that it also covered the accounts of the I.T.U. Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds. The cost entailed was very slight. The Council itself has set up a special committee for the audit of accounts. That committee has also examined the balance-sheet, accounting practices, accounting documents, and the inventory.

Several resolutions deal with approval of accounts and of financial operating reports.

The Administrative Council and General Secretariat have acted on all recommendations and suggestions made by the Swiss audit authorities and the Council Audit Committee.

It is recommended that the Administrative Council continue the system whereby accounts are audited by the Swiss Federal authorities.

17. Financial Operating Reports

During its examination of Financial Operating Reports from the year 1947 (the last year for which a single report on the overall activities of the Union including its finances was published) up to 1951, the Working Group has been able to ascertain that the Administrative Council and the General Secretariat have taken steps progressively to improve the form and the content of Financial Operating Reports. The reports for the years 1950 and 1951 particularly, with the detailed information and graphs they contained, are most instructive and permit every Member of the Union to become familiar with the Union's financial activities.

18. Union accounts

In considering Union accounting practices, together with accounting documents, the Working Group has found that Union accounts are kept in good and proper form, and with scrupulous care. The Group can do no more than confirm the conclusions set forth in the reports by the Federal Finance Control authorities and the Council Audit Committee, in this connection.

ANNEX 3

DRAFT RESOLUTION

CONCERNING THE APPROVAL OF THE ACCOUNTS
OF THE UNION FOR THE YEARS 1947 to 1951

The Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952

bearing in mind

the provisions of Article 10, paragraph 1, c) of the Convention;

the decision of the 5th Plenary Meeting of the Telegraph and Telephone Conference, Paris, 1949, concerning the approval of the accounts of the Telegraph and Telephone Division;

the report by the Administrative Council on the financial management of the Union (Doc.No.216);

the report by Committee 5 (Finance) (Document No. . . .)

resolves

a) to note the approval of the accounts of the Telegraph and Telephone Division of the Union for the years 1947 and 1948 by the Telegraph and Telephone Conference, Paris, 1949;

b) to approve the accounts of the Radio Division of the Union for the years 1947 and 1948;

c) to give final approval to the accounts of the Union for the years 1949 to 1951;

d) to express to the Secretary General and to the staff of the General Secretariat its entire satisfaction with the way in which the accounts were kept;

e) to request the organs of the Union not to lose sight of the observations and suggestions by Committee 5 contained in Annex 2 to Document No. . . .

ANNEX 4

DRAFT RESOLUTION

ON THE ASSISTANCE GIVEN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SWISS

CONFEDERATION TO THE FINANCES OF THE UNION

The Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952

noting

1. that, from 1947 to 1952, the General Secretariat was obliged to make several appeals for credits to the Government of the Swiss Confederation involving fairly considerable sums and that the Government of the Swiss Confederation invariably responded to those appeals by putting the requisite advances at the disposal of the Union;
2. that, furthermore, the Government of the Swiss Confederation renounced the differential rates of interest as from 1 July 1951 and fixed a flat rate of interest on funds advanced.
3. that, finally, the Federal Finance Control Department of the Swiss Confederation very carefully audited the accounts of the Union for the years 1947 to 1951;

resolves

to express its warmest thanks to the Government of the Swiss Confederation for its collaboration with the Union in the field of finance - a collaboration which offers the Union certain advantages and is conducive to economy

and instructs the Secretary General

to inform the Government of the Swiss Confederation of this decision.

Remarks:

The Working Group is of the opinion that the decision which forms the subject of the present Resolution, could - if the Conference decides to continue requesting advances of funds from the Government of the Swiss Confederation - be amended as follows:

"....economy for the Union and to express the hope that it may be possible to maintain this collaboration in the future, and instructs..."

ANNEX 5

DRAFT RESOLUTION

CONCERNING THE FINANCING OF THE EXTRAORDINARY
RADIO CONFERENCE BY THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE NETHERLANDS

The Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952,

noting

that the Administration of the Netherlands undertook to defray the expenses of the preparatory work for the Extraordinary Radio Conference which should have been held at the Hague in 1950 but which was subsequently cancelled,

and that the Administration of the Netherlands did not ask for interest on the sums advanced for the above-mentioned Conference,

resolves

to express its thanks to the Government of the Netherlands in this connection

and instructs the Secretary General

to inform the Government of the Netherlands of this decision.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

P.V.8 -

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the 8th Plenary Meeting,

Wednesday, 26 November 1952 at 4 p. m.

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

Subjects discussed:

1. Greetings to the Doyen of the Conference on his recovery from illness.
2. Obituary speeches:
 - a) Dr. Chaim Weizman, President of the State of Israel;
 - b) Mr. José Noto, Member of the Argentine Delegation;
3. Minutes of the 6th and 7th Plenary Meetings (Documents Nos. 220 and 221-E with corrigenda Documents Nos. 250 and 291);
4. First Report by Committee 7 (Document No. 269-E);
5. Procedure for notification of change of class of contribution:
Proposal by Committee 5 (Document No. 302-E);
6. Second Report by Committee 7 (Document No. 297-E);
7. Fourth Report by Committee 3 (Document No. 251-E).

Delegations present:

Afghanistan; People's Republic of Albania; Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; Bolivia; Brazil; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; Chile; China; Vatican City State; Colombia; Belgian Congo; Korea; Costa Rica; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Egypt; El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; Finland; France; Greece; Hungarian People's Republic; India; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Iceland; State of Israel; Italy; Japan; Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan; Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Philippines; People's Republic of Poland; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Swiss Confederation; Syrian Republic; Czechoslovakia; United States Territories; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South West Africa; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Uruguay; United States of Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Yemen; Spanish Zone of Morocco and Totality of Spanish Possessions.

1. GREETINGS TO THE DOYEN OF THE CONFERENCE ON HIS RECOVERY FROM ILLNESS

The Chairman, speaking on behalf of the Delegates to the Conference, expressed pleasure at seeing Mr. Gneme, of the Italian Delegation, the Doyen of the Conference, take his place once more, completely recovered, in the Plenary Assembly after his illness.

(Applause).

Mr. Gneme (Italy) expressed his thanks for the affectionate demonstration which had just greeted his re-entry. He was sorry to

have been for so long deprived of the pleasure of taking part in the work, which he had nevertheless been able to follow from a set of very well presented documents. He was ready once more to give his modest contribution to a work which, in an atmosphere of friendliness, was helping forward the telecommunication services of the whole world.

2. OBITUARY SPEECHES:

a) Dr. Chaim Weizman, President of the State of Israel.

The Chairman offered the sincere condolences of the Conference to the Government and people of the State of Israel on the recent death of their President, Dr. Weizman.

The Assembly rose and observed one minute's silence as a tribute to Dr. Weizman.

The Delegate of the State of Israel delivered the following address:

"Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Israeli Delegation I thank you and all delegates to this Assembly for your kind expression of condolences and sympathy on the occasion of the death of our President, Dr. Chaim Weizman.

"May I also use this opportunity to express our appreciation and thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, as head of the Argentine Delegation for the noble and friendly way in which the Argentine People and Government have shared our moments of deep sorrow.

"I should like to take a few minutes of your time and dedicate some words to the memory of Dr. Weizman, first President of the State of Israel and one of the greatest leaders of his people in all times.

"For over half a century, during one of the darkest periods in the history of the Jewish People, Dr. Weizman was their teacher and their guide. Like the prophets of old he knew when to alleviate the suffering of his followers and offer them consolation, when to warn off illusions or speak harshly against weakness, when to call for greater effort and spur on to acts of courage.

"Dr. Weizman devoted a lifetime to a cause, and that cause was the re-building of the land of his forefathers, the land of Israel. A great believer in international justice and in the conscience of mankind, Dr. Weizman was a man of vision and of action. His labours were fully rewarded when in the twilight of his life the State of Israel became a reality with Dr. Weizman as its first President.

"Dr. Weizman was not only a statesman but also a scientist of international repute. In this field too he applied all his zeal and energy to the pursuit of scientific research, the highlights of which were his wellknown contributions to the Allied war effort in World Wars I and II. It was natural therefore, that in addition to being President of the young State he should also direct the activities of the Weizman Institute of Scientific Research which he had helped to found and build.

"Statesman and scientist, Dr. Weizman will go down in the history of the world as a great man and a great leader and to his people he will always remain a symbol of nobility of spirit and abnegation, striving relentlessly for the advancement of international justice and human knowledge.

"Again, many thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to all of you present here."

b) Mr. José Noto, Member of the Argentine Delegation.

The Delegate of Uruguay wished to express the sincere condolences of his Delegation with the Argentine Delegation on the occasion of the death of a well known Argentine official, Mr. José Noto, the Assistant Director of Telecommunications, whose distinguished work in the field of telecommunications was recognized on both banks of the Rio de la Plata.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic expressed the thanks of his Delegation to their Uruguayan brothers, whose feelings they echoed. It was one more proof of the bonds of fraternity and mutual affection which united the two countries.

3. MINUTES OF THE 6TH AND 7TH PLENARY MEETINGS (Documents Nos. 220 and 221-E with Corrigenda Documents Nos. 250 and 291)

Approved, subject to the amendments published in Document No. 338.

4. FIRST REPORT BY COMMITTEE 7 (Document No. 269-E)

The Chairman opened discussion on Annex 1 of Document No. 269.

Mr. David, United Nations Observer, said:

"My colleague, Mr. Cox, explained the position of the United Nations and of the other specialized agencies as regards this matter in a comprehensive statement which he made to Committee 7. There were 40 delegations present at that meeting. I crave their indulgence while I repeat Mr. Cox's statement, in shortened form, for the information of those delegations which were not present then.

"The United Nations has proposed two alterations in the definition of "Government telegrams and telephone calls".

"The first is the addition of the term "Hheads of the principal organs of the United Nations". Reference to the proceedings at Atlantic City shows that it was clearly the desire that both the principal and subsidiary organs should be included, but that this intent was not given effect to in the definition as finally drafted, owing to the coincidence that the term "subsidiary" has a technical meaning in the United Nations Charter. The word "subsidiary" as inserted at Atlantic City was clearly intended to refer to all organs coming under the United Nations "umbrella", whereas in its technical meaning in the Charter it refers to organs such as the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, which are created by and work under a principal organ. The principal organs are the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat.

"As regards the subsidiary organs, fears have been expressed that they are growing in number and initiate a great volume of traffic. The truth is that the original list, supplied by the Secretary General of the United Nations and published in I.T.U. Notification No. 629 of 1 August 1951, contained 67 subsidiary organs of which only the Hheads of 19 were thought likely to originate traffic.

"The latest list shows 59 of which the Heads of only 15 are thought to be likely to originate traffic.

"Adequate provision for the subsidiary organs, and more particularly those the Heads of which are likely to originate traffic, is fully as important as that for the principal organs. They are "subsidiary" in a constitutional sense but are by no means so in function. A Truce Organization, a Conciliation Commission, or a mediator work with the same urgency, and perhaps even with more urgency, than a principal organ."

He then gave figures for two of the major specialized agencies to show that their use of telecommunications was too slight for the extension of the privilege to them to have any practical significance in proportion to world traffic: in 1951, I.L.O. expenditure for telegrams was U.S. \$ 37,203 and for telephone calls U.S. \$ 19,415. Provision in the 1953 budget was U.S. \$ 34,083 for telegrams and U.S. \$ 26,978 for telephone calls. W.H.O. spent U.S. \$ 70,000 in 1951 on telegrams and telephone calls and provided U.S. \$ 50,000 in its 1952 budget.

He concluded by urging that the recommendation of Committee 7 to include the specialized agencies in the definition under discussion be confirmed by the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of Italy agreed to Annex 1 as it stood, but trusted that the Secretary-General would keep an up-to-date list of all the organs included under f) and would communicate it periodically to all administrations.

The Observer from the International Labour Office said:

"With regard to the revised definition of "Government telegrams and telephone calls" proposed by the Committee on Relations with the United Nations (Document No. 269), I should like to make the following statement on behalf of the I.L.O. This definition does not extend the facilities and privileges granted by the International Telecommunication Convention to "the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Heads of the principal organs and of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations" to the Heads of the specialized agencies as, in our view, it should.

"On behalf of the I.L.O., I should like to repeat here in your Plenary Assembly the necessity of extending telecommunication facilities and privileges to the specialized agencies, including the I.L.O.

"Mr. Cox, of the Legal Division of the United Nations, has defended the views of the United Nations and specialized agencies in the appropriate Committee. There is little to be added to the sound legal arguments which he propounded at length and which Delegates have been able to study in Document No. 173, dated 5 November 1952. Further, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has submitted a detailed memorandum to this Conference on telecommunication facilities and privileges for the specialized agencies (Proposal No. 658 - Document No. 3) which deals exhaustively with this matter. The I.L.O. wishes to associate itself with the arguments contained in both these documents.

"The I.L.O., like the other specialized agencies, forms part of the system of the United Nations, is an intergovernmental agency under public law and performs international duties of the utmost importance for the community of nations and for the Member states. These manifold activities may all be briefly summarized when I say that their aim is the attainment of social justice as the most solid basis for the maintenance of peace. The activities of the I.L.O. are exercised throughout the world and the fact that it has 66 Member States will give some idea of its universality. Its activities have taken on greater intensity and importance with the widespread Technical Assistance programme which extends its benefits to all the underdeveloped regions of the world in the sphere of social problems, which is its specific field of action.

"The contribution of the I.L.O. to the development of international labour legislation throughout the world may be seen from the figure of 1,315 ratifications of International Labour Conventions by the various Member States, even though the drawing up of such Conventions is only one of its manifold activities. Another of its activities which is one of the most important aspects of social policy in our time is social security and in this field it will suffice to say that almost all the legal provisions in force in our continent have been influenced, to a greater or smaller extent, by the work of the I.L.O.

"As you know, social conflicts, which the I.L.O. is endeavouring to solve, have acquired an extraordinary importance and intensity in recent years and on their rapid and successful solution depend the welfare of the peoples of the world, the maintenance of the established order and the preservation of peace.

"Some of these social conflicts which, in their acute phase, may call for speedy intervention by the I.L.O., make it even more necessary for that body to have telegraph and telephone facilities and privileges, which give speed and security to telecommunications, particularly important being priority of despatch, respect of the confidential nature of some messages and security from interruption. This necessity is even more urgent in the cases of Technical Assistance missions to under-developed countries, international inquiries into social problems which need urgent solution and work conflicts or other social disturbances that may endanger the smooth working of the international community or even be a menace to peace. A recent example of this last type is the important mission effected by the I.L.O. in Egypt on the occasion of the politico-social conflicts which are well known to everyone.

"It is unnecessary to dwell on the legal arguments so clearly and eloquently elaborated by the Observer from the United Nations, but I shall reply briefly to the main objections raised in Committee against the extension of telecommunication privileges to the specialized agencies. It was said that "granting the privilege to everyone would mean granting it to no one" and that "to extend the privileges to more users would be to diminish its value".

"But what the specialized agencies are asking for is not that the privileges should be extended to everyone, nor even to a great number of users, but, on the contrary, that they should be granted to a restricted number of high officials in a limited number of specialized bodies, namely, ten. As Mr. Cox pointed out, "the use of the Government privilege affects no more than an insignificant proportion of world traffic". The figures quoted concerning the use of telecommunications by the specialized agencies show that such use is not excessively high in respect to the world volume of telecommunications and the importance of the services rendered by these agencies.

"Further, it has been stated that the Heads of the specialized agencies will make the most limited possible use of the privileges in question.

"It has also been said that "the main duty of the I.T.U. is to maintain the rights and defend the interests, not only of governments and international organs represented here, but also of the public and to facilitate the transmission of all categories of public correspondence routed over international services".

"The specialized agencies understand this preoccupation of the I.T.U., but they do not believe that the few messages transmitted by the Heads of a limited number of specialized agencies may involve any disturbance whatsoever in the attention paid to public messages in general.

"It has also been said that "It may well be wondered whether the specialized agencies really need this exceptional privilege treatment for their communications". In reply I will say that it is unnecessary to repeat the clear examples which were given in the Committee of the vitally important and urgent services rendered by W.H.O. in case of epidemics, F.A.O. in case of famine or failure of crops, plagues or epizootic diseases, and the I.L.O. in case of social conflicts, social security or technical assistance."

The Delegate of the United States of America made the following statement:

"Mr. Chairman, the question of the inclusion of the Heads of specialized agencies in the definition of government telegrams in Annex 2 of the Convention is of such importance that I feel that it deserves full consideration in Plenary Assembly in view of the fact that only 38 delegations participated in the voting in Committee 7.

"The principal arguments raised against the proposal are to the effect that the granting of government status to the telegrams of specialized agencies might adversely affect revenues where reduced rates for government telegrams are now in effect, and that the extension of privileges for priorities would debase the value of priorities to those which now enjoy those privileges.

"In so far as the effect of granting reduced government rates to specialized agencies for their communications exchanged with those countries where reduced rates are now in effect is concerned, the information furnished the government of the United States by three major international telegraph carriers indicates that the loss in revenues would be practically insignificant.

"With respect to the matter of priority handling of traffic, the volume of specialized agencies traffic is small and accounts for a very small fraction of one percent of all message traffic handled by U.S. international telegraph carriers.

"I do not wish to repeat the excellent argument presented in Committee by Mr. Cox and alluded to by Mr. David, which in the view of my Delegation makes the case so strong that I think it would be most unfortunate for this Conference to reject this modest proposal. We have already noted that both the Fund and the Bank enjoy government privileges by virtue of their articles of agreement. We have also noted that other governments, notably Switzerland where the headquarters of several specialized agencies are located, have granted certain privileges to the specialized agencies. In the United States our Congress has enacted a law, the International Organizations Immunities Act, which, among other things, grants the communications of international organizations the "privileges, exemptions and immunities.....accorded under similar circumstances to foreign governments". Under this Act the specialized agencies now appear to enjoy the privilege of requesting priority handling for traffic which they originate in the United States. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the countries which are most affected have in one degree or another accorded government treatment to the communications of specialized agencies.

"Now, of course, the I.T.U. is itself less affected by this proposal than the other specialized agencies, at least in so far as rates are concerned, because its own communications are handled as service telegrams. Although this point is not particularly relevant it would appear somewhat niggardly for the I.T.U. to refuse any recognition to the other specialized agencies of their governmental character insofar as the treatment of their communications is concerned.

"These governmental organizations, like our own, seek in their respective fields to advance the economic and social well-being of the peoples of the world. Let us not be grudging and unsympathetic or fearful of dire consequences. Since it has been shown that there is practically nothing to lose by accepting this proposal let us make a gesture which will be welcomed by the United Nations and the other specialized agencies in the family of the United Nations.

"I, therefore, urge, Mr. Chairman, that we agree to include in the definition of government telegrams in Annex 2 of the Convention the Heads of the specialized agencies."

The Delegate of Brazil made the following statement:

"The Brazilian Delegation has listened with close attention to the statement made by the United Nations and I.L.O. Observers. They are, one might say, interested parties. That cannot be said of the Brazilian Delegation, which, after a scrupulous study of the position, merely wishes to set forth its views in all frankness, in order that it may be very clear that, as the honourable Delegate of the United States of America has said, the claims made by the United Nations are just and modest.

"Because of the attitude ever taken by our country in relation to questions within the province of the United Nations, it seems to us that there can be no doubt about the warmth with which our Government has always supported the United Nations, and also the specialized agencies, with their noble aim of improving the lot of humankind.

"For this reason we think that every possible assistance should be extended to such organizations and that nothing which might facilitate their work should be denied them.

"Now the Secretary-General of the United Nations has asked the I.T.U. to accord to the subsidiary organs of that body, and also to the specialized agencies, the right to avail themselves of government privileges for their telegrams and telephone calls.

"Committee 7, in Document No.269, is submitting to the Plenary Assembly the results it has reached and recommends that such privileges be granted to the subsidiary organs of the United Nations. This was wholeheartedly supported by the Brazilian Delegation, since this is in effect the goal aimed at in the Atlantic City resolution. There is no need to justify this, it is so evident. Such organs are called subsidiary in a constitutional sense but all know full well that their real duties are as important as those of the main organs of the United Nations. That this is so will be seen from a simple enumeration of some of them:

United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;

United Nations Office for Korean Reconstruction;

United Nations Agency for Relief of Refugees in Palestine;

United Nations Representation for India and Pakistan;

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization;

Disarmament Commission, and others.

"As regards the specialized agencies, Committee 7 nevertheless in the same document submits a resolution according to which they should not enjoy government privileges.

"The Brazilian Delegation cannot agree with such a decision, and sees no reason why a majority of the Committee could not have acceded to the United Nations plea.

"But it is certain that that decision was taken at a meeting at which something like half the Members of the Union were absent. Hence the results of the vote do not really reflect the will of the majority.

"My Delegation accordingly requests that the Plenary Assembly consider the matter most closely, and that the Chairman take a vote after the views of delegations have been heard.

"Now Mr. David, the honourable representative of the United Nations, has shown that the fears expressed, namely, that the Atlantic City Conference left such a decision on the matter for this Conference, were in no sense founded, as has been shown. The specialized agencies have not increased in number; on the contrary, they have decreased by one. Their teletype and telephone expenses have not been by any means excessive and have not increased, and their share in world traffic might well be styled infinitesimal.

"In defence of our thesis, we have taken data relative to the I.L.O. and W.H.O., and we can say in all certainty that the total annual expenditure of the 10 agencies would not exceed 500,000 dollars, perhaps less, a great part of it being on local and not international calls.

"And the fact that the fears referred to are totally unfounded has been shown also by the fact that various nations have ratified the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, under which government privileges are extended to all these agencies, and by the number of countries which agreed to such privileges for the International Bank and International Monetary Fund, which were over more numerous.

"United Nations Proposal No.658 (Document No.3) gives us detailed reasons why the specialized agencies need government privileges. Time is precious and there is no need to repeat them here. Delegates can consult the document in question.

"The view taken by the Brazilian Delegation is that these agencies need such privileges as much as the governments which make up their membership. Nobody could maintain that the collective action of governments acting through a specialized agency is less important than their action in isolation. The I.T.U. is called upon to maintain and extend international cooperation for the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds.

"Its first duty is to the public. In our view, the infinitesimal loss incurred by the public service if government privileges were granted, which would amount, as said, to 500,000 dollars, for the traffic of the specialized agencies, per annum, would be more than made good by the benefit derived by the specialized agencies, which, in the last analysis, would be equivalent to returning the profit to the public itself.

"Gentlemen! we should have no fear that the specialized agencies will abuse their privileges. They have assured us that they are prepared to take all necessary action to avoid any excess or abuse. Further, Gentlemen, these agencies are under the control of governments, and many of them are controlled by their plenipotentiary organs (which meet annually) - a control which is, if anything, stricter than what we have in the I.T.U.

"Lastly, Mr. Chairman, the Brazilian Delegation would repeat its view that the specialized agencies need, and should therefore have, government privileges. More, the grant of such privileges could only benefit the public, i.e., the interests of mankind. And my Delegation therefore proposes, specifically, that the definition of government telegrams and telephone calls in Annex 2 of the Convention be amended in the sense that the Heads of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations should be included therein (this has been done) and also the Heads of the specialized agencies."

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"First of all, Mr. Chairman, I have a procedural proposal to submit. In Document No.269 appear some Committee 7 recommendations. They should, we feel, be discussed one at a time.

"As regards extension of government privileges to specialized agencies, this matter was examined by Committee 7 in exceedingly thorough fashion. A decision was taken which appears in Document No.269. Several Delegations expressed the view that the number of persons to whom such privileges are extended should not be increased.

"My Delegation is of the same opinion, and hence we are against extension of governmental privileges to the specialized agencies."

The Delegato of Colombia supported the request to include the specialized agencies in the definition of authorities to whom government privileges were extended, since the same governments were Members of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, including the I.T.U. In any case, the Administrativo Council of the I.T.U. was hardly competent to decide such a matter.

The Delegato of France observed that certain opinions seemed to have changed. At Atlantic City there was a body of opinion which would have preferred to grant no privileges to anyone. France had opposed that idea but perhaps it had been mistaken, since now there seemed to be tendency to ask for even more. He had prepared the draft resolution in Annex 2 to Document No.269 and it had seemed to satisfy the representatives of the United Nations and the specialized agencies since, without it, they would have received nothing at all. Of course, if a decision was taken to include the specialized agencies in the definition of Annex 1 of Document No. 269, both the draft resolution and any amendments became pointless.

In actual fact, all the arguments advanced were untenable. It had been said that the telecommunication budget of the specialized agencies was very small; then their telecommunication requirements could not be extensive enough for them to need a special network. It had been said that the specialized agencies could be assimilated to the United Nations; but they did not belong to the United Nations. It had been said that the specialized agencies were working for peace; there were many people, perhaps too many, working in that direction.

Committee 7 had decided to amend the definition to include the principal organs of the United Nations; that was a perfect idea, but at the same time the subsidiary organs would have been included with the specialized agencies in those who might be covered by the resolution in Annex 2 to Document No.269.

There was no doubt that all applications would receive a favourable welcome from the Council, but it was impossible to go further. The aims of the Union were to defend the interests of administrations and not those of private carriers. I.C.A.O. was already using the aeronautical network and the other specialized agencies would not fail to widen any such gap that was allowed to occur. There would be plenty of time to review the position five years later.

The Delegate of China thought that the arguments advanced by the Observers of the United Nations and the I.L.O. were exceedingly weighty and convincing. The aim of the I.T.U., like that of the other specialized agencies, was to promote international cooperation and the least it could do was to extend such a courtesy to its sister agencies. Great care should be taken before excluding those agencies from privileges which were extended, for instance, to such people as consular agents.

In the interests of international cooperation, the Chinese Delegation strongly supported the views of the United States and Brazil. He felt sure that a little generosity and courtesy would be amply repaid. It was therefore quite legitimate and reasonable to include the Heads of the specialized agencies in the revised definition in Annex 1 to Document No. 269.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that Committee 7 had, in his view rightly, rejected the proposal to include the specialized agencies in the definition. The arguments advanced by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in Committee 7 were in the best interests of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. If the privileges under discussion were to retain their value, they should be limited to the minimum. Priority for all would mean priority for none. The main duty of the I.T.U. was to safeguard the interests of the public, with all due regard to the legitimate interests of governments and the United Nations. Nothing that had been so far said had shown that the specialized agencies really required government privileges for their ordinary day-to-day traffic. In any case, the urgent service was always available when necessary. The resolution in Annex 2 would meet the need of the specialized agencies in exceptional circumstances and would in no way hamper them in their work.

The Chairman said that he would put the proposal by the United States of America and Brazil to the vote.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that he had already drawn the attention of the Chair to a procedural question, namely, a proposal by the U.S.S.R. to the effect that Document No. 269 should be put to the vote point by point.

The Chairman then put the numbered paragraphs on page 2 of Document No. 269 to the vote one by one.

Paragraph 1 (to include the Heads of the principal organs of the United Nations in the draft definition)

adopted by 73 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 (to retain the reference to the Heads of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations)

approved by 57 votes to 16, with 5 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 (to exclude the Heads of the specialized agencies from paragraph f) of the definition). On a proposal by the Delegate of Pakistan, supported by several other Delegations, a secret vote was taken.

The tellers were the Delegates of Cuba, the Vatican City and Switzerland.

By 49 votes to 24, with 5 abstentions, it was decided that the Heads of the specialized agencies should not be included in paragraph f) of the definition in Annex 1 to Document No. 269.

Paragraph 4 (to retain the existing paragraph g) unanimously approved.

Annex 1 to Document No. 269 was thus implicitly approved as it stood.

Annex 2 to Document No. 269 (Draft Resolution by Committee 7 on applications by specialized agencies for priority for telegrams and telephone calls).

The United Nations Observer was afraid that the resolution might be interpreted as restricting the applications to priority only. Would the Delegate of France agree to amend it so as to cover certain other privileges?

The Delegate of France had already prepared a text to that effect, covering the use of secret language and free official collation of telegrams in addition to priority.

A discussion arose, as a consequence of which it was decided to postpone consideration of Annex 2 until the text of the new draft by the Delegate of France could be distributed.

During the discussion, the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"My Delegation has already expressed its views on this resolution in Committee 7.

"Our view is that there is no need to adopt such a resolution.

"Hence we shall vote against it."

Annexes 3 and 4 to Document No. 269 were approved without comment.

5. PROCEDURE FOR NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE OF CLASS OF CONTRIBUTION; PROPOSAL BY COMMITTEE 5 (DOCUMENT No. 302-E)

After the Chairman of Committee 5 had presented the Document, a discussion arose in which the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said:

"We wish to make a few comments on Document No. 302.

"The basic reason for the publication of Document No. 302 is the exceedingly high level attained by I.T.U. expenditure. This is why the question of contributory classes has been raised. The steady, appreciable increase in Union expenditure undoubtedly creates serious difficulties for a good many Members of the Union.

"First of all, we feel, we should set a limit to I.T.U. annual expenditure. We should first of all ascertain how much Members of the Union would be willing to accept in the way of expenditure.

"In all countries, of course, it is customary to take an exceedingly scrupulous and circumspect attitude towards the approval of government expenditure. In this respect, the maximum possible economy is the guiding principle. To effect savings, it is customary

to organize the government departments concerned in the most rational possible way, and to make a rigorous check of the need for this or that item of expenditure.

"These are the principles that should be applied in the I.T.U. It is inadmissible that Union expenditure should be constantly increased. What has been done to ensure greater economy on the part of the I.T.U. permanent organs?

"In practice, nothing has been done. The task of the Union is to organize the work of its organs in the most rational possible way. It is perfectly possible, my Delegation considers, to do this and to preserve the existing limit on expenditure, namely 4,000,000 Swiss francs. A limit should be set, and that limit should be no higher than the existing one. In this fashion we would be able to avoid increasing the contributions hitherto paid by Members of the Union.

"Hence we consider that the Conference should postpone consideration of Document No. 302 until a decision is taken on a limit for Union expenditure. Such expenditure should not exceed the limit set, namely 4,000,000 Swiss francs. If we do this, then there will be no need at all to consider all these questions about changes in contributory class.

"In short, we cannot now consider Document No. 302. Consideration of it should be postponed.

"Committee 5 has organized a special working group to consider how Union expenses might be curtailed. Study of that question is a primordial task of the Conference. All remaining questions can be solved only after a decision has been reached on how to cut down Union expenditure to the utmost."

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland had carefully examined the document, but felt that many passages therein were somewhat obscure. The document was based on an estimated fiscal limit of some 6,000,000 Swiss francs. That figure, however, had not yet been adopted and the position would be quite different if the figure finally

adopted were 5 or 7 million Swiss francs. It was essential to adopt a figure for the fiscal limit before adopting such a procedure as that indicated in Document No. 302. The Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland therefore supported the views expressed by the Delegate of the Soviet Union.

The Delegate of India, Chairman of Committee 5, said that his Committee would certainly decide on the fiscal limit before 6 December. It had not done so up to the present, because it had not been in possession of full data. Of course, countries wanted to know the fiscal limit, but they were also interested in knowing exactly how much their contributions would be. The procedure described in Document No. 302 had been drawn up so that Delegates would not be in the dark in that respect when they returned to their countries at the end of the Conference.

The Delegates of Egypt, Lebanon and Yemen wanted to be sure that the date proposed did not exclude discussion of reclassification. Certain countries might eventually find that with the new figures even the contribution corresponding to Class 8 would be too heavy a burden to bear.

The Delegate of Canada was strongly opposed to the procedure and would vote against it, since it amounted to asking Delegates to make up their minds on their countries' contributory classes without knowing what those classes would be. In addition, it was unduly complicated and time-consuming at such a late stage of the proceedings.

The Delegate of India assured the Delegates of Egypt, Lebanon and Yemen that Committee 5 would decide the scales before 6 December.

A roll-call vote was taken on the procedure described on page 2 of Document No. 302.

Results of the vote:

For: 54 (Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, China, Vatican City, Belgian Congo, Korea, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Spain, United States of America, Ethiopia, France, India, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, New Zealand, Paraguay, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Morocco and Tunisia, Federal German Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

Sweden, Switzerland, United States territories, French Oversea Territories, Portuguese Oversea Territories, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet-Nam, Yemen, Spanish Possessions);

Against: 14 (P.R. of Albania, Bielorussian S.S.R., P.R. of Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia, Hungarian P.R., Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, P.R. of Poland, Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., Czechoslovakia, U.S.S.R.);

Abstentions: 9 (Austria, Egypt, Greece, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Pakistan, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia, Syria).

Four Delegations were absent.

The procedure described on page 2 of Document No. 302 was thus adopted.

6. SECOND REPORT BY COMMITTEE 7 (DOCUMENT No. 297-E)

The Observer from the United Nations asked the Plenary Assembly to reconsider the decision contained in the Resolution on pages 2 and 3 of Document No. 297. The United Nations network was purely ephemeral and had been set up for emergency reasons, which reasons were no longer existing. The total amount of traffic was very small - some U.S. \$ 11,500 in 6 months.

Some objections of principle had been raised in Committee 7. One was that the arrangement in question was against the Telegraph Regulations in that it was introducing an entirely new manner of calculating charges for telegrams and that the acceptance of such a principle might upset the generally accepted word rate structure of the international service. The second objection was that use of the network by the Specialized Agencies would infringe Chapter 7 of the Regulations. The third objection was that of economy - that it would amount to robbing Peter to pay Paul.

However, the United Nations had agreed that the network would be operated under the Convention and the Regulations. It was not, in any case, a common carrier, and many of the Regulations were thus inapplicable to it. It would always be operated in such a way as to avoid harmful interference.

The United Nations regarded all the Specialized Agencies as part of one family, since they were all working for the same ends. He could not see how the arrangement would affect the general rates, since the U.N. network was not a public service and the parts of the Regulations that concerned rates were inapplicable to it.

He agreed that use of the network by the Specialized Agencies would not save money, but wished to point out that it was not the aim of the network to save money.

He therefore asked the Assembly to reconsider the matter and to allow that the Specialized Agencies be allowed to carry their traffic over the United Nations network.

The Observer from the International Labour Office said that the restriction of the use of the United Nations telecommunication network did not satisfy the requirements of the I.L.O. He supported the Observer from the United Nations on every point.

The Delegate of France said that the resolution was necessary and would vote in favour of it. At Atlantic City, it had been thought that Article 15 of the Agreement between the United Nations and the I.T.U. concerned the United Nations exclusively.

If the network were to be used by the Specialized Agencies, it would be necessary to amend Article 15.

In no case would the resolution be an obstacle to the common use of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies of the radio circuits leased to government administrations or to the private operating agencies. That was in conformity with the decisions of the Paris Conference.

In reply to the Argentine Delegate, various speakers including the Delegate of the United States and the Observer from the United Nations explained that "emergency" included such cases as plague, famine, earthquakes or unfavourable conditions in stricken areas where normal channels were unavailable or inadequate. There ensued a long discussion on the exact

meaning of such "emergency" situations, after which it was decided not to change anything in the original text of the Annex to Document No. 297, which was adopted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. :

"Mr. Chairman, I would ask that in the minutes of this Assembly it be recorded that the Soviet Delegation abstained when the resolution in Document No. 297 was adopted."

7. FOURTH REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3 (DOCUMENT No. 251)

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said:

"Annexed to Document No. 251 is a draft text of Article 6 of the Convention, as adopted by Committee 3. My Delegation has stated in Committee 3 that it found this draft unacceptable.

"My Delegation considers that the I.F.R.B. could perform its frequency registration duties only on the basis of the provisions appearing in Article 47 of the Radio Regulations. That means that at this time, in the absence of an International Frequency List, frequency registration can take place only on the basis of the rules set out in the Cairo Radio Regulations.

"When this question of Article 6 was being considered in Committee 3, my Delegation took exception to the decision taken by the Committee and reserved its right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly. We now wish to propose a series of amendments, each of which, we suggest, should be considered separately.

"The first is in connection with paragraph 1 a) of the draft. We propose that the words: "and in accordance with any decisions that may be taken by competent conferences of the Union" should be deleted.

"The I.F.R.B. has to be guided only by the Radio Regulations, particularly, Article 47 thereof.

"After this amendment has been considered, we shall have a number of others to put forward."

The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic supported the views expressed by the Soviet Delegate. His Delegation also considered that sub-paragraph c) of paragraph 1 should not be included in the Convention, since additional tasks were not compatible with the structure of the I.F.R.B., as clearly defined in Chapter 4 of the Radio Regulations.

The Delegate of Denmark proposed that, as the U.S.S.R. proposal had already been fully discussed, it should be put to the vote forthwith.

The U.S.S.R. proposal to amend paragraph 1 a) was put to the vote by a show of hands and rejected by 56 votes to 9 with 1 abstention.

The Delegate of Pakistan proposed an amendment to paragraph 1 b), but since it was getting late, discussion of that amendment was adjourned.

The meeting rose at 9.15 p.m.

Reporters:

L. Mulatier

M.A. Andrada

H. Heaton

Secretary General

Chairman

G. Deniker

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 344-E
7 December 1952

P.V. 9 (Part one)

P L E N A R Y A S S E M B L Y

Minutes of the 9th.meeting

Thursday, 27 November, 1952

at 9 a.m.

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

Questions discussed:

1. Address of thanks to the Argentine Administration;
2. Fourth Report by Committee 3 (Document No. 251 and Document No. 286) - end of discussion;
3. First Report by Committee 7 (Relations with the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies) (Document No.269);
4. Second and Third Reports by Committee 5 (Documents No. 268 revised, No. 287 and No. 288).

Present:

Afghanistan; People's Republic of Albania; Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; Brazil; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Kingdom of Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; China; Republic of Colombia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi; Republic of Korea; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Egypt; Republic of El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; France; Greece; Republic of Haiti; the Hungarian People's Republic; India; the Republic of Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Iceland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; Kingdom of Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands; Surinam; Dutch Antilles; New Guinea; Peru; Republic of the Philippines; the People's Republic of Poland; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; the Roumanian People's Republic; the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Swiss Confederation; Syrian Republic; Czechoslovakia; Territories of the United States of America; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Oriental Republic of Uruguay; United States of Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions.

1. ADDRESS OF THANKS TO THE ARGENTINE ADMINISTRATION

1.1. The Delegate of the United States of America, on behalf of the entire Conference, warmly thanked the Argentine Government and the Argentine Administration for the opportunity afforded to the Conference to see Mendoza and other places of interest in Argentina. Delegates had brought back with them imperishable memories which, thanks to the cordial relations established and reinforced during the journey, would facilitate accomplishment of the tasks still before the Conference, and would help them to overcome any difficulties which might arise.

1.2. The Chairman thanked the Delegate of the United States of America, and the entire Assembly, for the gracious words addressed to Argentina.

2. FOURTH REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3 (Documents Nos. 251 and 286)

2.1. The Chairman then opened discussion on paragraph 1 b) of Annex 1 to the Fourth Report by Committee 3 (Document No. 251), and on the amendment (Document No. 317) submitted by the Delegation of Pakistan.

2.2. The Delegate of Denmark said that two comments, neither of which he could approve, had been made in connection with the Pakistan amendment. It had been stated that the methodical recording of frequency assignments could be effected by administrative staff only. That was wrong. Only technicians were competent to decide whether or not frequencies could be entered in the "registrations" column. That was the most important task of the I.F.R.B., and it involved technical considerations.

2.3. Secondly, it had been said that the I.F.R.B. would give its views only in case of interference. Now according to paragraph 1 b), the I.F.R.B. could give advice on radio operation in parts of the spectrum where interference might happen. Hence advice might be given even if interference did not actually occur.

2.4. His Delegation, therefore, while recognizing that the Pakistan amendment was an interesting one, considered that neither the time nor the place were appropriate for its consideration. Those were technical matters, which, incidentally, were extensively dealt with in the Radio Regulations, especially in paragraph 293. Hence he would ask the Delegate of Pakistan not to insist on his proposal, and to leave it until the Radio Conference met.

2.5. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, supporting what the preceding speaker had said, favoured adoption of the report as it stood. Besides, the matter had been exhaustively discussed in committee.

2.6. The Delegate of the United States of America supported what the two preceding speakers had said. The matter was one which might conveniently be dealt with by the Radio Conference.

2.7. There was a slight mistake in paragraph 1 a) of Annex 1 to Document No. 251, where the word "normal" should read: "official".

2.8. The Delegate of India observed that the question was a technical one which had been discussed at great length both at Atlantic City and in the E.A.R.C. Hence it would be undesirable to consider it afresh. Accordingly, he supported the views expressed by the Delegates of Denmark, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

2.9. The Delegate of Egypt regretted that he could not share those views. The date of the next Radio Conference was still unknown. Hence not to discuss the matter there and then meant, in all probability, that the question would be shelved for five years. The matter was an important one, and to solve it in Buenos Aires might well greatly facilitate things during those five years. He would, therefore, support the Pakistan proposal.

2.10. The Delegate of Pakistan had not been convinced by the arguments adduced against his proposal. Every time a delegation tried to suggest something definitive in connection with the duties of the I.F.R.B., an appeal was made for it to forgo its proposal, so that the solution would be adjourned for five years.

2.11. However, in order to meet, as far as possible, the appeals made to his Delegation, he was prepared to withdraw his proposal, provided paragraph 293 (Article 10) of the Radio Regulations were included in paragraph 1 of Annex 1 to Document No. 251, which enumerated the basic duties of the I.F.R.B. Nobody, he hoped, would object to that.

2.12. The Delegate of Denmark said that he had, in fact, no objection to make, but did not see what was to be gained from such a course.

2.13. The Delegate of Pakistan wondered why the basic duties of the I.F.R.B. were to be defined in the Convention, if it were considered that they were already described in the Radio Regulations. Besides, if some of the duties of the I.F.R.B. had to be mentioned in the Convention, why could not the same be done with the others?

2.14. The proposal by Pakistan for including paragraph 293 (Article 10) of the Radio Regulations in paragraph 1 of Annex 1 to Document No. 251 was then put to the vote.

2.15. By 32 votes to 11, with 24 abstentions, that proposal was rejected.

2.16. Mr. Dellamula (Chairman, I.F.R.B.) asked that it be recorded in the minutes that the I.F.R.B. was already in practice doing exactly what the Pakistan Delegation was asking in its proposal. In the future, the I.F.R.B. would continue to make every effort to provide administrations with advice, in accordance with the Pakistan proposal. As the Delegate of Pakistan had said, that idea was contained in paragraph 293 (Article 10) of the Radio Regulations and paragraph b) of the existing Article 6, although couched in very general terms, enabled the I.F.R.B. to go on providing administrations with advice, even when there was no interference.

2.17. Paragraph 1 c).

2.18. The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic :

"Allow me briefly to recall why we ask for the deletion of paragraph c).

"The duties of the I.F.R.B. are defined in detail in Chapter IV of the Radio Regulations.

"The I.F.R.B., as it at present is, was created with an eye to those duties, and in order that it might perform those duties only.

"It is obvious that the additional duties provided for in the above-mentioned paragraph are incompatible with the way the I.F.R.B. is at present organized.

"Highly complicated technical problems arise in connection with the preparatory work for certain conferences, and a small Board of 11 Members only (even if all those Members have exceptional qualifications) is not enough to consider all such problems.

"Only the C.C.I.R. could accomplish successfully the technical work which has to precede conferences.

"Hence we consider that paragraph c), providing for new duties for the I.F.R.B., should not be included in Article 6."

2.19. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

"Sub-paragraph c) should be deleted from paragraph 1 of Article 6.

"The I.F.R.B. can do no more than register frequencies. It can concern itself with nothing else.

"Hence we entirely support the Roumanian proposal to delete sub-paragraph c) of paragraph 1."

2.20. A vote was taken on the Roumanian proposal for deletion of paragraph c).

2.21. By 52 votes to 9, with 5 abstentions, the proposal was rejected.

2.22. The Delegate of Cuba said that the last part of paragraph c) was quite incomprehensible in the Spanish text, which required revision.

2.23. Mr. Dellamula (Chairman, I.F.R.B.) said that the same question had been raised in Committee 3. The Editorial Committee would have to revise the paragraph in question. The Administrative Council, taking its stand on a resolution passed by any competent conference (for example, a Radio Conference) could instruct the I.F.R.B. to prepare some future conference. For example, the I.F.R.B., at the request of the Council, had prepared the ground for the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference.

2.24. Admittedly, the paragraph was far from clear in any of the three languages, but it should be remembered that the Chairman of Committee 3 had already pointed that out, for the benefit of the Editorial Committee.

2.25. Paragraph 1d) was adopted without discussion.

Paragraph 2

2.26. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

"In connection with paragraph 2, my Delegation has an amendment to submit. The paragraph in question has three sections :

"The first defines the membership of the Board, and the second and third set forth what is required of I.F.R.B. Members.

"Those requirements are fully set forth in the Radio Regulations.

"We see no need to transfer these points from the Regulations to the Convention, and hereby submit the following amendment : 'Delete the second and third sections of paragraph 2.'"

2.27. The Delegate of Denmark said that the second part of paragraph 2 did not constitute a duplication of the Regulations, since it laid down that Members of the I.F.R.B. had to possess practical experience in frequency assignment and utilization.

2.28. The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, supporting the Delegation of the U.S.S.R., was likewise of the opinion that it was unnecessary to overload the Convention by including therein provisions already appearing in the Radio Regulations.

2.29. The proposal by the U.S.S.R. to delete paragraph 2 was put to the vote.

2.30. The proposal was rejected by 49 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

Paragraph 3

2.31. The Chairman, in response to a remark by the Delegate of Czechoslovakia to the effect that the word "balanced", used in the Atlantic City Convention, had been replaced in the Annex to Document No. 251 by "equitable", said that the new text was correct and the English was in line with the Spanish and French version.

2.32. The Delegate of Mexico having said that the first two lines of paragraph 3 did not clearly reflect the idea it was desired to bring out, the Chairman said that the Spanish text would be brought into line with the English and French.

2.33. The Delegate of Italy asked that the sub-paragraphs should be numbered.

2.34. Mr. Dellamula (Chairman, I.F.R.B.) said there was a grave discrepancy between sub-paragraph 1 and sub-paragraph 3. In sub-paragraph 1, it was stated that: "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", whereas in the third sub-paragraph the expression "countries Members of the Board" was used.

2.35. That was a grave discrepancy. Hence he wished to read out a message received from Geneva, which reflected the views of Members of the Board:

2.36. "In order to execute the provisions of Article 11 of the Radio Regulations, Members of the I.F.R.B., as custodians of an international public trust, must act individually in a completely impartial manner. If countries are to be Members of the I.F.R.B., it follows that persons who serve will in fact be representatives of countries and so might be constrained to consider what may be acceptable to their countries before expressing an opinion on frequency assignments and relative matters at Board meetings. The two foregoing ideas appear to the Board to be incompatible, and the latter idea appears to be at variance with their obligations as custodians of an international public trust. This situation would be completely contrary to the whole concept of the I.F.R.B. as expounded in principle in the present Convention and detailed in the Radio Regulations and E.A.R.C. Agreement, and might lead Members of the Union to doubt the impartiality of the findings of the Board."

2.37. When the Buenos Aires Conference had decided that countries should be elected, it had intended to set up machinery for the appointment of independent Members. In short, the Atlantic City procedure had merely been

repeated, but the decision taken made it difficult to believe that it was countries which were Members of the Board. The Argentine Delegation had proposed paragraph 3 with the idea in mind of avoiding ambiguity. Some confusion had arisen between Members (with a capital M) and members (with a small m) and the paragraph had been left as it stood.

2.38. The existing discrepancy was a grave one, and he asked that sub-paragraph 3 of paragraph 3 should simply be deleted.

2.39. The Chairman suggested that the 3rd sub-paragraph might read: "The countries thus elected shall be eligible for re-election."

2.40. The Delegate of Portugal, in connection with the remark made by the Delegate of Italy, observed that he had forgotten to ask the Editorial Committee to number the paragraphs, as was customary. Certain paragraphs might even be subdivided, and care would of course have to be taken to ensure that the versions in the three languages were identical.

2.41. He agreed with the Chairman of the I.F.R.B. The matter was a difficult one to settle, but since the difficulties arose because of a decision taken by the Assembly - a decision which his country accepted with regret - he would, in order not to hold up proceedings, support the draft suggested by the Chairman.

2.42. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland proposed the following text: "The countries called upon to nominate members of the I.F.R.B. shall be eligible for re-election."

2.43. The Chairman said that the Editorial Committee would bear that suggestion in mind.

2.44. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"There have been a number of comments in connection with the sentence appearing in paragraph 3:

"The countries Members of the Board shall be eligible for re-election."

"The Conference has already decided that countries, and not persons, shall be elected to the I.F.R.B. We must ensure that the text is in accordance with that decision by the Conference.

"The phrase itself is perfectly correct.

"If countries are elected to the I.F.R.B., then countries may be re-elected.

"The Editorial Committee must ensure that the text is correct."

2.45. The Delegate of the Argentine Republic suggested that once agreement had been reached on substance, time should not be lost on a question of drafting.

2.46. The Delegate of Pakistan said that the Plenary Assembly had indeed decided that countries should be Members of the I.F.R.B., but it had had been of the opinion that members of the I.F.R.B. ought to be independent. To that end, they would have to enjoy stability and remain in office for the whole period for which they had been appointed, namely, that elapsing between two Radio Conferences. That meant that when Member countries had nominated one of their citizens, the latter should go on serving the Union, and could not be recalled by his country during the period for which he had been appointed, unless he himself wished to abandon his post. If there was agreement on that point, the Editorial Committee might devise a formula specifying that once an individual had been appointed by his country, he could not be recalled without his consent or that of the Union.

2.47. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"I object to the Pakistan proposal.

"The Plenary Assembly is today considering Article 6, i.e., the question of substance. When the text has been considered by the Plenary Assembly, it has to be referred to the Editorial Committee. The Editorial Committee cannot, however, make any changes of substance."

2.48. The Delegate of Denmark said he entirely agreed with Mr. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.) that questions of substance could not be referred to the Editorial Committee. He supported the text submitted by the Chairman.

2.49. Further, having attended the meeting of Committee 3 at which the matter had been discussed, having read the summary record of that meeting and heard the points of view of Mr. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.), Mr. Mirza (Pakistan), etc., and having acquainted himself with the communication despatched by the ten I.F.R.B. members, he considered that the point had at all costs to be made clear. To this end, he suggested inclusion of a new paragraph as follows: "A country which has appointed one of its nationals to be a member of the I.F.R.B. shall be able neither to recall nor to replace him during the period for which he is normally appointed, except as provided in paragraph 3."

2.50. Since Article 6 did not discuss the possibility of a recall, that meant that no recall could take place. The Convention had to be absolutely unambiguous on that point. It should lay down that countries were not entitled to recall a member of the I.F.R.B.

2.51. If a member could be dismissed at the behest of his Administration, then he was no longer independent, and the word had no meaning. It was to safeguard that independence, and in the interests of the 79 countries not represented by a national on the Board, that his delegation was proposing the text thus submitted.

2.52. The Delegate of Cuba, while supporting the Danish proposal, doubted whether the measure envisaged could in practice be applied, in view of the idea of national sovereignty which was prevalent. A country could not, he felt, be asked to forego those sovereign rights, and it was for the countries themselves freely to enter into an undertaking in that respect.

2.53. The Delegate of the Argentine Republic said that the Assembly was discussing a matter of principle already exhaustively considered in Committee 3. He regretted his inability to support the Danish proposal, because that proposal, in the first place, ran counter to the principle of national sovereignty and, in the second place, was contrary to the basic principles of public international law. It was obvious that a country leading the Union would withdraw the member it had appointed to sit in the I.F.R.B.

2.54. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

"My Delegation supports the views put forward by the Delegate of Argentina.

"This matter has already been discussed at considerable length in Committee 3. As a result of that, Committee 3, and then the Plenary Assembly, decided that countries should be elected to the I.F.R.B.

"Obviously countries are sovereign to take decisions and they alone can decide on the appointment or recall of their representatives.

"We object to the Danish proposal and consider it should be rejected, since it runs counter to the principle of national sovereignty and to the principles of international law."

2.55. The Delegate of the United States of America recalled that the idea of the I.F.R.B. owed its origin to the United States of America. The idea had been that the I.F.R.B. should be made up of independent members appointed by countries. The Atlantic City Convention was clear about that. It was for practical reasons that it had been decided to ask countries to appoint their representatives on the I.F.R.B. The mechanism created at Atlantic City might give the impression that it had been intended to designate countries. That was obviously not the case.

2.56. A good deal had been said about international law and sovereignty. It was clear that all countries were sovereign, and that sovereignty could be diminished only by a voluntary act, such as an international agreement. Thus no country was forced to sign or ratify the Convention.

2.57. When the moment came to elect the members of the I.F.R.B., the United States of America would bear in mind those countries which were in favour of a country being able to recall its national from the I.F.R.B.

2.58. He was entirely in favour of the suggestion made by the Delegate of Denmark. If that suggestion were rejected, the United States of America would bear it in mind.

2.59. The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia said that the Delegate of Denmark had submitted a new proposal, and that, according to the Rules of Procedure (Rule 10, paragraph 4 (2)), the text of any major proposal to be voted on in Plenary Assembly had to be distributed in the working languages of the Conference in sufficiently good time for it to be considered before discussion.

2.60. Hence, without expressing his views on the point of issue, he asked that procedure set forth in the Rules of Procedure be applied.

2.61. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

"My Delegation does not object to the issue of this proposal as a printed text.

"But we would point out that the Plenary Assembly has already decided that countries and not persons shall be elected to the Administrative Council. Hence the proposal by the Danish Delegate is an attempt to evade, to infringe the decisions already taken by the Conference and to put through, in a disguised form, the principle of election by individuals.

"We object to this proposal and urge that it be rejected.

"Some comments should be made on the statement made by the Delegate of the United States of America.

"The United States of America of course considers national sovereignty an 'obsolete' notion.

"But the majority of other countries are convinced of the contrary, and that national sovereignty is something to be respected.

"The statement made by the Delegate of the United States of America, to the effect that he would 'bear in mind' the countries supporting the principle of election to the I.F.R.B, by countries, is an inadmissible threat, an attempt to exert pressure on delegations.

"The Delegate of the United States of America should be reminded that such threats are out of place at international conferences and cannot be tolerated."

2.62. It was decided not to consider paragraph 3 until the Danish proposal had been distributed.

Paragraphs 4 and 5 (1), 5 (2) and 5 (3) were approved without discussion.

Paragraph 6.

2.63. The Delegate of Italy said that paragraph 6 specified that any person sitting on the Board should automatically resign from the moment the country of which he was a national ceased to be a Member of the Union. Now the Convention made provision for only one way in which a country could cease to belong to the Union, namely, denunciation of the Convention by a Member. The Italian Delegation had proposed (Document No. 246) that a Member behindhand in its contributions should undergo sanctions. Hence he proposed that paragraph 6 should run : "Any person sitting on the Board shall resign in the cases envisaged in Articles X and Y -". The number of the Articles in question would be indicated.

2.64. The Chairman suggested that the text might be transmitted to the Editorial Committee.

2.65. The Delegate of the Argentine Republic thought that consideration of the problem should be postponed until the Articles in question were discussed in Plenary Assembly. If the Plenary Assembly accepted Committee 5's suggestions, then the Editorial Committee would have to amend the text.

2.66. The Delegate of Italy, agreeing, asked that a decision on paragraph 6 should be postponed.

2.67. The Delegate of France warned the Assembly against continually putting off decisions, and appealed to the Delegate of Italy to withdraw his suggestion. The existing text should be perfectly satisfactory, being drafted in an extremely general way. Whenever a country ceased to be a Member of the Union, for any reason whatsoever, (either by denunciation of the Convention according to the procedure laid down therein, or because sanctions were being applied as result of contributions remaining unpaid) paragraph 6 would be applicable.

2.68. The Delegate of Italy:

"Sub-Committee 3 A, in its report to Committee 3 (Document No. 184), proposed that in Article 6 of the Convention should be inserted a paragraph on the I.F.R.B. specialized secretariat. Committee 3, by no very considerable majority (17 votes in favour, 18 against, and 30 abstentions), rejected this proposal.

2.69. "My Delegation feels that decision was not very judicious. In Article 8 of the Convention (on the C.C.I.'s) there is a sub-paragraph 4 d) on the secretariat. We think, and hereby propose, that some such paragraph relative to the I.F.R.B. should be included in Article 6, in accordance with the proposal made by sub-committee 3 A."

2.70. The Delegate of Denmark was in favour of the Italian proposal.

2.71. The Delegate of Mexico was also in favour of that proposal. Besides, when the matter was being discussed in Committee 3, he himself had proposed that the I.F.R.B. should be given every opportunity to perform the tasks assigned to it. Further, it should be noted that the idea of providing the I.F.R.B. with a specialized secretariat was not new. It already appeared in number 308 of the Radio Regulations (page 71). In that paragraph, a small secretariat was mentioned. Hence the Italian proposal was in complete accordance with the Convention, and therefore his Delegation vigorously supported it. It was even of the opinion that the word "small" in the Convention should be deleted.

2.72. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The question just raised was rejected in Committee 3, which recognized that this text should not be included in the Convention.

"There is such a text in the Regulations already.

"There is no need to take a new decision. We are against inclusion of this point in the Convention."

2.73. The Chairman said that the new paragraph suggested in the report by Sub-Committee 3 (Document No. 184, page 4) partially reproduced paragraph 308 of the Radio Regulations.

2.74. Mr. Dellamula (Chairman, I.F.R.B.) recognized that it was indeed so. Nevertheless, the new paragraph as drafted by the Sub-Committee, contained the substance of the existing paragraph 308, namely that the Secretary General was the Administrative Head of the entire staff, and bore sole responsibility in administrative matters. That text had not been included, to avoid overlapping.

2.75. As regards the C.C.I.'s, the question was one to be included in the Convention, for it had financial implications.

2.76. A vote was taken on the addition of the paragraph mentioned in Italy's proposal.

2.77. The Italian proposal was rejected by 25 votes to 21, with 22 abstentions; hence the decision of Committee 3 stood.

2.78. Following a brief statement of views by various delegates, the Chairman decided to postpone consideration of Article 6 until the amendment to paragraph 3 submitted by the Delegate of Denmark had been printed in three languages and distributed to the members.

2.79. The Delegate of Brazil made the following statement concerning Annex 2 of Document No. 251:

"At a time when this Conference is about to give a final solution to the problem concerning the number of members of the I.F.B.R., the Delegation of Brazil wishes to state that the draft resolution contained in Annex 2 of Document No. 251 does not meet the expectations of a great number of countries Members of the I.T.U."

2.80. "This can easily be seen from the result of the vote as it appears in Document No. 221, even though for some inexplicable reason it was decided to take a secret vote.

2.81. "What is more, Mr. Chairman, the figure mentioned in the draft resolution to Annex 2 was obtained with the support of those delegations which desired to increase the number of Members of the I.F.R.B. and therefore they could not conceivably agree to a reduction in the present number.

2.82. "The Brazilian Delegation once again regrets that a compromise solution was not reached as had always been the case in these Conferences, so that the result might satisfy a reasonable majority of the Members of the I.T.U., and therefore will be unable to agree to the resolution under discussion without reserving its position, and desires that the preceding statement should be fully included in the minutes of the proceedings."

2.83. The Chairman submitted Annex 2 of Document No. 251 to a roll-call vote with the following result:

For:

Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bolivia; Kingdom of Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; Chile; China; Republic of Colombia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi; Denmark; Republic of El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; France; Greece; India; Ireland; Iceland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Kingdom of Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Norway; New Zealand; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Republic of the Philippines; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; 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; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa; Oriental Republic of Uruguay; Viet-Nam; Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions; Vatican City.

Against:

People's Republic of Albania; Saudi Arabia; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Egypt; Hungarian People's Republic; Pakistan; People's Republic of Poland; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; Syrian Republic; Czechoslovakia; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstentions:

Brazil; Republic of Korea; Costa Rica; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Republic of Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; Nicaragua; Paraguay; People's Republic of Yugoslavia; Portuguese Oversea Territories; United States of Venezuela; Yemen.

Did not take part in the vote:

Afghanistan; Finland; Guatemala; Republic of Haiti; Luxembourg.

2.84. By 49 votes to 13, with 15 abstentions and 5 Delegations not taking part in the vote, the resolution in Annex 2 (Document No. 251) was approved.

2.85. The Delegate of Pakistan explained that he had voted against the approval of Annex 2 because his Delegation considered that Region B was not adequately represented on the Board and that the proposal did not ensure an equitable geographical distribution.

3. FIRST REPORT BY COMMITTEE 7 (DOCUMENT No. 269)

3.1. The Chairman said that he had been asked to inquire whether it would be possible to consider Annex 2 (Document No. 269) concerning applications by Specialized Agencies for priority for telegrams and telephone calls. The Representative of the United Nations had con- the text, as it appeared in Document No. 269, too restrictive and so in conjunction with the Delegates of the United Kingdom and France had drawn up a more liberal text which would be submitted for the con- sideration of the Conference at its next meeting.

3.2. The United Nations Observer, before reading out the text of his proposed new draft, said that he had been sent to the Con- ference with instructions to obtain government privileges for the commu- nications of the Specialized Agencies. Before the Conference, there had been nothing to prevent the Specialized Agencies from approaching the Administrative Council with their requests for such privileges. He quoted the special treatment granted to W.H.O. epidemiological telegrams. If the resolution in Document No. 269 was approved as it stood, it would mean that he would go away empty-handed, since under that resolution the only privilege that the Specialized Agencies

could even ask for was priority. That is why he had drafted the new text. There need be no fear that any Member of the Union would suffer from it; on the contrary, they would all be fully protected since their approval would be necessary before any privileges were granted. The new text had retained much of Mr. Laffay's original wording and he felt that it was a reasonable compromise.

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

"This Assembly has already expressed its opinion that the specialized organs should not be mentioned in Annex 2.

"Hence adoption of this resolution would be illogical. We shall vote against this resolution."

3.4. The Delegate of Egypt supported by the Delegate of the United States of America, considered that the Delegates should have the written text before them before they could consider the question.

3.5. The Delegate of France said that he did not want the statement made by the United Nations Observer, to appear alone in the minutes of the day's proceedings. If he had heard correctly, the United Nations Observer had said that he would go away empty-handed, and had even given to understand that the position of the Specialized Agencies, under the terms of the resolution he had just read, would constitute a retrograde step compared to the previous situation. That was not the case, and he desired that the fact should be included in the minutes of the proceedings. Under the provisions of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities, certain privileges were accorded to the United Nations, but since the Specialized Agencies were not mentioned in Annex 2 of Atlantic City, they would not enjoy any prerogatives.

3.6. An argument could not be based on the fact that the Administrative Council had granted special treatment for W.H.O. epidemiological telegrams. That could be compared to emergency action for the safety of human life at sea and in the air. Each time the Council was faced with a request such as that by the W.H.O. it would make it a point of honour to grant it. But what the Specialized Agencies were requesting was something completely different and, while the Specialized Agencies had had nothing previously, the resolution which was about to be voted upon would indeed give them something.

3.7. The Delegate of Brazil made the following statement:

"We are aware that the Plenary has already taken a decision on Document No. 297.

3.8. "Nevertheless Mr. Chairman, and without wishing to set a precedent in our procedure, we would like to say a few words on paragraph 1, page 3, under the sub-title "resolves" of the above mentioned document.

3.9. "The delegation of Brazil considers that it is not very courteous on the part of this Conference to ask the Secretary General of the United Nations to withdraw his offer to the Specialized Agencies to carry their traffic over the United Nations network 'at the earliest possible moment'.

3.10. "That is what the Spanish text says which must be in accord at least with the French and English texts.

3.11. "Mr. Chairman, if the Conference agrees with us that such an expression is superfluous and also discourteous, we would suggest that the words "at the earliest possible moment" should be deleted from the above-mentioned paragraph.

3.12. "In case this should not be acceptable, the delegation of Brazil would like it recorded in the minutes of the proceedings that it does not favour this type of relations between two organs which should maintain the most cordial relations. "

3.13. The Chairman pointed out that Document No. 297 had been discussed and approved and that the matter could not be re-opened.

3.14. The United Nations Observer thought he could satisfy the Delegate of Brazil on the point he had raised. The fact was that there were budgetary considerations involved in the withdrawal of the offer made by the United Nations and it was in order to meet those considerations that the words "at the earliest practicable moment" had been inserted in the text since it might not be feasible to adjust the budget immediately.

SECOND AND THIRD REPORTS BY COMMITTEE 5 (DOCUMENTS Nos. 268 Revised,
287 and 288)

4.1. The Chairman said that the Conference would now take up the next point of the Agenda which was the Second Report of Committee 5 (Document No. 268 revised) dealing with contributions in arrears. He wondered whether in view of the fact that the problem had been discussed at length in Committee 5, it would not be possible to shorten the debate and reach a decision on that report.

4.2. The Delegate of Pakistan said that his Delegation had reserved its position in the discussions of Committee 5. He thought it was not reasonable to expect Members to accept liability for debts that had accrued before those Members had joined the Union. The debts referred to in the draft resolution under discussion concerned yearly expenses and he questioned whether it was equitable to distribute them among countries which were not Members of the Union at the time the debts were incurred. His Delegation had endeavoured to have that question discussed in Committee 5 but without success and perhaps it might be possible to refer it to a Working Group.

4.3. The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. said that the report of Committee 5 contained several questions and in view of their importance he suggested that its consideration should be taken point by point.

4.4. The Delegate of Portugal declared that his Delegation was against the principle contained in the resolution but that in order to maintain a spirit of cooperation his Delegation was willing to support it provided the reimbursement of the 366,210 Swiss francs should be spread over a period of 10 years.

4.5. The Delegate of the United States of America agreed with the Delegate of Pakistan that the debts in question had been incurred before that country had joined the Union but he pointed out that when an individual joined a Club he was aware of its financial standing and shared its liabilities. It would create a difficult if not impossible position for the I.T.U. if prospective new Members were to state upon joining that they did not assume any responsibilities for previous liabilities.

4.6. He considered that the Conference should empower the Administrative Council to decide in future which debts should be held in abeyance.

4.7. The Delegate of Viet-Nam made the following statement:

"I support the statement of the Delegate of Pakistan concerning the position of countries newly admitted to the Union when non-recoverable debts in arrears are being shared.

4.8. "If the Assembly decides to transfer the sum of 366,210 Swiss francs to the Profit and Loss Account (unpaid debts of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, the previous Italian Colonies, the Islands of the South Seas, the previous dependencies of Japan, and the pre-war debts of Germany) I wish to state, in the name of my Delegation, that I can accept no obligation in this matter for the period prior to 24 August 1951, the date on which Viet-Nam was admitted to the I.T.U.

4.9. "Before this date Viet-Nam, included in the entity of French Indochina, was represented, from the telecommunication point of view, in the Union, as were the neighbouring states of Cambodia and Laos, by Oversea France which signed the Atlantic City Convention in the name of 'Colonies, Protectorates and Oversea Territories under French mandate'.

4.10. "Consequently, it would be in order, for the period under consideration, namely up to 24 August 1951 inclusive, that Oversea France should accept for its own account all the charges devolving upon it as a Member of the Union in its capacity as representative of a group of territories and, if the need should arise, the charges resulting from a sharing of the unrecoverable debts in question with a view to clearing the pending accounts of the Union. It would be up to France to exercise its right to claim at a later date these amounts from the respective territories it formerly represented.

4.11. "In this manner there would be no repercussions on the Union's finances. If I submit this reservation, Mr. Chairman, it is only to justify a financial procedure concerning my country which being newly admitted to the Union cannot recognize pecuniary obligations of any kind for a period during which it did not belong to the Union. This we believe, is only justice."

4.12. The Delegate of France said that he did not agree with the previous speakers because if the resolution under consideration should be approved, it would have a determining influence on the debate. The Working Group had decided - and the Assembly would undoubtedly reach the same conclusion - that those debts were practically unrecoverable, while admitting that an attempt to recover them should be made. The main point from a juridical point of view was that the old debts which figured under the heading of "debtors" would become the "debts of the Union" from the moment the resolution was approved. That would imply that all the actual Members - not just those who were Members at the time the debts began accruing - would be bound to honour the debts of the Union - and that was one of them - the same as everyone else. The Delegate of Portugal understood perfectly the situation: those were not just any debts but debts of the Union and from the moment that a decision was taken on the matter, all the Members would be equally bound to discharge that debt.

4.13. The Delegate of India considered that the point raised by the Delegate of Pakistan was not relevant to the question under discussion. The resolution referred to the convenience of writing off those debts while the Delegate of Pakistan referred to the Union's intention to recover those sums. He considered that it was not the appropriate time to raise that issue. He fully endorsed the views of the Delegate of the United States of America that when a country decided to join the Union it did so with a full knowledge of its financial standing and was willing to assume its proportionate share of the financial liabilities of the Union. Therefore he raised a point of order as to whether the issue raised by the Delegate of Pakistan was or was not relevant to the question under consideration.

4.14. "The Delegate of France made the following statement:

"I would like to invite the attention of the Plenary Assembly to the vote which is to be taken. Personally, I think that Mr. Prasada (India) was right to insist upon his motion of order, since to do so will end the debate to which I have just alluded. If you vote in favour of the motion that means to say that the arguments adduced here by Mr. Mirza, (Pakistan) to avoid in the name of his country the debts which would result from taking into account the 365,000 Swiss francs, this means that this argument should not be retained, if on the other hand he were "defeated" that would mean that Mr. Mirza was right and that the countries at present members of the Union would have the right not to settle a part of the debt resulting from taking into account these 365,000 Swiss francs. Consequently we are going to settle the question.

As far as I am concerned, I consider that the arguments adduced by Mr. Mirza and others are without foundation, and that the debt becomes a debt of the Union from the moment when the resolution is voted and that it therefore devolves upon Members of the Union at the present time and not upon Members of the Union ten years ago."

4.15 After several delegates had spoken in favour of the point of view stated by the Delegate of Pakistan and in favour of the stand taken by the Delegate of India, the Chairman decided to put to the vote the point of order submitted by the Delegate of India.

4.16. By 37 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions, the Indian point of order to the effect that the resolution meant that certain debts of the Union were to be written off, was approved.

4.17 The Chairman said that the Assembly would now consider Appendix A of the second report of Committee 5 (Document No. 268 revised). In quick succession, the Assembly approved:

Sub-paragraph a) of paragraph 1 of the operative part concerning the debts of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;

Sub-paragraph b) concerning the debts of the former Italian Colonies;

Sub-paragraph c) concerning the debts of the South Sea Islands, formerly under Japanese Mandate;

Sub-paragraph d) concerning the debts of the former Japanese Dependencies;

4.18. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. stated that he desired to have recorded in the minutes of the proceedings that his Delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 1 of the operative part.

4.19. The Chairman submitted paragraph 2 of the operative part of Appendix A for the consideration of the Assembly.

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

"My Delegation considers that it is not at this time possible to examine the question of German debts owed to the International Telecommunication Union for the period up to 9 May 1945, since those debts were incurred by Germany as a whole.

4.21. "As yet, of course, no united Germany exists, and there is no all-German Government which could take over the legal responsibilities of the German State.

4.22. "The Bonn authorities do not and cannot represent Germany in the I.T.U. and cannot act on behalf of the whole of Germany. Hence at this time the I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference should post the amounts owed by Germany to the debtors' account, with a note to the effect that these debts can be settled only by the future all-German Government, to be set up after formation of a united Germany.

4.23. "My Delegation objects to any negotiations with the Bonn authorities in connection with the settlement of German debts, since those authorities do not represent Germany and cannot act on its behalf.

4.24. "As regards the question of settling German debts in the circumstances provided for by the London Conference on 8 August 1952 - those decisions, taken in the absence of the Soviet Union, are unilateral and illegitimate. According to the decisions taken at the Potsdam Conference in 1945, all questions connected with a peaceful settlement with Germany have to be jointly settled by the authorities of the four Great Powers responsible for the control of Germany and a peaceful settlement with that country. In the absence of a peace treaty with Germany, the decisions of the London Conference are legally invalid.

4.25. "Hence my Delegation objects to the decision appearing in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution appended to Document No. 268 (revised) on the question of German debts to the Union, and will vote against it."

4.26. The Delegate of Czechoslovakia made the following statement :

"I take the liberty of inviting your attention to the fact that the German debts to the Union up to 9 May 1945 are debts which affect the whole of Germany. At the present time however, there is no unified Germany with a single Government as was envisaged in the Potsdam agreement of 1945.

4.27. "The Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany in the affairs of the Union and the Conference which took place in London during the current year was in no way competent to adopt decisions in the matter of Germany's debts, owing to the absence of the U.S.S.R., which was one of the parties to the Potsdam Agreement.

4.28. "For the foregoing reasons, this Conference is not competent to take any decision on the debts of Germany as a whole and my Delegation therefore proposes that the question of these debts should be adjourned until such time as a unified Germany exists under a single Government, as laid down in the Potsdam Agreement."

4.29. The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic made the following statement :

"My Delegation considers that Germany's debts to the Union for the period up to 9 May 1945 are debts which concern Germany as a whole and they can therefore only be settled by a future Government of a unified Germany.

4.30. "The Bonn Authorities have no right to speak or act on behalf of Germany as a whole. We therefore consider that these debts should be shown in a debtor's account so that they can be settled, after the unification of Germany, by an all-German Government."

4.31. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland desired to have it recorded in the minutes of the proceedings that his Delegation fully supported the opinion of the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia concerning German debts.

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

"My Delegation associates itself entirely with the statement made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union in connection with the settlement of German debts.

"My Delegation objects to negotiations being undertaken with the Bonn authorities in connection with the settlement of old German debts, since those authorities do not represent Germany and cannot act on its behalf. Those debts can be settled only with the all-German government

"This Conference is not called upon to discuss questions of a political nature. Rather has it tried to find workable and honest solutions to the commercial problem by which it is faced. The way to such a solution is shown by the offer of the Federal German Republic.

"By accepting this proposal the I.T.U. would have the advantage of knowing that the debt of the D.R.P. will no longer remain on its books as a doubtful debt but that payment had been made. The I.T.U. can leave it to the Germans to examine the internal question of whether the amount paid should be imputed to the different zones of occupation. Furthermore the Conference cannot demand that the Germans should leave this debt - until now at least, continually increasing - pending, when the Germans are prepared and in a position to settle it. In asking that this matter should be settled as soon as possible, the Germans are motivated by financial considerations.

"In fact, the Federal German Republic has the right to speak and negotiate on behalf of the German people and to conclude agreements affecting the whole of Germany. This fact and its underlying reasons have already been explained here by Delegations other than ours."

4.34. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria made the following statement :

"My Delegation fully supports the statement made by the U.S.S.R. on the subject of German debts and that the question of settling these debts must be left in abeyance until such time as a single Government is set up for unified Germany. The Bonn Authorities cannot represent Germany in the Union and have no right to act on behalf of Germany as a whole,"

4.35. The Delegate of the Belorussian S.S.R. made the following statement :

"As regards approval of the second report by Committee 5 (Document No. 268), my Delegation wishes to state :

"That the Bonn authorities do not represent the whole of Germany and do not constitute a government responsible at law,

"The question of settling German debts should be decided with the government of the future united Germany.

"My Delegation supports the statement made by the Soviet Union and will vote against the decision taken by Committee 5."

4.36. The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic stated that the position of his Delegation had been repeatedly made clear in the meetings of Committee 5. In the circumstances his Delegation fully shared the opinion of the U.S.S.R. Delegation and would therefore vote against the paragraph.

4.37. At the request of the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., the Chairman put paragraph 2 of the operative part of Appendix A (Document No. 268 revised) to a roll-call vote.

For : Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Belgium; Brazil; Canada; Ceylon; Chile; China; Vatican City; Republic of Colombia; Republic of Korea; Costa Rica; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Egypt; Republic of El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; France; Greece; India; Republic of Indonesia; Iran; Ireland; Iceland; Italy; Japan; Kingdom of Laos; Mexico; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Republic of the Philippines; Portugal; French Protectorate of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; People's Republic of Yugoslavia; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Territories of the United States of America; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South West Africa; Oriental Republic of Uruguay; United States of Venezuela; Viet-Nam.

Against : Afghanistan; 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 : Irak; Israel; Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; Lebanon; Pakistan; Syrian Republic.

Did not take part in the vote : Austria; Bolivia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi; Ethiopia; Finland; Guatemala; Republic of Haiti; Luxembourg; Monaco; Swiss Confederation; Yemen; Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions.

4.38. By 53 votes to 10, with 6 abstentions and 12 delegations not taking part in the vote, paragraph 2 of the operative part of Appendix A (Document No. 268 revised) was approved.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

Rapporteurs :

G. Tripot

G.M. Mooney

Secretary General :

L. Mulatier

Chairman :

M.A. Andrada

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the 9th Meeting (2nd Part)

Thursday, 27 November at 4 p.m.

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

Questions dealt with:

1. Draft Resolution submitted by the United Nations Observer. Use of the United Nations network by the specialized agencies. (Document No. 321)
2. Second Report by the Chairman of Committee 5 (Document No. 268-revised) (continuation of the discussion)
3. Method of electing Members of the Administrative Council by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference. (Item 5 on the Agenda)

Present:

Afghanistan; Albania (People's Republic of); Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Australia (Commonwealth of); Austria; Belgium; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; Brazil; Bulgaria (People's Republic of); Cambodia (Kingdom of); Canada; Ceylon; Chile; China; Vatican City State; Colombia (Republic of); Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda Urundi; Korea (Republic of); Costa Rica; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Egypt; El Salvador (Republic of); Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; France; Greece; Haiti (Republic of); Hungarian People's Republic; India; Indonesia (Republic of); Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Iceland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Jordan (Hashimite Kingdom of); Laos (Kingdom of); Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Dutch Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Philippines (Republic of the); Poland (People's Republic of); Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Switzerland (Confederation); Syria (Republic of); Czechoslovakia; Territories of the United States of America; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South West Africa; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Uruguay (Oriental Republic of); Viet-Nam (State of); Yemen; Spanish Zone of Morocco and totality of Spanish Possessions.

1. DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER. USE OF THE UNITED NATIONS NETWORK BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (Document No.321)

The Chairman asked the Assembly to examine Document No. 321 which had just appeared and which had a bearing on the subject discussed the day before.

The Delegate of Egypt pointed out that the expression "bearing in mind" in sub-paragraph 2 of the operative part of the Resolution did not mean the same as the expression "en tenant compte" of the French text. He asked that his remarks be included in the minutes.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the new draft Resolution was little different from the one that had been submitted the previous day. It seemed to him to be still quite pointless and his Delegation would vote against the approval of the document.

The draft Resolution contained in Document No. 321 was put to the vote and approved by 36 votes to 9 with 9 abstentions.

2. SECOND REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE 5 (Document No. 268-revised)
(Continuation of the discussion)

The Chairman opened the discussion on the last two sub-paragraphs of the draft Resolution contained in Document No. 268; namely sub-paragraphs 3 and 4.

The Delegate of Canada said that his Delegation was very interested in seeing the problem of debts settled and he considered it desirable that the Conference take the necessary steps to solve the problem, although he did not think that the measures envisaged in sub-paragraph 3 would have that effect. As long as borrowing continued, the debt of the Union to the Swiss Government would continue to increase, and it would be preferable to realize funds by accelerating the recovery of contributions in arrears. He quoted the following figures : the debt was US\$ 874,544 less than the contributions to the Union which amounted to US\$ 2,185,544. In 1950 US\$ 2,000,000 had been paid and in 1951 US\$ 1,500,000. As a result of the arrangements made by the Conference, approximately US\$ 400,000 would be paid.

He would vote against the approval of sub-paragraph 3.

The Delegate of Sweden explained that Committee 5 and the Working Groups had arrived at the conclusion that the debts in question were irrevocable, with the exception, perhaps, of those mentioned under heading 1d). Committee 5 had decided, the previous day, that the contributions to be used for settling those debts should be spread over a period of ten years. It was possible that the total mentioned in the document would be slightly exceeded but the exact amount would be indicated at the time of drawing up the budget.

The Delegate of Pakistan had no objection to setting up a fund for the settlement of certain debts, but he would not be prepared to make payments to settle this or that particular debt.

Sub-paragraph 3, on page 4 of Document No. 268 was put to the vote and approved by 48 votes to 2 with 11 abstentions.

The Chairman passed to sub-paragraph 4 of Document No. 268. The Delegate of China pointed out that the sub-paragraph contradicted sub-paragraph 1. In effect, in sub-paragraph 1, there was a question of "writing off" a certain number of debts, among others those mentioned under heading 1d); namely the debts of the one-time Dependencies of Japan. It was difficult to reconcile the decision contained in sub-paragraph 1 with the instructions under sub-paragraph 4. His Delegation would be obliged to vote against the sub-paragraph.

The Delegate of Belgium associated himself with the remarks of the Delegate of China. In his opinion the decision to write off an amount was a definitive accounting decision. Instructions envisaging a recovery of part of the debt were contrary to that decision. The most that could be said was that if those debts were settled they could be posted to a special account.

Sub-paragraph 4 was put to the vote and approved by 38 votes to 11 with 3 abstentions.

The Delegate of Portugal, replying to a question asked by the Chairman, said that he did not wish to add a supplementary sub-paragraph to the draft Resolution. He simply wished it to be stated in the minutes that he had given his approval, with the proviso that the debt be settled in ten years.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

"In Document No. 268 which has just been approved, the name of my country has been mentioned in connection with certain outstanding debts. We consider it our duty to clarify this subject. The debt

which, from the accounting point of view, has been shown under the name of my country, represents the unpaid contributions of a satellite state set up in the territory of our country during its occupation by fascist forces.

"That country became a Member of the Union, and had, consequently, its contributions to pay. This question was examined in 1949 by the Administrative Council, which adopted a Resolution which stated that Yugoslavia had no debts towards the Union for the sums due during the occupation period. This Resolution was, quite rightly, and without opposition, adopted by the Council, for it was evident that Yugoslavia had not to pay the debts of a state artificially set up with the object only of fighting against Yugoslavia itself.

"We have no intention of repeating here the arguments that were adduced in support of Resolution 136. They can be seen in Document P.V. 34/48 CA, the minutes of the meeting of the Administrative Council concerned."

The Resolution as a whole contained in Document No. 268 was put to the vote and approved by 46 votes to 15 with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman pointed out that two points in the document, concerning the consolidated budget and working capital fund had still to be studied. He proposed that those two points should be examined after the Plenary Assembly had finished its study of Item 5 on the Agenda.

It was thus decided.

3. METHOD OF ELECTING MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL BY THE BUENOS AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE (Item 5 on the Agenda)

The Chairman summarized the question as it had been explained in Document No. 304, and invited the Assembly to give its opinion on the subject as a whole.

The Delegate of Spain :

"My Delegation has of course submitted two proposals relative to election of Members of the Administrative Council.

"One of these proposals was submitted in Committee 3. It, like the proposal we are about to discuss, advocated a general, world-wide election, in order that all Members of the Union might exercise their rights without let or hindrance. The fate of that proposal has been a curious one, rather like conjurer's handkerchiefs, which, passing from the right hand to the left, turn into a rabbit. Be that as it may, that first proposal, in passing to the left hand, evaporated. Let's say no more about it.

"There remains the proposal issued as Proposal No. 725. On this I would like to supply some explanations. But, before doing so, I would thank most heartily the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Andrada, for his work in drafting Document No. 304, in which the two methods of electing Members of the Council are set forth with a clarity and an acumen which it would be hard to equal.

"I shall say nothing about the solution consisting in an application of the procedure used at Atlantic City.

"As regards the second solution, as the Chairman says in Document No. 304, it amounts to our own proposal, in which all delegates would be entirely free to cast their votes at their discretion and to choose without let or hindrance the Members which are to sit in the Administrative Council. As regards the method of election, everything should be eliminated which might detract from the complete liberty of action conceded to the Assembly in the Rules of Procedure.

"Article 5 of the Convention, when it says that Members of the Council shall be elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference, lays down in unambiguous terms - unambiguous in the spirit as in the letter - the principle that the Plenipotentiary Conference shall be exclusively

responsible for the election. Any proclamation of candidates would logically result in depriving the Plenipotentiary Conference of a considerable share of its responsibilities, since it would presuppose the existence of some preliminary procedure as the result of which the Conference would be faced with a fait accompli, certain candidates having been eliminated. That would be a grave and irreparable blow to the competence of the Conference.

"Where it is laid down in Article 5 that the Plenipotentiary Conference elects the Members of the Administrative Council bearing in mind the need for an equitable representation of all parts of the world, this means, and it is thus that the Union has always understood it, that it is advisable to allot to the different zones of the world an equitable number of seats in the Council and this gives rise to the division of the world into four regions. But nobody could in good faith deduce that there is room for a preliminary choice of candidates within the regions themselves.

"Further to these reasons, the procedure of preliminary proclamation of candidates by geographical zones is an attack upon the juridical principle that underlies the organization of the Union. In effect, the principle which inspires the Convention and the Regulation (see Article 14 of the Regulations) is that each Member of the Union has the right to one vote at all meetings.

"And, if the method consisting of a preliminary choice of candidates within a region were used, the other Members of the Union, not belonging to that region, would find it totally impossible to make their opinions heard and to exercise their right to vote on questions as important as eliminating or not eliminating countries which could be candidates for the Administrative Council. This fact by itself disposes of other arguments.

"I take the liberty however of pointing out some other aspects of this question. It would be impossible, with regard to the procedure adopted at Atlantic City, to speak of custom. A single action does not constitute a custom. It lacks the juridical quality of the procedure which is mentioned in the Convention and in the General Regulations where Chapter 3, Article 16 is explicit.

"Both in the United Nations and in its technical organs such as the W.H.O. and F.A.O., the election of Members of the Executive Council is always carried out by single direct ballot.

"Furthermore the Members of our Administrative Council are, above all, the representatives of all the adherents to the Union. They are not the mandatories of the Members belonging to a particular region. Consequently they can be elected by all Members of the Union without distinction. No geographical considerations can modify this. A Member belonging to a geographical region will, it is agreed, possess a better technical knowledge of that region but it nevertheless remains at all times a mandatory of the whole of the Union.

"The election of Members of the Council within a particular geographical region is one thing, but it is quite another thing to say that the election of these Members must be effected previously in that region. This would be to place particular before general interests and to hide the real opinion of the majority of this Assembly. It could happen that a minority coalition of Members in a particular region might succeed in baulking the majority wishes of the Conference. In other words and without being specific as to people or things, we can envisage an example. Let us examine the list of countries in the four regions into which the world has been divided and let us suppose that among these countries there is one, which for "X" political reasons, is regarded with hostility by the majority of countries in the region. And let us suppose that this same country enjoys the sympathy of the majority of participants in this Conference. With the procedure of preliminary election of candidates by regions, this country, which would have received a majority vote at the Conference, will be eliminated in advance because a minority group in its region will, for political reasons, remove all possibility of its sitting in the Council.

"In fact, the object of our proposal is to give all countries of the Union, without exception or discrimination, the option fully to exercise their rights and to avoid the occurrence of cases such as we have imagined, where a minority group in a region might be able to paralyze the normal expression of feelings by the majority of this Conference."

The Delegate of the United States of America, after associating himself with the thanks addressed to the Chairman for the drafting of Document No. 304, said that his Delegation was in favour of the second solution. The Members of the Council should be elected by the Members of the Union as a whole. The Members had the absolute right to choose who they wished outside any geographical consideration. Furthermore, all Delegates knew each other well and

knew for whom they were voting. The Members in a geographical region were not better informed in this respect than the other Members of the Union." The Delegation of the United States of America would vote for the second solution.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia suggested that the following procedure should be adopted in the discussion :

1. Decide whether the Conference accepted the geographical distribution.
2. Decide whether it accepted these or those Members by region.
3. Give an ~~opinion~~ opinion on the method of election.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic made the following statement :

"Proposal No. 735, contained in Document No. 209, and submitted by the Delegate of Spain, is from all points of view fundamentally constructive and the Delegation of Argentina, quite **apart** from the juridical arguments adduced by the Delegate of Spain, is happy to support the principle without reserve and for various reasons of principle, particularly :

1. "Because it is a proposal of universal character, inspired by the very spirit of the International Telecommunication Union, namely by the high-minded spirit of international co-operation that has animated the Union since 1865.

2. "Because, without deviating from the geographical principle as a factor in the distribution of seats in the Administrative Council, it gives to the geographical idea its true institutional and functional value, namely that every Councillor, ex officio is charged with an international mandate and that he must, although he comes from a particular geographical region, act as an international mandatory in the body to which he belongs and which rules the destiny of the I.T.U. acting as a body that is universal and not regional. This body carries out its duties within the framework of the Convention and in the interval between two Plenipotentiary Conferences.

3. "Because it respects, in the highest sense of the term, the principle of equitable representation, really democratic, without placing geographical frontiers in the way of understanding, cooperation and international good will, and thus allowing nations to understand each other in the realm of telecommunication.

4. "Because, in giving each country, clearly and freely, the possibility of becoming a candidate for a seat in the Council, it gives equally to each country the means of evaluating itself, its ambitions and its qualifications, with the object of deciding at what moment it is competent to present its candidature.

5. "Because, from an eminently practical point of view, the proposal of Spain implied a real and positive saving of time - of this time which is like money for the Conferences of the Union - in that it would save time in the election procedure.

"For all these reasons of principle the Delegation of Argentina gives its fullest support to the proposal of the Delegation of Spain and is happy that it should be that country which thus leaves an ineradicable trace of its return to the Plenipotentiary Conferences of the Union, thanks to a brilliant proposal which re-affirms the best views of international collaboration and understanding which are a part of the tradition of our Union."

The Delegate of Portugal said he would support the proposal of Spain. He associated himself with the arguments of preceding speakers which he did not wish to repeat. He took the liberty, however, of pointing out that the spirit of Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Convention, would be better respected if, instead of speaking of "candidacy" one spoke of "countries willing to accept a mandate".

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria asked for the Chairman's explanation of the following three points:

1. In the first solution, what steps would be taken if there was a tie in voting at the second stage in the vote?

Reply :

A new election would be held.

2. As regards the second solution, Document No. 304 laid down that names of candidates would be put forward in writing. Did that mean that each country could propose itself, or that each country could propose some other country?

The Chairman was of the opinion that countries would submit their own names as being willing to accept the responsibilities of election.

3. What, exactly, was the significance of the special vote mentioned in paragraph 8 d) ?

Reply:

Should there be a tie, there would be a special vote concerning only the countries which had tied.

The Delegate of Egypt recalled that only after very considerable discussion had it been decided to divide the world into four regions, to be represented by 5, 5, 3 and 5 Members respectively. Thus the Members elected ought to represent the interests of the regions for which they were elected. It was difficult to understand why Members of the Union as a whole should be authorized to decide what those interests were for any particular region. The Spanish Delegation had mentioned that a situation might arise in which there might be a sort of clash between majorities. Hence his Delegation was in favour of the first solution, i.e., the procedure adopted at Atlantic City.

The Delegate of Australia wished to make it perfectly clear that in no circumstances would Australia covet a seat in the Council. What he had to say, then, could not be accused of partiality. The Conference had three decisions to take, one in connection with regions, one on how many Members there should be per region, and the third on election procedure. Contrary to the view expressed by the Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, he considered that agreement should first be reached on methods, for on that decision the solution of the two other problems depended. He entirely supported the Spanish proposal, and associated himself with the arguments adduced by the Delegations of Spain and of the United States of America, in favour of a really equitable geographical distribution of seats. The geographical

apportionment decided on at Atlantic City was not as satisfactory as might appear. Region D, for example, had been simply described as the "rest of the world". The Pacific Region had therefore been to some extent sacrificed. Should the Conference decide to adopt the first solution, i.e., the Atlantic City procedure, he might be led to ask that Region D be divided into two other regions. Otherwise, he would accept the existing position.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wholeheartedly supported the Spanish proposal, and favoured the procedure described in paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Document No. 304 - a procedure at once simple, speedy and democratic. The Chairman was to be congratulated on having produced such a document. He would not repeat the arguments adduced by previous speakers, with whom he was in entire agreement. The Convention did indeed lay down that geographical representation should be equitable. But once elected, Members had international responsibilities. Those who were attending the Conference were in the best position to judge who would undertake those responsibilities to the best effect, in the interests of the I.T.U. Like the Delegate of Australia, he thought that agreement should first be reached on election procedure.

The Delegate of Turkey was in favour of the second solution, but that solution assumed the existence of a world divided into four regions, with seats apportioned between them in the proportion of 5, 5, 3 and 5. Was that the understanding of the Conference? He recalled what the Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia had said in that connection.

The Chairman said that for the time being the Assembly merely had to choose between two election procedures. The two other questions would not be overlooked. They would be considered in due course.

The Delegate of the Republic of the Philippines supported the Spanish proposal. It was practical, democratic, and perfectly in agreement both with letter and spirit of the Atlantic City Convention.

The Delegate of Sweden wished that emphasis were laid more on the desire to serve than on the ambition to occupy a seat in the Council. Hence he could not agree with the wording of paragraphs 4 b) and 7, and asked that his suggestion be embodied in the document in one form or another.

The Delegate of Spain, in reply to the Delegate of Egypt, said that in speaking of a country which did not enjoy the confidence of the other countries in its region, but was supported by the Conference as a whole, the Delegate of Egypt had possibly forgotten that he was importing hypothetical political considerations which, however respectable they might be, were irrelevant when election of Council Members - responsible to the Union as a whole - was at stake. Logically, too, regional confidence and international confidence should coincide. It was the contrary which would be exceptional. In envisaging that hypothetical case, the Delegate of Egypt had said that regional confidence should take priority over international confidence. In that, he (the Delegate of Spain) could not agree. The one important thing was that Members should serve, and enjoy the confidence of, the Union.

The Delegate of Cuba supported the Spanish proposal and made a suggestion which might, he considered, save both time and money. In all likelihood, names would be put forward which some would consider desirable and others would not. Hence it would be sufficient to make elections by regions. If a country elected was unwilling to accept the responsibilities entailed, it should be replaced by the country coming next in order of votes and willing to accept.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"Firstly, Mr. Chairman, we would state that Document No. 304, issued by you, sets forth the problem fairly and squarely and clearly indicates the possible solutions.

"Having considered this document, my Delegation has the following remarks to make:

"Firstly, we wish to stress that elections for the Administrative Council must be effected in accordance with the provisions of the Convention in force (Article 5).

"Now the Convention of course lays down that elections have to be made in accordance with the principle that all regions must be equally represented in the Council.

"Hence it is essential that each of the four regions, A, B, C, and D be represented in the Council by an equal number of countries. We shall revert to this matter somewhat later, when the representation of regions is under discussion.

"What we now have to do is to decide on what system elections are to proceed. We are not now speaking about the adoption of this or that resolution, but of the principle according to which elections should be made.

"In Document No. 304, Mr. Chairman, you gave two possible solutions. We have closely scrutinized both of them, and we are in favour of the Atlantic City election system, i.e., the first solution mentioned in Document No. 304.

"The advantage of this is that it enables countries themselves in any given region to decide exactly what countries from that region they would like to see elected to the Council. The world is large, and hence countries cannot be expected to know the conditions prevailing in other regions. Each country will undoubtedly be more familiar with its own region and the conditions prevailing therein. Hence only countries from the region in question can decide who exactly is to represent that region in the Council.

"Let us, for example, take the American region. It is a long way from the Eastern Europe-Northern Asia region to which my country belongs. Let us assume that the countries in this region wish to see elected, as representatives of Region A, Argentina, Brazil, the United States of America, Mexico, and Uruguay (we are not proposing anything - these are simply examples). Now, if the Region A countries wish to elect these five, that is their concern, all the more so in that those countries, once elected, would, in accordance with the international character of their mandate, have to act in the interests

of the whole Union. In exactly the same way the countries in each of the regions B, C, and D would meet and decide what countries they wish to see elected to the Council on behalf of their own region.

"Further, provision is made for a vote in two stages. That would enable a country to vote in plenary assembly for the countries it considered the most appropriate candidates.

"In this fashion elections would be made on a world-wide scale, and each country would have the chance of voting for the countries it considered the most appropriate candidates for each region.

"Is this system an equitable one? Yes, indeed it is!

"This system is the most democratic one in that it enables any country, the name of which has been put forward, to be elected. With this system - an exceedingly important point - the views of the countries in each region are fully taken into account.

"There has also been talk here of practical considerations - of the time taken to make the elections. It may be said here and now that the first system, providing for a two-stage election, would be more rational and would shorten the time required.

"Hence my Delegation is in favour of the first solution, i.e., for the election in two stages. That is the solution we urge the Assembly to adopt.

"We agree with those delegations which have pointed out the need for first deciding on the procedure to be used in making the elections.

"Hence we must first of all decide what principle the Assembly is going to adopt for the election. Afterwards other points in connection with the election procedure can be considered."

There was a break from a quarter past six to a quarter to seven.

The Delegate of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay, without wishing to revert to the arguments already adduced by others - the Argentine Delegation in particular - supported the Spanish proposal, which was sound both practically and legally.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:

"As regards the procedure whereby Members should be elected to the Administrative Council, the Yugoslav Delegation is in favour of election by direct vote of the Plenipotentiary Conference. The Atlantic City procedure is no longer applicable. The Madrid Convention then in force contained no provision relative to election procedure. But at present we have Article 5 of the Atlantic City Convention, signed at Atlantic City. In paragraph 1.1 it is stated that the Administrative Council is composed of 18 Members of the Union, elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference". Thus no other body can interfere in the elections without running counter to the provisions in force, and we are emphatically against any procedure whereby the Plenipotentiary Conference would be deprived of its essential rights.

"In fact the very provisions of Article 5, paragraph 1, of the Atlantic City Convention make it impossible to apply the Atlantic City procedure. The only obligation incumbent on the Conference is to ensure an equitable apportionment among all parts of the world. That is the only condition laid down by the existing Convention, and that geographical apportionment should, we consider, be strictly respected.

"As regards election procedure, we are firmly in favour of direct election by the Plenipotentiary Conference, which is impossible except by a one-stage election as described in Document No. 209 and in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of Document No. 304. The solution advocated is the only one in accordance with the Convention. It ensures:

- 1) that each Member of the Union has the right to stand for election as a representative of its own region;
- 2) that each Member of the Union can directly elect any Member coming forward as a candidate in any particular region.

"From the Convention it follows that a procedure which would deprive Members of their essential election rights cannot be imposed on the Conference. All Members of the Union are entitled to choose directly any country belonging to any part of the world. This right is based on the fundamental fact that Members designate representatives who, like Members of the I.F.R.B., have an international mandate, and are not called upon to defend the interests of this or that country or group of countries. They must have in mind the interests of the Union only. Hence the Convention lays down that they shall be elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

"If, on the contrary, election to the Council depended on a previous decision by a country or group of countries, it is obvious that the Member elected would no longer be qualified to represent the interests of the Union as a whole. It would be bound to the interests of the countries electing it. We are indicating here only the main reasons for our choice, but we reserve the right to describe in detail the consequences which might ensue from adoption of a two-stage election.

"I might add that this matter came up in June last at the U.P.U. Brussels Congress, at which the proposal that there should be a previous election by regions was rejected by a large majority, the reasons given being that the proposal would mean making a minority view obligatory for the majority. We have no reason for accepting a procedure rejected by other international organizations, particularly since the procedure we favour is in complete accordance with the Convention."

The Delegate of Franco said that both systems were inherited from Atlantic City, and were equally valid for the Council and the I.F.R.B. The two-stage system might be all right for the I.F.R.B., since the Radio Regulations laid down that certain Members of the I.F.R.B. must have regional responsibilities. But the same arguments were not valid for the Council. The Atlantic City elections had taken place at the end of the Conference, and it had not been considered advisable to dissociate the two procedures. Article 5, paragraph 8, of the Convention described the terms of reference of the Council. Now the Council was called upon to act

on behalf of the Union in the interval between two Plenipotentiary Conferences. Hence it would have to be decided what election procedure should be adopted in order that the Council might play its part. The Conference was an international one, and so, in order that its intentions might be accurately reflected in the interval between two sessions, elections should take place on the broadest possible basis, i.e., on a world-wide basis.

Further, the single-stage election had two advantages. It meant that Council Members would be more independent, since regional views were always narrow. Secondly, it was the only one which gave Members equal rights in the choice of countries for election. Besides, in any particular region, it might well be that a regional majority would prevent the election of a country which otherwise would have obtained a majority of votes in the Conference. Lastly, the main tasks of the Council were administrative and financial, and were not, therefore, at all regional. The French Delegation would therefore vote for the second solution.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation is in favour of a two-stage election for the Administrative Council election of countries, first, within regions, and then in plenary assembly. We are, accordingly, in favour of the old system used for the first elections to the Council.

"This system is the one which will most effectively ensure equal representation of all parts of the world in the Administrative Council.

"The countries in a region are the best qualified to decide who can most effectively represent their region in the Council.

"With the two-stage system, regions will be really represented in the Council, since candidates' names will have been put forward by regions themselves.

"A country cannot be considered to represent a region if in the one-stage election it has been elected by the representatives of other regions, and does not receive a majority of votes from the countries within its own region.

"That is why, in order to ensure equal representation of all regions, we are in favour of keeping the old system, i.e., the two-stage system.

"We are emphatically against Proposal No. 725, which advocates a one-stage election."

The Delegate of Egypt, in reply to the Delegate of Spain, said that when he had contrasted regional and international majorities, he had not been thinking of confidence but of representation. Further, he agreed with the Australian proposal to subdivide Region D.

The Delegate of China congratulated the Chairman for his drafting of Document No. 304 and also thanked the Delegation of Spain for the proposal, so clear and so complete, which it had presented. Nevertheless, the considerations adduced by the Delegate of Egypt were worthy of attention, and the Chinese Delegation considered that regional representation would be advantageous. Nevertheless, the interests of the Union were of prime importance, and therefore his Delegation supported the Spanish proposal.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia said that if it had to choose between the two systems, it would opt for that applied at Atlantic City. That system was the only one to ensure just elections and to ensure that the Members elected would enjoy both the confidence of regions and of the majority of I.T.U. Members. Otherwise, the result might be that a Member elected might be agreeable to the majority but would not enjoy the confidence of its region. That, most assuredly, would not be equitable. Hence his Delegation was against the one-stage election.

The Delegate of Cuba, recalling the suggestion made by him before the interval, said that several persons had asked him to convert his suggestion into a proposal for amendment. Here, then, it was:

- 1) Page 3 of Document No. 304, delete paragraph 7;
- 2) To paragraph 8 (which would become paragraph 7) add a subparagraph f), as follows:

"Should one or more countries elected decline to accept the decision, another country in the same region and willing to stand shall be elected, in the descending order of votes obtained."

The Chairman thanked the Delegate of Cuba and said that the amendment would be considered in due course.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"We have listened with scrupulous attention to all the statements made, and they have merely reinforced our conviction that the Assembly should adopt the first solution, namely, the two-stage election.

"What is the problem with which this Assembly is confronted?

"Firstly, we have to ensure that all regions of the world are equally represented in the Council. That is laid down in Article 5, paragraph 1 (1) of the Convention.

"Secondly, we have to be sure that the countries elected to the Council are those which can most effectively represent their region in the Council.

"Naturally, the countries within each individual region are alone in a position effectively to put forward candidates for election.

"The first solution would produce, as a preliminary step, a group of the most likely candidates. That would be an assurance that when the elections take place nothing will be left to chance as regards the choice of candidates.

"That would ensure more authoritative decisions, and when the Assembly passed to the second stage of the vote, it would eliminate the possibility of candidates being nominated haphazard. It would ensure that elections would be both correct and equitable.

"After the preliminary vote has been taken by the countries in each region, meeting together, we shall have effective guarantees against fortuitous decisions, since the countries in each particular region will have an opportunity of first considering the candidates put forward. What would happen if Proposal No. 725 be adopted?

"If it is, then the names of 15 to 20 countries may appear on the voting slip. It will be exceedingly difficult to choose five countries from that number, and chance decisions may be taken.

"Precisely for these reasons we favour a two-stage election, as being conducive to the most equitable and authoritative decision. We urge that the first decision, as set forth in Document No. 304, be adopted."

The Delegate of Egypt, seconded by several other delegations, calling for a secret ballot, the Chairman said that a secret ballot would be taken on whether the election should comprise one stage only (second solution indicated in Document No. 304).

The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic raised a point of order. The principle in question was that laid down in Article 5 of the Convention, i.e., equitable apportionment. If there was a question of regions, why not bear that in mind? Why not vote first of all on that point?

The Chairman said that whatever the method adopted, the principle of apportionment was observed. The question at issue for the moment was the election procedure.

By secret ballot, it was decided that elections should take place by a single vote - there were 49 votes in favour to 25 against, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman said that two more questions had to be settled: whether there should continue to be four regions, and whether seats in the Council should continue to be apportioned in the ratio of 5, 5, 3, and 5.

The Delegate of Portugal said that no proposal had been submitted

thereon. Hence he proposed (and was seconded by several delegations) that the status quo be maintained.

The Delegate of Egypt recalled that the Delegate of Australia had proposed that Region D be sub-divided, and that his delegation had seconded that proposal.

The Delegate of Australia said he would make such a proposal only if the first solution in Document No. 304 were adopted. Since it had not been adopted, his Delegation would do nothing about the sub-division of Region D.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics spoke, and several other delegates. The Chairman ruled that discussion should be continued the following morning.

The meeting rose at 8.15 p.m.

Reporters:

Secretary General:

Chairman:

Jorge Deniker

L. Mulatier

M.A. Andrada

B.J.G. Dazar

P L E N A R Y A S S E M B L Y

MINUTES OF THE TENTH PLENARY MEETING

(1st part)

Friday, 28 November 1952, at 9 a.m.

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

Question discussed: Method of electing members
of the Administrative Council
at the Plenipotentiary
Conference (Document No. 304).

Present: Afghanistan; P.R. of Albania; Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bielorussian S.S.R.; Brazil; P.R. of Bulgaria; Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; China; Colombia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda Urundi; Korea; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Egypt; El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; France; Greece; Haiti; Hungarian P.R.; India; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Iceland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Jordan; Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Philippines; P.R. of Poland; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; F.P.R. of Yugoslavia; Ukrainian S.S.R.; Roumanian P.R.; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Switzerland; Syria; Czechoslovakia; United States Territories; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South West Africa; U.S.S.R.; Uruguay; Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Spanish Zone of Morocco and Totality of Spanish Possessions.

The meeting began at 0900 hours, and discussion was resumed on:

THE METHOD OF ELECTING MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE
COUNCIL AT THE PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE (Document No. 304).

1. The Chairman recalled that at the meeting held the day before, agreement had been reached as to the first step in the method referred to above. What the Assembly now had to consider was the division into regions and how many representatives each region should have in the Council.

2. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics announced that he would submit an amendment.

The Chairman explained that the day before it had been agreed that election should take place in one stage only.

3. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The principle on which Members of the Administrative Council are to be elected, as yesterday adopted by the Assembly, is set forth in paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Document No. 304.

"My Delegation wishes to submit an amendment to paragraph 7.

"The Swedish Delegate yesterday pointed out some drawbacks in the system whereby countries would put forward their own names as candidates. We agree with him, and are of the opinion that countries should not propose themselves as candidates for the Council. Hence we would submit the following amendment to paragraph 7 of Document No. 304:

"That the existing paragraph 7 be deleted and replaced by:

"Each country may put forward the name of any country in its region, but may not suggest itself. All the names so put forward shall be communicated in writing to the Chairman of the Conference, and shall be duly signed by the Head of the Delegation submitting them. On the voting slips a list of all the candidates submitted shall be given."

"This amendment we submit for consideration by the Assembly."

4. The Chairman said he would take due note of the amendment with a view to submitting it for discussion when the time was ripe. First, however, the questions of principle previously enumerated by him would have to be settled.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics urged that paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Document No. 304, as constituting the second solution adopted the day before, should be examined forthwith.

The Chairman asked the Assembly whether it would prefer to proceed in accordance with this latter procedure.

5. There was some discussion, in which the Chairman's views were supported by the Delegates of Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Dominican Republic, India, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, Italy, and the Philippines, while the views expressed by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were backed by the Delegates of the Roumanian People's Republic and of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Eventually, the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that, although he thought his proposal as to procedure the more logical, he would leave it to the Chairman's discretion to decide what should be done.

6. The Chairman ruled that a start should be made by deciding what the regions were to be and how many representatives in the Council each one of them should have. He submitted for discussion the proposal presented the day before by the Delegate of Portugal, which advocated the same regions, with the same relative number of representatives, as at Atlantic City.

7. The Delegate of Italy seconded the Portuguese proposal.

8. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"We have no objection to maintenance of the four Atlantic City regions (A, B, C, and D), but in Article 5 of the existing Convention, on which election to the Council is based, it is laid down that those regions shall be uniformly represented therein.

"Hence each region should be represented on the Council by an equal number of Members.

"Mr. Chairman, we would ask you to submit this matter of principle for discussion."

9. The Chairman ruled that, in the absence of objection to that part of the Portuguese proposal relative to division into regions, it should be considered approved. With regard to the relative number of Members per region, it had to be remembered as a starting point for discussion, that the Plenary Assembly had decided to keep the number of Members of the Council at eighteen.
10. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the Plenary Assembly had indeed rejected the proposal that membership of the Council should be increased to twenty, but the Assembly had not yet considered the question of regional representation in the Council. That point had to be considered first of all.
11. Each region should be represented in the Council by an equal number of Members.
12. Afterwards a decision could be taken as to the quantitative composition of the Council.
13. The Delegate of Italy proposed that Document No. 304 be approved in its entirety.
14. The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic said that the procedure described the day before by the Chairman ought to be followed, i.e., it should be decided first of all how many regions there should be, then how Members should be apportioned between them, and lastly, how many representatives each region should have in the Council.
15. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

"As you said, Mr. Chairman, the Portuguese proposal is in favour of keeping the old representation for the regions, i.e., 5 Members for each of the regions A, B, and D, and 3 for region C.

"This we consider unjust. Each region should be represented by an equal number of Members in the Council.

"We are against the Portuguese proposal, because it advocates an unequal representation of regions."

16. As the Chairman was about to put the Portuguese proposal to the vote, the Delegate of Italy asked that his own proposal be put to the vote first. The Delegate of Portugal observing that his proposal was identical, in substance, with the Italian one, the Chairman decided to put to the vote the Italian proposal, but divided into two parts.

17. There was a vote by roll-call on the first part, namely, on the maintenance of the relative representation of regions in the Council. It was approved by 55 votes to 9, with 10 abstentions. Eight countries were absent.

For : Afghanistan; Argentine Republic; Australia; Austria; Belgium; Brazil; Canada; Ceylon; China; Colombia; Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi; Korea; Costa Rica; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; France; Greece; Haiti; India; Indonesia; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Philippines; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Switzerland; Territories of the United States of America; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa; Oriental Republic of Uruguay; United States of Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Spanish Zone of the Protectorate of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions.

Against : the People's Republic of Albania; the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; the People's Republic of Bulgaria; the Hungarian People's Republic; the People's Republic of Poland; the Ukranian Soviet Socialist Republic; the Roumanian People's Republic; Czechoslovakia; the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstentions : Saudi Arabia; Cambodia; Egypt; Iran; Iraq; Jordan; Laos; Lebanon; Pakistan; Syrian Republic.

Absent : Bolivia; Chile; Vatican City; Finland; Guatemala; Iceland; Luxembourg; Yemen.

18. The Chairman announced that a vote would be taken on the annex to Document No. 304 containing the Atlantic City list of countries with those new Members which had joined the Union after Atlantic City.

19. The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic :

"My Delegation is against Yugoslavia being in Region C, and proposes that it appear in Region B.

"At the Brussels Congress of the Universal Postal Union, in June last, Yugoslavia passed to the Western European Region."

20. The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic supported this amendment.

21. The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia recalled that the Assembly had already approved the apportionment of countries between regions. Further, since geography had remained unchanged since Atlantic City, there was no justification for the Ukrainian amendment. It constituted an act of aggression against his country. He protested most vehemently at the attempt being made to introduce political disputes into the I.T.U. - an essentially technical body. It was enough to look at a map to see that Yugoslavia was in Region C, and at the U.P.U. Congress of which mention had been made, it had been acknowledged that geographically, his country was indeed in that region. That had been a source of moral satisfaction for Yugoslavia.

22. Nobody could force Yugoslavia to forgo its freedom, independence and sovereignty. "Yugoslavia was in that region and there it would stay."

23. The Chairman said that at Atlantic City it had been decided that in similar cases the country concerned should be fully entitled to choose the region in which it wished to be.

24. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics :

"As the Conference is now discussing the apportionment of countries between regions, the proposal presented by the Delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic should be examined.

"In June of this year, at the Brussels Congress of the Universal Postal Union, Yugoslavia passed into the European region.

"We see no reason why that question should not be solved in the same way here, and we support the proposal made by the Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

"It has been asserted that the inclusion of Yugoslavia in the European region would constitute an 'aggression'. That is a strange thing to say, and is groundless. It would be ridiculous to suspect the Universal Postal Union of aggressive intentions.

"We consider the proposal very apposite, and strongly support it."

25. The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation supports the proposal made by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, to the effect that Yugoslavia should be transferred from Region C to Region B, for the reasons adduced by the Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. It should not be overlooked that telecommunication exchanges between Yugoslavia and countries in Region C are exceedingly slight."

26. The Chairman thought that the Assembly should do no more than take note of the statement made by the Head of the Delegation of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, to the effect that his country wanted to stay in Region "C".

27. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked that a vote be taken on the Ukrainian proposal.

28. The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia wished to correct what the previous speakers had said. At the U.P.U. Congress it had been decided that Yugoslavia should go on being a member of the existing Region C. The Chairman's view was the right one. Each country had an absolute right to choose which region it wished to belong to. Besides, the Assembly had already decided about geographical apportionment.

29. The Delegate of the Republic of the Philippines supported the Chairman's views, and was against a vote on the Ukrainian proposal.

30. The Chairman said that the Assembly could not decide to include a country in a region against its will, and since Yugoslavia wished to belong to the same region in which it had been at Atlantic City, that situation had to be accepted. To decide otherwise would be an arbitrary act.
31. The annex to Document No. 304 was thereupon approved without amendment.
32. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
- "For the reasons already given by my Delegation, I would ask that note should be taken in the minutes that we disagree with the decision taken in connection with the division of countries between regions, appearing in the annex to Document No. 304."
33. The Delegate of Iraq wished to take the opportunity of recalling that at Atlantic City his country had not been included in the European Region of Region 1, as it had wished. Perhaps the Assembly would approach the appropriate body with a view to correcting such an anomaly.
34. The Chairman suggested that the Delegate of Iraq should submit his proposal in writing.
35. The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
- "My Delegation considers the decision taken by this Assembly to leave Yugoslavia in Region C to be unjust, for the reasons given in the statement made by my Delegation."
36. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria:
- "For the reasons previously given, my Delegation considers the decision to include Yugoslavia in Region C unjust."
37. The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic asked that it be recorded in the minutes that he disagreed with the decision to include Yugoslavia in Region C.

38. Paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of Document No. 304 were thereupon discussed.

39. The Chairman recalled that there were various proposals for amendment, and suggested the following procedure :

1) Countries unwilling to stand as candidates should inform the Chairman to that effect in writing.

2) It would be assumed that countries making no communication would be willing to stand as candidates.

3) The communications mentioned in 1) above would have to be handed in by Saturday at noon.

4) The Secretary General would prepare a list, by regions, of the countries not unwilling to stand as candidates.

5) The Secretary General would prepare a voting slip like that appearing in the annex to Proposal No. 725 (Spain).

6) A date would be set in the near future for the election, once the Secretary General had distributed the list of possible candidates and the voting slips.

40. The provisions of Document No. 304, paragraph 8, b) and c) (possibility of a tie, and statement on the election of Members) would be maintained.

41. The Delegate of Spain supported the above suggestion.

42. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, thereupon :

"Mr. Chairman, to facilitate the election, you have suggested that a list be prepared showing the countries which are not unwilling to stand for election to the Council.

"We have not the slightest objection to that, but we would remind you that at the beginning of this meeting, my Delegation submitted an amendment to paragraph 7, the text of which was handed to you.

"I would ask that the amendment in question be examined before all else."

43. The Delegate of Sweden agreed to the procedure suggested by the Chairman.

The Delegate of Portugal likewise agreed. He had been in favour of the Cuban proposal. Nevertheless, the Chairman's proposal was substantially the same, and was simpler.

44. The meeting was suspended from 11 to 11.15 a.m.
-

45. The Delegates of Switzerland and of India agreed with the procedure suggested by the Chairman.

46. The Delegate of Cuba was against it. His proposal of the day before had been made at the instance of several delegations, among them that of Spain. It had been submitted first, and should be first considered.

47. The Delegate of the Netherlands supported the Chairman's proposal and begged the Delegate of Cuba to withdraw his.

48. The Delegate of France feared lest with the procedure suggested by the Chairman, votes might be dispersed, thus diminishing the authority of certain Members of the Council.

49. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"We wish to make some comments on the text read out by you, Mr. Chairman.

"Like the Delegate of France, we consider that the procedure proposed is inappropriate.

"The considerations adduced by the Delegate of France are highly convincing.

"The Delegate of Sweden was speaking about the same thing yesterday.

"It would be wrong to ask delegations to confirm that they do not wish to stand for election.

"At the beginning of today's meeting we submitted an amendment to paragraph 7 of Document No. 304.

"I wish to recall that amendment. It defined the method whereby names would be put forward.

"We propose that paragraph 7 of Document No. 304 be replaced by: 'Each country may put forward the name of any country in its region, but not its own name. All names thus put forward shall be communicated in writing to the Chairman of the Conference and shall be signed by the Head of the Delegation submitting them.'

"All names submitted shall appear in the voting slip.'

"That is our amendment. That system, we feel, is the correct one. In what does its advantage lie?

"The views of countries in the region considered must be taken into account, since those countries are the best judges of who can represent their interests.

"Decisions taken in accordance with this procedure would be more authoritative.

"That would ensure that nothing haphazard occurred.

"This system would make it possible to take fully into account the views of delegations.

"I would ask that the views of the Assembly be ascertained and that a decision be taken on the matter."

50. The Delegate of the Republic of the Philippines disagreed with the first point of the Chairman's proposal, and asked that to paragraph 7 of Document No. 304 be added: "by the countries wishing to form part of the Administrative Council".

51. The Delegate of Italy agreed with the Delegate of France. Countries should not be asked whether they were unwilling to stand as candidates. He called for a vote on paragraph 7 of Document No. 304.

52. The Delegate of the Dominican Republic supported the Cuban proposal, which was in harmony with the sense of the Assembly.
53. The Delegate of the Argentine Republic supported the Chairman's suggestion and said that it was for a country alone to decide whether it wished to be a candidate.
54. The Delegate of Spain said he had considered the Chairman's suggestion as an amendment to the Cuban proposal, as had others.
55. The Chairman said the debate was over and put the Cuban amendment to the vote. The Cuban amendment was rejected by 26 votes to 12, with 21 abstentions.
56. When a vote was to be taken on the Soviet proposal, the Delegate of the Argentine Republic observed, as a point of order, that the proposal in question ran counter to the decision taken the day before, namely, that there should be but one stage in the election. Nevertheless, he would bow to the Chairman's ruling.
57. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
- "I am unable to agree with what the Delegate of Argentina has said. Yesterday it was decided that there should be but one stage in the election.
- "Our proposal does not run counter to that decision and there is nothing to stop the Assembly adopting it."
58. The Soviet proposal was thereupon put to the vote and rejected by 46 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.
59. The amendment of the Philippines was then put to the vote and approved by 46 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.
60. The Chairman read out paragraph 7 of Document No. 304, as amended: "Candidatures will be sent in writing to the Chairman of the Conference by the countries wishing to form part of the Administrative Council."

61. The Delegates of India, the United States of America, and Italy, said it should not be possible for countries not represented at the Conference to stand for election.

It was agreed that only Members of the Union represented in Buenos Aires should be eligible.

62. It was likewise agreed that names would have to be submitted before noon on Saturday the 29th of November, 1952.

63. There was some discussion about the date on which the list of candidates should be issued, and when the General Assembly should meet to make the election (participants: the Delegates of Portugal, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Italy, Pakistan, Switzerland, the United States of America, and the Chairman).

It was agreed that the Secretary General should, if possible, publish the list by Sunday, 30 November, and that the Plenary Assembly would meet on Wednesday, 3 December 1952, at 9 o'clock in the morning, to make the election.

64. The Chairman, in reply to a plea from the Delegates of Portugal and of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, said that a document would be issued containing the decisions that day taken. The names of countries wishing to stand for election would have to be handed in to the Chairman's Office (Room 104), where there would be an official to receive them up to noon on Saturday, 29 November 1952.

- - - - -

65. Discussion on matters related to the election of Council Members having been disposed of, the Chairman said it was getting late. Did the Assembly wish him to suspend the meeting and to re-convene it in the afternoon?

66. There followed a short discussion (participants: the Delegates of Cuba, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, Egypt, the United States of America, Portugal, and the Chairman).

It was agreed that the meeting should adjourn and meet again at 3.30 p.m.

The time was 1.15 p.m.

Rapporteur:

Felipe F. Moreno

Secretary General:

L. Mulatier

Chairman:

M.A. Andrade

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

P.V. 10 (Part 2)

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Minutes

of the Tenth Plenary Meeting
(Part 2)

Friday, 28 November 1952, at 3.30 p.m.

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

Subjects discussed:

1. Third Report by the Chairman of Committee 5 (Document No.287) and Draft Resolution (Document No.260) concerning action to be taken to ensure continuity in the work of the I.F.R.B.
2. Continuation of Discussion on the 2nd Report by the Chairman of Committee 5 (Contributions in arrears, structure of budget, Working Capital Fund) (Document No.268 revised).
3. Continuation of Discussion on 4th Report by Committee 3 (Document No.251). Proposal No.722 by Denmark (Document No.320)

Present:

Afghanistan; P.R. of Albania; Saudi Arabia; Argentine Republic; Commonwealth of Australia; Austria; Belgium; Bielorussian S.S.R.; Brazil; P.R. of Bulgaria; Cambodia; Canada; Ceylon; China; Colombia; Korea; Cuba; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Egypt; El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; Ethiopia; France; Greece; Haiti; Hungarian P.R.; India; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Jordan; Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Pakistan; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea; Peru; Philippines; P.R. of Poland; Portugal; French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia; Federal German Republic; F.P.R. of Yugoslavia; Ukrainian S.S.R.; Roumanian P.R.; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Switzerland; Syria; Czechoslovakia; United States Territories; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa; U.S.S.R.; Uruguay; Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Yemen; Spanish Zone of Morocco and Totality of Spanish Possessions.

1. THIRD REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE 5 (Document No. 287) AND DRAFT RESOLUTION (Document No. 260) CONCERNING ACTION TO BE TAKEN TO ENSURE CONTINUITY IN THE WORK OF THE I.F.R.B.

1.1. The Chairman opened the discussion on Document No. 287 (relating 1°, to the special authorization to the Secretary-General to enable him to maintain continuity of the work of the I.F.R.B.; and 2°, to paragraph 5 of Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention) and Draft Resolution (Document No. 260) on continuity in the work of the I.F.R.B.

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

"My Delegation wishes to point out that the budget for 1953, as it has been drawn up, is excessively inflated, especially in regard to the financing of the I.F.R.B.

"We consider that first and foremost the budget must be revised and reduced considerably. Only then could we settle the question of financing the I.F.R.B.

"You have indicated, Mr. Chairman, that contracts are in force until 31 December of this year. Since the decision on the budget will obviously be taken by the Conference during the next two weeks, discussion of this question should be postponed until the budget has been approved.

"But if the resolution in Document No. 260 is put to the vote, we shall, for the reasons indicated, vote against it."

1.3. The Chairman, said that the resolution under discussion was urgent, and affected not only the staff, but also contracts for equipment. It did not imply any prolongation of the present budget, approved by the Administrative Council in 1952.

1.4. Mr. Dellamula, Chairman of the I.F.R.B., said that the budget increase relating to the I.F.R.B. was justified by the decisions of the E.A.R.C. Every item had been studied by the Administrative Council at its last session, and the result of that study was outlined in Resolution No. 258 of the Council.

1.5. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland said that, independently of the fact that it had been decided to maintain the I.F.R.B. the estimated expenses of that body must be studied. It was necessary to establish the budget for 1953 and to try to save money. So that the work should be done as well as possible, it was necessary first of all to analyse the Administrative Council report on the expenses of the I.F.R.B., its staff and its installations.

1.6. The Delegation of Poland considered that Documents Nos. 287 and 260 were inadequate from that point of view, and that was why it strongly supported the U.S.S.R. proposal to postpone examination of the question until the exact expenses of the I.F.R.B., and the tasks entrusted to it by the Conference, were known.

A vote was then taken.

1.7. By 59 votes to 9, the Draft Resolution (Document No. 260) and Document No. 287 were approved.

2. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON THE SECOND REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE 5.

(Contributions in arrears, structure of budget, Working Capital Fund) (Document No. 268 revised).

2.1. The Chairman opened the discussion on paragraphs 2.2. and 3, in which Committee 5 expressed itself against a consolidated budget and the establishment of a Working Capital Fund.

2.2. The Delegate of the United States of America made the following statement :

"Mr. Chairman, the United States feels very strongly about the adoption of the principle of a consolidated budget and urges that this Plenary Session reverse the decision made in Committee 5 with regard to this matter. As can be seen, this measure was defeated by a vote of 28-18-2 with a great number of governments not present. We are of the opinion that it is not in the best interests of the Union to continue the present system whereby expenses are divided into ordinary and extraordinary expenses and conferences and meetings are financed independently with the expenses divided among those attending after the costs have been determined. This system requires that the Union obtain advances from the Swiss Government to finance the meetings and is an unnecessarily costly process both in terms of an interest paid by the Members and the time spent by the Secretariat in handling interest accounts.

2.3. "Things are not going along well in the fiscal affairs of the Union. If that were so, Working Group 3 of Committee 5 would not have

been struggling these many weeks with problems of arrearages, various classifications of queried arrearages and related problems.

2.4. "I am certain that the arrearages to the Union are mostly of the type that we presently characterize as extraordinary rather than ordinary. I believe that a great deal of this is caused by the same problem which faces my Government in securing the necessary appropriations to meet its financial obligation to the Union and that is not knowing the ultimate extent of that financial obligation. We are able to determine what our share of the ordinary budget will be but we are never in a position to know at the time our estimating is usually done, what our share of the extraordinary expenses will be until after the meetings have been completed. I believe that many other governments have this same problem. If they were in a position to include, at the beginning of the budget period, their total financial obligation to the I.T.U. instead of having to face up to many bills at the end of the budget period, I believe many arrearages would not occur.

2.5. "Now how about our problems of queried debts. I know of no other specialized agency that has this problem except the I.T.U. and since all of the other specialized agencies have consolidated budgets, it is reasonable to assume that this problem is a product of the I.T.U. split budget system.

2.6. "The queried debts have arisen from two major sources - budget fragmentation which enables governments to pick and choose as between what activities of the Union they wish to support, and the application of different rules on various separately financed parts of the Union's overall expenditures. These queries could not arise under a consolidated budget drawn up to cover all the expenses of the Union in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Convention in force.

2.7. "I do maintain that we should pause and take note of the fact that the various representatives of all our governments representing the finest fiscal brains we have at our disposal in the international financial field have all come to the conclusion, as expressed in the

financial procedures that have been adopted, that the consolidated budget is the most orderly, rational and efficient method of financing international organizations.

2.8. "We are of the firm belief that the benefits of meetings accrue to the organization as a whole and hence to all members of the Union, not to just those who participate in that meeting. Actually, those who participate offer more to the Union through their participation rather than receive more from such meetings. As such we believe the costs attendant upon such meetings should be borne by all in proportion to the class of contribution chosen by it.

2.9. "I reiterate what has been said in Committee 5 that the extent of this financial burden has been greatly magnified.

2.10. "With regard to these financial reforms, it is interesting to note that the one group which is most familiar with the difficulties arising from our present financial system, the Administrative Council, have generally been the major supporters of the adoption of a consolidated budget. I need only to refer to Mr. Ribeiro of Portugal and his brilliant and forceful argument adduced in favour of our adopting the consolidated budget principle.

2.11. "One word of clarification before I conclude, ladies and gentlemen, and that is with regard to Regional Conferences. We, of course, are not in favour of any activities being financed outside the consolidated budget. In the case of Regional Conferences held, not in the interests of the Union as a whole but in the interests of a particular region or a limited geographical group of countries, we do believe that the countries concerned should make their own financial arrangements and not require the Union to make expenditures and collect contributions on their behalf. Should secretariat aid be requested of the Union for meetings of this type, and the best example that comes to my mind would be N.A.R.B.A., with which you are familiar, such aid should be provided on a contractual basis between the Union and the countries involved but should not be financed by the Union itself.

2.12. "In conclusion, therefore, I urge that this Session adopt the principle of having a consolidated budget in place of its present financial system. Mr. Chairman, I request that this statement be included in the proceedings of this meeting."

2.13. The Delegate of Italy did not wish to repeat the arguments he had adduced in Committee 5 in support of a consolidated budget. He merely wanted to say that he agreed completely with the United States Delegation, and he thought that the decision of Committee 5 was a mistake from the point of view of equity and good administration of the Union.

2.14. The Delegate of Argentina recalled that his administration had submitted proposals for consolidating the budget, in the belief that it would be the safest way of carrying on the Union's activities harmoniously and avoiding the difficulties that existed at the present time.

2.15. Nevertheless, while he agreed with the Delegate of the United States, he thought that it was too late to revert to the problem, since by doing so all the work of Committee 5 would be wasted.

2.16. The Delegate of Portugal was entirely in agreement with the United States Delegate. At the present time, however, his own attitude was different from the one he had held in Committee 5, where on several occasions he had tried to explain what Mr. de Wolf had just explained. He had not changed his mind regarding a consolidated budget: he was absolutely convinced that it was the right solution. Moreover, he was sure that many delegations had not examined the problem or had not studied it sufficiently. The measure proposed could not be very efficacious until all those concerned understood it and were prepared to follow it. Any reorganization should be acceptable to all, and at the present time that could not be said.

2.17. The best that could be done, therefore, would be to instruct the Administrative Council to study the problem and submit a report to the next Plenipotentiary Conference on the financial implications of a consolidated budget. It seemed so simple and straightforward to him that he had not produced figures to support his arguments, whereas other delegations, which were opposed to the measure suggested, had produced figures and had thus succeeded in impressing their colleagues.

2.18. Finally, as the Delegate of Argentina had said, it was now too late for the Conference to consider a reorganization of the financial structure of the Union.

2.19. He ended by asking for it to be recorded in the minutes that he was still in favour of adopting a consolidated budget, and that the arguments adduced against it in Committee 5 had not impressed him at all. He had, on the other hand, been struck by the superficiality of the arguments against a consolidated budget, and the lack of support for his own arguments.

2.20. Replying to a question by the Chairman, the Delegate of Portugal said that he thought it unnecessary to pass a resolution asking the Council to study the problem; it would be sufficient to mention the matter in the minutes.

2.21. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regretted that the question was being re-opened in a plenary meeting after a decision had been taken in committee, but he recognized the justification for it in view of the rather narrow vote in committee.

2.22. He summarized the views of the United Kingdom Delegation as follows:

His Delegation was not adverse in principle to a consolidated budget, but its application in the I.T.U. would involve fundamental changes, and for that reason it was undesirable at the present time. The present system was well-known and worked reasonably well. A change-over to a new system would mean considerable alterations in the organization and financial structure, without any assurance that the new system would be better than or even as good as the old one.

2.23. Moreover, at the present stage of the work, if the question were re-opened there would be considerable complications and much delay.

2.24. The change contemplated would not lead to any improvement in the matter of arrears and similar problems, and the Union would no doubt have to continue to borrow from the Swiss Government or draw on the Working Capital Fund, if established.

2.25. A consolidated budget might be the cause of difficulties towards the end of the period between Plenipotentiary Conferences, if conferences were unduly prolonged or excessive in number. Moreover, Members which had not participated would presumably be charged, even if they had wished to avoid the expense of a conference that was not of particular interest to them.

2.26. The United Kingdom Delegation was therefore opposed to the creation of a consolidated budget, and thought that the Committee's decision should be maintained.

2.27. Replying to the Delegate of Portugal, he wished to say that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a serious study of every proposal and had brought considered views to the conference.

2.28. The Delegate of Brazil said:

"When the question of a consolidated budget was to put to the vote in Committee 5, the Delegation of Brazil abstained. It did so because it was awaiting instructions from its Administration. It has, however, had occasion to say that in principle it would not be opposed to the adoption of a consolidated budget.

2.29. "Now that we have studied the question, we give approval to the adoption of a consolidated budget and we are pleased to say that the Delegation of Brazil has received a good impression of the considerable and sincere efforts to settle the economic and financial problems of the I.T.U. in the most satisfactory way.

2.30. "Nevertheless, we have heard it said that if such a measure were adopted at this Conference it would be prejudicial to the work of Committee 5. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, we think it would be

advisable to hear what Mr. Prasada, Chairman of Committee 5, has to say; he will tell us what would happen if we were to adopt a consolidated budget now.

2.31. "The Delegation of Brazil considers that it should be adopted at this Conference or that the problem should be referred to the Administrative Council for study and adoption on behalf of the Conference."

2.32. The Delegate of Portugal assured the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that when he was speaking of the work of Committee 5 the remarks he made were not directed at his delegation.

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

"The Delegation of the U.S.S.R. is opposed to the establishment of a consolidated budget, since it is contrary to the fair principle of apportionment of extraordinary expenses. These expenses should be shared solely by the countries that participate in Conferences and meetings of the Union.

2.34. "It would be unfair to oblige the Members of the Union to contribute to the extraordinary expenses of Conferences and meetings which they do not attend. Consequently we state that we are against the establishment of a consolidated budget and we shall vote in favour of the decision by Committee 5, which was opposed to the establishment of a consolidated budget."

2.35. The Delegate of Canada could not agree with the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that the present system worked well. The adoption of a consolidated budget and a working capital fund, and the practice of limiting expenditure to income, would stop the arrears of a few Members becoming debts of the Union.

2.36. Under the present system, whereby the Union held meetings before it had received the funds to pay for them, the delay or failure of some Members to meet their obligations placed the Union in debt to the Swiss Government, and as far as his Delegation knew, the I.T.U.

was the only organization in the United Nations' system which permitted arrears in contributions to place it in debt to a Member state.

2.37. There was another reason for adopting a consolidated budget: it would open the way to a simple and inexpensive solution to the problem of the debt to the Swiss Government.

2.38. From the figures available, it appeared that the debt was \$874,544 less than the \$2,185,544 owed to the Union by Member States, so that even if a substantial amount of arrears were never paid, it should be possible to collect enough to pay the debt.

2.39. During discussion of the consolidated budget in Committee 5, objections had been raised on the grounds that it would force some countries to pay for activities that would not directly benefit them. If such a narrow and selfish attitude were adopted in the United Nations and the other Specialized Agencies, it would have very unfortunate results for the United Nations programme as a whole, and particularly for the economic and social aspects of that programme.

2.40. It had also been argued in Committee 5 that a consolidated budget would mean increased contributions from Member States. Some delegations, too, had feared that it was a device for transferring part of the financial burden to the smaller countries, but no evidence had been presented to prove such an assertion.

2.41. Moreover, Mr. Ribeiro - the acknowledged authority on the finances of the Union - had given his word that the adoption of a consolidated budget would not increase contributions by more than a few Swiss francs.

2.42. He would like to see the question of a consolidated budget put to the vote, in which case the Canadian Delegation would vote in favour of its adoption. If the vote were defeated, he hoped that the Plenipotentiary Conference would authorize the Administrative Council to study the problem with a view to making recommendations to the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

2.43. Mr. Prasada, Chairman of Committee 5, did not see how his Committee could finish its work in one week if the question of a consolidated budget were sent back to it. He therefore suggested closing the discussion and taking a vote on the Portuguese Delegate's proposal that the Council should be asked to make a study before the next Plenipotentiary Conference. Such a study should cover all aspects of the question and should be submitted to all the governments.

2.44. A vote was then taken.

2.45. Paragraph 2.2. of Document No. 268 revised (2nd Report by the Chairman of Committee 5) was approved by 41 votes to 10, with 9 abstentions.

2.46. The proposal by the Delegate of Portugal to instruct the Administrative Council to study the question of a consolidated budget was approved by 58 votes to 2, with 14 abstentions.

2.47. The Delegate of Egypt explained that he had abstained from voting because he had wanted some clarification. He thought the Administrative Council should be given some directives regarding the study. A question of principle was involved - that countries not attending conferences would nevertheless have to pay for them - and he did not think that the Council could study such a point of principle.

2.48. The Chairman replied that the Administrative Council's study would cover all aspects of the question, including the one mentioned by the Egyptian Delegate.

2.49. The Delegate of Portugal said that his remarks concerning the introduction of a consolidated budget would also apply to the establishment of a working capital fund, and the Administrative Council study should also cover that matter.

2.50. The Delegate of the United States of America said :

"The United States is strongly in favour of the establishment of a Working Capital Fund. In this connection we would like to call your attention to Proposal No. 710 of the United States of America contained in Document No. 119 which contains a draft resolution authorizing the establishment of such a fund. We would also urge that the reasons for United States Proposal No. 226 contained on Pages 186 and 187 of the Book of Proposals be studied since, in its support of a Consolidated Budget the United States had also covered the reasons for United States support of the establishment of a Working Capital Fund in considerable detail, and I would not wish to take up the time of this session to repeat all the information contained therein.

2.51. "The present system whereby the Union borrows from the Swiss Government to finance its expenses pending the receipt of Member contributions has not, since Atlantic City, proved a satisfactory manner of providing for the Union's financial needs. It has resulted in a debt to the Swiss Government which at one time reached 15,000,000 Swiss francs, almost four times the amount of the annual ceiling on ordinary expenditures, and has rarely been below 6,000,000 Swiss francs. It is proposed, therefore, to substitute a Working Capital Fund for the Swiss Government as the financing mechanism for the Union's expenditures pending the receipt of Member Government contributions.

2.52. "We want it clearly understood that this proposal is in no way a reflection upon the Swiss Government, who have been overly generous and helpful to the Union in this respect. However, we are of the opinion that the time has definitely come when the Union should cease to depend on one Member Government for providing its day-to-day monetary requirements. That responsibility is something which should and must be shared by all the Members of the Union and it is through the establishment of a Working Capital Fund that this can be accomplished.

2.53. "We are of the opinion that it would be better to create the authority for the establishment of a Working Capital Fund as a resolution rather than as part of Article XIV itself on the theory that the Convention itself should be rather general, dealing with matters of principle, and that matters of

detail such as the establishment of a Working Capital Fund should be handled separately under Resolutions or Directives which lend themselves more easily to change than does the Convention itself.

2.54. "The United States Delegation, therefore, urges establishment of a Working Capital Fund."

2.55. The Delegate of France thought that the discussion on a working capital fund should be closed, and supported the Portuguese Delegate's suggestion to refer the matter to the Administrative Council.

2.56. The French Delegation had prepared a draft resolution, which was under discussion in Committee 5, suggesting that the Administrative Council should make a detailed study. Contrary to the general idea, the problem of the Union's finances could be solved in several ways, and not solely by means of a working capital fund.

2.57. The Delegate of Argentina said that in Committee 5 his delegation had supported the proposal to set up a working capital fund. Chapter 6 of the Report by the Administrative Council gave a very clear idea of the way in which the Fund should be set up, and the action to be taken, and the Council's experience in the matter should not be forgotten. The Argentine Delegation thought that a working capital fund would be of great value to the Union in the future, but that nevertheless it should be set up little by little out of annual contributions from Members of about 3% to 5% of the ordinary contributions of each administration.

2.58. The Delegation of Argentina therefore supported the United States proposal.

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

"We are against the creation of a Working Capital Fund, since that would lead to an increase in the expenses of I.T.U. Member Countries.

2.60. "There is, we consider, no need for such a Fund.

2.61. "Reference has been made to difficulties of a financial nature. The existence of such difficulties is due simply and solely to the infringements of Article 14 of the Convention, relative to the prompt payment of contributions, on the part of certain Members of the Union.

2.62. "To eliminate such difficulties, all I.T.U. Member Countries must be induced to pay their contributions accurately and in good time. That is an elementary requirement, and must be fulfilled. My Delegation, therefore, will vote against the creation of a Working Capital Fund."

2.63. Mr. Prasada, Chairman of Committee 5, suggested that the discussion on the working capital fund be closed, and the matter referred to the Council for study. The Council's report should then be sent to all the governments, so that their Finance Ministries could study it.

2.64. The Delegate of Canada favoured the adoption of a working capital fund, but it would not be practical to have such a fund without a consolidated budget. He therefore supported the proposal by the Delegate of Portugal.

2.65. He ended by emphasizing that, from the point of view of the financial organization of the Union, a consolidated budget and a working capital fund would be extremely practical.

2.66. A vote was then taken.

2.67. Paragraph 3 was approved by 54 votes to 4, with 9 abstentions.

2.68. By 49 votes to 0, with 15 abstentions, the proposal to ask the Administrative Council to study the question was approved.

2.69. The Delegate of Portugal asked for it to be recorded in the minutes that, having followed all the discussions in Committee 5 and in the plenary meetings, he noticed that the practice followed since Atlantic City concerning the establishment of a reserve fund had not been objected to by the

Conference, and consequently he concluded that it could be maintained for the future.

His conclusion was tacitly accepted.

3. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON FOURTH REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3 (Document No. 251). PROPOSAL No. 722 BY DENMARK (Document No. 320).

3.1. The Chairman pointed out that the Assembly still had to approve Paragraph 3 of Annex 1 to Document No. 251, and recalled that the Delegate of Denmark has submitted a proposal (No. 722) in Document No. 320 for an additional clause in Article 6 of the Convention.

3.2. The proposal was supported by the Delegations of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay and France.

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

"Document No. 320 contains a proposed addition to Article 6. This amendment is quite unacceptable, since it is contrary to the principle of the sovereignty of countries. Every country has the sovereign right to decide who shall represent it in an international organ.

"That is the sovereign right of a country, and it cannot in any circumstances be violated.

"The Conference cannot interfere in questions which are the province of the countries Members of the Union themselves.

"Consequently we are opposed to the adoption of this amendment."

3.4. The Delegations of Brazil, Czechoslovakia, the Philippines and China were also opposed to the inclusion of the text in the Convention, since they considered that any country should have the right to withdraw its representative from the I.F.R.B. if it so wished.

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

"The Delegation of the Ukrainian S.S.R. is opposed to the Danish proposal contained in Document No. 320.

"This proposal is incompatible with the sovereignty of countries and with the standards of international law.

"A provision that violates the sovereignty of countries cannot be included in the Convention. Consequently, we are categorically opposed to the proposal by Denmark."

3.6. The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland could not agree with the statements made by certain delegations on the subject of the sovereign rights of states under international law. In the field of international telecommunications the governments represented at the Conference were sovereign only to the extent that that sovereignty was not limited by international agreements to which they were parties.

3.7. It was clear from the text of the new Article 6 that persons nominated to the I.F.R.B. should be strictly independent of their governments, and the independence of the Members of the Board would be jeopardized if they were subject to recall by their governments.

3.8. The Delegate of South Africa, while in sympathy with the object of the Danish proposal, felt that it would be out of place in the Convention, and more likely to receive support if it were changed into a proposal that the Conference should issue an opinion.

3.9. The Delegate of Argentina made the following statement:

"Having read the amendment suggested by the Delegate of Denmark in his Proposal No. 722, we regret to say that we are, today, exactly where we were yesterday. The alternative suggested is simply one of phraseology which does not basically change the question.

3.10. "It is evident that if a Government undertakes not to withdraw its official, it is under an obligation, and this is exactly equivalent to saying that it cannot withdraw him. This is no lyrical promise but a formal undertaking. And because this is so we are in the same position as we were yesterday.

3.11. "The position resulting from the proposal submitted by the Delegate of Denmark is extremely delicate, but it can be examined quietly, dispassionately and without introducing an element of drama which would be quite foreign to the atmosphere of the International Telecommunication Union. It is, we repeat, a very delicate situation, but one which can be handled dispassionately and with full latitude. We shall endeavour to act thus, contributing as we always have, in the measure of our powers, to better international understanding and concord. And in tribute to this spirit of concord and understanding, we must oppose the proposal of Denmark with which we cannot agree, much as we should like to.

"I) The International Telecommunication Union, at Atlantic City, resolved to set up a technical body to be known as the International Frequency Registration Board (I.F.R.B.) with a specific task of international scope and significance.

"II) This international organization - the I.F.R.B. - is composed of eleven countries - countries and not persons - which are elected by all the Members of the I.T.U. and as such consequently receive the necessary mandate to carry out the tasks allotted to the I.F.R.B. and envisaged in the Convention.

"III) The countries elected to the I.F.R.B. in their turn nominate the individuals, or in other words the persons with a physical presence to take part in the work of the organization. By so doing, these countries undertake the obligation that the persons nominated act not as representatives of their respective countries of origin or adoption, but as real international officials and impartial, objective judges, etc.

"IV) Reciprocally as far as the members of the I.F.R.B. are concerned, it is assumed that they cannot accept instructions from their country, nor from International organizations, undertakings, etc. Briefly the countries are elected to the I.F.R.B.

and in their turn they nominate physical persons who must carry out the mandate. This means that the juridical and functional system of the I.F.R.B. rests on two principles duly conciliated and capable of conciliation, namely :

"1) the sovereignty of member countries concerning the right to nominate - and therefore to remove - persons or representatives who form the I.F.R.B. during the period covered by the mandate conferred, since these representatives at no time renounce their nationality or citizenship,

"2) the administrative independence of the representatives insofar as they hold a conferred mandate. Here arise the reciprocal obligations that the Convention imposes on the countries conferring the mandate and on the representatives in order to avoid any interference that could prejudice the nomination of members of the I.F.R.B.

"V) This system, certainly rather complicated, has operated without serious difficulties until today, and it permits all the countries, members of the I.F.R.B., to give their closest collaboration to the I.F.R.B. without calling upon them to face the grave problem of reducing their sovereignty in matters which cannot be delineated.

3.12. "Having stated these questions of principle we must expressly and emphatically declare that the Argentine Republic, as a member of the I.F.R.B., has never thought of removing the person in whom it has placed the confidence necessary for the discharge of this International mandate which is such an honour to my country. Similarly it has never thought of belittling in any way the function of its nominated representatives by an attitude in opposition to the principles proclaimed. But, although Argentine respects as much as anyone these basic principles, it also considers for the same reasons of principle that it cannot renounce its sovereign right to withdraw the person nominated - this is of course a hypothetical case - if there is valid reason for doing so : for example, the need for this person to rejoin the technical staff of the administration, etc. Similarly, and also as an example, it might happen that it

was necessary to withdraw a person for ethical reasons, etc.

3.13. "As can be seen, it is evident that the country, as a country, cannot be deprived of its inalienable right to remove those persons it has nominated to carry out a mandate. We are decidedly and energetically opposed to this attempt to deprive countries of their rights because it is contrary to the sovereignty of states and is in open conflict with the fundamental principles of international law.

3.14. "Finally, as far as the personal position of Mr. Dellamula is concerned, the Argentine delegation feels bound to say that the extremes given as an example cannot be applied to a person of his capacity and moral stature. Mr. Dellamula is worthy of all our respect, but logically, positions of principle are always positions of principle and are always above the persons who occasionally become involved in them.

3.15. "For all these reasons, Mr. President, we shall vote against the proposal of the Delegation of Denmark and we have to state that it would be extremely painful to us to have to make a formal reserve on this point if the case arose."

3.16. The Delegate of Egypt thought that the clause would serve no purpose since it conflicted with the last sub-paragraph of paragraph 3 of the proposed new Article 6 of the Convention (Document No. 251), under which a Member could resign.

3.17. Having noted the number of objections raised, the Chairman asked whether the Delegate of Denmark would be prepared to transform his proposal into a recommendation by the Plenipotentiary Conference. He thought that if that were done it might be possible to avoid a number of reservations to the Convention.

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

"Obviously many delegations disregard the fact that the Conference has already decided that it is countries and not persons who are Members of the I.F.R.B. If we recognize a country's right to designate its representative, we must equally recognize its right to replace him or to recall him.

"The Danish proposal is contrary to the principle of the sovereignty of Member countries, and consequently we shall vote against the adoption of this proposal."

3.19. Replying to the Chairman's question, the Delegate of Denmark said that provided his supporters agreed, his delegation would be prepared to withdraw the proposal and submit a fresh one, on similar lines, as a recommendation. A Member of the Union would then feel that it had a moral, rather than a legal obligation not to withdraw its representative from the I.F.R.B. during his term of office.

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

"First of all, we must know whether Proposal No. 722 has been withdrawn. I should like this to be confirmed very clearly.

"We cannot discuss the resolution proposed by the Delegate of Denmark until we have it before us in the form of a text. However, it is already clear that Mr. Pedersen's suggestion concerning a draft resolution is as unacceptable to us as his original proposal."

3.21. Replying to the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., the Delegate of Denmark confirmed that his delegation was willing to withdraw the proposal contained in Document No. 320 if those who supported it agreed. He would propose a new text in the form of a recommendation of the Conference.

3.22. The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said :

"So we finally understand that Proposal No. 722 has been withdrawn. The fact should be recorded in the minutes.

"As regards the draft resolution, we must say that we cannot discuss the question until we have a written text before us.

"Until then, we cannot discuss it."

3.23. It was decided that the matter should be left in abeyance pending the publication of the new Danish proposal.

3.24. The Chairman asked the Assembly to vote, by roll-call, on the text proposed by Committee 3 for Article 6 of the Convention (Annex 1 to Doc.No. 251).

3.25. The Delegate of the People's Republic of Poland made the following statement :

"During the 6th plenary meeting of the Plenipotentiary Conference, as can be seen from Document No. 220, the Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland gave its views on the functions that the I.F.R.B. should carry out to justify its existence under the terms of Article 47 of the Atlantic City Radio Regulations. Our point of view was rejected without discussion and without any arguments being advanced to prove that our opinion was incorrect.

"During the present discussion on Document No. 251 containing the proposed Article 6 of the new Convention a whole series of proposals and amendments made by the Delegates of the U.S.S.R., the Roumanian People's Republic and others have been rejected - proposals that would genuinely improve the proposed Article 6 both in form and substance. During the voting we fully supported the amendments submitted, but, since they were not adopted, we consider that without such amendments the draft Article 6 of the new Convention relating to the I.F.R.B., as set out in Document No. 251, is unacceptable to the Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland."

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

"Mr. Chairman, since you are going to take a vote on the question of the approval of the text of Article 6 of the Convention, the Soviet Delegation feels bound to say the following :

"In our opinion the I.F.R.B. should only perform the duty of registering frequencies on the basis of the provisions of Article 47 of the Radio Regulations.

"It can deal only with questions concerning frequency registration, and it is inadmissible that the I.F.R.B. should be entrusted with any other tasks.

"Since the amendments suggested by the Soviet Delegation to Article 6 of the Convention were not approved by the Assembly, the Soviet Delegation will vote against the approval of Article 6."

3.27. A roll-call vote was then taken on the proposed Article 6 of the Convention (Document No. 251), with the following result :

In favour - 59 Delegations :

Argentina; Australia; Belgium; Brazil; Cambodia; Ceylon; Canada; China; Colombia; Belgian Congo; Korea; Costa Rica; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Egypt; El Salvador; Spain; United States of America; France; Greece; Haiti; India; Indonesia; Iran; Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; Laos; Lebanon; Mexico; Monaco; Nicaragua; Norway; New Zealand; Paraguay; Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles and New Guinea; Peru; 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; Syria; United States Territories; French Oversea Territories; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of South Africa and Territory of South West Africa; Uruguay; Venezuela; Viet-Nam; Yemen.

Against: 10 Delegations:

Albania; Saudi Arabia; 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.

Abstentions: 3 Delegations:

Austria; Denmark; Pakistan.

Ten Delegations were absent.

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

"Since the new text of Article 6 of the Convention, now under consideration, is not in conformity with Article 47 of the Radio Regulations and the tasks of the I.F.R.B. concerning frequency registration, the Delegation of the Bielorussian S.S.R. voted against the adoption of Article 6 of the Convention in its new wording."

3.29. The Delegate of the P.R. of Bulgaria said his delegation had voted against the adoption of the new text of Article 6 because it considered that the I.F.R.B. should only carry out those tasks allotted to it in Article 47 of the Radio Regulations; it should not be entrusted with any additional duties.

3.30 The Delegate of the Hungarian P.R. said that his delegation had voted against the adoption of the new Article 6 of the Convention because it considered that it was incorrect to allot duties to the I.F.R.B. other than those defined in Article 47 of the Radio Regulations.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

Reporters:

Secretary General:

Chairman:

G. Tripot

L. Mulatier

M.A. Andrada

J. Dazar

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CLASSIFICATION OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF THE UNION

Result of the first consultation

(Decision taken by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952 -
Document No. 318, paragraph III.1., page 8).

Situation at 29 November 1952

Present number of units, according to the Atlantic City scale
(Convention, Article 14, paragraph 4)..... 794

- 2 Members, namely Kenya (an Associate Member) and the United Kingdom of Libya, have not yet notified the class they have chosen.

1.- Notifications of change in class prior to
the above-mentioned decision:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Former Class</u>	<u>New Class</u>	<u>Difference in units</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Saudi Arabia	VII	VIII	- 2 +	Document 262
Dominican Republic	V	VI	- 5	Document 308
Ethiopia	VI	VIII	- 2	Document 15
Guatemala	VII	VIII	- 2	Document 168
Japan	VIII	I	+29	Document 263
Paraguay	VII	VIII	- 2	Document 114
Republic of the Philippines	VI	VIII	- 4	Document 84 revised
Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such	II	III	- 5	Document 122
Viet-Nam	VII	VIII	- 2	Document 15 and Annex 22
Yemen	VII	VIII	- 2	Document 15
Union of South Africa and Territory of South-West Africa	II	IV	- 10	Document 322
Carried forward.....			- 36 +29	

Brought forward..... - 36 +29

2. - Notifications received since
the decision of 26 December:

Argentine Republic	I	II	- 5	Annex	3
Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	VI	VIII	- 4	Annex	4
People's Republic of Bulgaria	VII	VIII	- 2	Annex	5
Colonies, Protectorates, Oversea Territories and Territories under Mandate or Trusteeship of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	III	IV	- 5	Annex	6
Cuba	VI	VII	- 2	Annex	7
Denmark	V	VI	- 5	Annex	8
Italy	II	III	- 5	Annex	13
Norway	V	VI	- 5	Annex	15
Peru	VI	VII	- 2	Annex	16
People's Republic of Poland	III	V	- 10	Annex	17
Portugal	IV	V	- 5	Annex	18
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	IV	VI	- 10	Annex	19
Portuguese Oversea Territories	IV	V	- 5	Annex	20
Turkey	V	VI	- 5	Annexes 21 and 21a	

-106 +29 Difference: -77
Number of units
after 1st
consultation: 717
(See Annex 1)

3. Countries making reservations as regards their choice of class if the existing scale should be revised:

- | | | |
|--|-------------|------------|
| a) will probably choose a class lower than Class I | India | (Annex 10) |
| b) will stay in class VI provided a new scale is introduced. | Greece | (Annex 9) |
| | Ireland | (Annex 12) |
| c) will choose a class lower than Class VIII | Afghanistan | (Annex 2) |
| | Iran | (Annex 11) |
| | Lebanon | (Annex 14) |

ANNEX 1

RESULTS OF THE FIRST CONSULTATION IN CONNECTION
WITH THE CLASSIFICATION OF MEMBERS AND
ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF THE UNION

(Decision taken by the Plenary Assembly
on 26 November 1952)

Situation at 29 November 1952

Present classification according to the Atlantic City scale (Convention, Article 14, paragraph 4):			Notification of a change of class in the Atlantic City scale (Con- vention, Article 14, paragraph 4):		
I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference:	Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +
Afghanistan	VIII	1			
People's Republic of Albania	VIII	1			
Saudi Arabia	VII	3	VIII	1	- 2
Argentine Republic	I	30	II	25	- 5
Commonwealth of Australia	I	30			
Austria	VIII	1			
Belgium	V	10			
Biclorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	VI	5	VIII	1	- 4
Bolivia	VII	3			
Brazil	II	25			
People's Republic of Bulgaria	VII	3	VIII	1	- 2
Kingdom of Cambodia	VIII	1			
Canada	II	25			
Ceylon	VII	3			
Chile	VII	3			
China	II	25			
Vatican City State	VIII	1			
Republic of Colombia	VI	5			
Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi	VII	3			
			carried forward		- 13

I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference:			Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +
					(brought forward) - 13		
Republic of Korea	VIII	I					
Costa Rica	VII	3					
Cuba	VI	5	VII	3		- 2	
Denmark	V	10	VI	5		- 5	
Dominican Republic	V	10	VI	5		- 5	
Egypt	V	10					
Republic of El Salvador	VII	3					
Spain	VII	3					
United States of America	I	30					
Ethiopia	VII	3	VIII	1		- 2	
Finland	VI	5					
France	I	30					
Greece	VI	5					
Guatemala	VII	3	VIII	I		- 2	
Republic of Haiti	VIII	1					
Hungarian People's Republic	VIII	1					
India	I	30					
Republic of Indonesia	V	10					
Iran	VIII	1					
Iraq	VIII	1					
Ireland	VI	5					
Iceland	VIII	1					
Israel	VII	3					
Italy	II	25	III	20		- 5	
Japan	VIII	1	I	30		+29	
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan	VIII	1					
					carried forward -34 +29		

I.T.U.Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference:	Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +
					(brought forward) - 34 + 29
Laos	VIII	1			
Lebanon	VIII	1			
Luxembourg	VII	3			
Mexico	V	10			
Monaco	VIII	1			
Nicaragua	VII	3			
Norway	V	10	VI	5	- 5
New Zealand	VI	5			
Pakistan	IV	15			
Paraguay	VII	3	VIII	1	- 2
Netherlands, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, New Guinea	V	10			
Republic of the Philippines	VI	5	VIII	1	- 4
Peru	VI	5	VII	3	- 2
People's Republic of Poland	III	20	V	10	-10
Portugal	IV	15	V	10	- 5
French Protectorate of) Morocco (1 entity))	VIII	1			
French Protectorate of) Tunisia (1 entity))		1			
Federal German Republic	III	20			
Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia	VIII	1			
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	IV	15	VI	5	-10
Romanian People's Republic	VIII	1			
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	I	30			
			carried forward		-72 +29

I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference			Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +
					(brought forward: -72 + 29)		
Sweden	V	10					
Swiss Confederation	V	10					
Syrian Republic	VII	3					
Czechoslovakia	V	10					
Territories of the United States of America	I	30					
Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such	II	25	III	20		-5	
Portuguese Oversea Territories	IV	15	V	10		-5	
Thailand	V	10					
Turkey	V	10	VI	5		-5	
Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa	II	25	IV	15		-10	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	I	30					
Oriental Republic of Uruguay	VI	5					
United States of Venezuela	V	10					
Viet-Nam	VII	3	VIII	1		-2	
Yemen	VII	3	VIII	1		-2	
Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions	VIII	1					
		<hr/>					
		755					
					carried forward: -101 + 29		

I.T.U. Members and Associate Members not attending the Buenos Aires Conference			Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +
			(brought forward: -101+ 29)				
British West Africa (Associate Member)			VIII	1			
Burma			VII	3			
Colonies, Protectorates, Oversea Territories and Territories under Mandate or Trusteeship of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland			III	20	IV	15	-5
Ecuador			VI	5			
Republic of Honduras			VII	3			
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate of) (Associate Member)			(not notified)				
Liberia			VII	3			
United Kingdom of Libya			(not notified)				
Panama			VII	3			
Southern Rhodesia			VIII	1			
				<u>39</u>			
Present total				754			- 106 + 29
Differences resulting from changes in class				<u>-77</u>			
New total				<u><u>717</u></u>			

ANNEXES 2 TO 22

• TO FOLLOW

A N N E X E S 2-22

TO

DOCUMENT No.348-E

- 9 -

(348-E)

A N N E X 2

Buenos Aires, 27 November 1952

The Secretary General

I.T.U.

Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

In behalf of the Government of Afghanistan I should be grateful if you will note in case a new class lower than the actual class eight of contribution in the expenses of the International Telecommunication Union is created in the Buenos Aires Convention, Afghanistan should be included in that class.

Yours sincerely,

ALIGUL

Delegate of Afghanistan

A N N E X 3

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952.

International Telecommunication
Plenipotentiary Conference
Buenos Aires.

Mr. L. Mulatier,
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

Further to the resolution recently adopted by the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, I have pleasure in informing you that the Argentine Administration has chosen Class II (25 units), of the scale shown in the existing Article 14 (4), for its share in defraying Union expenses.

If there should be a change in that scale of contributions, or should there be an appreciable decrease in the number of units subscribed, the Argentine Administration reserves the right to review its decision.

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

(signed) Marco Aurelio Andrada
Chairman

- 11 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 4

Buenos Aires, 28 November 1952

To Dr. M.A. Andrada,
Chairman of the
Plenipotentiary Telecommunication
Conference.

Dear Sir,

Further to the decision taken on 26 November 1952 by the Plenary Assembly of the Conference, in connection with the procedure to be used by countries in choosing their class for contributions to the budget of the I.T.U., I have the honour to inform you that the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses Class VIII (1 unit) of the scale set forth in paragraph 4 of Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention (1947), for the period 1953-1957.

Yours very truly,

D. Arkadiev
Head of the Delegation of the
Bielorussian Soviet Socialist
Republics.

A N N E X 5

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

Delegation of the
People's Republic of Bulgaria

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

I beg you to note, in accordance with Article 14,
paragraph 5, of the Convention, that the People's Republic
of Bulgaria has decided to change from Class VII to
Class VIII.

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

Panayor J. Panayotov

Head of the Delegation of the
People's Republic of Bulgaria.

- 13 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 6

OVERSEAS TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEPARTMENT
Headquarters Building, General Post Office
St. Martin's Le Grand, London, E.C.1.

Buenos Aires, 22 November 1952

The Secretary General
I.T.U.
Plenipotentiary Conference
Buenos Aires

I have the honour, by direction of Her Majesty's Postmaster General, to refer to the terms of Article 14, paragraph 5 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947, as it relates to modifications of Members' classes of contribution, and to request, on behalf of the "Colonies, Protectorates, Overseas Territories and Territories under Mandate or trusteeship of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" that this Member, at present in Class III for purposes of apportionment of expenses, be transferred to Class IV.

This modification is rendered desirable by the withdrawal of two groups of colonial territories, East Africa and West Africa, from participation in the Colonial Ensemble Member upon their attainment of the status of Associate Members of the Union.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

(signed)
(A. WOLSTENCROFT)

- 14 - .

(348-E)

A N N E X 7

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

The Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

In connection with the contents of Document No. 302,
approved at this International Telecommunication Conference,
I have the honour to inform you that the Republic of Cuba
wishes to be in the following class : Class VII (three units).

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

(signed) Nestor Carbonnel

Acting Head of the
Cuban Delegation.

- 15 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 8

Generaldirektoratet for Post-og Telegrafvaesenet
1. Teknisk Kontor

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

To
The Secretary General of I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

Sir,

In accordance with the decision of Committee 5 (Document No. 302 of 25.11.1952) the Danish Delegation has the honour hereby to notify that Denmark wishes to be included among countries under class 6 of contributions with 5 units.

Thus Denmark is to be registered one class lower than hitherto. The reason for this is that the present class 5 is too high for Denmark taking into consideration as well the classes chosen by other countries as the contributions of Denmark to other international organizations.

Sincerely yours,
Gunnar Podorsen

- 16 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 9

Greek Royal Legation
in Argentina,
Hellenic Delegation to the
I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference.

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

CONTRIBUTORY CLASS
ARTICLE 14 of the CONVENTION

No. 2431 B/2

L. Mulatier,
Secretary General of the Inter-
national Telecommunication Union,
BUENOS AIRES

Sir,

With reference to the decision adopted by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952, in connection with the choice of a contributory class, I have the honour to inform you that should the fiscal limit on Union expenditure go up or should the contributory scale be revised, I hereby reserve the right of my administration to chose a class lower than that to which it at present belongs.

I should be grateful if you would be so good as to take note of this.

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

Constantin VATIKIOTTY
Head of the Hellenic Delegation

- 17 -
(348-E)

ANNEX 10

DELEGATION OF INDIA
Alvear Palace Hotel
Room N° 416
Buenos Aires

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication Union
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

With reference to the Resolution contained in Document No. 302 passed by the Plenary Assembly on the 26th November, 1952 I write to inform you that I have been instructed by Government of India to say that in view of the shortness of time it is not possible for them to take any decision, but that there is a likelihood of India electing a lower class of membership. They therefore wish to keep the matter open for a later decision.

Yours faithfully,

(Krishna Prasada)

Leader, Indian Delegation.

A N N E X 11

Buenos Aires, 27 November 1952

Mr. L. Mulatier,
Secretary General,
International
Telecommunication Union,
BUENOS AIRES.

Sir,

Further to the proposal adopted by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952, in connection with the choice of contributory class, I have the honour to inform you that should the fiscal limit on Union expenses go up or should the contributory scale be revised, Iran reserves the right to choose a class lower than the present Class VIII.

I have the honour to be, Sir, etc.

Hassan Ali GAFFARY
Head of the Delegation of Iran

A N N E X 12

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication Union
Buenos Aires

Sir,

On the basis of the classes set out in Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention it is the present intention of Ireland to remain in Class VI.

It is to be understood that the Delegation of Ireland reserves the right to consider the matter further when the intentions of other members become known, and in the event of the Conference deciding on any change in the present classification.

T.S. O'Muineachain
Head of the Delegation of Ireland

- 20 -

(348-E)

A N N E X 13

Italian Delegation to the
Plenipotentiary Telecommunication
Conference,
BUENOS AIRES.

Buenos Aires, 28 November 1952

To the Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

With reference to the proposal concerning the choice of contributory class (Document No. 302) adopted yesterday by the Plenary Assembly, I have the honour to inform you that Italy intends to go from Class II to Class III in the scale set forth in Article 14, paragraph 4, of the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City, if the applications for lower classes requested by other Members should result in a substantial increase in the unit contribution towards Union ordinary expenses.

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

G. Gnome

Vice-Chairman of the Delegation of Italy

- 21 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 14

Buenos Aires, 27 November 1952

Mr. K. Prasada,
Chairman of Committee 5 (finance).

Sir,

Further to the proposal adopted by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952, in connection with the choice of contributory class, I have the honour to inform you that if the fiscal limit on Union expenses should go up or should the scale of contributions be revised, Lebanon reserves the right to choose a class lower than the present Class VIII.

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

Nicolas Kayata
Head of the Delegation of Lebanon.

- 22 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 15

Norwegian Delegation
to the Plenipotentiary
Conference.

Buenos Aires, 28 November 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication Union
Buenos Aires

Sir,

With reference to Document No. 302 of 25 November regarding choice of class of contribution I have the honour to inform you that it is the opinion of my Administration that the contribution of Norway to the payment of the expenses of the Union is too high compared with that of most other countries. I may in this connection point out that while my country is paying 0,5% of the expenses of the United Nations, the corresponding figure for the Union is about 1,3%. With an even distribution of the expenses on all the members of the Union our share would be 1,1%.

Under these circumstances I regret to say that we will have to place Norway in the sixth class (5 units).

However, if a new scale is introduced giving us a possibility to choose a more reasonable placing, we reserve the right to reconsider our position.

Yours sincerely

Rynning Tonnesen

A N N E X 16

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

To the Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union.

Sir,

We have the honour to ask you to note that in accordance with Article 14, paragraph 4, of the Atlantic City Convention, the Administration of the Republic of Peru has decided to change its class of contribution, and to move from Class VI (5 units) to Class VII (3 units).

This decision is attributable to the heavy increase in the I.T.U. budget envisaged for the period 1953-1959, and the actual economic possibilities of our Administration, which wishes to honour its obligations punctually.

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

Carlos Tudela

Miguel Flores

For the Peruvian Delegation

A N N E X 17

Delegation of People's Republic of Poland
to the Plenipotentiary I.T.U. Conference,

Buenos Aires, 28 November 1952

Dr. M.A. ANDRADA, Chairman of the I.T.U.
Plenipotentiary Conference
Buenos Aires

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that in accordance with provisions of the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City, my Government, for the coming period from 1953 until 1957, will contribute to the expenses of the Union in the 5-th class /10 units/ instead of in the 3-d class, as has been declared in Atlantic City in 1947.

I, also, would like to draw your attention to the fact that in case if there will be any changes made, by the I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference in Buenos Aires, in the present rules of classification as they are given in the Convention of Atlantic City, then my Government reserves its rights to revise if - necessary its present position.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours,

/ Anatol ARCIUCH Engineer /
Head of Delegation of People's
Republic of Poland

A N N E X 18

International Telecommunication
Conference

The Portuguese Delegation

Buenos Aires, 27 November 1952

To the Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

In connection with the decisions taken by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952 (and only with respect to the studies now being undertaken by Committee 5), the Portuguese Delegation hereby declares that it has chosen the 10-unit class of the scale set forth in the Atlantic City Convention, Article 14, reserving its right to review the position when the results of the inquiry envisaged by that Committee become known.

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

Carlos Ribeiro
Head of the Portuguese Delegation

- 26 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 19

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

Dr. M. A. Andrada,
Chairman,
Plenipotentiary Telecommunication
Conference.

Sir,

In accordance with the decision taken by the Plenary Assembly of the Conference on 26 November 1952, in connection with the procedure for choice of class of contribution to the I.T.U. budget, I have the honour to inform you that the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses Class VI (5 units) in the scale set forth in the Atlantic City Convention (1947), Article 14, paragraph 4, for the period 1953-1957.

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

Gleb Uspensky
for the Head of the Delegation of
the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

- 2 7 -
(348-E)

A N N E X 20

Buenos Aires, 27 November 1952

Mr. León MULATIER,
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

In connection with the decisions taken by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952 (and only with respect to the studies now being undertaken by Committee 5), the Delegation of the Portuguese Oversea Territories hereby declares that it chooses the 10-unit class in the scale set forth in the Atlantic City Convention (1947), Article 14, paragraph 4, nevertheless reserving the right to review its position when the results of the inquiry envisaged by that Committee become known.

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

T. de M. Ferreira de Aguiar

- 28 -

(348-E)

A N N E X 21

Buenos Aires, 27 November 1952

Mr. Léon MULATIER,
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires

Sir,

With reference to the decision taken by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952, in relation to the choice of contributory class, I have the honour to inform you that should the fiscal limit on Union expenses go up, or should the contributory scale be revised, I hereby reserve for the Turkish Administration the right to choose a class lower than the Vth, to which it at present belongs.

I beg you to take note of the above.

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

Oguz GOKMEN

Head of the Turkish Delegation

A N N E X 21a

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

Mr. Léon MULATIER,
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires

Sir,

With reference to the decision taken by the Plenary Assembly of the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference, in relation to an increase in the fiscal limit on the expenses of the International Telecommunication Union, I have the honour to inform you that Turkey has decided to pass from Class V, in which it now is, to the class immediately below, namely, Class VI.

I beg you to take due note of this communication and to take the requisite action in connection therewith.

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

Oguz GÖKMEN
Head of the Turkish Delegation

- 30 -

(348-E)

A N N E X 22

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952

Subject: Choice of class of contribution.

The Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires

Sir,

Pursuant to the decision taken by the Plenary Assembly on 27 November 1952, in connection with the procedure to be followed in choosing classes of contribution, I have the honour to inform you that for the period 1954-1959, Viet-Nam chooses Class VIII (1 unit) in the scale appearing in Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention.

Further, I hereby confirm my application for a lower class of contribution, dated 20 August 1952 (Document No. 15), in which, because of domestic budget reasons, and with a view to an increase in the fiscal limit on Union expenses, my country feels obliged to pass from Class VII to Class VIII.

I have the honour to be, Sir, etc.

NGUYEN Van Mo
Head of the Viet-Nam Delegation
to the International Plenipotentiary
Telecommunication Conference,
Buenos Aires.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention Committee)

Summary Record of the 24th Meeting

Friday, 28 November 1952 at 7 o'clock p.m.

Chairman : Mr. C. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Committee embarked on the study of Article 15 of the Convention: languages.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria withdrew his Proposal No. 634 in favour of Proposal No. 240 (U.S.S.R.), together with his Proposal No. 640.

Article 15. paragraph 1

"1. (1) The official languages of the Union shall be Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

(2) In case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic."

The existing text was maintained without change.⁽¹⁾

(1) At its 25th Meeting, the Committee decided to insert here a new sub-paragraph defining "working languages."

Article 15, paragraph 2.

"2. The final documents of Plenipotentiary and Administrative Conferences, as well as the Final Acts and Protocols, shall be drawn up in the languages mentioned above in versions equivalent in form and content."

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

"We have submitted Proposal No. 240, which advocates a change in paragraph 2. We propose that the text of paragraph 2 should be changed, and that it, together with paragraphs 3 (1) and 3 (2) should be amalgamated into a single text, as a drafting improvement.

"Since the five official languages of the I.T.U. are all on an equal footing, we are proposing that not only the final documents of conferences, but also working documents, should be published in those same five languages.

"Hence we propose that paragraphs 2, 3 (1), and 3 (2) be replaced by what follows: "The final documents and working documents of Plenipotentiary, Administrative, and Special Conferences, the resolutions and minutes of Plenary Assemblies of I.T.U. permanent organs, and all I.T.U. service documents shall be drawn up in the five official languages in versions equivalent in form and content.

"This proposal we request should be considered."

After a statement by the Chairman, the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked that his Proposal No. 240 be considered first, for it raised a question of principle which would have to be settled before the following paragraphs of Article 15 could be considered.

The Chairman said that as regards paragraph 2, the Soviet proposal contained nothing new, so that the text could be maintained.

Paragraph 2 was maintained without comment.

Article 15. paragraph 3 (1)

"3 (1) All other documents of the conferences shall be drawn up in English, French and Spanish."

The following proposals related to this paragraph:

- Proposals Nos. 236 (United States of America), 239 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 242 (Japan) and 261 (France) for maintaining the status quo. The Japanese proposal was withdrawn;
- Proposals Nos. 240 (U.S.S.R.) and 635 (Czechoslovakia) providing for the use of the five official languages.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation supports Proposal No. 240 by the Soviet Union.

"All the I.T.U. official languages should, we consider, be used on an equal footing. We consider that all final and working documents of all international conferences, together with the resolutions and the minutes of Plenary Assemblies of the I.T.U. permanent organs, and all Union service documents should be drawn up in the five official languages."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation associates itself with the proposal made by the Delegation of the Soviet Union in connection with the publication of conference documents in the five official languages of the Union, being of the opinion that that would be a really just decision.

"My Delegation sees no reason why one group of official languages should be treated in one way and another group in another way. It would be more just and more correct if conference documents (both working and final documents) were published in all the official languages.

"Hence my Delegation supports the proposal by the Soviet Union."

The Delegates of the People's Republic of Poland and of Czechoslovakia, supporting, said the proposal would be conducive to mutual understanding and would, consequently, speed up the work of conferences.

The Delegate of the United States of America, opposing, pointed to the very considerable economic and practical difficulties of the proposal. The Delegate of India said that, no matter how sympathetically he might envisage such a proposal, he must, for financial reasons, oppose it. The Delegate of China said that the proposal would be of advantage to his Delegation, but would hamper the activities of the Union and so was unacceptable.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The Delegate of the United States of America has referred to 'absolute justice' and has asserted that if the proposal were to be adopted, then all the languages used by I.T.U. Member-Countries should be adopted as working languages.

"I do not intend to carry this discussion into the realm of metaphysics. The International Telecommunication Union recognized five languages as official languages of the I.T.U. Those five languages, all on an exactly equal footing, are the official languages. We cannot, therefore, agree to a state of affairs in which some of those official languages - Russian and Chinese, for example - are placed at a disadvantage in relation to the others.

"At one time French only was used at International Conferences. However, with the development of society and of international intercourse, we see other languages coming into use at International Conferences, and remaining.

"New peoples, new nations appear on the international scene and bring their languages with them.

"At the present time five languages are being used in a good many international organizations. There can be no doubt that the future will see even more languages used, as the result of the progress and growth of culture and of more intensive international relations. Such a phenomenon is an excellent index of the development of international collaboration.

"As regards the I.T.U., we are at a stage at which not all the official languages are being used on an equal footing. That is wrong, and we propose that this state of affairs be put right, and that all the official languages of the I.T.U. should be placed on an equal footing.

"Hence we submitted our Proposal No. 240. We urge its adoption."

It was decided by 38 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions, to maintain the existing text of paragraph 3 (1).

Article 15, paragraph 3 (2)

"3 (2) All service documents of the Union shall be published in the five official languages."

Proposals No. 241 (United States of America) and No. 584 (Egypt) were withdrawn.

Paragraph 3 (2) was maintained, without comment, as it stood.

Article 15, paragraph 3 (3)

"3 (3) All other documents for general distribution prepared by the Secretary General in the course of his duties shall be drawn up in English, French, and Spanish."

The Proposals relative to this paragraph advocated maintenance of the status quo, except Proposal No. 243 (U.S.S.R.), No. 635 (Czechoslovakia) and No. 636 (People's Republic of Bulgaria).

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"In our Proposal No. 243, we are proposing that the various documents issued by the Secretary General (notifications, circulars, statistics), together with the working documents of I.T.U. organs, should be drawn up in French only. Such a measure would enable the Union appreciably to reduce its expenditure and by so doing to effect considerable economies.

"Hence for publication of the literature indicated in Proposal No. 243, French alone should, we think, be used."

The Delegates of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Hungarian People's Republic supported Proposal No. 243 of the Soviet Union.

The decision to maintain the existing text of paragraph 3 (3) was then taken by 28 votes to 9, with 7 abstentions.

The Delegate of France said that he had not taken part in the preceding discussion, and had abstained from voting, because his Delegation did not wish to disturb the language system so painfully introduced by the Atlantic City Conference. The Delegates of Italy and the Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories Administered as such made similar statements.

The Delegate of Spain said he had voted for the status quo for purely practical reasons. The Atlantic City Convention had been signed in English and French only, but at Buenos Aires a Spanish text would also have to be submitted for signature.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the question of drafting the Convention in various languages was bound up with Article No. 49, and that he would make known his views in that connection when the Committee came to consider Article No. 49.

Article 15, paragraph 4 (1)

"4 (1) In conferences and at the meetings of the permanent organs of the Union, the debate shall be conducted with the aid of efficient systems of reciprocal translation from and into English, French and Spanish."

The Proposals relative to this paragraph amounted to maintaining the status quo, except Proposal No. 247 (U.S.S.R.), No. 637 (People's Republic of Bulgaria), and No. 638 (Czechoslovakia).

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"The aim of our Proposal No. 247 is to lay down that at

conferences and meetings of the I.T.U. permanent organs, the use of the five official languages shall be allowed, with an effective system of simultaneous interpretation. The proposal provides for all five languages to be on an equal footing.

"The question not only involves a matter of principle, but has a practical significance. Adoption of our proposal would be conducive to the most favourable working conditions for Union conferences and meetings.

"We urge the Committee to adopt Proposal No. 247."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation supports the Soviet proposal. We have already expressed our views in the Committee in connection with the use of the official languages without them being divided into groups, one of which enjoys privileged treatment and the other does not.

"Such a state of affairs can be justified in no way whatsoever.

"The use of an effective system of interpretation in the five official languages would considerably improve the work of conferences and would be conducive to mutual understanding - something very necessary in the Union.

"We shall, then, vote for the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union."

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria made a similar statement.

It was decided, by 28 votes to 10, with 1 abstention, to maintain paragraph 4 (1) as it stood.

Article 15, paragraph 4 (2)

The Chairman said that some proposals introduced a definition of working languages. That was a drafting question to be referred to a drafting group.

He drew the Committee's attention to Proposals Nos. 249 and 257 (U.S.S.R.), this latter proposal contained also in Proposal No. 732, and to Proposal No. 260 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland). Proposal No. 260 was thereupon withdrawn by its author.

The Meeting rose at 15 minutes past eight o'clock.

Reporters:

R. V. Hatton

G. Terras

J. Revoy

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 350-E
1 December 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

CORRIGENDUM No. 1 TO DOCUMENT No. 311-E

(Report No. 2 by Working Group 1 of Committee 4)

Page 2, paragraph 2a)

Replace the word "modified" by "motivated".

THIRD REPORT

by the Chairman of Committee 4

At its Meeting on 25 November 1952, Committee 4 examined the proposals for amending Chapter 6 of the General Regulations, taking as a basis Document No. 253 adopted by the Plenary Assembly (Rules of Procedure of the Plenipotentiary Conference, Buenos Aires).

Committee 4 made some amendments to Documents No. 253, chiefly to adapt the Rules of Procedure to Administrative Conferences. Other amendments, of less importance, were purely drafting changes.

The text of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations, as adopted by Committee 4, is annexed to this Report.

In accordance with the decision of the Editorial Committee, the text of Chapter 6 has been submitted to that Committee for subsequent submission to the Plenary Assembly.

Chairman of Committee 4:

I. Tsingovator

Annex: 1

A N N E X

Text of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations

Rule 1

INAUGURATION OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference shall be inaugurated by a person appointed by the inviting government. When there is no inviting government, it shall be inaugurated by the Chairman of the Administrative Council or by the Secretary General.

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

1. Plenipotentiary Conference:

Committees shall be composed of the Delegates of Members and Associate Members and the Observers, referred to in Chapter 1, paragraph 8, which have so requested or which have been designated by the Plenary Assembly.

2. Administrative Conferences:

Committees shall be composed of the Delegates of Members and Associate Members, and the Observers and Representatives referred to in Chapter 2, paragraph 3, which have so requested or which have been designated by the Plenary Assembly.

Rule 7

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 therefore.

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.

(Ann. to Doc. 351-E)

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 the discussion of a question, a Delegation may move that the Meeting be suspended or adjourned, giving reasons for its proposal. If the proposal is seconded, the floor shall be given to two speakers to oppose the suspension or adjournment and solely for that purpose, after which the motion shall be put to the vote.

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 under the conditions described in Chapter 3.

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 it 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 confirm 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 or from approving the Regulations, 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 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 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 Convention, the Regulations and other 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

The texts of the Convention, the Regulations and other Final Acts shall be considered final when they have been approved at the second reading in Plenary Assembly.

Rule 24

SIGNATURE

1. The final text approved by the Conference shall be submitted for signature to the delegates provided with the full powers defined in Chapter 3, in the alphabetical order of the French names of their countries.

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.

PAYMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS AND ENTRANCE FEES TO THE PENSION

FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REGULATIONS FOR

THE SUPERANNUATION AND BENEVOLENT FUNDS

Years 1949 to 1951

(Number of members at end of 1951 : 67)

	<u>I.T.U.</u>	<u>Members</u>
1. <u>Regular contributions of 15%</u> (Articles 12 and 13, Regulations for the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds)		
1949	63,143.95	21,049.95
1950	94,049.20	31,157.15
1951	127,020.45	42,342.95
Total	284,213.60	94,550.05
2. <u>Single contributions for each salary increase</u> (Articles 12 and 13, Regulations for the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds)		
1949	27,512.65	8,514.25
1950	36,226.25	11,660.20
1951		
Total	63,738.90	20,174.45
3. <u>Entrance Fees as in annexed table</u> (Article 11, Regulations for the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds)		
1949	67,917.90	67,917.90
1950	404,639.55	15,689.55
1951	95,517.20	95,517.20
Total	568,074.65	179,124.65



Recapitulation of payments by the I.T.U.

Regular contributions, as under 1.	284,213.60
Single payments, as under 2.	63,738.90
Entrance fees	568,074.65
Grand total	<u>916,027.15</u>

Name	Year	Total Entrance Fee	I.T.U. Share	Share of person concerned	Observations
Adamok	49	3,217.90	1,608.95	1,608.95	--
Buecher	49	5,865.--	5,865.-- x	--	--
Castagné	49	4,248.--	4,248.-- x	--	--
Crichton	49	23,534.--	11,767.--	11,767.--	Has paid 166.50 and the balance by permanent reduction of 1,379 from her pension.
Dassonval	49	60,028.--	60,028.-- x	--	--
Delacrétas	49	1,659.90	829.95	829.95	--
Felix	49	67,226.--	67,226.-- x	--	--
Honry	49	3,562.--	3,562.-- x	--	--
Janariz	49	5,100.--	2,550.--	2,550.--	--
Lalou	49	432.--	432.-- x	--	--
Lavorry	49	3,898.--	3,898.-- x	--	--
Lewis	49	79,326.--	39,663.--	39,663.--	Has paid 15,000 and pays a monthly addition- al contribution of 100, the balance being made good by a permanent reduction of 2,570 in his pension.
Mao	49	188.--	94.--	94.--	--
Quillot	49	22,810.--	11,405.--	11,405.--	--
Valonsi	49	170,796.--	170,796.-- x	--	--
Townshend	50	72,895.--	72,895.--	--	Insured person's share paid by definitive reduction of 9,232 in his pension.
Carried Forward :		524,785.80	456,867.90	67,917.90	

x - paid out of the C.C.I.F. Provident Fund.

Name	Year	Total Entrance Fee	I.T.U. Share	Share of person concerned	Observations
Brought forward		524,785.80	456,862.90	67,917.90	
Bocca	50	8,547.10	4,273.55	4,273.55	-
Besseyre	50	22,832.--	11,416.--	11,416.--	-
Stead	51	15,227.40	7,613.70	7,613.70	-
Falcou	51	10,916.--	5,458.--	5,458.--	-
Wasilewska	51	15,938.30	7,969.15	7,969.15	-
Ramma	51	17,938.--	8,969.--	8,969.--	-
Chambaz	51	4,817.--	2,408.50	2,408.50	-
Revoy	51	7,947.20	3,973.60	3,973.60	-
Heaton	51	10,590.90	5,295.45	5,295.45	-
Moreno	51	11,073.20	5,536.60	5,536.60	-
Lepretre	51	2,970.--	1,485.--	1,485.--	-
Monti	51	5,624.--	2,812.--	2,812.--	-
Brossa	51	4,709.40	2,354.70	2,354.70	-
Bertrand	51	637.--	318.50	318.50	-
Schmocker	51	9,310.--	4,655.--	4,655.--	-
Van der Mark	51	73,336.--	36,668.--	36,668.--	Has paid 5,547, the balance being made good by a permanent reduction of 4,133 in his pension.
		<u>747,199.30</u>	<u>568,074.65</u>	<u>179,124.65</u>	

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 353-E

1 December 1952

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA & TERRITORY OF SOUTH WEST AFRICA

The Secretary General,
International Telecommunication Union,
Buenos Aires.

Dear Sir,

My Delegation desires to withdraw Proposal No. 652
(Page 160.1 of the General Proposals).

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. A. Borland
Head of Delegation
Union of South Africa & Territory
of South West Africa

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE 3

DRAFT TEXT OF ARTICLE 15

Article 15

Languages

1. (1) The official languages of the Union shall be Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. (No change)

(1 bis) The working languages of the Union shall be English, French and Spanish. (New)

(2) In case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic. (No change)

2. (1) The final documents of the plenipotentiary and administrative conferences, as well as their final acts and protocols shall be drawn up in the official languages of the Union in versions equivalent in form and content. (Old paragraph 2 with drafting changes)

(2) All other documents of these conferences shall be issued in the working languages of the Union. (Old paragraph 3(1) transferred, with drafting changes)

3. (1) The official service documents of the Union as prescribed by the Regulations annexed to the Convention shall be published in the five official languages. (Old paragraph 3(2), with drafting changes)

(2) All other documents for general distribution prepared by the Secretary General in the course of his duties shall be drawn up in the three working languages. (Old paragraph 3(3), with drafting changes)



3 bis. Any of the documents referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above may be published in languages other than those there specified, provided that the Members and Associate Members requesting such publication undertake to defray the whole of the cost of translation and publication involved. (New)

4. At conferences of the Union and at meetings of its permanent organs, the debates shall be conducted with the aid of an efficient system of reciprocal interpretation between the three working languages. (Old paragraph 4(1) with drafting changes)

5. (Deleted)

6. (1) At conferences of the Union and at meetings of its permanent organs, languages other than the three working languages may be used:

- a) if an application is made to the Secretary General or to the Head of the permanent organ concerned to provide for the use of an additional language or languages (oral or written), provided that the additional cost so incurred shall be borne by those Members and Associate Members which have made or supported the application; or
- b) if, subject to the concurrence of the conference or meeting concerned, any delegation itself makes arrangements at its own expense for oral translation from its own language into any one of the three working languages.

(2)a) In the case provided for in sub-paragraph 6 (1) a) above, the Secretary General or the Head of the permanent organ concerned shall comply to the extent practicable with the application, having first obtained from the Members and Associate Members concerned an undertaking that the cost incurred will be duly repaid by them to the Union;

b) In the case provided for in sub-paragraph 6 (1) b) above, the delegation concerned may, furthermore, if it wishes, arrange at its own expense for speeches to be translated orally into its own language from one of the three working languages. (New)

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 355-E

1 December 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CORRIGENDUM No. 1 TO DOCUMENT No. 348

Concerns only the French text.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CLASSIFICATION OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF

THE UNION

Addendum to Document No. 348

On page 2 add:

Colombia (Republic of)

former class 6 (5 units)

new class 7 (3 units)

a difference of minus 2 units

which brings the total decrease in

units to. 79

and the total units after the first consultation to 715

Annex: 1

- 2 -
(356-E)

A N N E X

DELEGATION OF COLOMBIA

I.T.C.

BUENOS AIRES

29 November, 1952.

Mr. L. Mulatier,
Secretary General of the I.T.U.,
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Colombian
Administration has decided to transfer from Contributory Class 6
(5 units) to Class 7 (3 units).

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(signed)
Head of the Colombian
Delegation

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Plenipotentiary Conference (Buenos Aires)

considering:

1. the situation of accounts in arrears under the Madrid Convention,
2. the arrears relating to the supply of publications,

resolves to authorize the Secretary General:

1. to use payments by the Members of the Union, if necessary, primarily to pay off accounts in arrears under the Madrid Convention,
2. to request the Members and Associate Members of the Union and the private operating agencies to settle their accounts for the supply of publications within the customary period,
3. to suspend the despatch of documents to private operating agencies and private individuals who do not settle their accounts for the supply of publications within the customary period.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 358-E
2 December 1952

PLENARY SESSION

AGENDA

OF THE 11th PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 3 December 1952, at 9 a.m.

Plenary Hall

Election of the Members of the Administrative Council:

While the votes are being counted, the hall will be available for Committee 7, which is due to meet from 10 a.m. to 12 noon.

If Committee 7 finishes its work before 12 noon, Committee 3 will use the hall until 1 p.m.

Union internationale
des télécommunications

Document N° 359-F/E/S
2 décembre 1952

CONFERENCE DE PLENIPOTENTIAIRES

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMISSION 8

4ème SERIE

DE TEXTES TRANSMIS A LA COMMISSION DE REDACTION

(Voir Annexe au Document N° 351-F)

4th SERIES

OF TEXTS TRANSMITTED TO THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE

(See Annex to Document N° 351-E)

4a SERIE

DE TEXTOS COMUNICADOS A LA COMISION DE REDACCION

(Véase Anexo al Documento Núm. 351-S)

International
Telecommunication Union

—
PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 360-E

6 December 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

TEXTS SUBMITTED TO THE PLENARY

ASSEMBLY FOR FIRST READING AFTER REVISION

BY THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

1st SERIES

- 2 -
(360-E)

A N N E X 2

(See Article 48)

Definition of Terms used
in the International Telecommunication Convention and its Annexes

Administration: Any governmental department or service 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 sent by a recognized private operating agency to an Administrative Conference, or to a meeting of an International Consultative Committee.

Expert: A person sent by a national scientific or industrial organization authorized by the government or the administration of its country to attend meetings of study groups of an International Consultative Committee.

- 3 -
(360-E)

Observer: A person sent by:

the United Nations in accordance with Article 26 of the Convention;

the Government of a country not a party to the Convention;

one of the international organizations invited in accordance with the provisions of the General Regulations to participate in the work of a Conference.

Delegation: The totality of the delegates and, should the case arise, any representative, 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 delegates or advisers, persons belonging to private operating agencies which it recognizes or persons belonging to other private enterprises interested in the field of 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. This service may include transmissions of sounds, or transmissions by television, facsimile or other means.

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.

- 4 -
(360-E)

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

the Head of a State;

the Head of a Government and members of a Government;

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;

Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air;

diplomatic or consular agents;

the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Heads of the principal organs and the Heads of the subsidiary organs of the United Nations;

the International Court of Justice at The Hague.

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

- 5 -
(360-E)

Service Telegrams: See the Telegraph Regulations currently in force.

Private Telegrams: Telegrams other than service or Government telegrams.

Service Telephone Calls: See the Telephone Regulations currently 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.

- 6 -
(360-E)

RESOLUTION No....

on the application of a special telegraph tariff
for Prisoners of War and for Civilians interned in Wartime

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires,

considering

1. the provisions of Articles 74 and 124 of the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War, dated 12 August 1949 and of Articles 110 and 141 of the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilians in Wartime, dated 12 August 1949;
2. the provisions of Article 35 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Buenos Aires, 1952;

recommends the next International Telegraph and Telephone Conference

1. to consider sympathetically whether, and to what extent the telegraph franking privileges and the reductions in telegraph charges envisaged in the Geneva Conventions mentioned above could be accorded;
2. to make any necessary modifications to the International Telegraph Regulations.

- 7 -
(360-E)

RESOLUTION No.

on use of the United Nations Telecommunication Network
for the telegraph traffic of the Specialized Agencies

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires, 5

having examined the request of the United Nations (Document No. 228) that the International Telecommunication Union should sanction their proposal 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 Agreement between the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union;
2. that any departure from the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and the Telegraph Regulations in favour of the United Nations is undesirable;
3. that the United Nations telecommunication network should never in normal circumstances be set up in competition with existing public channels of telecommunication;
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;

- 8 -
(360-E)

declares

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. does not favour any departure from the provisions of Article XV of the Agreement between the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union;
3. that some exception may be made in cases of emergency;

instructs the Secretary-General

1. to convey to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the opinion of this Conference;
2. 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
3. to inform him that the International Telecommunication Union would have no objection if, in cases of emergency, 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.

- 9 -
(360-E)

ARTICLE 6

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 formal 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, with the consent of the majority of the Members of the Union, 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 duties.

2. (1) The International Frequency Registration Board shall be a body composed of independent members, all nationals of different countries, Members of the Union.

(2) 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.

- 16 -

(360-E)

(3) Moreover, for the more effective understanding of the problems coming before the Board under paragraph 1.b) above, each member shall be familiar with geographic, economic and demographic conditions within a particular area of the world.

3. (1) 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.

(2) The method of this election shall be established by the Conference itself, in such a way as to ensure an equitable distribution of the Members among the various parts of the world.

(3) The countries so elected are eligible for re-election.

(4) 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 date determined by the following conference for their successors to take up their duties.

(5) 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.

- 11 -
(360-E)

(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. However, 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.

- 12 -
(360-E)

RESOLUTION No.

on the Number of Members of the International
Frequency Registration Board

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International
Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires

resolves

that the International Frequency Registration Board shall
continue to have eleven members.

- 13 -
(360-E)

RESOLUTION No.

on various Contributions in abeyance as a result
of the Second World War

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International
Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires

in view of

1. The Report by the Administrative Council of the Union to the Plenipotentiary Conference, Chapter VI, section 4.3. and the documents and information submitted by the Secretary-General of the Union;
2. Administrative Council Resolutions 52/CA3 and 136/CA4, relative to the book debts shown against the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia;
3. Administrative Council Resolution 52/CA3, relative to the arrears of the former 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 those Colonies can be attributed 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 position is extremely confused;
4. that on account of 2 and 3 above it is not possible to fix definitely upon any Member of the Union the responsibility for the debts in question; and

- 14 -
(360-E)

5. that it is inadvisable to carry over debts indefinitely in the accounts 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 the German debts in their entirety on condition that, in accordance with the report of the London Conference of 8 August 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 31 December 1952, 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.

- 15 -
(360-E)

RESOLUTION No.

on Telegrams and Telephone Calls

of the Specialized Agencies

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International
Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires,

considering

1. that the Heads of the specialized agencies are not mentioned in the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls, which appears in Annex 2 to the Convention;
2. that there may be circumstances in which the urgency or importance of the telecommunications of the specialized agencies warrants special treatment for their telegrams or telephone calls,

resolves

that if specialized agencies wishing to obtain special privileges for their telecommunications inform the Administrative Council, justifying the particular cases in which special treatment is necessary, the Administrative Council

- a) shall inform Members and Associate Members of the Union of the requests which, in their opinion, should be accepted;
- b) shall take a final 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 any decisions taken by the Council.

- 16 -
(360-E)

RESOLUTION No.

on the participation of the Union in the
Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires,

in view of

the report by the Administrative Council, 1952, Chapter I paragraph 3.5 and Chapter VII paragraph 1 :

endorses

the action taken by the Administrative Council as regards participation of the International Telecommunication Union in the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance;

authorizes

the Administrative Council to continue to ensure the participation of the Union in the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, and to call on the various organs of the Union as appropriate to facilitate this participation, which, for the time being, shall continue to be in accordance with the arrangements made in 1952;

invites

the Administrative Council to coordinate in this field the activities of the permanent organs of the Union and to prepare each year a report on the participation of the Union in the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

FIFTH REPORT

BY COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SUBJECT: Proposed texts for Articles 12 and 13 of the Convention.

At its 25th and 26th meetings Committee 3 adopted the texts which it now submits to the Plenary Assembly for consideration.

The text proposed for Article 12 (Rules of Procedure of Conferences) was adopted by 30 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

The various paragraphs of the text proposed for Article 13 (Regulations) were adopted after the following votes:

- Paragraph 1 (Atlantic City text retained by 42 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions).
- Paragraph 2 (Atlantic City text retained without comment).
- Paragraph 3 (new text adopted by 35 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions).
- Paragraph 4 (Atlantic City text retained without comment).

C. Ribeiro
Chairman of Committee 3

Annex: 1

A N N E X

Article 12

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF CONFERENCES

Administrative Conferences, for the organization of their work and the conduct of their discussions, shall apply the Rules of Procedure for Conferences included in the General Regulations annexed to the Convention. However, before starting its deliberations, each conference may adopt such additional provisions as, in its view, may make for smooth and speedy work.

Article 13

REGULATIONS

1. The General Regulations contained in Annex 4 shall have the same force and duration as this Convention, subject to the provisions of Article 12 of the Convention.
2. The provisions of the Convention are completed by the following sets of Administrative Regulations:

Telegraph Regulations,
Telephone Regulations,
Radio Regulations,
Additional Radio Regulations.
3. These Regulations shall be binding on all Members and Associate Members, which shall inform the Secretary General of their approval of any revision of these Regulations by administrative conferences. The Secretary General shall inform Members and Associate Members promptly regarding receipt of such notifications of approval.
4. In case of inconsistency between a provision of the Convention and a provision of the Regulations, the Convention shall prevail.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

COMMITTEE 3

Buenos Aires, 1952

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 2 OF COMMITTEE 3

(Work:- To establish draft texts of Articles 5, 10 and 11 of
the Convention)

The Chairman, Committee 3.

Working Group 2 of Committee 3 was appointed at the nineteenth meeting, with membership Argentina, Brazil, United States, France, Italy, Mexico, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Bielorussia. Its terms of reference, to draft Articles 10 and 11 of the Convention, are contained in the Annex to the Minutes of that meeting. (Document No. 264).

At the 23rd meeting (Minutes, Document No. 326) it was instructed additionally to re-draft Article 5 of the Convention.

The Working Group held five meetings, concluding its work on 1st December, and I submit for the consideration of Committee 3 the draft texts resulting from its discussions.

In the course of the Working Group's discussions, I was requested to bring to your attention and that of Committee 3 the following points relating to the draft texts:

1. Art. 10, para. 1(e). U.S.A. may wish to return to its Proposal No. 159.
2. Art. 10, para. 1(f). The joint proposal of Argentina, U.S.A. and France in Document No. 213, incorporated in the text, is not fully acceptable to the U.S.S.R. who may wish to return in Committee to the point regarding 'draft' or 'provisional' agreements.

3. Art. 10, para. 2. U.S.A. may wish to return in Committee to the last part of their Proposal No. 164 relating to change of time and place of the Plenipotentiary Conference.
4. Art. 10, para. 3. and in parts of the text in Article 11. The expression "with the concurrence of more than 50% of the Members of the Union" will need to be compared with the text adopted by Committee 4 in Chapter 4 of the General Regulations to ensure that they are in line.
5. Art. 5, para. 3(2). The Working Group considered it desirable that the Administrative Council in establishing its own Rules of Procedure should bear in mind the Rules of Procedure incorporated in the General Regulations attached to the Convention.
6. The Working Group draws attention to the inclusion in Article 11 of reference to Special Conferences and suggests that Committee 4 may wish to consider whether the inclusion of any reference to these Conferences in the General Regulations attached to the Convention is desirable.

In conclusion, I should like to thank the Delegates participating in the work of the Group, and the interpreters, for their valuable help.

A. H. READ

Chairman

Annex: 1

A N N E X

Article 10

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

1. The Plenipotentiary Conference shall:

a) consider the report by the Administrative Council on its activities and those of the Union since the last Plenipotentiary Conference;

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;

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

c) (unaltered) finally approve the accounts of the Union;

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

e) (unaltered) revise the Convention if it considers this necessary;

f) if necessary, conclude or revise agreements between the Union and other international organizations and examine and, if appropriate, finally approve any provisional agreements with such organizations concluded, on behalf of the Union, by the Administrative Council;

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

2. (Unaltered) The Plenipotentiary Conference normally shall meet once every five years at a time and place fixed by the preceding Plenipotentiary Conference.

3. The time or place or both of the next Plenipotentiary Conference may be changed:

a) when at least twenty Members of the Union have proposed a change to the Administrative Council or to the Secretary General;

b) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

In either case a new time or new place or both shall be determined with the concurrence of more than fifty per cent of the Members of the Union.

Article 11

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCES

Zero (new) Administrative Conferences held under the auspices of the Union comprise:

- a) ordinary Administrative Conferences;
- b) extraordinary Administrative Conferences;
- c) special conferences, which include regional or service conferences.

1. 1) Ordinary Administrative Conferences shall:

- a) (unaltered) revise the Regulations provided for in Article 13 paragraph 2 of this Convention with which they are respectively concerned;
- b) (unaltered) deal with all other matters deemed necessary within the terms of the Convention and the General Regulations or in accordance with any directive given by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

2) In addition, the Administrative Radio Conference shall:

- a) (unaltered) elect the members of the International Frequency Registration Board;
- b) (unaltered) review its activities.

2. Ordinary Administrative Conferences shall normally meet every five years, preferably at the same time and place as the Plenipotentiary Conference.

2 bis. (new) The time or place or both of the next ordinary Administrative Conference may be changed:

- a) when at least twenty Members of the Union have proposed a change to the Administrative Council or to the Secretary General;

- b) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

In either case a new time or place or both shall be determined with the consent of more than fifty per cent of the Members of the Union.

- 3. 1) (Unaltered) An extraordinary administrative conference may be convened:

- a) (unaltered) by a decision of the Plenipotentiary Conference which shall determine its agenda and the time and place of its meeting; or
- b) when at least twenty Members of the Union have made known to the Administrative Council or to the Secretary General their desire that such a Conference shall be held to consider an agenda proposed by them; or
- c) (unaltered) on the proposal of the Administrative Council.

2) In the cases specified in b) and c) of sub-paragraph 1) above, the time and place of the Conference, as well as its agenda, shall be determined with the concurrence of more than fifty per cent of the Members of the Union.

- 4. (new) 1) Special conferences may be convened:

- a) by decision of the Plenipotentiary Conference or an ordinary or extraordinary Administrative Conference which shall determine its agenda and the time and place at which it shall meet;
- b) when at least twenty Members of the Union in the case of a world conference, or one quarter of the Members of the region concerned in the case of a regional conference have made known to the Administrative Council or to the Secretary General their desire that such a conference should be held to consider an agenda proposed by them;
- c) on a proposal by the Administrative Council.

(Ann. to Doc. 362-E)

2) In the cases specified in sub-paragraphs b) and c) of paragraph 1) above, the time and place of the conference as well as its agenda shall be determined with the concurrence of more than fifty per cent. of the Members of the Union for world conferences, or of more than fifty per cent of the Members in the region concerned for regional conferences.

5. 1) Extraordinary Administrative Conferences shall be convened to consider certain specific telecommunication matters of an urgent nature. Their deliberations shall be strictly confined to the items included in their agenda.

Extraordinary Administrative Conferences may revise certain provisions of any set of Regulations with which they are concerned, provided that such revision is included in the agenda approved by more than fifty per cent of the Members of the Union, in accordance with paragraph 4.2) above.

2) Special Conferences shall only be convened to consider the matters included in their agenda. Their decisions must in all circumstances be in conformity with the terms of the Convention and Administrative Regulations.

6. (now) Proposals for changing the time or place or both of extraordinary administrative conferences and of special conferences must, to be adopted, have the approval of more than fifty per cent of the Members of the Union (or of more than fifty per cent of the Members in the region concerned in the case of regional conferences). Detailed provisions governing such changes are contained in Chapter 4 of the General Regulations.

Article 5

ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

A. Organization and working arrangements

1. (1) The Administrative Council shall be composed of eighteen 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 Members of the Union elected to the Council shall hold office until the time when a new Council is elected by the Plenipotentiary Conference. They are eligible for re-election.

(2) (Unaltered) If between two Plenipotentiary Conferences a seat becomes vacant on the Administrative Council, it shall pass by right to the Member of the Union, from the same region as the Member whose seat is vacated, who had obtained at the previous election the largest number of votes among those not elected.

2. Each of the Members of the Administrative Council shall appoint, to serve on the Council in the exclusive interests of the Union, a person qualified in the field of telecommunication services.

3. (1) (Unaltered) Each Member of the Council shall have one vote.

(2) The Administrative Council shall establish its own Rules of Procedure.

4. The Administrative Council shall elect its own Chairman and Vice-Chairman at the beginning of each annual session. They shall serve until the opening of the next annual session and shall be eligible for re-election. The Vice-Chairman shall serve as Chairman in the latter's absence.

5. (1) The Council shall hold an annual session at the seat of the Union.

(2) During this session it may decide to hold, exceptionally, an additional session.

(3) Between ordinary sessions, it may be convened (as a general rule at the seat of the Union) by its Chairman at the request of the majority of its Members.

6. The Secretary General and the two Assistant Secretaries General, the Chairman of the International Frequency Registration Board, the Directors of the International Consultative Committees and the Vice-Director of the C.C.I.R. shall participate as of right in the deliberations of the Administrative Council, but without taking part in the voting. Nevertheless, the Council may exceptionally hold meetings confined to its own Members.

7. (Unaltered) The Secretary General of the Union shall act as Secretary of the Administrative Council.

8. (1) (Text of present paragraph 8 unaltered) In the intervals between Plenipotentiary Conferences, the Administrative Council shall act on behalf of the Plenipotentiary Conference within the limits of the powers delegated to it by the latter.

(2) The Council shall act only in formal session.

9. Only the travelling and subsistence expenses incurred by the representative of each Member of the Council in this capacity shall be borne by the Union.

B Duties

10. (1) The Administrative Council shall be responsible for taking all steps to facilitate the implementation by the Members and Associate Members of the provisions of the Convention, of the Regulations, of the decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference, and, where appropriate, of the decisions of other conferences and meetings of the Union.

(2) (Unaltered) It shall ensure the efficient co-ordination of the work of the Union.

11. In particular the Administrative Council shall:

a) (unaltered) perform any duties assigned to it by the Plenipotentiary Conferences;

(Ann. to Doc. 362-E)

- b) in the interval between Plenipotentiary Conferences, be responsible for effecting the co-ordination with all international organizations contemplated in Articles 26 and 27 of this Convention; and, to this end,
 - (i) conclude, on behalf of the Union, provisional agreements with the international organizations contemplated in Article 27 of the Convention, and with the United Nations in application of the Agreement contained in Annex 5 to the Convention (these provisional Agreements shall be submitted to the next Plenipotentiary Conference for examination and, if it is so decided, final approval);
 - (ii) appoint, on behalf of the Union, one or more representatives to participate in the conferences of such organizations, and, when necessary, of co-ordinating committees established in conjunction with those organizations;
- c) (unaltered) appoint the Secretary General and the two Assistant Secretaries General of the Union;
- c bis) (new) decide on the numbers and grading of the staff of the General Secretariat and of the Specialized Secretariats of the permanent organs of the Union, taking into account the general directives given by the Plenipotentiary Conference.
- c ter) (new) draw up such regulations for the administration of the secretariats of the Union as it may consider necessary;
- d) (unaltered) supervise the administrative functions of the Union;
- e) (unaltered) review and approve the annual budget of the Union;
- f) (unaltered) 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;

- f bis) text in preparation by Committee 5;
- g) arrange for the convening of Plenipotentiary and Administrative Conferences of the Union in accordance with Articles 10 and 11 of this Convention;
- g bis) (new) present to the Plenipotentiary Conferences of the Union any opinions deemed useful;
- h) co-ordinate the activities of the permanent organs of the Union, take such action as it deems appropriate on requests or recommendations made to it by such organs, and fill ad interim vacancies for C.C.I. Directorships or Vice-Directorships;
- i) (unaltered) perform the other functions prescribed for it in this Convention and, within the framework of the Convention and the Regulations, the functions deemed necessary for the proper administration of the Union;
- j) (new) submit a report on its activities and those of the Union for consideration by the Plenipotentiary Conference

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 363-E
2 December 1952

COMMITTEE 3

DRAFT OF ARTICLE 8 OF THE CONVENTION

DRAWN UP BY WORKING GROUP 3/1

Article 8

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

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

(2) The duties of the International Telephone Consultative Committee (C.C.I.F.) shall be to study technical, operating and tariff questions relating to telephony and to issue recommendations on them. (unchanged)

(3) The duties of the International Radio Consultative Committee (C.C.I.R.) shall be to study technical radio questions and operating questions the solution of which depends principally on considerations of a technical radio character and to issue recommendations on them. (unchanged)

2. The last phrase of the text being amended as follows: "... decided upon by its Plenary Assembly or requested by at least twelve Members or Associate Members in the interval between two meetings of the Plenary Assembly concerned."

3. The International Consultative Committees shall have as Members (existing text):

- a) of right, the administrations of all Members and Associate Members of the Union;
- b) all recognized private operating agencies which, with the approval of the Member which has recognized them, express a desire to have one or more of their representatives participate in the work of these Committees.

4. Each Consultative Committee shall work through the medium of:

a) the Plenary Assembly, meeting normally every three years; each meeting of the Plenary Assembly shall normally be held at the place fixed by the preceding meeting;

b) Study Groups, which shall be set up by the Plenary Assembly to deal with questions to be studied; (unchanged)

c) a Director, who shall be appointed by the Plenary Assembly for an indefinite period, but with the reciprocal right of terminating the appointment; the Director of the Radio Consultative Committee shall be assisted by a Vice-Director specializing in Broadcasting, appointed under the same conditions; (unchanged)

d) a specialized Secretariat, which assists the Director; (unchanged)

e) laboratories or technical installations set up by the Union. (unchanged).

5.(1) Consultative Committees shall observe the rules of procedure in the General Regulations annexed to this Convention. (unchanged).

(2) The Plenary Assembly of a Consultative Committee may adopt such additional rules of procedure as may facilitate the work of the Committee if they do not conflict with the General Regulations. (unchanged).

6. The working arrangements of the Consultative Committees are defined in Part II of the General Regulations annexed to this Convention. (unchanged).

PROPOSAL No. 735

ARGENTINE, FRANCE, PORTUGAL, UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND NORTHERN IRELAND, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Delegations of Argentina, France, Portugal, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, with a view to expediting the work of Committee 3 in the discussion of the revision of Article 1, jointly submit the following proposal for the modification of this Article in lieu of their respective proposals on this subject which were all designed to provide for the maintenance of the existing Membership of the Union. (Proposal No. 23 of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, relating to Paragraph 4 of Article 1, is not withdrawn).

Substitute the following text for Paragraph 2 of Article 1 :

2. The members of the Union are :
- a) Any country or group of territories listed in Annex 1, Section A of this Convention or which becomes a Party to the International Telecommunication Convention of Atlantic City prior to the entry into force of this Convention;
 - b) Any country listed in Annex 1, Section B of this Convention, upon signature and ratification of, or accession to this Convention;
 - c) Any country which becomes a Member of the United Nations and which accedes to this Convention in accordance with Article 17;
 - d) Any sovereign country, not a Member of the United Nations which applies for Membership in the Union, and which, after having secured approval of such application by two-thirds of the Members of the Union, accedes to this Convention in accordance with Article 17.

Substitute the following text for Paragraph 4 of Article 1 :

4. Associate Members of the Union are :
- a) Any territory or group of territories listed in Annex 1, Section C.
 - b) Same as present a).
 - c) Same as present b).
 - d) Same as present c).

Annex 1.

Section A

(List here all parties to the Atlantic City Convention)

Section B

(List here those countries included in Annex 1 of the Atlantic City Convention which have signed, but not ratified, or which have not acceded to that Convention up to the date of signature of the Buenos Aires Convention)

Section C

(List here the two Associate Members admitted under the provisions of the Atlantic City Convention)

SIXTH REPORT

BY THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE 4

Committee 4 considered the draft Part II of the General Regulations, as submitted by Sub-Committee 4A, and approved the text attached.

It was decided to refer the question of paragraph 2 of Chapter 11 to the Plenary Assembly for consideration (see Document No. 402).

When the draft text for Part II of the General Regulations was being considered, some delegations declared that they found Chapter 17 unacceptable, and reserved the right to submit their remarks in Plenary Assembly.

The statements they made appear in the summary records of the Committee's meetings.

The attached text for Part II of the General Regulations is intended for the Editorial Committee, for subsequent transmission to the Plenary Assembly.

Annex: Draft text for Part II of the General Regulations.

I.A. Tsingovarov

Chairman, Committee 4

PART II

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

CHAPTER 7

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The provisions of Part II of the General Regulations supplement Article 8 of the Convention defining the scope and structure of the International Consultative Committees.
2. Consultative Committees shall also observe the applicable Rules of Procedure of Conferences contained in Part I of the General Regulations.

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) The first request from a recognized private operating agency to take part in the work of a Consultative Committee shall be addressed to the Secretary General who shall inform all the Members and Associate Members and the Director of the Consultative Committee concerned. A request from a recognized private operating agency must be approved by the Administration of the Government recognizing it.
- (3) Deleted.

2. (1) International organizations, which are coordinating their work with the International Telecommunication Union and which have related activities, may be admitted to participate in the work of the Consultative Committees in an advisory capacity.

(2) The first request from an international organization to take part in the work of a Consultative Committee shall be addressed to the Secretary General who shall invite by telegram all the Members and Associate Members to say whether the request should be granted; the request shall be granted if the majority of the replies of the members received within a period of one month are favourable. The Secretary General shall inform all the Members and Associate Members and the Director of the Consultative Committee concerned of the result of the consultation.

(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) Scientific or industrial organizations, which are engaged in the study of telecommunication problems or in the design or manufacture of equipment intended for telecommunication services, may be admitted to participate in an advisory capacity in meetings of the Study Groups of the Consultative Committees, provided that their participation has received the approval of the administrations of the countries concerned.

(2) The first request from a scientific or industrial organization for admission to meetings of Study Groups of a Consultative Committee shall be addressed to the Director of the Consultative Committee; such a request must be approved by the administration of the country concerned.

CHAPTER 9

DUTIES OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

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 in conformity with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Convention; and if need be, establish a study programme;
- c) so far as necessary, maintain existing Study Groups and 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) approve a report on the financial needs of the Committee until the next Plenary Assembly for submission by the Director to the Administrative Council;
- 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 Plenary Assembly normally meets every three years.
2. The date of the meeting of the Plenary Assembly may be changed with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Consultative Committee concerned.
3. 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 but, as far as possible, the meeting shall be held at the seat of the Union.
4. At each of these meetings, the Plenary Assembly shall be presided over by the Head of the Delegation of the country in which the meeting is held; the Chairman shall be assisted by Vice-Chairmen elected by the Plenary Assembly.
5. The Secretariat of the Plenary Assembly of a Consultative Committee shall be composed of the specialized Secretariat of that Committee, with the help, if necessary, of the personnel of the administration of the inviting Government and of the General Secretariat.

CHAPTER 11

LANGUAGES AND METHOD OF VOTING IN SESSIONS OF THE PLENARY ASSEMBLIES

1. The languages used in the Plenary Meetings and in the official documents of the Consultative Committees. shall be as provided in Article 15 of the Convention.
2. (See Document No.402).

CHAPTER 12

COMPOSITION OF STUDY GROUPS

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 (admitted in accordance with paragraph 2 of Chapter 8) 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. 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 Director concerned and the members of his Study Group, suggest a meeting at a convenient place bearing in mind the need to keep expenses to a minimum.

2. However, in order to avoid unnecessary journeys and prolonged absences, the Director of a Consultative Committee, in agreement with the Group Chairmen of the various Study Groups concerned, shall draw up the general plan of meetings of groups of Study Groups which are to meet in the same place during the same period.

3. 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) The Director of a Consultative Committee shall coordinate the work of the Consultative Committee, including its Plenary Assembly and Study Groups, and shall be responsible for the organization of the work of the Consultative Committee.

(2) He shall be responsible for the documents of the Committee.

(3) The Director shall be assisted by a secretariat composed of a specialized staff to work under his direction and to aid him in the organization of the work of the Committee.

(4) The Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee shall also be assisted by a Vice-Director in accordance with Article 8 of the Convention.

2. The Director shall choose the technical and administrative members of the secretariat within the framework of the budget as approved by the Plenipotentiary Conference or the Administrative Council. The appointment of the technical and administrative personnel is made by the Secretary General in agreement with the Director.

3. The Director shall participate as of right, but in an advisory capacity, in meetings of the Plenary Assembly and of the Study Groups. He shall make all necessary preparations for meetings of the Plenary Assembly and of the Study Groups.

4. The Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee shall participate as of right in an advisory capacity in meetings of the Plenary Assembly and of the Study Groups when questions in which he is concerned are on the Agenda.

5. 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 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

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.

CHAPTER 16

RELATIONS OF CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES BETWEEN THEMSELVES AND WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

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 Plenary Assembly or the Director of a Consultative Committee 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. The Secretary General of the Union, or one of the two Assistant Secretaries General, the representatives of the International Frequency Registration Board, and the Directors of the other Consultative Committees of the Union or their representatives may attend meetings of the Consultative Committees in an advisory capacity.

CHAPTER 17

FINANCES OF INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

1. The salaries of the Directors of the International Consultative Committees, including the salary of the Vice-Director of the International Radio Consultative Committee, and the ordinary expenses of the specialized secretariats shall be included in the ordinary expenses of the Union in accordance with the provisions of Article 14 of the Convention.

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 even if they have not attended the meeting of the Plenary Assembly;
- 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.
- e) the scientific and industrial organizations which have, in accordance with Chapter 8 paragraph 3, attended meetings of Study Groups of the Consultative Committee.

. 2. bis. The recognized private operating agencies, international organizations and scientific or industrial organizations, referred to in sub-paragraphs c), d) and e) of paragraph 2 shall declare the class, from among those mentioned in paragraph 4 of Article 14 of the Convention, according to which they will contribute to the extraordinary expenses of the Consultative Committee.

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, international organizations and scientific or industrial organizations referred to in sub-paragraphs a), b), c), d) and e) 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, international organization or scientific or industrial 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, international organization or scientific or industrial 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. Each administration, recognized private operating agency, international organization and scientific or industrial organization shall defray the personal expenses of its own participants.

6. However, the personal 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.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 366-E
2 December 1952

CORRIGENDUM No. 1
TO DOCUMENT No. 313

Replace paragraph 7 on page 5 by the following text:

"The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. commented on Document No. 278 generally. He said that the Secretary General, quite rightly, yesterday recalled that at Atlantic City the fiscal limit was originally fixed at 4,800,000 Swiss francs; but was later reduced to 4,000,000 Swiss francs. This reduction made it difficult to balance the budgets, and only thanks to the skill of the Administrative Council could this be done. He pointed out that if the I.F.R.B. had started its work in 1949 - as was envisaged at Atlantic City - it would have referred to Administrations to raise the fiscal limit. He also pointed out that of the total increase of 1,500,000 Swiss francs in the draft budget for 1953, only 800,000 corresponded to the I.F.R.B. and to the special tasks entrusted to it by the E.A.R.C. The remainder corresponded to other organs. As the Secretary General had said, the I.F.R.B. had made an estimate of expenditure which was revised by the Administrative Council and approved by Resolution No. 258 after the estimates had been investigated and found to be correct. If it were desired to make any reduction, this could only be done by limiting the tasks to be performed; but the Conference had already approved the decisions of the E.A.R.C. He added, that criticism had been levelled at the progressive increase in I.F.R.B. expenditure, and in this respect he stressed that the estimates for 1953 did not take into account future needs, as had been done in the case of other organs of the I.T.U. The healthy policy of graduating expenditure had been followed in previous years, bearing in mind that in two or three years' time a "climax" would be reached. The new frequency bands would progressively come into force, thus entailing an increase of work. If these future expenses had been envisaged for 1953, budget estimates would have reached a total of more than 6,000,000. The scale planned, although it may appear so, is not excessive. Finally, he pointed out that item 4 of Document No. 278 included the normal salary increases for the I.F.R.B. and therefore, if these increases had also been included in item 2 by the Secretary General, they had been duplicated."



Union internationale
des télécommunications

Document N° 367-FES
2 décembre 1952

CONFERENCE DE PLENIPOTENTIAIRES

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMISSION 5

CORRIGENDUM N° 1 AU DOCUMENT N° 352-F

Ne concerne que le texte espagnol.

CORRIGENDUM N° 1 TO DOCUMENT N° 352-E

Concerns only the Spanish text.

CORRIGENDUM N° 1 AL DOCUMENTO N° 352-S

En la segunda página de este documento, en las observaciones referentes al Sr. Lewis, en lugar de "una cotización complementaria", léase: "una cotización complementaria mensual."

-----oOo-----

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

THIRD AND FINAL REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 3

TO COMMITTEE 5

(Finance)

1. Subject: Contributions in arrears - Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, paragraph 4.2. Outstanding Contributions which are queried.
 - 1.1. During its sixth to tenth meetings, Working Group 3 examined the question of outstanding contributions which are queried (paragraph 4.2. of Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference) and decided to submit to Committee 5 (Finance) draft resolutions 1 - 5 which are attached hereto.
 - 1.2. The Working Group took as a basis for its work a working document prepared by the Secretariat. This working document is attached hereto as Annex O. The first eleven pages of this document contain detailed information about the different cases of queried debts given on the subsequent pages 15 - 20 of the document.
 - 1.3. The Working Group has considered each of the five groups of queried debts separately and very carefully examined each column of the tables on pages 15 - 20 of Annex O. In this connection it has taken note of the resolutions adopted by the Administrative Council on the items in question, as well as of every relevant decision and recommendation of the conferences and meetings for which the amounts have been billed and contested. As the standpoints of the various organs of the Union in some cases are not consistent, the Working Group has been faced with the delicate task of judging whether or not the contestations are justified. In its decisions the Working Group has also taken into account the repercussions on the finances of the Union and the consequences of creating precedents by approving certain contestations.
 - 1.4. The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was not in agreement with the decisions taken by the Working Group, as set forth in Resolutions Nos. 2, 3, 5, and 6 (annexed to this Document), and made the following statement:



"Administrative Council Resolutions Nos. 188, 203, 204, and 215, and E.A.R.C. Resolutions Nos. 10 and 13, which had been used as a basis for the decisions of the Working Group, contradicted, he considered, and constituted a breach of the Convention and Radio Regulations provisions dealing with those matters. Hence he considered that the Working Group's resolutions ran counter to the Atlantic City Convention and Radio Regulations."

The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic supported this statement.

1.5. The result of the considerations of the Working Group is to be found in the annexed resolutions, which are hereby submitted to Committee 5 (Finance) for action. The resolutions are the following:

Resolution No. 1: Cases in which there have been discrepancies in the interpretation given to Article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention, on the use of additional working languages in the conferences or meetings held since 1947 (Annex 1)

Resolution No. 2: Cases in which the Atlantic City Resolution relative to the preparation of the new International Frequency List, and subsequent Council decision (P.F.B. activities) have been differently interpreted. (Annex 2)

Resolution No. 3: Cases in which Article 14, paragraph 3 (1) of the Convention, relative to the share to be borne by Members and Associate Members in defraying the expenses of conferences and meetings have been differently interpreted (Annex 3)

Resolution No. 4: Cases in which Article 14, paragraph 3 (2) of the Convention, relative to the share to be borne by recognized private operating agencies in defraying the expenses of conferences and meetings have been differently interpreted (Annex 4)

Resolution No. 5: Cases in which Article 15, paragraph 5, of the Convention, relative to the apportionment of expenses incurred by the use of languages in conferences and meetings have been differently interpreted. (Annex 5)

2. Subject: Contributions in arrears - Chapter VI of the Report by the Administrative Council to the Plenipotentiary Conference, page 86. Contributions to the Netherlands Administration for the postponed Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference 1950

2.1. The Working Group has during its ninth meeting taken note of the fact that the Netherlands Administration had at 1 December 1952 recovered no more than 214.708,04 florins out of the 323.000 florins which I.T.U. Members according to a decision of the Administrative Council had been asked to pay to it to cover the financial consequences of postponing the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference, which was to have taken place in The Hague in 1950.

2.2. In order to draw the attention of the Members of the Union to the necessity for the amounts due to be paid without undue delay and not later than the 1 July 1953 (Annex 6), the Working Group decided to submit to Committee 5:

Resolution No.6: Contributions to the Netherlands Administration for the postponed Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference 1950.

3. Subject: Measures to be taken in the budgets in order to finance the amounts to be written off on outstanding debts.

3.1. To sum up, the following credits in round figures should be granted to the Secretary General of the Union in order that the Profit and Loss Account may be balanced:

According to Resolution Annex 1 to Document No.268
of Committee 5 approved by the Plenary Assembly
on 27 November 1952 (Document No. 345) 366,210 Sw.frs.

According to Resolution 4 to this report
(Annex 4) 5,840 Sw.frs.

total sum 372,050 Sw.frs.

3.2. The Working Group proposes to Committee 5 that this amount shall be repaid by all Members of the Union during a period of 10 years and that for this purpose a sum of approximately 37,205 Sw.frs. shall be entered in the budget of the Union for each of the next 10 years.

4. In submitting this third and final Report and referring to its previous two Reports (Documents Nos. 138 and 229) the Working Group considers that it has terminated its work according to the terms of reference given to it by Committee 5. Finally the Working Group wishes to express its gratitude to the staff of the Secretariat for the assistance they have rendered.

Håkan Sterky

Chairman

Working Group 3 of Committee 5

A N N E X O

NOTES BY THE SECRETARY GENERAL, DATED 10 NOVEMBER 1952, RELATING
TO OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS WHICH ARE QUERIED (CHAPTER VI PARA-
GRAPH 4.2 OF THE REPORT BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL TO THE BUENOS

AIRES PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE)

(Document submitted to Working Group 5/3)

- 1° - Differences of interpretation of the provisions of para. 4 of Art. 15 of the Convention, relating to the use of supplementary working languages at conferences or meetings held since 1947.
(Use of the Russian language)

A. Atlantic City Conference, 1947.

The expenses resulting from the use of the Russian language at the Atlantic City Conferences were shared, in 1948, between the Administrations which contributed to the other expenses of these conferences, following a query from the Administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and taking into consideration Resolution No. 16 of the Council.

B. Mexico Conference (H.F.B.) - 1948/1949.

1. The budgetary expenses submitted to the Administrative Council (Document No. 166/CA3), envisaged "the possibility of the supplementary use of the Russian language". In this connection, the Finance Committee of the Council proposed the following (extract from Document No. 248/CA3, page 3):

"With regard to the use of the Russian language, the expenses have been calculated with a view to the following three hypotheses:

- a) That the Russian language be treated on an absolutely equal footing with the three languages at present translated simultaneously, and also for the translation of documents;

- b) that the Russian language be translated into the other languages used in debates, without reciprocity and without translation of documents;
- c) that the Russian language shall not be used in debates.

The Budget Committee proposed to the Council, until a decision on this point was adopted, and without purporting to influence this decision, to sanction the expense envisaged in the first hypothesis mentioned above. It should be pointed out that the Preparatory Committee for the Mexico Conference had already accepted the Russian language as a working language during the course of its first meeting held at Geneva."

2. Decision of the Council (Extract from Document No. 265/CA3, page 8)

"The Council approves the extraordinary budget for 1948, with the reserve that it can eventually be modified in accordance with the decisions which are taken on the question of languages."

3. Decisions of the Mexico Conference (H.F.B.)

The question of the use of the Russian language at the Mexico Conference (H.F.B) was the subject of Documents Nos. 2, 80, 229, 361, 420, 911 and 956.

At the second meeting of the Plenary Assembly, the Conference approved by 36 to 0 with 6 abstentions the proposals of the Chairman which were expressed in the following terms:

"The Chairman, referring to practical and utilitarian reasons which had inspired the decision of the Administrative Council, proposed to accept the use of the Russian language as foreseen in Document No. 2F (Resolution No. 85) without special obligation for administrations except for those prepared to contribute to the financing of this use."

.....

"The Chairman confirmed that the payment of supplementary expenses, resulting from financing the use of the Russian language, was absolutely voluntary and that during the Copenhagen Conference several days had been spent discussing this question. The expenses represented by these days of discussion were certainly in excess of the cost of financing the Russian language." (Extract from Document No. 80(H.F.B.), page 6).

However, of the 36 countries that accepted the proposition, six did so with reserves relating to finance, namely:

Colombia, Chile, Guatemala, Salvador, Brazil and India.

Subsequently, and before the accounts for the Conference were despatched, the following participants stated that they did not wish to share in the expenses and on this account they did not share in the cost of using the Russian language:

Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Portugal, Sweden, South Africa, and Territories of South-West Africa.
(Document No. 622/CA5)⁺

Reports by the Budget Committee of the H.F.B. concerning the expenses resulting from the use of the Russian language:

Doc. No. 361 H.F.B. - approved unanimously (Doc. No. 420 H.F.B.)

Doc. No. 911 H.F.B. - approval of budget and accounts
(Doc. No. 956 H.F.B.)

C. Technical Committee for H.F.B. Plan (T.P.C.) Paris, 1949.

The budget of this meeting was drawn up by the H.F.B. Conference at Mexico City (Doc. No. 871 H.F.B.) and it envisaged the use of the Russian language in the same conditions as those accepted by the H.F.B. at Mexico City.

The Russian language was used until the 15th of October 1949, namely, until the departure of the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the 15th of October (Doc. No. 581/CA5). The sharing of the expenses of the T.P.C. was, furthermore, the subject of Resolution No. 204 by the Council.

D. Provisional Frequency Board (P.F.B.) Geneva 1949

During its 21st Plenary Assembly, the P.F.B. adopted a resolution - which was confirmed at the 24th Plenary Assembly of 25 January 1949, on the subject of the use of the Russian language by the P.F.B. The resolution read as follows: - (Extract from Document No. 300/CA4)

"The P.F.B. considers that the text of Resolutions Nos. 84 and 85, adopted by the Administrative Council, is not clear, since one of the resolutions envisages that the payment of expenses arising from the

⁺ See note on page 6-bis.

NOTE:⁺ The representative of China desires it to be recorded in this Document that on 27 April 1950, after previous correspondence, the Chinese Administration sent a telegram to the Secretary General as follows : "Please note that respecting additional working language China abides by provisions Article 15 Convention and according to Resolution 84 Administrative Council we cannot undertake to be responsible for the four entries of additional contribution for the use of Russian language contained therein. This notification applies also to the case for the Conference now being held in Florence".

Use of a supplementary language will be incumbent upon Members who were in favour of using this language, while the other envisages a refusal to make such a payment. It is partly as a result of this imprecise decision adopted by the Council, and partly because of the limited time that the P.F.B. has at its disposal, that the latter has decided to continue the present practice; in doing this, it has taken into consideration that no delegation present at the P.F.B. was authorized to commit its Administration financially one way or the other, above all when the amount of the expenses was unknown. The P.F.B. invites the Administrative Council again to examine the point at issue and to clarify its decision."

After having considered this question during its 4th Session (1949) - 31st and 32nd meetings - the Administrative Council took the following resolution:

Resolution No. 139 - LANGUAGES OF THE P.F.B.
(cf. PV CA4/31 and PV CA4/32)

The Administrative Council,

in view of the report of the Secretary General
No. 300/CA4;

resolves

to maintain the present language arrangements of the P.F.B. until the end of its work, at the expense of all Members of the Union, with the exception of those which have made reservations in virtue of Article 15 of the Convention with respect to payment for the use of additional working languages.

E. Telegraph and Telephone Conference, Paris, 1949.

The Conference decided that the Russian language would be used only in oral discussions, that interpretation would be carried out in both directions by the countries which asked for the use of Russian. It was however agreed that, for the sharing of expenses, the Secretary General would submit a draft to all the Members of the I.T.U. that took part in the Conference, in accordance with the provisions of Resolution No. 85 of the Administrative Council. It is to be noted that these expenses did not exceed the sum of 37,500 Swiss francs. (Extract from Document No. 407/CA4).

Furthermore, 66% of the participants in the Conference accepted to pay their share of the expenses.

The Members of the Union which queried their share in these expenses invoked, in particular, the provisions of Article 15 of the Convention, paragraph 4, as well as Resolutions Nos. 84 and 85 of the Council. It should be noted that Resolution No. 85 was cancelled by the Council during its 4th Meeting (Document No. 549/CA4).

In addition, three Members of the Council, on paying their contributions, made formal reservations concerning a supplementary share resulting from certain Members refusing to pay their share of the expenses.

These queries raised questions of interpretation of the Convention that are difficult to resolve in a practical manner. Furthermore, at its 5th session the Council decided as follows:

"That it would be unjust - and also impossible - continuously to revise the accounts of Administrations following a refusal by certain of them to participate in the expenses occasioned by the use of the Russian language. There is therefore no other solution but to bring this question before the next Plenipotentiary Conference." (Documents Nos. 754 and 773/CA 5).

- 2° Differences of interpretation of the Atlantic City Resolution relating to drawing up a new International Frequency List and the subsequent decisions of the Council (Part of the P.F.B.)

Queries relating to the expenses of the P.F.B. for the years 1949 and 1950, from the dates shown in the document being examined by WG 5/3.

- a) Members of the Union which have ceased to take part in the work of the P.F.B. (Extract from Document No. 606/CA 5 -- Report on the Provisional Frequency Board for the period from 25 August 1949 to 30 June 1950 - Supplemented by Documents Nos. 634, 662, 663, 680/CA5).

"1) The Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics published on 26 October 1949, in the form of a P.F.B. document, a statement according to which, in conformity with the instructions of the Administrations they represent, it considered that it could not continue to take part in the work of the P.F.B. This document also mentioned that the Delegation of the U.S.S.R. was authorized to state that the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., and the Bielorussian S.S.R. would not participate in the expenses incurred by the Board after the 17 May 1949. Similar declarations were published in the form of P.F.B. documents by:

- the Delegation of Czechoslovakia, 27 October 1949
- the Delegation of the People's Republic of Poland, 27 October 1949
- the Delegation of the P.R. of Bulgaria, 27 October 1949
- the Delegation of the P.R. of Albania, 28 October 1949
- the Delegation of the Roumanian P.R., 27 October 1949
- the Delegation of the Hungarian P.R., 28 October 1949.

2) These statements were received by the Board in view of their publication in the form of P.F.B. documents, but, since they dealt with questions not within the competence of the Board, the Chairman of the P.F.B. invited the attention of the Secretary General to them by a letter P.F.B. 3/213 of 3 November 1949, and which is reproduced in Annex 4. This letter stressed that these Delegations had, in fact, taken part in the work of the P.F.B. after 17 May 1949, and that the Board, as far as it was concerned, had understood that the statements signified that their participation in the work of the P.F.B. had officially ceased at the date of these statements.

3) At its 36th Meeting, the Plenary Assembly, while taking note of these statements and of the letter addressed to the Secretary General, considered that no other action need be taken except concerning the use of the Russian language. Because of the departure of the Delegates using this language, and since no other Delegation had asked for its use to continue, the Secretary General was informed that the P.F.B. had no more need for the arrangements which had until then been made for the use of the Russian language.

4) The provisions of paragraph 8 of the Atlantic City Resolution relating to the establishment of the new International Frequency List rendering it necessary to distribute the expenses of the P.F.B. between all the Members of the Union, the Secretary General was not able to accede to the wishes of those countries that had declared that they would not participate in the expenses incurred by the Board after 17 May 1949, and that the account he sent them to cover their contribution to the expenses of the P.F.B. represented, as for all other countries, a quota of the expenses incurred during 1949.

But the Administrations of the U.S.S.R., Bialorussia and the Ukraine made it known that they could not accept the account which had been presented to them since, in conformity with the statement made by their Delegations to the P.F.B., they could not participate in the expenses of the Board after 17 May 1949."

b) Guatemala. The request for frequencies by the Administration of Guatemala gave rise to an exchange of numerous communications between this Administration and the P.F.B. (Documents Nos. 662 and 680/CA5).

From the letter of 21 August 1950 from Guatemala, the following extract is taken:

"1° My Administration states, regretfully, that it should not be called upon to pay its share of the expenses occasioned by the Meeting of the P.F.B., observing that this body has not assigned to Guatemala the frequencies she demanded, and not only has the Board withdrawn from Guatemala the use of frequencies to which she had a right as a Member of the I.T.U., and which she had been using for many years, but the Board has not taken into account Guatemala's other requests which are, nevertheless, perfectly justified; thus favouring other countries to the detriment of Guatemala.

2° By signing the Atlantic City Convention in 1947, Guatemala certainly undertook to meet the same obligations as the other signatory countries, but she is equally assured of the same rights as other countries, being a sovereign nation and a Member of the Union. It would be well to think also of our rights and not only of our duties in financial matters, as has been done in calling upon us to contribute to expenses that were not made in the interest of our Administration.

3° We do not deny that as Members of the Union we have to share the expenses and extraordinary expenses of the Union if they are fair and equitable, but we do not consider that we should make payments WHICH WE CANNOT JUSTIFY in our accounting transactions, as would be the case of expenses occasioned by the P.F.B., which has not only not taken our request into consideration, to the detriment of our rights, but which, in addition, wishes to allocate us channels which we cannot use either technically or practically without causing harmful interference to nearby countries and which would give rise to the most serious difficulties."

These queries were the subject of Resolution No. 203 by the Council.

+
+ +

3° Differences of Interpretation of paragraph 3 (1) of Article 14
of the Convention relating to the participation of
Members and Associate Members in the expenses of Conferences
and Meetings

- a) T.P.C. Paris and Florence 1949 and 1950
H.F.B. Conference Florence/Rapallo 1950

The H.F.B. Conference at Florence/Rapallo, 1950, expressed the following opinion:

"1° That there is no need, with regard to the sharing of expenses occasioned by the present Conference, to envisage any other procedure than that allowed for by the provisions of Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention.

2° that the Secretary General of the Union should apply Article 14 par. 2, sub-paragraph 1 of the Atlantic City Convention and consequently share the expenses of the Conference between all the Members and Associate Members of the Union who agreed to participate in the Conference, even if they are not effectively present, and even if they withdraw at any time during the Conference." (Extract from Document No. 723/CA5).

Consequent upon this opinion, the Council adopted Resolution No. 188, confirming the view of the aforementioned Conference.

The validity of this Resolution was contested by the Members mentioned in the list under examination.

b) E.A.R.C. Geneva 1951

In the budget for the year 1952 (Resolution No. 218 of the Council) a sum of 200,000 Swiss francs was included for the aftermath of the Extraordinary Radio Conference held in Geneva in 1951 - "work to be carried out between 1 January and 30 June 1952."

Resolution No. 10 of the E.A.R.C. also mentioned this sum which was provided to permit the I.F.R.B. to carry out the duties with which it had been entrusted by the Agreement.

The query was related to contributions and associated matters.

o

-

4° Differences of Interpretation of the Provisions of paragraph 3 (2) of Article 14 relating to the participation of private operating agencies to the expenses of Conferences or Meetings.

The participation of private operating agencies in the expenses of Conferences and Meetings of C.C.I.'s has given rise to differing interpretations. (Definition of the terms: "Delegation", "Representative", "Expert"). However, the Administrative Council adopted, on this subject, Resolutions Nos. 131 and 171 (Amended) and took Decisions Nos. 5 and 10, reproduced in the Resolutions of the Administrative Council, 7th Session (Bound Volume).

Several private operating agencies made a legal study of the question, as did the State Department at Washington; the latter's study forming the subject of Document No. 612/CA5 distributed to Delegates of WG 5/3. The representative of France on the Administrative Council also presented a study to the representatives on the Council.

5° Differences of Interpretation of the Provisions of paragraph 5 of Article 15 of the Convention relating to the sharing of expenses occasioned by the use of languages at Conferences or Meetings. . .

The point at issue was the expenditure resulting from the linguistic service of the E.A.R.C., which amounted to 629.041,30 Swiss francs.

The Delegations of the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R., and the Bielorussian S.S.R. wished their contributions to these expenses (English, French and Spanish interpretation) to be deducted from their accounts, since these Delegations used the Russian language, which was admitted as a working language. They met the associated expenses which amounted to 61,625 Swiss francs.

However, the Chairman of WG 5/3 has already informed the Delegates taking part in the work of the group that the above mentioned Delegations are querying only the expenses relating to English and Spanish at the E.A.R.C. They wished to pay their part of the contribution relating to the French language.

Consequently, the amount queried is no more than 26,710 Swiss francs, made up as follows:

Belorussian S.S.R.	2,671	Swiss francs
Ukrainian S.S.R.	8,513	" "
U.S.S.R.	16,526	" "

The Secretary General has all the files relating to the queries mentioned in paragraphs 1 to 5 above; they are at the disposal of WG 5/3.

State of accounts of debtors (Notification No. 658 of 16.10.1952)

Some outstanding accounts which have been queried, or are in abeyance on account of the war, are no longer shown under the heading of "debtors" in the statement published quarterly in the Notifications of the Union, since they have been included in the balance sheet as "contested accounts, temporary assets to be dealt with by the Plenipotentiary Conference at Buenos Aires", following the decisions of the Council.

The following sums are involved:

Round figures:

Accounting debt resulting from the period of occupation of Yugoslavia (Resolution No. 136)	26,298 Swiss francs
Russian language, vide paragraph 1, page 4, above	322,473 Swiss francs
	<hr/>
Total	348,771 Swiss francs

1. Differing interpretations of the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article 15
of the Convention relating to the use of supplementary working languages
at conferences and meetings since 1947

Payments contested by:	A. Atlantic City Conference 1947 Russian:	B. HFB Conf. Mexico 1948/49 Russian:	C. Tech. Plan Com. TPC. Paris 1949 Russian:	D. PFB. Geneva 1949 Russian:	E. TT Conference Paris 1949 Russian:	Total
1. Argentine (Republic)		29.462,10	4.498,80	1.376,40		35.337,30
2. Australia (Commonwealth of)		29.462,10	4.498,80	1.376,40	1.597,80	36.935,10
3. Belgium		9.820,70	1.499,60	458,80	532,60	12.311,70
4. Canada		24.551,75	3.749,-	1.147,-	1.331,50	30.779,25
5. China		24.551,75	3.749,-	1.147,-	1.331,50	30.779,25
6. Egypt		9.820,70	1.499,60	458,80	532,60	12.311,70
7. United States of America		29.462,10	4.498,80	1.376,40	1.597,80	36.935,10
8. Greece	1.378,55			229,40	266,30	1.874,25
9. India				1.376,40	1.597,80	2.974,20
10. Ireland		4.910,35	749,80	229,40	266,30	6.155,85
11. Iceland		982,07				982,07
12. Norway		9.820,70	1.499,60	458,80	532,60	12.311,70
13. New Zealand		4.910,35	749,80	229,40	266,30	6.155,85
14. Netherlands, Surinam, Dutch Antilles, New Guinea					532,60	532,60
15. Portugal					798,90	798,90
16. French Protectorate of Morocco		982,07	149,96	45,88	53,26	1.231,17
17. Southern Rhodesia		982,07	149,96	45,88	53,26	1.231,17
18. Sweden				458,80	532,60	991,40
19. Switzerland (Confederation)		9.820,70	1.499,60	458,80	532,60	12.311,70
20. Territories of the United States of America		29.462,10	4.498,80	1.376,40	1.597,80	36.935,10
21. Turkey		9.820,70	1.499,60	458,80	532,60	12.311,70
22. Union of South Africa and Territory of South West Africa				1.147,-	1.331,50	2.478,50
23. The Marconi Radio Co. of Portugal					53,26	53,26
Total queried (carried forward):	1.378,55	228.822,31	34.790,72	13.855,76	15.871,48	294.718,82

Total queried:	1.378,55	228.822,31	34.790,72	13.855,76	15.871,48	294.718,82
Deduct: Portugal ¹⁾				688,20		688,20
	1.378,55	228.822,31	34.790,72	13.167,56	15.871,48	294.030,62
Interest at 31.12.51 ²⁾	179,20	22.098,50	3.359,90	1.271,65	1.532,80	28.442,05
Total	1.557,75	250.920,81	38.150,62	14.439,21	17.404,28	322.472,67

1) Portugal had stated that it would not participate and was therefore not debited.
Subsequently Portugal nevertheless decided to pay its share of 688,20 Swiss Francs.
This amount is therefore deducted from the sums contested.

2) Caloulated to the end of 1952, the interest would increase by approximately 19.300 Swiss Francs.

2. Differing interpretations of the Atlantic City Resolution relating to preparation of the new International Frequency List and of subsequent decisions of the Council (work of the P.F.B.)

Payments contested by:	Contested from: (date)	P.F.B. Geneva 1949	P.F.B. Geneva 1949 Russian:	P.F.B. Geneva 1950	Total
1. Albania (People's Republic of)	17.5.1949	1.186,08		550,15	1.736,23
2. Bielorussian S.S.R.	17.5.1949	5.930,40		2.750,75	8.681,15
3. Bulgaria (People's Republic of)	17.5.1949	3.558,24		1.650,45	5.208,69
4. Guatemala	1.1.1949	5.888,94	137,64	1.650,45	7.677,03
5. Hungarian People's Republic	17.5.1949	1.186,08 1)		550,15	1.736,23
6. Poland (People's Republic of)	17.5.1949	23.721,60		11.003.-	34.724,60
7. Ukrainian S.S.R.	17.5.1949	17.791,20		8.252,25	26.043,45
8. Roumanian People's Republic	17.5.1949	1.186,08 1)		550,15 1)	1.736,23
9. Czechoslovakia	17.5.1949	11.860,80 2)		5.501,50	17.362,30
10. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	17.5.1949	35.582,40		16.504,50	52.086,90
Total queried:		107.891,82	137,64	48.963,35	156.992,81
Interest at 31.12.1951 3)		9.513,32	13,75	2.420,65	11.947,72
T O T A L		117.405,14	151,39	51.384.-	168.940,53

1) Amount paid but contested

2) Amount partly paid (5,473.- Swiss francs) but all contested

3) Calculated to 31.12.52, the interest would increase by 9,400 Swiss francs.

3. Differing interpretations of the provisions of paragraph 3 (1) of Article 14 of the Convention relating to the shares of Members and Associate Members in defraying the expenses of Conferences or meetings

Payments contested by:	Technical Plan Committee Paris, 1949	Technical Plan Committee Florence, 1950	HFB Conference Florence/ Rapallo, 1950	E.A.R.C. Geneva 1951	Total
1. Albania (People's Republic of)	210,67 1)	110,70	1.940,81	254,75	2.516,93
2. Bielorussian S.S.R.	1.053,35	553,50		1.273,75	2.880,60
3. Bulgaria (People's Republic of)	2.511,39	332,10	5.822,43	764,25	9.430,17
4. Hungarian People's Republic	210,67 1)	110,70	1.940,81	286,60	2.548,78
5. Poland (People's Republic of)	4.213,40	2.214.-	38.816,20		45.243,60
6. Ukrainian S.S.R.	3.160,05	1.660,50		3.821,25	8.541,80
7. Roumanian People's Republic	210,67 1)	110,70	1.940,81	254,75	2.516,93
8. Czechoslovakia	2.106,70	1.107.-	19.408,10	2.547,50	25.169,30
9. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	6.320,10	3.321.-	58.224,30	7.642,50	75.507,90
Total queried	19.997.-	9.520,20	128.093,46	16.845,35	174.356,01
Interest at 31.12.1951 2)	1.905,50	452,20	6.083,92	-	8.441,62
T O T A L	21.902,50	9.972,40	134.177,38	16.845,35	182.797,63

1) Amount paid but contested

2) Calculated to 31.12.1952, this interest would increase by 10,300 Swiss francs.

4. Differing interpretations of paragraph 3 (2) of Article 14 of the Convention relating to the share of private operating agencies in defraying the expenses of conferences or meetings

Payments Contested by:	Region I Confer. Geneva 1949	Aeronaut- ical Conf. II Geneva 1949	T.T. Conference Paris 1949	Vith Meeting of CCIT Brussels 1948	E.A.R.C. Geneva 1951	Total
1. Aeronautical Radio Inc.		453,64				453,64
2. All America Cables & Radio Inc.			1.459,32			1.459,32
3. American Cable & Radio Corp.				2.946,90		2.946,90
4. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.			1.459,32			1.459,32
5. Commercial Cable Co.			1.459,32			1.459,32
6. Marconi Radio Co. of Portugal			1.406,06 ¹⁾		2.154,75	3.560,81
7. Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co.			1.459,32	2.946,90		4.406,22
8. Press Wireless Inc.			1.459,32			1.459,32
9. Radio Corp. of America		453,64				453,64
10. Radio Holland	581,06					581,06
11. Radiomarine Corp. of America			1.459,32			1.459,32
12. R.C.A. Communications Inc.			1.459,32	74,38		1.533,70
13. Transradio International			5.837,28 ²⁾			5.837,28
14. Western Union Telegraph Co.			1.459,32	589,38		2.048,70
Total queried	581,06	907,28	18.917,90	6.557,56	2.154,75	29.118,55
Interest at 31.12.1951 ³⁾	55,16	86,12	1.663,85	863,39	-	2.668,52
Total	636,22	993,40	20.581,75	7.420,95	2.154,75	31.787,07

¹⁾ Amount paid but contested in the event of other agencies' claims being admitted.

²⁾ This agency stated originally that it would participate in the Vith Class (5 units), but later sent a telegram to say it chose Class VIII (1 unit). It paid 1 unit. The difference has been left in abeyance pending the Buenos Aires Conference.

³⁾ Calculated to the end of 1952, interest would increase by 1,700 Swiss francs.

5. Differences of interpretation of Article 15, paragraph 5 of the Convention, on shares in the expenses caused by the use of languages at conferences or meetings.

E.A.R.C., Geneva 1951
(Language Services)

Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	2.671
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	8.013
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	16.026
	<hr/>
	26.710

Calculated to the end of 1952, interest would amount to 1.400 Swiss francs.

ANNEX 1

DRAFT RESOLUTION 1

CONTRIBUTIONS QUERIED ON ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATION OF PARAGRAPH 4 OF ARTICLE 15 OF THE CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE USE OF ADDITIONAL WORKING LANGUAGES IN CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS HELD SINCE 1947 (SEE PAGES 15 AND 16 OF ANNEX 0).

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference

having considered

that Russian was used at the following conferences and meetings: H.F.B., Mexico 1948; T.P.C., Paris 1949; P.F.B., Geneva 1949; T.T.C., Paris 1949,

that this utilization was permitted under the conditions laid down in Administrative Council Resolutions 84 and 85,

that in accordance with the latter resolution Members whose delegations had not formally stated that they did not wish to contribute to the cost of using a supplementary language could refuse subsequently to pay the contributory share allocated to them by the Secretary General (Resolution No. 85 having been cancelled by a later decision of the Administrative Council), and

that this has placed the accounts of the Union in a delicate situation,

having considered, moreover

that in view of this situation, certain Members that did not formally request the use of Russian have nevertheless agreed to pay their contributory share,

that no additional share could be asked of them, and

that, moreover, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to make changes in the accounts of the Union for the period 1948/1952

recommends

the Members who have been charged with the cost of using Russian to be good enough to agree to settle their accounts, it being clearly understood that such settlement would merely constitute a gesture of goodwill on their part, contributing to the international collaboration that is the very basis of the Union,

and instructs

the Secretary General to bring this resolution to the notice of all the Members concerned, supplying them at the same time with complete and detailed information on the origin of these debts, which are due to conflicting arrangements made by the Administrative Council in this matter, so that, once they are fully informed of the facts, they may see their way to agree to pay the outstanding amounts and interest to the date of payment.

ANNEX 2

DRAFT RESOLUTION 2

CONTRIBUTIONS QUERIED ON ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES OF INTER-
PRETATION OF THE ATLANTIC CITY RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE PREPARATION
OF THE NEW INTERNATIONAL FREQUENCY LIST AND SUBSEQUENT DECISION OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL (P.F.B. ACTIVITIES) (SEE PAGE 17 OF ANNEX 0)

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

having considered

the circumstances in which certain Members have contested or
have refused to pay accounts rendered to them in respect of certain
extraordinary expenses for the Provisional Frequency Board for the years
1949 and 1950,

resolves

to endorse the decision of the Administrative Council in
Resolution No. 203/CA5 and

instructs

the Secretary General to bring to the notice of the Members
concerned the provision of the present Resolution and to request them
to pay the outstanding amounts and interest to the date of payment.

ANNEX 3

DRAFT RESOLUTION 3

CONTRIBUTIONS QUERIED ON ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATION OF PARAGRAPH 3 (1) OF ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATE MEMBERS IN DEFRAYING THE EXPENSES OF CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS (SEE PAGE 18 OF ANNEX 0).

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

having considered

- a) the circumstances in which certain Members of the Union have protested or have declined to pay the accounts sent them in connection with the expenses of the Technical Plan Committee (Paris, 1949, and Florence, 1950), and in connection with the expenses of the High-Frequency Broadcasting Conference (Florence/Rapallo, 1950), which they attended or in which they had agreed to participate.
- b) Resolution 10 of the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference (Geneva, 1951), designed to permit the I.F.R.B. to take up the duties assigned to it by the Agreement signed at that Conference;

resolves

to endorse the decisions of the Administrative Council in Resolutions Nos. 204/CA5, 188/CA5 and 218/CA6, and

instructs

the Secretary General to bring to the notice of the Members concerned the provisions of the present Resolution and to request them to pay the outstanding amounts and interest to the date of payment.

ANNEX 4

DRAFT RESOLUTION 4

CONTRIBUTIONS QUERIED ON ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATION OF PARAGRAPH 3 (2) OF ARTICLE 14 OF THE CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE PARTICIPATION OF RECOGNIZED PRIVATE OPERATING AGENCIES IN DEFRAYING THE EXPENSES OF CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS (see page 19 of annex 0)

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

having considered

that, in conformity with the provisions of Annex 2 to the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City 1947 each Member shall be free to make up its delegation to conferences and meetings of the I.T.U. as it wishes,

that, in particular, it has the absolute right to include in its delegation, in the capacity of delegates or advisors, representatives of recognized private operating agencies, and

that, the Administrative Council referred the matter of certain debts of various operating agencies to the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference for decision;

is of the opinion

that, as of right, recognized private operating agencies all of whose representatives have been included in the delegation of a Member of the Union as members of that delegation should not participate in the expenses of such conferences and meetings,

recommends

that, the debts in question should therefore be cancelled as having been billed in contravention of the said Annex 2 of the Atlantic City Convention, and

deems

that, to avoid accounting difficulties, it would be desirable if these private operating agencies which were debited with expenses for participation in conferences attended by their representatives in the capacity of delegates or advisors included in the delegation of a

(Ann.4 to Doc. 368-E)

Member of the Union would agree, as a gesture of good will, to pay an amount equal to the sums in question, and

instructs

the Secretary General to inform the private operating agencies concerned of this resolution, and

finally considering

that, on account of a misunderstanding in the Secretariat, the Transradio International was placed in the VI class (5 units) instead of in the VIII class (1 unit) of contributions to costs of the Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference 1949

resolves

that the book debt thus resulting and the interest to the date of this resolution shall be written off, and to grant the necessary credit to the Secretary General of the I.T.U. in order that the Profit and Loss Account as regards this item, amounting to approximately the sum of 5,840 Swiss Francs may be balanced.

ANNEX 5

DRAFT RESOLUTION 5

CONTRIBUTIONS QUERIED ON ACCOUNT OF DIFFERENCES OF INTERPRETATION OF PARAGRAPH 5. ARTICLE 5, OF THE CONVENTION RELATIVE TO THE APPORTIONMENT OF EXPENSES INCURRED BY THE USE OF LANGUAGES IN CONFERENCES AND MEETINGS. (SEE PAGE 20 OF ANNEX O)

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference

having considered

that some Members of the Union have objected to the expenses involved through the use of the Spanish and English languages in the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference, Geneva 1951,

that it is undeniable that every Member of the Union, in accordance with the provisions of Article 15, paragraph 5 of the Convention, has the right to share in the expenses of only one of the authorized working languages; and

that the above mentioned objections give rise to accounting difficulties since all the Members of the Union have already received and some of them settled the accounts relating to the above mentioned conference;

resolves

to make an appeal to the Members concerned to pay, as a gesture of good will, the expenses arising out of the use of all three working languages at the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference, Geneva 1951, with a view to avoiding alterations to past accounts; and

instructs

the Secretary General to inform all the Members concerned of this resolution, and to request them to pay the outstanding amounts and interest to the date of payment.

ANNEX 6

DRAFT RESOLUTION 6

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NETHERLANDS' ADMINISTRATION FOR
THE POSTPONED EXTRAORDINARY ADMINISTRATIVE RADIO CONFERENCE 1950.

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference

in view of

the fact that according to the decision of the Administrative Council in Resolution No. 215 it is recognized that as a matter of equity the Netherlands' Administration be reimbursed a certain proportion of the expenses incurred in preparations for the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference which was to have been held at The Hague in September 1950, but which was cancelled,

having considered

that it was finally agreed between the International Telecommunication Union and the Netherlands' Administration that the sum owed by the International Telecommunication Union to the Netherlands' Administration in respect of costs to be reimbursed to that Administration amounts to 323,000 florins;

that the Administrative Council decided that the sum to be repaid to the Netherlands' Administration should be apportioned among all the Members of the Union, the contributory shares to be quoted and payable in florins;

that the said sum has not been previously settled by the Secretary General by means of an advance from the Swiss Government;

that, in accordance with the statement made to the Administrative Council by the representative of the Netherlands' Administration the sums due are not liable to interest;

that out of the 323,000 florins advanced by them to the Union, the Netherlands' Administration had at 1 December 1952 only recovered 214,708.04 florins;

reaffirms

the decision taken by the Administrative Council at its 5th Session by Resolution No. 215, recognizing the debt of the Union and

appeals

to the Members of the Union who have not yet paid their contributory shares in accordance with the decisions laid down in Notification No. 615 of the General Secretariat dated 1 January 1951, to pay the amounts due as soon as possible and not later than the first of July 1953.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

RESULTS OF THE SECOND CONSULTATION IN CONNECTION

WITH THE CLASSIFICATION OF MEMBERS AND

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS OF THE UNION

(DECISION TAKEN BY THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY ON 26 NOVEMBER 1952)

Situation at 2 December 1952, at noon.

(For the first consultation, see documents Nos. 348, 355 and 356)

Present classification according to the Atlantic City scale (Convention, Article 14, paragraph 4):			Notification of a change of class in the Atlantic City scale (Con- vention, Article 14, paragraph 4):			
I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference:	Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +	Remarks
Afghanistan	VIII	1				
British West Africa (Associate Members)	VIII	1				
People's Republic of Albania	VIII	1				
Saudi Arabia	VII	3	VIII	1	- 2	Doc.No.262
Argentine Republic	I	30	II	25	- 5	Doc.No.348
Commonwealth of Australia	I	30				
Austria	VIII	1				
Belgium	V	10				
Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	VI	5	VIII	1	- 4	Doc.No.348
Bolivia	VII	3				
Brazil	II	25				
People's Republic of Bulgaria	VII	3	VIII	1	- 2	Doc.No.348
Kingdom of Cambodia	VIII	1				
Canada 1)	II	25				
Ceylon 2)	VII	3				
carried forward					- 13	

1) see statement, Annex 1

2) see statement, Annex 2



I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference:			Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +	Remarks
					brought forward			- 13
Chile	VII	3						
China	II	25	IV	15	-	10		Annex 3
Vatican City State	VIII	1						
Republic of Colombia	VI	5	VII	3	-	2		Doc.No.356
Belgian Congo and Territories of Ruanda-Urundi	VII	3						
Republic of Korea	VIII	1						
Costa Rica	VII	3						
Cuba	VI	5	VII	3	-	2		Doc.No.348
Denmark	V	10	VI	5	-	5		Doc.No.348
Dominican Republic	V	10	VI	5	-	5		Doc.No.308
Egypt	V	10	VI	5	-	5		Annex 4
Republic of El Salvador	VII	3						
Spain	VII	3						
United States of America	I	30						
Ethiopia	VII	3	VIII	1	-	2		Doc.No.15
Finland	VI	5	VII	3	-	2		Annex 5
France	I	30						
Greece	VI	5						
Guatemala	VII	3	VIII	1	-	2		Doc.No.168
Republic of Haiti	VIII	1						
Hungarian People's Republic	VIII	1						
India	I	30						
Republic of Indonesia	V	10						
Iran	VIII	1						
Iraq	VIII	1						
Ireland	VI	5						
Iceland	VIII	1						
Israel	VII	3	VIII	1	-	2		Annex 6
Italy	II	25	III	20	-	5		Doc.No.348
Japan	VIII	1	I	30		+ 29		Doc.No.263
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan	VIII	1						
					carried forward			- 55 + 29

I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference:	Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +	Remarks
			(brought forward)		-55 +29	
Laos	VIII	1				
Lebanon	VIII	1				
Luxemburg	VII	3				
Mexico	V	10				
Monaco	VIII	1				
Nicaragua	VII	3				
Norway	V	10	VI	5	- 5	Doc.No.348
New Zealand	VI	5				
Pakistan	IV	15				
Paraguay	VII	3	VIII	1	- 2	Doc.No.114
Netherlands, Surinam, Nether- lands Antilles, New Guinea	V	10				
Republic of the Philippines ¹⁾	VI	5	VIII	1	- 4	Doc.No.84Rev.
Peru	VI	5	VII	3	- 2	Doc.No.348
People's Republic of Poland	III	20	V	10	-10	Doc.No.348
Portugal	IV	15	V	10	- 5	Doc.No.348
French Protectorate of) Morocco (1 entity))	VIII	1				
French Protectorate of) Tunisia (1 entity))		1				
Federal German Republic	III	20				
Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia	VIII	1				
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	IV	15	VI	5	-10	Doc.No.348
Roumanian People's Republic	VIII	1				
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	I	30				
carried forward					-93 +29	

¹⁾ See statement in Annex 7

I.T.U. Members attending the Buenos Aires Conference	Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +	Remarks
			(brought forward:-93 +29)			
Sweden	V	10				
Swiss Confederation	V	10				
Syrian Republic	VII	3	VIII	1	-2	Annex 8
Czechoslovakia (1)	V	10				
Territories of the United States of America	I	30	II	25	-5	Annex 10
Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such	II	25	III	20	-5	Doc.No.122
Portuguese Oversea Territories	IV	15	V	10	-5	Doc.No.348
Thailand	V	10				
Turkey	V	10	VI	5	-5	Doc.No.348
Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa	II	25	IV	15	-10	Doc.No.322
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	I	30				
Oriental Republic of Uruguay	VI	5	VII	3	-2	Annex 11
United States of Venezuela	V	10				
Viet-Nam	VII	3	VIII	1	-2	Doc.15 and 348
Yemen	VII	3	VIII	1	-2	Doc.No.15
Spanish Zone of Morocco and the Totality of Spanish Possessions	VIII	1				
		755				

carried forward: -131 +29

(1) See statement in Annex 9

- 5 -
(369-E)

I.T.U. Members and Associate Members not attending the Buenos Aires Conference		Class	Units	Class	Units	Difference - or +	Remarks
				(brought forward: -131 + 29			
Burma	VII	3					
Colonies, Protectorates, Oversea Territories and Territories under Mandate or Trusteeship of Her Majesty's Government in United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	III	20		V	10	- 10	Doc.N° 348 and Ann.12
Ecuador	VI	5					
Republic of Honduras	VII	3					
Konya (Colony and Protectorate of) (Associate Member)	(not notified)						
Liberia	VII	3					
United Kingdom of Libya	(not notified)						
Panama	VII	3					
Southern Rhodesia	VIII	1					
		<u>39</u>					

Present total	794	- 141 + 29
Differences resulting from changes in class	<u>-112</u>	
Now total	<u><u>682</u></u>	

3. Countries making reservations as regards their choice of class if the existing scale should be revised :

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| a) will probably choose a class lower than Class I | Commonwealth of Australia
India | (Annex 13)
(Doc. 348) |
| b) will stay in Class VI provided a new scale is introduced | Greece
Ireland | (Doc. 348)
(Doc. 348) |
| c) will choose a class lower than Class VIII | Afghanistan
Saudi Arabia
Austria
Iraq
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
Lebanon
Yemen | (Doc. 348)
(Annex 14)
(Annex 15)
(Annex 16)
(Annex 17)
(Doc. 348)
(Annex 18) |

ANNEXES 1 TO 18 TO FOLLOW

ANNEXES 1 to 18

OF DOCUMENT No. 369-E

- 7 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 1

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

Mr. L. Mulatier
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication
Union,
Buenos Aires

Dear Mr. Mulatier,

I wish to refer to the decision taken by the Plenary Assembly on 26 November 1952 (Document No. 318), concerning the classification of Members and Associate Members of the Union.

The Canadian Delegation has noted that a number of delegations have indicated that their countries will reduce their present class of contributions. Should these countries, and possibly other countries, finally decide to be placed in a lower class this may have an adverse effect on the classification to be decided on by Canada.

In these circumstances, I have to advise that the Canadian Delegation reserves its position with regard to the class Canada may select for contributions to the Union, pending a careful study of the situation and decision by the Canadian Government.

Yours truly,

Charles J. Acton

(on behalf of the Head of
the Canadian Delegation)

A N N E X 2

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

The Secretary General of the I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

The Delegation of Ceylon, having taken into account the changes in classes of contributions contained in Documents Nos. 348 and 356 desires to continue in contributory class seven on the assumption, (1) that the existing system of classification, will be maintained and (2) that changes notified subsequent to the first consultation do not substantially reduce the total number of units below the figure 715.- The Delegation of Ceylon reserves the right to alter its present contributory class should there be any change in the circumstances referred to in (1) and (2) above.-

signed: A. I. Perera C.B.E.
Ceylon Delegation

A N N E X 3

Chinese Delegation
Plenipotentiary Conference
I. T. U.
Buenos Aires

Buenos Aires, 29 November 1952.

Monsieur Leon Mulatier
Secretary General
Plenipotentiary Conference,
I. T. U.
Buenos Aires

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that owing to the increase of the budget of the I.T.U. as well as conditions beyond our control, my country desires to choose Class IV (15 units) as our membership contribution for the period 1954-1959, in application of the provisions of Article 14, paragraph 5, of the International Telecommunication Convention and pursuant to the procedure for the choice of contributory class as laid down by the Plenipotentiary Conference at its 8th Plenary Meeting held on November 26th, 1952.

May I add that China has been a loyal member of the I.T.U. since joining the organization and has always done her best to support it in every way possible. Even under the extremely difficult circumstances obtaining in my country, we have during this year remitted to you ten thousand U.S. dollars (US\$10,000); and that fact amply demonstrates our earnestness in our effort to meet our obligations to the Union. Consequently, the class of contribution we hereby request is because of sheer necessity, and we are certain that the Conference will accord it the best consideration.

Yours very sincerely

signed: Yü Tsune-chi
Head, Chinese Delegation

- 10 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 4

Légation
de
S.M. le Roi d'Egypte
Buenos Aires

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication
Union
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

With reference to the decision of the Plenary Assembly of the Plenipotentiary Conference of Buenos Aires on the 26th of November 1952, Egypt would like to notify that it should be put in Class Six instead of Class Five in case that there will be no change in the existing scales of contributions.

Yours sincerely,

signed: Dr. Hassan Moharram
Head of the Egyptian Delegation

- 11 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 5

Legation of Finland

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

Mr. L. Mulatier
Secretary General, I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that in view of the fact that the new budget is expected to amount to some 6,000,000 Swiss francs, and in view of the effects of the notifications of changes of class submitted by several delegations up to 29 November, Finland will in all likelihood choose Class VII, in the scale set forth in Article 14 of the Atlantic City Convention, for the period 1953 to 1957.

The Director General of Finnish P.T.T. will confirm this later.

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

signed: Leo TUOMINEN
Head of the Finnish Delegation

A N N E X 6

DELEGATION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Buenos Aires, December 1, 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication
Union
Buenos Aires.

Sir,

Class of Contribution
Article 14 - Atlantic City Convention

I have the honour to inform you that in view of the notifications of change of class as contained in Document No. 348 dated November 30, 1952 and in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Plenary Assembly on November 26, 1952, the Administration of the State of Israel wishes to change its class of contribution from class 7 to class 8.

Yours faithfully

M.E. Berman
Head of Delegation
State of Israel

- 13 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 7

LEGATION OF THE PHILIPPINES

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

To the Secretary General
I.T.U.,
Buenos Aires

Sir,

With reference to the notification addressed by me to the Secretariat, on 9 October 1952, applying, in accordance with the instructions received by me, for the Philippines to be transferred from Class VI (in which it now is) to Class VIII, I wish hereby to reiterate this application, adding that :

.... should the new scale of classes proposed by the French Delegation be approved, the Republic of the Philippines asks that the class corresponding to 1 unit in the new scale be assigned to it.

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

Manuel Escudero
Head of the Delegation
of the Republic of the Philippines

N.B. Our original application dated 9 October appeared in Document No. 84 of this Conference.

- 14 -
(369-E)

A N N ' E X 8

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

The Secretary General
I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

With reference to the decision of the Plenary Assembly of the Plenipotentiary Conference of Buenos Aires on the 26th November 1952, the Syrian Republic would like to notify that it desires to be put in class eight instead of class seven of the actual scales of contributions.

Yours sincerely

For the Delegation of Syria

ANIS EL BARDAI

A N N E X 9

Buenos Aires, 1 December 1952

Mr. L. Mulatier
Secretary General
International Telecommunication
Union,
Buenos Aires

Sir,

With reference to Document No. 302, approved by the Plenipotentiary Conference, and to Document No. 348, I have the honour to inform you of the following, with the request that you publish my statement as a conference document :

For the time being, my Delegation has no intention of requesting a change of class.

It does, however, reserve the right of its administration to review its opinion on ~~this~~ matter and to take a final decision in regard to a change of class, if, because of the changes in class indicated in Document No. 348, the other Members of the International Telecommunication Union should notify changes of class or if those Members should make changes later, before the new Convention comes into force.

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

F. KROUTL
Head of the
Czechoslovak Delegation

- 16 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 10

THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Buenos Aires, December 1, 1952

Mr. Leon Mulatier,
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication
Union,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina.

My dear Mr. Mulatier:

This is to inform you that in accordance with the
decision of the Plenary Assembly, the Territories of the
United States wish to be classified in Class 2 instead of
Class 1 in which they now are.

Yours very sincerely,

signed : Florence A. Trail
Chairman
Delegation of Territories
of the United States,

- 17 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 11

URUGUAYAN EMBASSY

Buenos Aires, 1 December 1952

Mr. L. Mulatier
Secretary General,
International Telecommunication
Union
Buenos Aires

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that in accordance with paragraph 4 of Document No. 302, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay has decided to apply for a change of class, from Class VI to Class VII. Hence it will pay for 3 units'-worth of I.T.U. expenses.

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

Chairman, for the Uruguayan Delegation:

Col. Dario T. Saráchaga

A N N E X 12

United Kingdom Delegation to the
I.T.U. Plenipotentiary Conference

Alvear Palace Hotel
Buenos Aires

Buenos Aires, 1st December 1952

The Secretary-General
International Telecommunication
Union
Buenos Aires

Sir,

I have the honour by direction of Her Majesty's Postmaster General to refer to the letter sent on 22nd November from London about a proposed modification in the class of contribution of the Member of the Union comprising the Colonies, Protectorates, Overseas Territories and Territories under mandate or trusteeship of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Her Majesty's Postmaster General desires me to inform you that the Member of the Union comprising the Colonies, Protectorates, Overseas Territories and Territories under mandate or trusteeship of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in view of the provisions of paragraph III on page 8 of Document No. 318 now wish to be transferred to Class V, and not, as was stated in the letter of 22nd November, to Class IV.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed) C. B. JERRAM

- 19 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 13

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

Secretary General
International Telecommunication
Union
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

Australia desires to make a reservation as regards its choice of class if the existing scale should be revised.

In this event, Australia may desire to choose a class lower than Class I.

(Signed) H. W. HYETT
Australian Delegate

A N N E X 14

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

The Secretary General
International Telecommunication
Union
Buenos Aires

, Dear Sir,

In my request contained in Document No. 262 my Delegation asked that Saudi Arabia be placed in the 8th class of contribution i.e., 1 unit.

This decision was based on the existing contribution classes as laid down in Atlantic City.

My country reserves the right to reconsider this matter and to choose any other class of contribution, which we may believe is suitable for Saudi Arabia, in case it is decided here, in this Plenipotentiary conference, Buenos Aires, to change the contribution classification of the Atlantic City convention.

I remain Sir,

Respectfully yours

(Signed) M. D. Reda HAMIZA

Head of Saudi Arabian Delegation

A N N E X 15

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

Mr. Léon Mulatier
Secretary General of the I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

With reference to Document No. 318, page 8, paragraph III, subparagraph 4, Austria reserves her right to apply for a lower class of contribution than class 8 in case the present scale of contributions should be changed.

Respectfully yours,

Signed: F. Henneberg
Head of the Austrian Delegation

- 22 -
(369-E)

A N N E X 16

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

The Secretary General
I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

Should any change to the Atlantic City class of contributions be adopted by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference, the Delegation of Iraq wishes to reserve the right to choose a class lower than class VIII.

Thank you, Sir.

Signed: Raghīb Rashīd
Head of the Delegation of Iraq

A N N E X 17

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

The Secretary General
I.T.U.
Buenos Aires

Dear Sir,

Should any change to the Atlantic City class of contributions be adopted by the Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference, the Delegation of the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan wishes to reserve the right to choose a class lower than class VIII.

Thank you, Sir.

Signed: Raghib Rashid
Delegation of
Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan;

A N N E X 10

YEMEN DELEGATION

to I.T.C.

Buenos Aires

Buenos Aires, 2 December 1952

To the Secretary General of
the International Telecommunication
Union.

Dear Sir,

In accordance with the decision of the fifth committee,
I hereby declare, on behalf of my Government, that we will ask for a
class inferior to the VIIIth class of contribution if the committee
will decide on a new scale of classes.

Please accept, Sir, the assurance of my high consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Signed: Tawfik Chamandy
Delegate of Yemen
to the I.T.C.

C O M M I T T E E 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 15th meeting

Tuesday, 2 December, 1952 at 10 a.m.

Chairman : Mr. Krishna Prasada (India)

The Chairman submitted for approval the summary records of the 11th and 12th meetings (Documents Nos. 312 and 313).

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic pointed out a slip in the Spanish text of Document No. 313, page 6 (statement attributed to the Delegate of Sweden). The figure given should be 400,000 and not 4,000,000 Swiss francs.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia asked for an amendment to the Spanish and French texts of Document No. 313, paragraph 2.

The Delegate of Portugal asked that the following be included in the summary record of the 11th meeting (Document No. 312) towards the end : "The Delegate of Portugal had been convinced by a quick perusal of Document No. 278 that the fiscal limit on expenditure, as appearing in the budget estimate for 1957, could be reduced by some 1,200,000 Swiss francs."

The Chairman opened discussion on Documents Nos. 348 and 356, showing changes in contributions. On page 3 of Document No. 348 there was a list of countries which had made informal reservations. According to Document No. 356, the number of units fell from 794 to 715, which would entail an increase of 10% in the unit contribution. Incidentally, the time limit for notification by countries of the class chosen was due to expire that day at midday.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland pointed out a mistake on page 2 of Document No. 248. The Colonies, Protectorates, Oversea Territories, and Territories under Mandate or Trusteeship of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland were applying for a transfer to Class V, and not to Class IV.

The Delegate of Israel said he had been instructed to apply for Class VIII.

The Delegate of China said he had asked his government for instructions, but none had yet been forthcoming. He might possibly ask for a transfer to Class IV (10 units).

The Chairman said that the total contribution would thereby be reduced to 698 units.

The Delegate of Portugal observed that the results as shown in Documents Nos. 348 and 356 seemed acceptable, but the movement towards lower classes still seemed to continue. If it carried on, then a new scale would have to be envisaged. Perhaps that was due to the absence of intermediate classes. Atlantic City had intended Classes VII and VIII for the small countries (Luxembourg, Monaco) or for those very under-developed. But that should not become the rule. Perhaps a 40-unit class ought to be envisaged.

The Chairman expressed the hope that some Members would change their minds about declassification as Iran had already done.

The Delegate of Sweden thought that it might be useful if classes of contribution corresponded with the units of contribution.

The Chairman said that those proposals would be discussed in the next meeting. He passed on to the Working Group 2 Documents Nos. 218 and 331, analysing them in a general way.

The Delegate of Portugal said that those documents were clear and comprehensive. The solution proposed in Document No. 331 was the best. It should be adopted. As regards Document No. 218, he would opt for solution B.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland speaking of Document No. 218, favoured solution A.

The Delegates of France, the Argentine Republic, and Switzerland supported the Delegate of Portugal, and favoured solution B.

The Delegate of Canada thought that the available to the Delegates on salary question, was not adequate. That task should be entrusted to the Administrative Council, which should be allowed a margin, say, 5%.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that maintenance of the Atlantic City scales would be unjust. In the absence of data, the task of revision might be entrusted to the Administrative Council.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, speaking of Document No. 218, said that in ECOSOC his country's Delegation had opposed the system of automatic increments keeping pace with increases in the cost of living. He would vote against solution B. Solution B was excessively generous to the staff and would make for inflation. Hence the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland would vote in favour of A.

The Delegate of Sweden, referring to Annex 2 of Document No. 218, asked what was meant by : "taking into account the basic salary scales....."

The Chairman of Working Group 2 replied that the salary had two parts : the basic salary properly so-called, plus cost of living allowances.

The Secretary General feared lest the Working Group's findings might cause disaffection among the staff. At the last session of the Council, the staff had asked that a parallel should be drawn between the situation of I.T.U. staff and that of staff in the United Nations and other specialized agencies, and had made the comparison itself. Since then, the W.M.O. had effected a complete assimilation with the United Nations. I.T.U. staff enjoyed none of the advantages accorded to the W.M.O. - advantages it had a right to claim. As

regards the I.T.U., it was not easy to understand why such assimilation could not be effected, since with another 41,000 Swiss francs a year more than the sum proposed by Working Group 2, it would be possible to effect an almost complete assimilation, as follows :

	Minima	Maxima	U.N.
8th Class	6,200	11,445	11,445
7th Class	6,500	12,865	12,865
6th Class	7,400	15,000	16,545
5th Class	8,700	16,500	18,300
4th Class	10,100	18,500	19,260
3rd Class	11,400	21,000	20,833
2nd Class	12,600	25,500	26,673
1st Class	17,000	29,800	33,341
Class D	32,000	36,000	45,844

The Delegate of the French Protectorate of Tunisia said, that according to the Secretary General, his scheme would cost 241,000 Swiss francs in 1957, whereas Working Group 2 was advancing 965,000 Swiss francs in Document No. 331.

The Secretary General said that total assimilation would have to be effected step by step, whereas he had proposed the addition of no more than two steps to the existing scale. The financial effects would not be evident until the officials concerned were approaching the end of their career, and the minima would remain intact.

The Chairman of Working Group 2 disagreed with the Secretary General. He could well understand the Secretary General's feelings, but thought that the proposed scale would complicate the work which the Group had suggested might be entrusted to the Council, to wit, the preparation of a new salary scale. What, exactly, did the staff request for? Assimilation with the United Nations. If they were to proceed as far as the United Nations, the minima would have to be raised. As regards the maxima, the United Nations' grades were, in fact, less than the maxima proposed because the United Nations provided for careers ordinarily lasting ten years.

The Delegate of the United States of America was 99% in agreement with the Secretary General. He was prepared to accept a revision of the Atlantic City scales. He was 1% in disagreement, for the new scales which had been proposed could not for the time being be considered. The task ought to be entrusted to the Council.

The Delegate of Sweden thought the Committee was in a perilous position, for if the new proposal had not been considered in the Working Group, it would have to be referred to the Group.

The Secretary General said he had not submitted the scale to Working Group 2, because the Group was discussing another scale without being able to reach agreement thereon. But he thought it was his duty to submit his suggestion, being aware that it was proposed to ask for 200,000 Swiss francs for the staff. Besides, the sums provided for the last two classes could be reduced, which would bring the additional 41,000 Swiss francs below that figure.

The Delegate of Portugal said that when sitting on the Council he had favoured assimilation with the United Nations. That did not mean that he agreed as regards expenditure. Now, assimilation would mean an increase of 1,200,000 Swiss francs, and the time was short. He proposed, then :

- 1) that a decision should be taken on the Working Group's proposals : opinion B and Document No. 331;
- 2) that the Council should be instructed to study a revision of staff salary scales and to submit a report with all possible despatch to Members of the Union, which would decide by majority vote.

Such a procedure would do something to allay disquiet, and would represent some remedial action, not for the future, but forthwith.

The Delegate of France did not agree to the Secretary General's proposal. Working Group 2 had proposed 200,000 Swiss francs to cope with fluctuations in the cost of living. The reclassification, estimated at 251,000 Swiss francs, would have to be added to that. Total : 441,000 Swiss francs. If to that were added the 66,000 Swiss francs provided for by the Working Group to cope with a provisional adjustment in salaries, 500,000 Swiss francs would

be arrived at. Hence the thing to do was first to accept the Working Group's proposal, and then to adopt the Portuguese proposal.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"My Delegation considers that this Plenipotentiary Conference should take a decision setting up a definite salary scale for I.T.U. staff. Such a decision would enable administrations to obtain a clear and definite idea of the financial consequences entailed by the decisions here taken.

"Hence my Delegation objects to the Portuguese proposal to refer the question of salary scales to the Administrative Council, even if Members of the Union are to be consulted in connection therewith."

The Chairman of Working Group 2 said it would be injudicious to adopt a salary scale hastily. The problem should be examined with meticulous care with the Secretary General and the various C.C.I.s. Hence he vigorously supported the Portuguese proposal.

The Chairman discussed the items on page 3 of Document No.331 one by one, with the following result:

- a) Increase in salary for Class 8: adopted
- b) Reclassification of duties: adopted
- c) Provisional adjustment in salaries: -

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that the 3rd paragraph had no connection with Document No.218. It represented a compromise between those who advocated an increase in salaries and those who wanted the existing scale maintained.

The Chairman of Working Group 2 said that that was so. Paragraph 4 (66,000 Swiss francs) was designed for the immediate grant of a temporary allowance to compensate for the increased cost of living since 1947.

The Delegate of the United States of America said that if the Portuguese proposal were adopted, his Delegation would agree to the Working Group's proposal relative to a provisional adjustment in salaries (paragraph 3).

Adopted.

The Delegate of Ireland said that the question of the 200,000 Swiss francs credit to be included in ordinary expenditure was simply a question of detail. For, if the proposal of Working Group were approved, no provision at all would have to be made in the 1953 budget. No readjustment for the cost of living should operate before 1954.

The Delegate of Canada said it was difficult to adopt the 200,000 Swiss francs credit before Document No.218 had been considered. He would vote in favour of solution A. He agreed with the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that adjustment should be automatic.

The Chairman of Working Group 2 referred to the word "automatic" used by the Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of Canada. Nowhere in the Document was there any talk of automatic adjustment. It was for the Council to judge when the time was ripe to grant an allowance, if the cost of living justified it.

The Chairman put Document No.218 to the vote.

Solution A: 12 votes
Solution B: 18 votes

The Delegate of the French Protectorate of Tunisia, referring to the vote on paragraph 5, relative to the 200,000 Swiss francs credit, said that, as the Delegate of Ireland had said, it was to be expected that from 1954 50,000 Swiss francs would be added yearly to the fiscal limit.

The Secretary General said that such a vote would not jeopardize the finances of the Union, and that it was difficult to stagger it, since the rise in the cost of living was not known for certain. It was better

to leave that matter for the Council. The first thing to do would be to decide on the Portuguese proposal, which would determine all else.

The Delegates of France and the Argentine Republic had been of the opinion that the 66,000 Swiss francs had already been decided on, and that the Committee had to do no more than to decide about the 200,000 Swiss francs credit. What had to be made clear was that that amount would be entered in the budget only when the Council considered it necessary.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia appealed for an unambiguous decision for the benefit of Working Group 5, which had to draw up the draft budget. For the 66,000 Swiss francs there would be no difficulty. That sum would be provided for in deciding on the fiscal limit.

As regards the 200,000 Swiss francs, to be used in case of an increase in the cost of living, it would be reasonable not to make provision for that sum in deciding on the fiscal limit. Besides, that sum did not have to be provided for 1953, but for 1954, and that would have to be considered by the Council when the time was ripe.

The Delegate of Portugal agreed.

The Chairman also thought that provision should not be made for 200,000 Swiss francs in deciding on the fiscal limit. In that case, Resolution B would have to be appropriately amended.

The Delegate of the United States of America said he could agree only after the Portuguese proposal had been put to the vote.

The Delegate of Canada was prepared to support a permanent readjustment of salaries.

The Chairman thought that the Committee was prepared to approve Document No.331 and Opinion B in Document No.218, and to agree that the problem of salaries should be referred to the Administrative Council for study.

Approved.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. recalled his previous remarks to the effect that he did not agree with such a procedure.

The Delegate of the Roumanian P.R. made the following statement:

"The Delegation of the Roumanian People's Republic wholeheartedly supports the point of view expressed by the Delegate of the Soviet Union. We consider that the question of salary scales should be discussed and settled here at the Plenipotentiary Conference, since this conference is qualified to deal with such a matter. We see no acceptable reason why this question should be referred to the Administrative Council.

"We therefore object categorically to the question of salary scales being referred to the Administrative Council for settlement."

The Delegates of the Hungarian P.R., the P.R. of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia supported the views expressed by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R.

The Delegate of Portugal pointed out that he had suggested that the Administrative Council should be instructed to study the salary problem and submit its findings to the Members of the Union, which would ultimately decide by a majority vote.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said he approved Document No.331, but wished it to go on record that he reserved the right to revert to the question of the Secretary General's salary (sub-paragraph 2 of paragraph 2) at a plenary meeting.

The Delegate of Argentina drew attention to the last paragraph of Document No.331.

The Chairman explained that it had been proposed that recruitment on an international basis applied only to Classes 3 and above.

Approved.

Consideration of Document No.357 - Publications.

The Delegate of Portugal said he agreed with No.1, but in No.2 the following phrase was missing: "to authorize the Administrative Council, in the event of excessive delay, to charge interest on the amounts owing."

With regard to No.3, it was the Administrative Council which would instruct the Secretary General on the advisability of a decision to suspend.

The Delegate of Canada thought that great care should be taken, and that certain documents used by ships on the high seas should be excluded from No.3.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed with this view, but the Delegate of Portugal held the contrary view. There was no reason why shipping companies should not pay for the documents they needed. If necessary, to avoid suspending the despatch of documents, they could be sent Cash on Delivery.

The Committee approved this view.

The meeting rose at 1315 hours.

Reporters:

J.T. Arregui
H. Bouchon
M. Caws

Chairman:

Krishna Prasada

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

A DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

considering:

1. The position as regards accounts outstanding under the Madrid Convention;
2. Unpaid debts for supplies of documents;

instructs:

the Administrative Council to consider the matter, and to order the Secretary General:

1. If necessary, to use the payments made by Members of the Union to pay off, first of all, bills outstanding under the Madrid Convention;
2. To request Members and Associate Members of the Union, other administrative departments of administrations, and private operating agencies, to pay their bills for supplies of documents within the customary period;
3. If bills are not paid within the customary period, to charge interest on the accounts for documents supplied to the Members and Associate Members concerned, or
4. To suspend the despatch of documents to private operating agencies, private individuals and administrative departments, or to despatch them against payment, if they do not pay their bills for supply of documents within the customary period.

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 372-E
3 December 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

THIRD REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 2 TO

COMMITTEE 5

Subject : Possibility of bringing into line allowances granted by the I.T.U. with those granted by the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies.
Chapter V, paragraph 2.1 of the Report by the Administrative Council.

Working Group 2 examined this question at its meetings on 29 November and 1 December.

With the object of facilitating a comparison between the allowances granted, on the one hand to staff of the I.T.U., and on the other to staff of the U.N., a working document (Annex 1) has been drawn up.

The Working Group, leaving aside the allowances which exist in the I.T.U. as well as in the U.N., has first compared expatriation allowance (I.T.U.) with installation grant and repatriation grant existing in the U.N.

Several Members were in favour of replacing the expatriation allowance (I.T.U.) by the two allowances (installation and repatriation) of the U.N. because to do so would bring into line the allowances of the I.T.U. with those of the United Nations, and would also be advantageous to staff on appointment.

Other Members were against bringing these allowances into line because to do so would favour the resignation of staff expatriated after a very short time (12 years), which is not desirable, and in case of termination, the present system of the I.T.U. is more favourable, at least for the permanent staff.



After examining carefully the two suggestions put forward, the Group arrived at the conclusion that it would be better to maintain the status quo in the matter. However, as far as the Children's education expenses allowance granted to the U.N. was concerned, the Working Group was of the opinion that it would be good social policy to grant to expatriated personnel of the I.T.U. the same rights as those granted to the U.N.

Consequently, the following sums should be written into the budgets for the years 1953 to 1957 :

	<u>1953</u>	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u>
Expatriation allowance	120,000	100,000	80,000	50,000	45,000
Children's education expenses	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000	52,000
	<u>172,000</u>	<u>152,000</u>	<u>132,000</u>	<u>102,000</u>	<u>97,000</u>

If the foregoing receives the approval of Committee 5, a draft resolution on these lines will be drawn up and submitted in the very near future.

Chairman of W.G. 2

R. Vandenhove

Annex : 1

A N N E X

VARIOUS ALLOWANCES GRANTED BY THE I.T.U.

AND UNITED NATIONS

(According to Document No.265)

I.T.U.

United Nations

Family Allowances

(Staff Regulations, Article 19)

800 Swiss francs per dependent child
up to 22 years of age in certain
cases.

856 Swiss francs per dependent
child up to age of 21 in certain
cases.

Expatriation allowances; children's education allowances; installation
allowances; home leave.

(x) Expatriation allowance:
(Staff Regulations, Article 18)

(x) Children's education expenses:

1. For five years:

Class:

A 5,000 Swiss francs

B 2,600 " "

C.D 2,000 " "
(formerly 2,200)

1 1,500 Swiss francs

All other

classes 1,000 " "

856 Swiss francs per year per
child being educated in the
country of origin;

or per:

child under 13 in an inter-
national school in Geneva;

plus:

payment of travel expenses
for one annual journey from
school and back (to Geneva)
by the child.

2. Maintenance, for the benefit
of the Assistant Secretaries
General, of the allowance they
enjoyed before Atlantic City,
after the five year period.

On appointment to permanent status:

Removal allowance:
(Staff Regulations, Article 25)

Removal allowance:

for permanent (and in some cases for
temporary) staff.

(x) The allowances marked (x) exist only in the I.T.U. or only in
the United Nations.

(Ann.to Doc.372-E)

On appointment to permanent status (Cont'd)

Travel allowances for permanent
(and in some cases for temporary)
staff, and travel allowances for
dependents:

(Staff Regulations, Articles 20
and 21)

Travel allowances for officials and
their families:

(x) Installation grant:

30 days' travelling allowance per
member of family with a maximum of 4
persons.

On resignation:

Removal allowance
for

Permanent officials - after five
years' service;

Temporary officials - nothing.

Removal allowance:

after 1 year's service.

(x) Repatriation grant

after 2 years' service. Varies with
length of service and family situation.
May reach 21,400 Swiss francs.

In case of termination:

(except in cases of summary dismissal)

Removal allowance:

(Staff Regulations, Article 25)
for:

Permanent officials

and to

Temporary officials

(when expenses were paid at the
outset or after three years'
uninterrupted service).

Removal allowance:

(x) Repatriation grant:

(see above)

Separation allowance:

(Staff Regulations, Article 35)

for permanent officials

(equal to 3 months' salary per
year of service, with maximum
of 3 years).

In case of termination:
(except in cases of summary dismissal)
(Cont'd)

plus:
grant of a pension
for temporary officials:
not more than 25% of the salary
still to be received if the
contract had not been terminated.

Home leave:
(Staff Regulations, Article 41)

Once every two years

(Annual leave plus ten working
days, with a maximum of 30 days'
travelling time.)

Once every two years

(No additional leave.)

COST OF I.T.U. ALLOWANCES

(Budget estimate for 1953)

Family allowance	124,200	Swiss francs
Expatriation allowance	152,700	" "
Removal allowance	88,000	" "
Home leave	66,300	" "
Total :	431,200	Swiss francs

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 17th Meeting

19 November, 1952

Chairman : Mr. Igor A. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman submitted for consideration the summary records of the 10th and 11th meetings of the Committee (Documents Nos. 225 and 226).

Document No. 225 was adopted without comment.

Document No. 226 - the first sentence in the second paragraph on page 1 was amended to read : "The Chairman read out the Working Group's terms of reference". Thus amended, Document No. 226 was adopted.

The Chairman said he had received two communications announcing the withdrawal of proposals. Switzerland was withdrawing Proposals Nos. 442, 451, and 483, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Proposals Nos. 419, 440, 441, 446, 453, 461, 467, and 468.

The example set by those two countries was highly gratifying. Other countries, he hoped, would follow it.

To revert to Chapter 4 of the General Regulations. It would be remembered that, at the end of the previous meeting, the Committee had decided that a two-thirds majority was required for decisions relative to the date ~~and~~ place of a conference. Should the same majority be required for convening extraordinary administrative conferences?



On this point, the Committee was divided. The Delegates of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of Czechoslovakia favoured a two-thirds majority; the Delegates of Egypt, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, Mexico, and Australia thought that the assent of a simple majority of Members was enough.

The Delegate of Mexico said it was useless to lay down, in the General Regulations, a majority other than that specified in the Convention, Articles 10 and 11. It was for Committee 3 to consider these Articles. Hence the problem should be referred to that Committee.

The Chairman called for a vote on whether or not the Committee was competent to take a decision.

It was decided, by 40 votes to 7, with 1 abstention, that the Committee was not competent.

Hence the Committee would not discuss the matter.

The Delegate of Switzerland observed that the decision taken in connection with Chapter 4, paragraph 2, called for an appropriate change in paragraph 3, which should begin with the words : "If a two-thirds majority in favour is not attained, the Council...".

The Chairman noted that inclusion of the above aroused no objection. What authority would be responsible for the procedure set forth in Chapter 4 ? Would it be the Administrative Council or the Secretary General ?

The Delegate of France drew attention to Proposal No. 731 (Italy) - Document No. 239 - which should be studied in connection with the question just raised by the Chairman.

The Delegate of Mexico asked whether the Committee considered itself competent to discuss the matter. Was it not something for Committee 3 ?

The Chairman called for a vote on the question raised by the Mexican Delegation.

It was decided, by 32 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions, that the Committee would settle the matter itself. Nevertheless, it was unanimously decided that Proposal No. 731 should be referred to the Working Group for a thorough study.

The Chairman drew attention to the period of ten days mentioned in several proposals, for the despatch of replies in urgent cases. That period seemed to him excessively short, and he begged the delegations concerned to withdraw that part of their proposals in favour of the six-week period. The Delegates of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Portugal, and Italy, agreed to do so.

The Chairman called for a vote on the proposal to retain the six-week period.

The proposal was adopted by 48 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

The Chairman said that the Working Group, in drafting the final text, would have to see to it that the consultations provided for in Chapter 4 would be effected among Members of the Union only, whereas Associate Members would only be informed thereof.

Further, Chapter 4 had to contain, without exception, all provisions relative to convocation of a conference and changes in its place and date.

The Delegate of France observed that, in accordance with Committee 3's decisions, the idea of a "service conference" should perhaps be introduced into the General Regulations.

Chapter 4 was thereupon referred to the Working Group for final drafting.

Chapter 2, paragraphs 1 and 2, Italian Proposals Nos. 372 and 376.

The question was whether "Administrative Council" could be replaced by "Secretary General".

After some discussion, it was decided to refer the two proposals to the Working Group, which would consider them with the Italian Proposal No. 731.

Chapter 2, paragraph 2, Argentine Proposal No. 374.

The Chairman thought that the Argentine Delegation had not intentionally omitted to make reference, in the last sentence, to the assent of the Administrative Council, or - in certain cases - that of the Secretary General.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic said that the matter would be reviewed in the Working Group.

Chapter 2, paragraph 5, Proposals Nos. 380 to 382.

The Delegate of Belgium said that all the Belgian proposals where the term "recognized private operating agencies" had been deleted had been based on a broad definition of the word "observer" (Belgian Proposal No. 327). That definition not having been accepted, all proposals deriving therefrom became pointless and were withdrawn.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic drew the Committee's attention to the wording of Proposal No. 380. Operating agencies had to be duly authorized by the Member on which they were dependent. That point had to be thoroughly considered by the Working Group.

The Delegate of Lebanon suggested that the term "international organization" should be defined.

The Chairman put the question into relation with Article 27 of the Convention, and asked the Working Group to deal with it.

With the consent of the Italian Delegation, he suggested that consideration of Proposal No. 385 should be postponed until Chapter 3 of the General Regulations had been considered.

This suggestion was adopted.

The Chairman felt that Proposal No. 386 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) was closely bound up with the definition of the term "expert", and could not be considered until that definition had been drafted.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed.

The questions of principle in Chapter 2 having thus been clarified, the entire Chapter was referred to the Working Group.

ANNEX 2

DEFINITIONS

The Chairman then submitted for consideration Document No. 205, the Annex to which contained the definitions proposed by the Working Group.

The Delegate of France succinctly outlined the activities of the Working Group. Questions of principle had arisen in connection with the terms "expert" and "observer" - questions which the Committee would have to solve. The Working Group had done nothing about the technical definitions. On the other hand, it had introduced the ideas of "public correspondence" and "service call". Generally speaking, the Group had been chiefly concerned with drafting improvements.

Definitions appearing in Document No. 205.

Administration.

After some discussion, the Committee decided by 29 votes to 16, with 3 abstentions, to retain the old definition.

Private operating agency.

The Committee decided by 36 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions, to retain the old text.

Recognized private operating agency.

It was decided, by 33 votes to 0 with 11 abstentions, to keep the Atlantic City definition.

Delegate.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, seconded by the Delegate of France, suggested that, in line 4, the text should read : "..... or an Administration of a Member or Associate Member of the Union at an Administrative Conference....."

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics suggested: "The envoy of the government of a Member country or Associate Member country".

This definition was referred to the Working Group for final drafting.

Representative

The text proposed by the Working Group in Document No. 205 was adopted.

The rest of the Document would be considered at a later meeting.

Reporters :

A. Wolf
C.R. Brandon
S.J.M. Penas

Chairman :

Igor A. Tsingovatov

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE
Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 3

RESERVATIONS TO THE CONVENTION AND REGULATIONS

At the 26th meeting of Committee 3 on 1 December 1952, the Secretary General was asked to publish a list of reservations to the Convention and Regulations made subsequent to the signature of the Convention and Radio Regulations at Atlantic City.

The reservations made at the time of signature of the Convention and Radio Regulations are contained in the Final Protocol to the Convention.

There is also a reservation to the Additional Protocol to the Acts of the Radio Conference.

Reservations made subsequently, upon ratification of the Convention or accession to it, are published at pages 24 and 25 of the Annual Report of the Secretary General for 1951.

Reservations made at the time of signature of the Telegraph Regulations 1949 are contained in the Final Protocol to those Regulations. No reservations were made at the time of signature of the Telephone Regulations.

Reservations and various statements made at the time of approval of the Telegraph and Telephone Regulations have been published in the fortnightly Notification. The reservations and statements so published are listed in chronological order in the Annex to the present paper together with reservations and statements affecting the Convention published since the issue of the Report of the Secretary General for 1951.

Annex: 1



A N N E X

RESERVATIONS, STATEMENTS, ETC. ADDITIONAL TO THOSE CONTAINED IN THE
FINAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION AND TO THE TELEGRAPH REGULATIONS AND TO
THOSE REPRODUCED IN THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL FOR 1951.

<u>Notification Number</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Country</u>
596	16.III.1950	Belgian Congo
"	"	United States of America
602	16.VI.1950	Canada ¹⁾
605	1.VIII.1950	Argentina
609	1. X. 1950	United States of America
611	1.XI.1950	Denmark
647	1. V.1950	Federal German Republic

- 1) Declaration of acceptance of the Telegraph Regulations without reservation (see Section 1 of the Final Protocol to the Convention).

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 375-E
3 December 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SIXTH REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3

(Convention Committee)

TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Subject: Text proposed for Article 9 of the Convention

At its 26th and 27th meetings, Committee 3 considered the text of the Convention, Article 9, the drafting of which it had entrusted to Sub-Committee 3A. Attached is the final text as approved by the Committee.

Chairman, Committee 3

Carlos Ribeiro

Annex : 1

A N N E X

Article 9

THE GENERAL SECRETARIAT

1. (1) The General Secretariat shall be directed by a Secretary General, assisted by two Assistant Secretaries General, who shall all be nationals of different Member countries.

(2) The Secretary General shall be responsible to the Administrative Council for all duties entrusted to the General Secretariat, and for all the administrative and financial services of the Union. The Assistant Secretaries General shall be responsible to the Secretary General.
2. The Secretary General shall:
 - a) appoint the staff of the General Secretariat in accordance with any directives of the Plenipotentiary Conference and the rules established by the Administrative Council;
 - b) organize the work of the General Secretariat and undertake administrative arrangements for the specialized secretariats of the permanent organs, and ensure that in these specialized secretariats the administrative and financial Regulations approved by the Administrative Council are applied.

These specialized secretariats, under the Secretary General's supervision for administrative purposes only, shall work directly under the orders of the Heads of the permanent organs.

The Secretary General shall appoint the staff of each specialized secretariat in agreement with the Head of the permanent organ concerned and on the basis of the latter's choice, but the final decision regarding appointment or dismissal shall rest with the Secretary General.

c) carry on secretarial work preparatory to, and following, Conferences of the Union;

d) provide, where appropriate in cooperation with the inviting Government, the secretariat of every conference of the Union, and when so requested, or provided in the Regulations annexed hereto, the Secretariat of meetings of the permanent organs of the Union or meetings placed under its auspices and may, when so requested, provide the secretariat of other telecommunication meetings on a contractual basis;

e) keep up to date the official lists other than the master registers and such other essential records as may be related to the duties of the I.F.R.B., compiled from data supplied for this purpose by the permanent organs of the Union or by Administrations;

f) publish the recommendations and principal reports of the permanent organs of the Union;

g) publish international and regional telecommunication agreements communicated to them by the parties thereto and keep up to date records of them;

h) publish such data concerning the assignment and utilization of frequencies as are prepared by the I.F.R.B. in the discharge of its duties;

i) prepare, publish and keep up to date with the assistance, where appropriate, of the other permanent organs of the Union:

1. a record of the composition and structure of the Union;
2. the general statistics and the official service documents of the Union as prescribed by the Regulations annexed hereto;
3. such other documents as conferences or the Administrative Council may direct;

(Ann. to Doc. 375-E)

- j) distribute the published documents;
- k) collect and publish, in suitable form, data both national and international regarding telecommunication throughout the world;
- l) collect and publish such information as would be of assistance to Members and Associate Members regarding the development of technical methods with a view to achieving the most efficient operation of telecommunication services and especially the best possible use of radio frequencies so as to diminish interference;
- m) publish periodically, with the help of information put at his disposal or which he may collect, including that which he may obtain from other international organizations, a journal of general information and documentation concerning telecommunication;
- n) prepare an annual budget for submission to the Administrative Council which, after approval by the Council, shall be transmitted for information to all Members and Associate Members;
- o) prepare a financial management 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 be submitted to the next plenipotentiary conference for examination and final approval;
- p) prepare an annual report on the activities of the Union which, after approval by the Administrative Council, shall be transmitted to all Members and Associate Members;
- q) perform all other secretarial functions of the Union.

3. The Secretary General or one of the two Assistant Secretaries General shall participate, in a consultative capacity, in Plenary Assemblies of International Consultative Committees and may so participate in all conferences of the Union; the Secretary General or his designated representative may participate in a consultative capacity in all other meetings of the Union.
4. The paramount consideration in the recruitment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing for the Union the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard must be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.
5. (1) In the performance of their duties the Secretary General, the Assistant Secretaries General and the staff must not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Union. They must refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials.

(2) Each Member and Associate Member undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General, the Assistant Secretaries General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 376-E
4 December 1952

COMMITTEE 3

(Convention Committee)

Summary Record of the 25th Meeting

Saturday 29 November 1952 at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. C. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted for approval the Summary Records of the 20th and 21st meetings (Documents Nos. 289 and 299). They were approved with the following corrections requested by the Vice-Director of the C.C.I.R.:

- Document No. 289, page 9 (English text only), in the 4th and 6th sub-paragraphs, replace: "regularly every three years" by "normally every three years".
- Document No. 299, page 3, replace Dr. van der Pol's statement by the following: "Dr. B. van der Pol (Director, C.C.I.R.) made a statement to the same effect as Mr. Valensi. He drew the attention of the Committee to the opinion expressed by the Interim Director of the C.C.I.T. which appeared in the last paragraph on page 9 of Document No. 204. 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 Committee then resumed the study of Article 15 of the Convention: Languages.

Article 15, sub-paragraph 4 (2)

The proposals concerning that sub-paragraph were as follows:



- Proposals Nos. 261 (France) and 585 (New Zealand) were withdrawn by the respective delegations;
- Proposal No. 253 (Italy), which was not submitted for discussion because it was not seconded;
- Proposals Nos. 249 (U.S.S.R.) and 259 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) which were the only ones that remained for discussion.

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

"I would like to introduce now Soviet proposal No. 249 with a slight editorial amendment. We propose to replace sub-paragraph 4 (2) by the following: 'Languages other than the five official languages of the Union may be used in meetings provided that the delegations which desire to do so supply the necessary oral translation into any of the official languages and vice-versa'.

"In this way, if a delegation wishes to use a language other than one of the official languages it will be able to do so, but it will be obliged to take the necessary steps to ensure the required interpretation. We recommend that the Committee adopt this resolution because the number of languages used will undoubtedly increase in the future and this contingency should be foreseen. This proposal is in the interests of the Members of the Union and the Committee would do well to adopt it.

"We consider that the decisions taken by Committee 3 concerning our proposals Nos. 240, 243 and 247 are not correct and we shall return to this question in Plenary Meeting."

The U.S.S.R. proposal No. 249 was put to the vote and rejected by 29 votes to 8, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman submitted for discussion Proposal No. 259 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

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

"We consider that Proposal No. 259 implies a manifestly

discriminatory treatment against two official languages, Russian and Chinese, and therefore cannot be approved.

"We can see no reason why two of the five official languages should be placed in a situation of inferiority.

"The clearly discriminatory nature of the United Kingdom proposal is made manifest in this other example: this proposal even forbids, without any reason, the use of the simultaneous interpretation installation for statements made in other languages. It seems that it could not go any further.

"The proposal is a characteristic attempt at discrimination and we reject it most categorically."

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland announced that in the circumstances he would withdraw the last phrase of sub-paragraph b) of his proposal.

The United Kingdom proposal No. 259 as amended, was put to the vote and approved by 24 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. requested that it should be recorded in the minutes of the proceedings that he considered Proposal No. 259 completely unacceptable, that he voted against that proposal and that he would return to that question in Plenary Assembly.

Article 15, paragraph 5

The proposals referring to that paragraph were as follows:

- On the one hand, those of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (No. 256), the U.S.S.R. (No. 257), the People's Republic of Bulgaria (No. 640) and Czechoslovakia (No. 641);
- On the other hand, those of Argentina (No. 251), United States of America (No. 252), Japan (No. 254) and Portugal (No. 255), which envisaged the deletion of that paragraph.

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

"With reference to paragraph 5 of Article 15 we submitted Proposal No. 257; later, we improved somewhat its text and it is now issued as No. 732.

"In that Proposal No. 732 we proposed that the expenses of publication of documents in the five official languages should be included in the general expenses of conferences and meetings of permanent organs of the Union.

"The expenses arising from oral translation of the official languages of the Union, must be included in the general expenses of conferences and meetings.

"The expenses ~~must~~ be distributed among all the Members and Associate Members (with the exception of those who expressed a desire to use languages other than the official ones) in accordance with the class of contribution chosen by them under Article 14 of the Convention.

"We consider that we must ensure equal conditions for those Members of the Union who use the official languages in the conferences and those who use other languages. This principle is a just one and we recommend that the Committee approve Proposal No. 732."

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

"Proposal No. 732 is worthy of the closest attention, because it would solve several questions in connection with the use of languages and in particular the method of payment of the expenses involved in translation into other languages. In view of the constructive character of this proposal, my Delegation supports it and will vote for it."

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

"My Delegation opposes Proposals Nos. 251, 252, 254, and 255 which propose the deletion of paragraph 5. It supports Proposal No. 732 of the U.S.S.R., which introduces a new text for that paragraph.

"The expenses of publication of documents written in the five official languages, as well as the expenses arising from the oral translation of the same languages, must be included in the general expenses of conferences and meetings of the Union and distributed among the Members of the Union, with the exception of those who signified their intention of using other languages, in accordance with the class of contribution which they chose.

"Proposal No.732 establishes a fair distribution of expenses and that is why we support it."

The Delegate of the Roumanian P.R. supported the foregoing statements.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland withdrew his Proposal No.256 and said that he would support the deletion of paragraph 5.

The Delegate of France said that he also supported the proposal to delete paragraph 5, because the latter had proved inapplicable.

The Delegate of Portugal pointed out that if paragraph 5 was suppressed, the expenses concerning the use of authorized languages would be simply distributed among the Members and Associate Members as was the current practice.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. pointed out that his Proposal No.732 consisted of three separate sub-paragraphs and that in accordance with the Rules of Procedure those three paragraphs should be put to the vote separately.

The Chairman accepted that procedure and put to the vote the three sub-paragraphs of Proposal No.732, one after the other.

The three paragraphs of Proposal No.732 were rejected, the first one by 29 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions; the second by 33 votes to 8, with 1 abstention, and the third by 32 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. asked that the following statement should be included in the minutes of the proceedings:

"My Delegation considers that Committee 3 incorrectly resolved the questions relating to Article 15 of the Convention, which

concern the use of the official languages of the Union, as well as those concerning the distribution of expenses arising from their use. It reserves the right to return to these questions in the Plenary Meeting."

The Chairman asked the Committee to consider the deletion of paragraph 5.

The deletion of paragraph 5 was approved by 33 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions.

Coming back to the text adopted above for sub-paragraph 4 (2), the Chairman pointed out that it introduced the term "working languages" and he wondered whether the Committee considered that a sub-paragraph should be added to define that term. He thought that the Committee could approve Proposal No.235 of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which read: "The working languages of the Union shall be English, French and Spanish".

That suggestion was approved by the Delegates of India and the United States of America, on the other hand it was opposed by the Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R., who stated:

"The proposal under consideration discriminates against two of the official languages of the Union, Russian and Chinese, because it puts in the privileged position of 'working languages' English, Spanish and French. We consider that in the work of the conferences and permanent organs of the Union the official languages must be used on an equal footing."

Proposal No.235 was approved by 34 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

Since consideration of Article 15 of the Convention had come to an end, the Chairman requested the Assistant Secretary General, Mr. Townshond, to draft the new text with the help of the reporters, Messrs. Hatton and Revoy.

-oOo-

The Committee then considered Article 12 of the Convention, Rules of Procedure for Conferences.

The proposals concerning that Article were as follows :

- Proposal 193 (United States) which stated that General Regulations annexed to the Convention should be used as the Rules of Procedure of all conferences and meetings of the Union;
- Proposals 191 (Belgium) and 580 (New Zealand) which tended to maintain the status quo;
- Proposals 190 (Argentina), 192 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 194, paragraph 2.(2) (France), 195 (Italy), 196 (Japan) and 197 (Portugal) which differed slightly from the status quo in the sense that conferences could establish their Rules of Procedure based on the General Regulations by making some additions, but no deletions.

The Delegate of the United States of America introduced his proposal and pointed out that its purpose was to avoid that conferences should lose time drawing up their Rules of Procedure. The Delegate of Denmark supported that proposal.

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

"The Delegation of the United States of America has proposed that the Rules of Procedure be left unchanged.

"In spite of the vast amount of work done in Committee 4, in connection with the Rules of Procedure, the Rules of Procedure adopted by that Committee are exceedingly far from being perfect, and a number of their provisions are wrong.

"Hence it is essential that the door be left open for a change in those Rules, with a view to improving them and adapting them to changing circumstances. That is why we object to adoption of the United States proposal.

"That proposal, we consider, is wrong and does not ensure sufficient flexibility. Future conferences must be given an opportunity to make changes in the Rules of Procedure. Hence we propose that Article 12 of the Convention be left as it stands."

The Chairman put to the vote the U.S.S.R. proposal which would maintain Article 12 of the Convention as it now appeared. That proposal was rejected by 26 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman then submitted for discussion the United States proposal 193.

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

"I wish to say once more that the adoption of the United States proposal is obviously inadvisable, since it will bind all future Union conferences to the Rules of Procedure adopted for this conference. That is both inadmissible and wrong. Future conferences must have the opportunity of making changes in the Rules of Procedure.

"It is exceedingly probable that practical experience will show the need for new Rules of Procedure, more in line with changing circumstances. The proposal made by the United States of America does not offer future conferences that opportunity, and hence is unacceptable.

"In Article 12 it is unambiguously laid down that the Rules of Procedure adopted shall serve as a basis for the work of subsequent conferences. Is that right? Of course it is.

"If the Committee does not want to keep the old text of Article 12, that text might be to some extent redrafted, but its basic provision should be maintained, i.e., that conferences should adopt the Rules of Procedure (Chapter 6 of the General Regulations) as a basis, making such changes in them as they may deem desirable.

"Hence we most vehemently oppose the United States proposal."

The Delegates of the Bielorussian S.S.R., and of Czechoslovakia shared the opinion of the U.S.S.R. Delegate.

The proposal of the United States (193) was put to the vote and rejected by 22 votes to 15, with 8 abstentions.

The Chairman then submitted for discussion the Italian Proposal 195 which was seconded by the Delegates of Switzerland and France.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he could accept the first sentence of that proposal, but that the second one should be replaced by : "However, each conference may modify the Rules of Procedure in any way it may deem necessary." That amendment was supported by the Delegate of Czechoslovakia.

The Delegate of India submitted another amendment. He considered the text should read : "... may adopt whatever modification it may consider strictly indispensable for the efficient performance of its task." (See Proposal 191). That amendment was seconded by the Delegate of Cuba.

The Delegate of Italy stated that he could not accept any of those amendments, because they would tend to maintain that status quo which the Committee had just rejected.

The amendment submitted by the Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was rejected by 30 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.

The amendment submitted by the Delegate of India was rejected by 26 votes to 15, with 6 abstentions.

Finally, the Italian proposal 195 was adopted without amendment by 30 votes to 10, with 7 abstentions.

Therefore, the text of that proposal would constitute the new text of Article 12 of the Convention.

°
° °

Article 8, paragraph 5

The Chairman returned to paragraph 5 of Article 8 (Rules of Procedure for C.C.I.s), which had been left in abeyance until after the examination of Article 12. He was afraid that the text of the paragraph in question was not in complete agreement with Paragraph 2 of Chapter 7 of the General Regulations and he asked the Committee whether it wished to retain the paragraph or delete it.

All proposals relating to this paragraph had been withdrawn.

After a short discussion in which the Delegates of U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. supported the retention of the existing text, while the Delegate of France opted for its deletion, the Committee decided by 27 votes to 11 with 6 abstentions to leave paragraph 5 of Article 8 as it stands.

The Chairman of Working Group 1 was asked to take note of this decision. Committee 4 would have to ascertain whether or not there was any contradiction between that paragraph and Chapter 7, paragraph 2 of the General Regulations.

-oOo-

The Committee passed to the examination of Article 13:
Regulations.

Article 13, paragraph 1.

"1. The General Regulations contained in Annex 4 shall have the same force and duration as this Convention, subject to the provisions of Article 12 of the Convention."

The Chairman put to the vote the question of maintaining the existing text. The maintenance of the existing text was rejected by 19 votes to 15 with 8 abstentions.

The Chairman then opened discussion on Proposal No. 198 (U.S.A.), designed to delete that paragraph; all the other proposals relating to the paragraph under discussion amounted, in effect, to questions of drafting.

The Delegate of the U.S.A. explained that the deletion of that paragraph would give future Plenipotentiary Conferences latitude to amend the General Regulations without affecting the Convention.

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

"The General Regulations, intimately bound up as they are with the Convention, are an integral part thereof. Hence they cannot be separated from the Convention. Those Regulations were ratified by Members of the Union when they ratified the Convention. The General Regulations can only be amended if the Convention is amended at the same time.

"The General Regulations and the Convention are so inseparably connected that the former cannot be revised apart from the latter. Hence Proposals Nos. 161 and 198 (United States of America) should be rejected.

"It is no accident that Article 13, paragraph 1 lays down that the General Regulations are just as valid as the Convention, and for the same period."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. opposed, for the same reasons, the adoption of Proposals Nos. 161 and 198 of the U.S.A.

The Delegates of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, India, France and Czechoslovakia were of the opinion that it would be imprudent to delete all reference to the General Regulations in the Convention and, like the Delegate of the U.S.S.R., they preferred to retain the existing text.

The Committee decided to vote by roll call on the retention of the present paragraph 1.

The retention was approved by 41 votes to 7 with 2 abstentions.

The following 41 Delegations voted in favour of maintaining the status quo:

Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bielorussian S.S.R., Brazil, P.R. of Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, Spain, France, Hungarian P.R., India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Laos, Monaco, Norway, New Zealand, Pakistan, Netherlands, P.R. of Poland, Portugal, French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia., Ukrainian S.S.R., Roumanian P.R., United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Czechoslovakia, Overseas France, Portuguese Overseas Territories, Thailand, Turkey, South Africa, U.S.S.R., Spanish Zone of Morocco.

The following 7 Delegations voted against maintaining the status quo:

Colombia, Cuba, U.S.A., Japan, Mexico, Territories of the U.S.A., Uruguay.

The following 2 Delegations abstained:

Federal German Republic, F.P.R. of Yugoslavia.

The text of paragraph 1 was therefore retained without change. Proposal No. 161 had therefore no further grounds for existence and Article 10 could be drafted - in toto - by Working Group 2.

Article 13, paragraph 2.

Proposal No. 202 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) being withdrawn, paragraph 2 of Article 13 was adopted without change.

The meeting rose at 7.45 p.m.

Reporters:

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

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

C O M M I T T E E 3
(Convention)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Monday, the 1st of December, 1952
at 10 o'clock

Chairman: Mr. C. Ribeiro (Portugal)

The Chairman submitted for approval the summary record of the 22nd meeting (Document No. 315).

The following amendment should be made in the statement attributed to the Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R., on page 8: line 3, for "may remain", read: "may lead to it remaining."

Thus amended, Document No. 315 was adopted.

Article 13 of the Convention - Regulations:

Article 13, paragraph 3:

The existing paragraph 3 runs as follows:

"These Regulations shall be binding on all Members and Associate Members. However, Members and Associate Members shall notify the Secretary General of their approval of any revision of any of the Administrative Regulations by an administrative conference in the interval between two plenipotentiary conferences. The Secretary General shall inform Members and Associate Members promptly regarding receipt of such notifications of approval."

The following proposals had been submitted for amendment of this paragraph:

Proposals 203 (Belgium), and 695 (Chile), proposing that Members of the Union should be bound by the Regulations, but should be able to make reservations.

Proposal 206 (Switzerland), advocating, to some extent, a return to the Madrid Convention.

Proposals 204 (Italy), 205 (Portugal), 207 (France), 581 (New Zealand), and 628 (Czechoslovakia).

The French, Czechoslovak, and New Zealand proposals were withdrawn. The Delegates of Belgium and Switzerland submitted their proposals.

The Delegate of Belgium explained that the aim of Proposal 203 was to avoid the discrepancy between the first two sentences of paragraph 3, and to enable Members of the Union to make reservations in connection with a set of Regulations, even after signature of the Convention. The Delegate of Switzerland said he was trying to ensure that reservations would be less than at Atlantic City. No Member was obliged to ratify more than one set of Regulations.

The Delegate of the United States of America favoured the Belgian proposal, provided the reservations were submitted in reasonable time. He could support the Swiss proposal, provided it spoke of approval of the Regulations, and not of their ratification.

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa most vehemently opposed the idea that the Regulations should be binding on all Members of the Union, and explained in detail what the position of the extra-European countries was in relation to the Telephone Regulations. The Swiss proposal alone was acceptable, since it did not lay down that countries had to approve all the Regulations.

The Delegate of India wanted paragraph 3 deleted - either that, or the Swiss proposal, as amended by the United States of America, should be approved.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"Swiss Proposal 206 is, we consider, generally acceptable, and, if the word 'ratification' were replaced by: 'approval', we could support it.

"As it stands, paragraph 3 is illogical and contradictory, and requires amendment.

"We propose the following for the first sentence of paragraph 3: 'These regulations shall be binding on those Members which have approved them.' The Delegate of the Union of South Africa has convincingly demonstrated, in connection with the Telephone Regulations, that equal application of those Regulations in all parts of the world and in all countries can hardly be demanded.

"Further, the Final Protocol to the Atlantic City Convention contains a good many reservations relative to Article 13 thereof. The text we are proposing eliminates these difficulties."

"The Delegate of India could accept the text proposed by the previous speaker, and suggested that it be amended thus: "These Regulations shall be binding on those Members which have approved them, in so far as they are not amended by reservations."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that, having listened to what previous speakers, especially the Delegate of India, had said, he would not insist on his amendment, and would support the Swiss proposal, provided the word: "ratification" were replaced by: "approval".

The Delegate of Switzerland accepted that amendment.

The Delegate of Italy, France, the Argentine Republic, Portugal, and Egypt were against the Swiss proposal. In future, all Members should have to approve the Regulations. If a Member accepted the international responsibility attached to a seat in the Administrative Council or in the I.F.R.B., then it should likewise accept all the obligations deriving from its Membership of the Union, in particular, the obligation to abide by the I.T.U. Administrative Regulations. It might conceivably be that paragraph 3 represented an advance on facts. Nevertheless, the possibility of submitting reservations within a reasonable period gave each Member adequate freedom.

The Chairman then put Swiss Proposal 206, as amended by the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to the vote, it being understood that under that proposal approval of the Additional Radio Regulations would not be enough.

The proposal was rejected by 37 votes to 13, with 6 abstentions.

The Delegates of France and Portugal announced their support for the Italian Proposal (No.204), which was thereupon put to the vote.

It was adopted by 35 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R.:

"I ask that it be recorded in the summary record that we have voted against Italian Proposal 204, for we find it unacceptable. Should it be adopted by the Plenary Assembly, a good many reservations will obviously be submitted.

"The decision taken is, we feel, incorrect, and we shall revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of the Bielorussian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation has voted against adoption of Italian Proposal 204, for it contains a formula we cannot accept, viz.: 'Members and Associate Members.... shall inform the Secretary General of their approval of any revision of these Regulations by administrative conferences.' Countries have a sovereign right to approve or not to approve a set of Regulations. We cannot force Members of the Union to approve revisions of the Regulations.

"Hence we have voted against the proposal, and we reserve the right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation has voted against Italian Proposal 204, because it lays down that the Regulations shall be binding on all Members of the Union.

"The Regulations, we consider, can be binding only on those countries which have approved them.

"We reserve the right to revert to the matter in Plenary Assembly."

The Delegate of the Union of South Africa and the Territory of South-West Africa said he would be obliged to make a reservation with regard to Article 13, paragraph 3, of the Convention. His Administration could not agree to be bound by the Telephone Regulations.

The Delegate of Cuba said that the paragraph just adopted would result in reservations by his Administration in connection with the Telegraph and Telephone Regulations.

The Delegate of Italy asked the Secretary General to publish the reservations made to the Convention and Regulations after signature of the Atlantic City Acts.

Article 13, paragraph 4:

This paragraph was left, without comment, as it stood.

The Chairman said that, consideration of Articles 12 and 13 being over, he would include, in his report to the Plenary Assembly, the text adopted for those two articles.

SECOND REPORT BY SUB-COMMITTEE 3A (DOCUMENT No.303): TEXT PROPOSED
FOR ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION

Article 9 (Document No.303), paragraph 1 (1)

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia proposed, and it was unanimously decided, that the word: "different" should be added - "all three nationals of different Member countries".

Article 9 (Document No.303), paragraph 1 (2)

The Delegate of the United States of America proposed the addition of the words: "... and for all the administrative and financial services of the Union. The Assistant Secretaries General shall be responsible to the Secretary General."

The Delegate of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia seconded.

The Delegate of France and Portugal supported the first part of the proposal, while the Delegate of Egypt supported the second.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was against it. Article 5 laid down that the Administrative Council had to "supervise the administrative functions of the Union". That was enough. Further, the second sentence was pointless. The proposal represented an attempt to go back on the decision already taken by the Committee, when Proposal 120 had been rejected. It was obvious that the Assistant Secretaries General were subordinate to the Secretary General.

The proposal made by the United States of America was adopted by 47 votes to 8, with 3 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 (2), thus amended, was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

Article 9 (Document No.303), paragraph 1 (3):

The Delegates of Italy and of the F.P.R. of Yugoslavia proposed, and it was so decided by 26 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions, that this passage would more appropriately appear in Article 5. Working Group 2 was asked to include it in Article 5, and to amend it in such a way as to make mention of the specialized secretariats of the permanent organs.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that Article 5, paragraph 11 d) was enough. He was against transfer of the paragraph to Article 5.

The Delegate of Brazil formally proposed that the Committee set up a sub-committee to discuss Articles 18 to 49 of the Convention. Should too many delegations wish to be members of it, it should be divided into three groups, which would transmit their findings to the Committee direct.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. was against setting up such a sub-committee.

The question was put to the vote. There were 7 in favour of the sub-committee, 15 against, and 28 abstentions, so that the vote was invalid.

The meeting rose at 1320 hours.

Reporters:

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

Chairman:

C. Ribeiro

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

REPORT OF WORKING GROUP 6 OF COMMITTEE 5

ARTICLE 14

Working Group 6 was appointed at the 8th Meeting of Committee 5 on 18 November 1952, to draft the text of Article 14. The text annexed has accordingly been prepared and is submitted to Committee 5 for consideration and approval.

Attention is drawn to the following points:

- a) paragraph 3 (2) has been prepared provisionally and subject to review if necessary when the final text of Chapter 17 of the General Regulations has been prepared by Committee 4;
- b) paragraph 4 is a provisional draft only and will need to be reviewed in the light of decisions still to be made by Committee 5;
- c) the first line of paragraph 5 will need consequential review.

A. H. Read

Chairman
Working Group 6 of Committee 5

Annex: 1

A N N E X

ARTICLE 14

Finances of the Union

1. The expenses of the Union shall be classified as ordinary expenses and extraordinary expenses.
2. The ordinary expenses of the Union shall be kept within the limits prescribed by the Plenipotentiary Conference. They shall include, in particular, the expenses pertaining to the meetings of the Administrative Council, the salaries of the staff and other expenses of the General Secretariat, of the International Frequency Registration Board, of the International Consultative Committees, and of the laboratories and technical installations created by the Union. These ordinary expenses shall be borne by all Members and Associate Members.
3.
 - 1) The extraordinary expenses shall include all expenses pertaining to plenipotentiary conferences, administrative conferences and meetings of the International Consultative Committees. They shall be borne by the Members and Associate Members who have agreed to participate in these conferences and meetings.
 - 2) Private operating agencies and international organizations shall contribute to the extraordinary expenses of the administrative conferences and the meetings of the International Consultative Committees in which they participate, in proportion to the number of units corresponding to the class chosen by them among the classes provided in Paragraph 4 of this Article. The Administrative Council may, nevertheless, excuse certain international organizations from contributing to these expenses.
 - 3) Expenses incurred by laboratories and technical installations of the Union, in measurements, testing, or special research for individual Members or Associate Members, groups of Members or Associate Members, or regional organizations or others, shall be borne by those Members or Associate Members, groups, organizations or others.

4. For the purpose of apportioning expenses:

- a) Members shall be divided into eight 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:	unit

- b) Each Associate Member shall contribute a share equal to 50% of the contribution of a Member in the lowest class mentioned in sub-paragraph a) of this paragraph.

5. Each Member (and Associate Member) shall inform the Secretary General of the class in which it wishes to be included. This decision shall be communicated to the other Members and Associate Members by the Secretary General and shall not be changed during the interval between the coming into force of this Convention and the opening of the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

6. The sale price of documents sold to administrations, recognized private operating agencies or individuals shall be fixed by the Secretary General, in collaboration with the Administrative Council, bearing in mind the fact that the cost of publication must be covered by the sale of the documents.

7. Members and Associate Members shall pay in advance their annual contributory shares calculated on the basis of the estimated expenditure of the Union for the following financial year.

8. The amounts due shall bear interest from the beginning of each financial year of the Union with regard to ordinary expenses and from thirty days after the date on which accounts for extraordinary expenses are sent to Members and associate Members. This interest shall be at the rate of 3% (three per cent) per annum during the first six months and at the rate of 6% (six per cent) per annum from the beginning of the seventh month.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Buenos Aires, 1952

REPORT BY COMMITTEE 6 TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Subject: Use of Russian 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 of Committee 6. Its findings, which appear below, were accepted by Committee 6 on 29 November 1952.

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 the cost of using French.

If 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 arising when a second language is added.

The Administrative Council has considered this problem and has adopted the only possible solution, deciding that, as 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 of Committee 6 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.o., ($\frac{650,000}{3} = 216,666$ Swiss francs).

3

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
English, French 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	<u>216,666</u>	323.85 Swiss fr.
except group using	669	
Russian		

(c) Spanish

All Members pay	<u>216,666</u>	=	323.85	"	"
except group using	669				
Russian					

According to the above figures therefore, those Members using Russian who have made reservations in respect of French 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 Sw. 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 ($934.65 - 860.85 = 73.80$).

Committee 6, 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 is outside its terms of reference.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 380-E

4 December 1952

COMMITTEE 4

The attached statement made by Dr. Yu Tsune-chi
during the 13th Meeting of Committee 4 on 4 November 1952
should be Annexed to Document No. 282-E.

Annex : 1

A N N E X

STATEMENT MADE BY DR. YU TSUNE-CHI DURING THE
13TH MEETING OF COMMITTEE 4 ON 5 NOVEMBER 1952.

Concerning the question of invitations to the Members and Associate Members, as contained in the Provision of Chapter 1, paragraph 2 of the General Regulations, my Delegation wishes to express briefly its position. As it is clearly stipulated in the Convention, all Members and Associate Members of the Union are entitled to participate in all Conferences of the Union. The host Government is duty bound to send invitations to member countries. Difficulty, however, has arisen in the case when there is no diplomatic relation between the host Government and the invited Government. Under such circumstances, the host Government sometimes takes a peculiar position which, so far, cannot be solved by any directives from the Convention. In consequence, it is necessary to remedy this situation. The Administrative Council during its 5th Session, with a view to eliminating such difficulty, has adopted a Resolution which expresses the opinion that, in undertaking to convene a conference or meeting on behalf of the Union, the inviting Government should send invitations to all the Governments representing the various Members and Associate Members of the Union within the Union itself, and to these Governments alone, and that in so doing the inviting Government may send the invitations direct, or through the Secretary General of the Union, or through the good offices of another Government. Such a procedure is quite logical and simple to follow by the inviting Government without misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

My Delegation is very glad to note that adequate provision concerning this problem is incorporated in the text of the Argentine Proposal No. 354, which my Delegation gives its full support.

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

C O R R I G E N D U M

to

Document No. 283

Page 4, last paragraph: for the statement attributed to the Chairman of the I.F.R.B., read as follows:

"The Chairman of the I.F.R.B. presumed that, under the decision taken, it was left to the discretion of the permanent organs to decide when they had to be represented".

THIRD REPORT OF COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations
and the Specialized Agencies)

The Committee has completed the work assigned to it by the examination of the three questions mentioned below :

1. Measures for the possible abrogation of Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. As a corollary of the decision not to include the Heads of the Specialized Agencies in the definition of Government telegrams and Government telephone calls and as indicated in the last paragraph of section 1 of the first report of the Committee (Document No. 269), the Committee was presented with a draft resolution (Document No. 177) on measures for the possible abrogation of Article IV, section 11 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. After a discussion which is outlined in the summary records of the 4th meeting of the Committee (Document No. 245) the Committee was presented at its 6th meeting with the modified draft resolution contained in Document No. 177 (revised). The operative part of the revised draft envisaged firstly an approach by the Secretary-General of the Union to the Secretary-General of the United Nations with a view to adoption of measures for an amendment of Article IV, section 11 of the Privileges Convention and secondly a recommendation and invitation to Members of the Union which are Members of the United Nations. The Committee finally decided to delete the second part of the resolution and to recommend the adoption of the first part subject to a verbal change. The resolution, as recommended for adoption by the Plenary Assembly, is annexed to the present report. In accordance with current arrangements, the text has been transmitted direct to the Editorial Committee.

2. Freedom of Information. Document No.258. The Committee appreciated that the reply to be sent by the Secretary General of the Union to the letter from the United Nations of 14 August 1952 (Annex 1 to Document No.258) would be influenced by the decisions of the Conference on certain proposals relative to Article 29 of the Convention which came in the terms of reference of Committee 3. It was accordingly decided to refer Document No.258 to the consideration of the Plenary Assembly after consideration by Committee 3 of the proposals on Article 29 and that, if necessary, those proposals should be considered in the Plenary Assembly in connection with the discussion of Document No.258.

3. The case for considering epidemiological telegrams of the World Health Organization as Government telegrams. The Committee considered Document No.190 and an oral statement made by Dr. Biraud of the World Health Organization. In view of the decision not to include the Heads of the Specialized Agencies in the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls and of the adoption of the resolution on Telegrams and Telephone Calls of the Specialized Agencies, the Committee recommends that the Secretary General of the Union should inform the World Health Organization that the matter could be considered by the next session of the Administrative Council when a representative of that organization could be invited to attend and supply all the information required by the Council.

Annex: 1

F.C. de Wolf

Chairman

ANNEX

DRAFT RESOLUTION No...

ON ARTICLE IV, SECTION 11 OF THE CONVENTION ON THE
PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International
Telecommunication Union, Buenos Aires

considering

1. that the International Telegraph and Telephone Conference, Paris, 1949, recommended to the Administrative Council that the Secretary-General be instructed to communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the proposal that, in view of the apparent conflict between the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls contained in Annex 2 of the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947, and Article IV Section 11 of the International Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, the United Nations should consider the revision of Article IV Section 11 of the latter Convention;
2. that as a result of this recommendation, the proposal was put on the Agenda of the Fourth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and that the Sixth Committee of that Assembly merely took note of the situation;

recognizing

that it is desirable that the United Nations be asked to reconsider this problem;

instructs

the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to place before the eighth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations the opinion of this Plenipotentiary Conference that Article IV Section 11 of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities

- 4 -
(Ann. to Doc. 382-B)

of the Specialized Agencies should be revised in view of the decision taken by this Conference not to include the Heads of the Specialized Agencies in the definition of Government Telegrams and Government Telephone Calls contained in Annex 2 of the International Telecommunication Convention.

Union internationale
des télécommunications

Document N° 383-~~FES~~
4 décembre 1952

CONFERENCE DE PLENIPOTENTIAIRES

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMISSION 8

5^{ème} SERIE

DE TEXTES TRANSMIS A LA COMMISSION DE REDACTION

(Voir Annexe au Document 382-F)

5th SERIES

OF TEXTS TRANSMITTED TO THE DRAFTING COMMITTEE

(See Annex to Document 382-E)

5a SERIE

DE TEXTOS COMUNICADOS A LA COMISION DE REDACCION

(Véase Anexo al Documento N° 382-S)

COMMITTEE 7

(Relations with the United Nations
and the Specialized Agencies)

Summary Record of the 7th Meeting

Wednesday, 3 December 1952, at 10.15 a.m.

Chairman : Mr. Francis C. de Wolf (United States of America)

The Chairman opened the meeting by submitting the summary records of the 5th and 6th meetings (Documents Nos. 274 and 314) to the Committee for approval.

The Delegate of India asked for the following amendment to be made to the second sentence of his statement in the summary record of the 5th meeting (page 9 of Document No. 274) :

"He recalled that at the sixth session of the General Assembly it was decided that there should be no extension of point-to-point communications by the U.N.O. and that U.N.O. should not establish such communications in competition with the existing national communications services, and at its seventh session, the Administrative Council of the Union had considered...." etc.

The summary record, thus amended, was adopted.

The following comments were made on the summary record of the 6th meeting (Document No. 314) :

The Delegate of India asked that the statement attributed to him on page 3 be changed to read as follows :

"The Delegate of India said that his Delegation was against the principle of the United Nations telecommunication network being used by the Specialized Agencies, but it would now vote in favour of that resolution, permitting its use during cases of emergency."

The Delegate of Switzerland asked that the words "Swiss Administration", appearing in his statement on page 2, should be replaced by : "Société Radio-Suisse".

The summary record of the 6th meeting, thus amended, was adopted.

The Chairman thereupon passed to the second item of the agenda - discussion on the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Document No. 177 revised).

At the end of the previous meeting, there had been a vote on the draft resolution as a whole, with a Belgian amendment. That vote had been invalid, abstentions having been more numerous than half the votes cast (Rule 15, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Procedure for the Buenos Aires Conference). Hence a fresh vote had to be taken, in which abstentions would no longer count.

The Delegation of the Argentine Republic asked that consideration of the draft resolution be begun again from the beginning, because of the muddled situation resulting from previous debates.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the following points:

- 1) On the first part of the resolution, down to and including the paragraph "instructs";
- 2) On the last two paragraphs: "recommends" and "invites";
- 3) On the resolution as a whole, with any amendments which might have been made therein.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic agreed to this procedure.

Before the vote, the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics wished to offer the following explanation of the vote about to take place.

Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure laid down that in such a vote, abstentions should not count. That did not mean that they would not be counted. It meant that in assessing the results of the vote, only votes for and against would be taken into consideration.

The Chairman, thanking the preceding speaker for this explanation, called for a vote by roll-call on the first part of the resolution:

For: 21 (Argentine Republic; Austria; Belgium; Canada; Ceylon; Belgian Congo; Denmark; Egypt; France; India; Israel; Italy; New Zealand; Netherlands; Peru; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Sweden; Switzerland; Syrian Republic; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such; Union of South Africa).

Against: 9 (Bolivia; Brazil; China; Costa Rica; Cuba; United States of America; Mexico; People's Republic of Poland; Territories of the United States of America).

Abstentions: 16 (Afghanistan; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Hungarian People's Republic; Iceland; Japan; Norway; Federal German Republic; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; Czechoslovakia; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Thus the first part of the resolution was adopted.

The Chairman called for a vote on the two last paragraphs: "recommends" and "invites".

Mr. Esteban A. Garbarini-Islas (I.L.O. Observer), before the vote:

"Before a vote is taken on this resolution, I would call your attention to something important. In Document No. 3 (Proposal No. 658), page 17, paragraph 31, we find the following: 'The Secretary-General of the I.T.U. was also directed to suggest to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the question be put on the agenda of the General

Assembly with a view to calling a special conference for the purpose of abrogating the offending section 11.

"The suggestion of the Administrative Council was put to the Sixth Committee at the Fourth Session of the General Assembly (September/December, 1949) and was not adopted'.

"The I.L.O must oppose this resolution. It has ever maintained that the specialized agencies should enjoy the privileges and facilities accorded to them under the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies. Lastly, it should be remembered that the Convention in question has been ratified by 16 States, and that the proposed change might occasion difficulties of all kinds in connection with those acts of ratification."

The floor was then given to the Delegate of Italy, who suggested that the paragraph "recommends" be amended as follows before being put to the vote:

For "Member Governments", read: "I.T.U. Member Governments which are also Members of the United Nations".

The Chairman announced that the Committee would vote on the second part of the draft resolution, as amended by the Delegate of Italy. The vote would be by roll-call, and abstentions would not count.

For: 8 (Argentine Republic; Austria; Franco; Italy; Mexico; New Zealand; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Oversea Territories of the French Republic and Territories administered as such).

Against: 16 (Belgium; Bolivia; Brazil; Canada; China; Republic of Colombia; Belgian Congo; Costa Rica; Cuba; United States of America; India; Israel; Netherlands; Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia; Territories of the United States of America; Union of South Africa).

Abstentions: 22 (People's Republic of Albania; Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; People's Republic of Bulgaria; Denmark; Egypt; Hungarian People's Republic; Ireland; Iceland; Norway; Republic of the Philippines; People's Republic of Poland; Federal German Republic; Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; Roumanian People's Republic; Switzerland; Syrian Republic; Czechoslovakia; Portuguese Oversea Territories; Thailand; Turkey; Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

Hence the second part of the resolution - "recommends" and "invites"- was rejected.

The Chairman passed to the third item on the agenda - Document No. 258 . This contained a communication from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on freedom of information.

The question was linked with Article 29 of the Convention, which Committee 3 had to consider. Hence consideration of Document No. 258 should be referred to the Plenary Assembly, and it would be for that Assembly to make the comments which the Secretary-General of the Union would then transmit to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

This procedure was approved.

The Chairman said that to avoid another meeting of Committee 7, he intended to draft a report for the Plenary Assembly - a plain statement of the results of the vote taken on Document No. 177 revised (Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies) and of the decision to refer Document No. 258 (Freedom of Information) to the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of the United States of Mexico, before the Committee rose for the last time, thanked and congratulated Mr. Francis Colt de Wolf for the deftness with which he had directed the Committee's deliberations. (Loud applause).

The Chairman, thanking the Delegate of Mexico, said that his task as Chairman had always been a source of pleasure.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic, warmly congratulating Mr. Francis de Wolf, wholeheartedly associated himself with what the Delegate of Mexico had said.

The Chairman thanked the Delegate of the Argentine Republic.

The meeting rose at five minutes to eleven.

Reporters:

R. Lemoine
J. Garrido Moreno

Chairman:

Francis Colt de Wolf

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 18th meeting

20 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I.A. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman submitted for consideration the summary record of the 9th meeting (Document No. 224). The last paragraph on page 2 of the English version should be brought into line with the French.

The Delegate of Egypt asked that his speech appearing on page 2 should be amended as follows:

"....because if the Assembly was to decide whether an amendment was compatible or not with the initial proposal, it would be obliged to discuss it, and it would thereby automatically..."

Document No. 224, with the above slight amendments, was adopted.

The Chairman then proceeded with Document No. 205 (definitions).

Expert

The Delegate of France was prepared to second Italian Proposal No. 329, but subject to two amendments:

- 1) any person sent by.....
- 2) before "administration" delete "telecommunication".

The Delegate of Belgium supported the proposal thus amended, and suggested that the term "national organization" be replaced by "national enterprise".

The definition of "expert" as appearing in the Italian Proposal No. 329 and as amended by France and Belgium, was put to the vote and adopted by 37 votes to 0 with 2 abstentions.

Observer

There were four paragraphs to this; they were separately discussed.

a) The Delegate of France suggested, in order that the definition might remain in harmony with the General Regulations, adding: "in application of Article 26 of the Convention."

Paragraph a) thus amended was approved.

b) The Delegate of France wanted the text brought into line with Chapter 1, paragraph 7 of the General Regulations.

The Committee agreed to say: "The government of a non-contracting country invited to take part in a conference".

c) The Chairman, for the sake of precision, proposed: "One of the international organizations invited, in accordance with the General Regulations, to take part in the work of the conference."

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic said that the matter had been debated at very considerable length in the Working Group, and proposed to maintain the distinction between the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the other international organizations. The definition should run: "One of the United Nations specialized agencies or one of the other international organizations which might be invited under the General Regulations."

The Delegates of France and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, although agreeing with the substance of the Argentine proposal, observed that the Working Group's report had not yet appeared, and that the Committee could therefore not take it into account when reaching a decision.

The Committee approved without comment the definition proposed by the Chairman, but it was agreed that the definition might have to be amended in the light of later decisions.

d) The Delegate of the Argentine Republic, seconded by the Delegates of Switzerland, Egypt, France, and Belgium, proposed that the possibility of a Member being represented at a conference by observers should not be considered at all. After a brief discussion, the proposal for deletion was put to the vote and adopted by 35 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

Delegation

The words "experts" and "or experts" occurring within brackets were deleted after which the Working Group's definition was adopted.

The following definitions proposed by the working group were adopted without change:

International Service
Mobile Service
Broadcasting Service
Telecommunication
Telegraphy
Telephony
Telegram
Government Telegrams and Government
Telephone calls.

The definition of this latter was adopted subject to any later decisions by the Plenary Assembly relative to the findings of Committee 7.

Service Telegrams
Private Telegrams
Service Telephone Calls

The Delegate of France, as Chairman of the Working Group, observed that the presence in Annex 2 of technical definitions had been criticized in the Group. All such definitions could be replaced by a reference to the appropriate Administrative Regulations.

The Committee, having duly noted that remark, approved the three texts in question.

Public Correspondence

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic and the Delegate of Belgium jointly proposed that the word "must" be deleted.

This proposal was adopted by 33 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Radio Communication
Hertzian Waves
Radio
Harmful Interference,

were approved without comment.

Document No. 205, as a whole, thus amended, was unanimously adopted.

The Chairman asked the Chairman of the Working Group to draft, with the assistance of two Members of the Group, and of the reporters, the texts with a view to publication in their final form.

Reverting to the General Regulations, he called for comments on Chapter 3 thereof: "Voting at Conferences".

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considered that Chapter 3 might be reduced to a mere statement relative to the form which credentials ought to take, and that the provisions in the existing Chapter 3 could perfectly well be embodied in the Rules of Procedure.

After a short discussion, the Committee agreed to the title: "Examination of credentials", proposed by France in Document No. 349.

The Chairman said that Chapter 3 of the Atlantic City General Regulations spoke only of the credentials required for Plenipotentiary Conferences. It seemed only logical also to define the credentials required for Administrative Conferences. Further, it remained doubtful whether a distinction had to be made between the credentials authorizing Delegations to take part in conferences, and credentials authorizing it to sign the Final Acts.

There was a general discussion on this matter.

The Delegate of the United States of America drew attention to the American Proposal No. 733, just published. It was not yet in the hands of all Delegations.

The Delegates of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and of New Zealand withdrew, in favour of Proposal No. 733, those parts of their proposals (Nos. 395 and 592) requiring full credentials for participation and voting in Plenipotentiary Conferences.

No decision having been taken by the end of the Meeting, it was agreed that discussion should continue at the next meeting.

Reporters:

A. Wolf
G. R. Brandon
A. E. Zatorre

Chairman:

I. A. Tsingovatov

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

C O M M I T T E E 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 19th Meeting

Saturday, 22 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. A. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman opened the meeting by reporting that the Steering Committee wished further to speed up the work of the Conference. As a consequence, he would try to complete the work of Committee 4 by 2 December.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that as a result of the decisions taken by Committee 3, he would withdraw Proposal No. 568.

Document No. 227 (12th meeting)

The Delegate of Brazil asked for the words: "for its so complete and democratic work" to be added at the end of the penultimate paragraph on page 5.

The Delegate of the People's Republic of Bulgaria asked that the last sentence of the first paragraph of his statement on page 8 should read: "It more particularly objected to Rule 13, paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8".

Document No. 227, thus amended, was approved.

The Chairman then reopened the discussion on credentials (questions of principle to be settled in connection with Chapter 3 of the General Regulations).

It was unanimously agreed that for signature of the final acts of plenipotentiary conferences, full powers signed by the Head of the State, the Head of the Government, or the Minister of Foreign Affairs were necessary.

With regard to participation in such conferences and the right to vote, there was a lengthy general discussion. Some delegations, particularly those of the Argentine Republic, Australia, and Pakistan, thought that the credentials required for that purpose had to be signed by those same authorities, but that temporary or provisional credentials might be made out by the Head of the Diplomatic Mission of the country concerned, accredited to the government of the country where the conference was taking place.

The Delegates of Italy, Mexico, Israel, Cuba and Iraq, while generally agreeing with the proposal, thought that it should contain some indication of the period during which temporary or provisional credentials were valid.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic said his Delegation supported the proposal under which credentials entitling a delegation to attend and vote in plenipotentiary conferences might be signed by the Head of the State, the Head of the Government, or the Minister of Foreign Affairs, or could be given, provisionally, by the Head of the diplomatic mission accredited to the government of the country in which the conference was taking place.

He was against the amendments proposed by the United States of America and Italy to that proposal.

The Delegate of the United States of America, seconded by the Delegate of Egypt, proposed, as an amendment to the proposal under discussion, that credentials be signed by the Head of the State, the Head of the Government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, or by an official authorized by him to sign in his stead. That would eliminate the need for the clause under which temporary credentials could be signed by the Head of a diplomatic mission.

The Delegate of Switzerland proposed, and the Delegate of the United States of America agreed, that the United States amendment should read:....."any person authorized to sign on behalf of the Head of the State, the Head of the Government, or the Minister of Foreign Affairs".

The amendment submitted by the United States of America, thus amended, was put to the vote and rejected by 22 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.

The original proposal was then adopted by 32 votes to 0, with 16 abstentions.

After a short discussion, the committee agreed, without objection, that the credentials required for signing the final acts of administrative conferences should be signed by the Head of the State, the Head of the Government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, or the Minister responsible for the matters discussed at the conference.

The Committee then turned to the question of the time to be allowed to the Credentials Committee to complete its work, and, on a proposal by the Delegate of the Argentine Republic, unanimously agreed that Chapter 3 should merely provide for the Credentials Committee to submit its conclusions within the time limit specified by the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of Brazil, supported by the Delegate of the Argentine Republic, proposed that, until the Credentials Committee had reported, delegations should be permitted to vote on a provisional basis, and that the sense of Rule 14, paragraphs 2 and 4, of the Rules of Procedure for the current conference (Document No. 186) should be included in Chapter 3.

The Delegate of Italy expressed doubts as to the exact meaning of the word: "provisional". Would it, for example, mean the re-opening of all questions decided before the verification of credentials had been completed?

The Committee decided to accept the proposal made by the Delegate of Brazil.

The Committee then decided, without discussion, to retain the sense of the existing paragraph 3.

The Chairman then opened discussion on the question whether Chapter 3 should contain provisions permitting one country to accredit all or part of the delegation of another country to represent it.

A general discussion followed, during which it was generally agreed that, if such provisions were included, each of the two countries would be liable for its normal share of the expenses of the conference.

The Delegates of Egypt, the Federal People's Republic, and Mexico favoured some provision permitting one delegation to represent two countries.

The Delegate of India considered that a provision in somewhat broader terms than that proposed by Italy in Proposal No. 398 should be added. He proposed:

"A Member may accredit the delegation of another Member or give it power to sign on its behalf. In no case may one delegation have such authority from more than one Member."

The Delegates of Australia, Ireland, and Brazil supported a provision on those lines.

The Delegate of Italy preferred the text of Proposal No. 398.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"We are against inclusion in Chapter 3 of the General Regulations of an article permitting a Member Country to authorize the delegation of another Member, or to provide that delegation with credentials to sign on its behalf. Such a provision gives no more than the right to vote, but does not give each Member Country of the Union the possibility of expressing its views at Union conferences and meetings.

"In order to extend international cooperation, and to ensure the smooth running of Union conferences and meetings, each Member of the Union should send its own delegation."

The Delegate of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considered that the principle of dual representation was dangerous, and opposed the inclusion of any provision in that sense.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"In order to extend international cooperation, and to ensure the smooth running of conferences and meetings, it behoves every Member of the Union to send a delegation. Hence we are against Italian Proposal No. 398 and the similar proposal by India."

The Delegate of Pakistan was against a provision which would suggest that the above was a normal arrangement. He therefore proposed the following amendment to the Indian proposal:

"All Member countries are expected to send their own delegations to conferences. However, if for any exceptional reason a Member country cannot send its own delegation, it may accredit...."

The Delegate of Saudi Arabia considered that with a slight change the Italian proposal would be satisfactory. He proposed that the final words of the second paragraph of Proposal No. 398 should be amended to read: ".... more than one such set of credentials."

The Chairman, closing the meeting, said that the debate would be continued at the next meeting, when he hoped the Committee would reach an early decision.

Reporters:

C.R. Brandon
A. Wolf
Adolfo Zatorre

Chairman:

I.A. Tsingovarov

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 20th Meeting

Monday, 24 November 1952 at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. I.A. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman, opening the meeting, said it would be devoted to Chapter 3 of the General Regulations, keeping to general principles only; particular attention would be given to the question of authority delegated by one country to another at Union conferences.

Proposal No. 398 (Italy) was submitted for consideration, and the Delegate of Saudi Arabia submitted an amendment to the effect that one and the same person should not be able to exercise more than one proxy vote.

The Delegate of India submitted the following amendment: "A country Member of the Union may grant another country Member of the Union the right to sign on its behalf, and this latter country shall be entitled to act in virtue of the authority delegated to it."

The Delegate of Pakistan proposed: "All countries Members of the Union are considered as being under an obligation to send a delegation to conferences. If they do not wish to do so, they can transfer the right to represent them to another country, etc....." The rest would be as in the Indian amendment.

The Delegate of Italy thought that three questions of principle were involved:

- 1) Was it possible for a country to give a mandate to another delegation at a conference or meeting?
- 2) Could a delegation receive more than one mandate at a time?



3) Could one individual have more than one vote at a time?

The Delegate of Japan supported the Indian amendment and did not insist on the text of his Proposal No. 399. He requested that the seconded amendment should be put to the vote.

The Delegate of Brazil supported the Italian amendment and considered that all Member countries should be enabled to ratify the Convention and General Regulations.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics thought that all Member countries of the Union should participate in conferences and meetings. The interests of a country might differ from those of another country which represented it and in that case the delegate concerned would vote differently on the same subject. Thus, delegation of authority was not recommendable

He proposed that paragraph 3 of Chapter 3 of the General Regulations should read: "Each Member shall send its own delegation to a conference."

Since he considered that the proposal was the furthest removed, he requested that it should be put to the vote.

The Delegate of Egypt suggested a new text for the Pakistan amendment to read as follows:

"Each Member shall do everything possible to send its own delegation. However, if circumstances do not permit it to send its own delegation....." The rest would follow the Pakistan text.

The Delegate of Pakistan, in accord with the Egyptian compromise and the Indian amendment, submitted the following new text:

"All countries Members of the Union should, as a general rule, endeavour to send their own delegation. But, if circumstances do not permit a country to do so, that country can empower another Member of the Union to sign in its name, and this latter may act through the delegation of authority."

The Chairman then put to the vote the question of whether or not a provision should be introduced into the General Regulations laying down that a country could authorize another delegation, or another delegate only, the right to represent its interests.

The vote was by roll-call. Result : Against introduction : 10;
for : 28; abstentions : 17.

The Delegate of France said he had abstained, for he favoured direct representation. But a country could not be denied the right to arrange for another country to represent it. Hence he would likewise abstain on the second issue.

The Chairman thereupon put the Pakistan amendment to a roll-call vote. Result: 27, against 8, abstentions 21.

Hence the matter was referred to the Working Group for production of the final text.

The Delegate of Italy raised a point of order. The matter was not exhausted, since of the three questions he had raised, no more than the first had been dealt with. The two others still remained for consideration. He proposed that the following paragraph should be included in connection with a country's right to be represented by another:

"In no circumstances shall a delegation exercise more than one proxy vote, nor shall any one person hold more than one proxy vote at any one time".

The Chairman said that a decision had already been taken in regard to the questions raised. Hence there was no call to revert hereto. Besides, the General Regulations talked about delegations, and not persons. What a delegation could not do, a person could not do either. The Delegate of Egypt agreed.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic:

"We do not deny that a country has a sovereign right to arrange for its representation in any way it pleases, but as a matter of principle, and because it is in the higher interests of the Union, we believe that the right so to do should be limited, and that all I.T.U. Members should send their own delegations to conferences."

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said his Delegation had voted against the text submitted by the Delegate of Pakistan. To consolidate and extend international collaboration, each Member of the Union ought to send its own delegation to conferences.

The Chairman recalled that the Committee was now dealing with questions of principle. It was for the Working Group to do the drafting.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic wanted to know what exactly the restrictions on a country's right of ~~representation~~ would be.

The Chairman said that the exact text was not yet available. The Working Group would have to draft the text later, bearing in mind the views expressed.

Incidentally, Chapter 4 could not be considered until the Group had submitted its text.

The Committee then passed to Chapter 5 of the General Regulations. It was decided not to keep a separate Chapter 5, but to embody its provisions in Chapters 1 and 2. The matter was referred to the appropriate Working Group.

The Committee then passed to Annex 3 (arbitration), and considered Proposal No. 345 (Switzerland), which was seconded by Italy, France, and Uruguay.

The Delegate of Switzerland said the proposal filled a gap in the existing paragraph 5.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said the Swiss proposal was unacceptable:

"My Delegation finds Swiss Proposal No. 345 unacceptable. That proposal lays down that the Secretary General of the Union shall appoint an arbiter for the party which has failed to nominate one within three months of receipt of the notification stating that the dispute has been submitted for arbitration.

"Adoption of this proposal would signify that the arbitration procedure would be made obligatory for those parties which are Members of the Union.

"Now to settle disputes between parties which are Members of the Union, different procedures are available, and the choice between them is for the parties alone, by common agreement, to make. The parties in question must decide for themselves whether they will reach an understanding between themselves whether they will have recourse to arbitration, or whether they will adopt some other means to settle the dispute. It would be incorrect, and inadmissible, to try to oblige Members of the Union to have recourse to arbitration if they do not wish to do so.

"Should difficulties arise, the parties Members of the Union should try to settle the dispute, first and foremost, by direct negotiation. The arbitration procedure should come into effect only if all other means of settling the dispute have failed. Nevertheless, I.T.U. Member Countries must in every case decide for themselves whether or not they will resort to arbitration. Arbitration to settle disputes can be accepted only if the parties concerned have agreed thereto. Otherwise no decision obtained by arbitration can be binding.

"Hence my Delegation considers Swiss Proposal No. 345 unacceptable, and submits the following amendment :

"Delete the second sentence of Proposal No. 345, i.e., keep paragraph 5 of Annex 3 as it is."

The Delegate of Egypt thought that arbitration should not be imposed, and that there should be no obligation to resort to it. Now the Swiss proposal made it obligatory. The Secretary General might suggest an arbiter, but could not appoint one.

The Delegate of Brazil said that adoption of Proposal No. 345 would entail a change in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Annex 3.

The Delegate of Switzerland said that arbitration was a consequence of the Atlantic City Convention, Article 25, which laid down a definite procedure.

The Chairman said he could not agree with the Delegate of Switzerland, and read out Article 25 of the Atlantic City Convention. That article nowhere specified that arbitration was compulsory. Hence arbitration could not apply unless the parties to the dispute agreed to it.

The Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic recalled the advisory judgement rendered, for the United Nations, by the International Court of Justice at The Hague on 18 July 1950. The Secretary General of the I.T.U. could not appoint a member of an arbitration committee. He could merely give his opinion. Hence he (the Delegate of the Roumanian People's Republic) supported the statement made by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

There was a lengthy discussion (participants : the Delegates of Italy, France, the Argentine Republic, and the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) as to whether recourse to arbitration was obligatory or optional.

The Delegate of the Bielorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:

"My Delegation considers that the arbiter can be chosen only by common agreement between the parties concerned, and that in no circumstances can he be imposed. A fortiori, the arbiter cannot be compulsorily appointed by the Secretary General, as laid down in Swiss Proposal No. 345. Here are the reasons why: the Secretary General is no more than a Union official engaged to perform certain specific tasks; he is not a sort of authority set over and above countries. He cannot mediate between them.

"Hence Swiss Proposal No. 345 is unacceptable, and the existing texts should be maintained in their entirety.

"We fully support the proposal by the Soviet Union."

The Delegate of Australia, as a point of order, asked that discussion on the matter be discontinued. The Delegate of the Hungarian People's Republic spoke; the Australian motion was put to the vote and adopted by 37 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia supported Proposal No. 345.

The Delegate of Mexico thought that Article 25 of the Convention did not make arbitration compulsory.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, agreeing, said:

"My Delegation is against Annex 3 to the Convention being completed by a provision making arbitration obligatory.

"Arbitration can only be resorted to if the parties concerned agree. Otherwise, the decisions reached as a result thereof cannot be binding. Hence we support the U.S.S.R. amendment to the Swiss proposal, i.e., that the second part of Proposal No. 345 be deleted."

The Chairman announced that he would put to the vote Proposal No. 345 with the U.S.S.R. amendment to delete the second sentence.

First of all, a vote would be taken on the amendment. If it was approved, the status quo would be maintained.

There was a lengthy discussion (participants: the Delegates of Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Brazil, Italy, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, and Pakistan, and the Chairman) to decide whether or not the amendment was compatible with the original proposal.

The Chairman called for a vote on the question of whether the U.S.S.R. amendment should be voted on first. By 19 votes to 8, with 23 abstentions, it was decided that it should not.

The Chairman declared that the decision taken ran counter to the Rules of Procedure.

Swiss Proposal No. 345 was then put to the vote and was rejected by 28 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.

The Chairman said that Proposal No. 345 was rejected. Hence Annex 3 to the Convention (arbitration) would stay as it was, without change.

There was an interval, after which the meeting began again.

The Chairman embarked on the discussion of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations, i.e., of the Rules of Procedure for conferences.

The Committee decided that the Rules of Procedure adopted by the Buenos Aires Conference (Document No. 186 revised and re-issued as Document No. 253) should serve as a basis for discussion.

The Chairman proposed that Chapter 6 should be taken paragraph by paragraph.

Rules 1 and 2 were adopted.

The Chairman asked for a decision on the following question: when there was no inviting government, should the conference be inaugurated by the Secretary General?

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic thought that that duty could more appropriately be performed by the Chairman of the Administrative Council, when that body was in session. The Chairman of the Council should have precedence, but in his absence the Secretary General might open the first meeting. This view was shared by the Delegates of Brazil and Egypt.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that the Argentine proposal would oblige the Chairman of the Council to reside in Geneva.

The Delegate of Switzerland, referring to Proposal No. 412, said that the senior delegate should inaugurate conferences when there was no inviting government, for the Secretary General was an I.T.U. official.

The Delegate of Pakistan agreed.

The Delegate of Brazil was not against Proposal No. 412, but preference should be given to the Chairman of the Council, when present.

The Chairman said there were three possibilities, namely:
1) the senior delegate; 2) the Secretary General, or 3) the Chairman of the Council.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic said his proposal would not mean that the Chairman of the Council would have to inaugurate all conferences and meetings, but only those at which he was present. He withdrew Proposal No. 410 in favour of Proposal No. 412.

There was some discussion between the Delegates of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, Egypt, Switzerland, Mexico, and Brazil, and the Chairman, and the following question was put to the vote:

"If there is no inviting government and the Chairman of the Council is attending a conference, should he inaugurate it?"

35 in favour, none against, and 9 abstentions.

Hence, priority would be given to the Chairman of the Administrative Council when there was no inviting government. A vote was immediately taken on the following:

"In the absence of the Chairman of the Council, the Secretary General shall inaugurate a conference."

29 for, none against, and 9 abstentions.

The Chairman then called for a vote on whether the senior delegate might inaugurate a conference.

8 for, 17 against, and 15 abstentions.

Hence the matter was referred to the appropriate Working Group for final drafting.

Rule 3. Adopted without objection.

The Delegate of France objected to Rule 4, and asked for deletion of "besides the duties incumbent on him under these Rules of Procedure". The matter was referred to the Working Group.

Rules 5 and 6 were adopted.

The Delegates of Pakistan, Brazil, Italy, and France spoke on Rule 7. The Chairman said it was getting late and ruled that consideration of the rule should be postponed until the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 25 minutes past 1 o'clock.

Reporters:

J. R. Brandon
A. Wolf
A. Zatorre

Chairman:

I. A. Tsingovator

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 388-E

5 December 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

SEVENTH REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Subject: Articles 2, 3 and 4 of the Convention.

At its 28th meeting, Committee 3 considered Articles 2, 3 and 4 of the Convention, and decided to make no change therein.

Chairman, Committee 3

C. Ribeiro

FOURTH REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 2 TO COMMITTEE 5

Subject : Questions relating to pensions and the insurance systems for staff. Pension Fund and Provident Fund. Section 3 of Chapter V of the Report by the Administrative Council.

At its meetings on 1 and 3 December, the Working Group made a careful study of all questions relating to the staff pension scheme.

After the Chairman had explained the pension scheme in force in the I.T.U. (Annex 1), the Working Group ascertained that there was a new deficit in the Provident Fund of the order of 800,000 Sw. frs., which should be compensated by annual payments into the fund with the object of spreading in-payments over a number of years so that they would not be too heavy a burden on the annual ordinary budgets of the Union.

The Working Group having ascertained that :

- 1) generally speaking, the pension scheme in force in the Union, shows a very heavy burden on the budget by the very fact of the capitalization system;
- 2) it would also appear that the necessary mathematical reserves are calculated on actuarial bases which involve an excessively wide margin of safety;
- 3) the system of entrance fees entails heavy outlay for the Union and lays financial burdens on the staff that they are often unable to bear (see Document No. 352);

was of the opinion :

- 1) that the administrative Council should be instructed to re-examine the present pension scheme, guaranteeing their work by reference to all the experts necessary (actuaries and others), with the object of lightening the burdens due to the present system and of bringing a new scheme into force as soon as possible.

2) to rehabilitate the Provident Fund of which the deficit at present stands at 798,414 Sw. frs., by annual payments of 100,000 Sw. frs. until the liability is discharged.(Sub-head 14, Document No.278);

3) that it would not be advisable to authorize the temporary staff to join the Pension Fund, this being contrary to the Regulations of the Fund.(Sub-head 12, Document No. 278);

4) that it would be advisable to approve the inclusion in the annual budgets of the necessary credits to cover the increase in the single contributions by officials over 40 years of age, in conformity with the Regulations for the staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds. (Sub-head 10 b, Document No. 278);

5) that any cost-of-living allowances granted to retired staff must be posted to the ordinary budget and no alignment of pensions could be effected except after thorough study by the Administrative Council, since it is against the principle of capitalization.

--oOo--

The Group then examined the proposal of France (No. 729, Document No. 231) for a revision of the Regulations for the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds so that the Union should not in future pay its share of the entrance fees and that age limits should be imposed on the recruiting of staff.

The Working Group, while acknowledging that the proposal was interesting, was of the opinion that the attention of the Administrative Council should merely be invited to these points when it undertook the revisions of the pensions scheme.

--oOo--

The Chairman of the Working Group having made a proposal (Annex 2) for immediately taking steps to avoid excessive capitalization during the period 1953-1957 and to reduce the budgets for the years under review, until the Administrative Council was able to study a new pension scheme, the majority of the Working Group was of the opinion that this proposal should not be retained for the following reasons:

1) it did not wish to mix the product of the capitals of two funds;

2) observing the sound position of the Pension Fund capital at the present time, it did not desire to place it in deficit as regards contributions;

3) it was not happy concerning the long term financial consequences of the proposal and was afraid that it might have an unfavourable psychological effect on the staff since the proposal meant maintaining payments by the staff and suspending those by the Union.

---oOo---

The draft resolutions, in conformity with the decisions to be taken by Committee 5 on this Report, will be immediately submitted to the Committee.

Chairman of Working Group 2

R Vandenhove

Annexes : 2

ANNEX 1

EXPLANATION BY THE CHAIRMAN OF WORKING GROUP 2
ON THE PENSION SCHEME IN FORCE IN THE I.T.U.

In the I.T.U. there are Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds for staff pensions which comprise three separate funds:

- a) a Pension Fund
- b) a Provident Fund
- c) a Savings Fund

a) Pension Fund

To this fund belong all permanent officials of the I.T.U. appointed after 1 January 1948 under the new Staff Regulations and who have no claims on the Provident Fund.

Contributions by insured persons

- 1) 5% of the insured earnings (Article 12 of the Regulations for the Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds);
- 2) payment of 25% of each increase in insured earnings (Article 12);
- 3) for appointments made after the age of 34 years, payment by the insured person of half of the mathematical reserve required to allow for his age, as a buying-in fee (Article 11).

Contributions by the Union

- 1) 15% of the insured earnings (Article 13).
- 2) payment of 75% of each increase in insured earnings (Article 13);

- 3) for appointments made after the age of 34 years, payment by the Union of half the mathematical reserve required for the age of the person, as a buying-in fee (Article 11).
- Right to pension: at the age of 65 years (Article 19) and 60% of insured earnings after 30 years' service.
- Exception: maximum of 50% for classes A and C;
maximum of 55% for class D.
- Widow's pension: 35% of the insured earnings of the deceased husband (Article 25).

b) Provident Fund

To this fund belong all those officials of the Union who entered its service before 31 December 1947, under the Staff Regulations in force at that date.

There are 36 persons at present belonging to this fund:

7 pensioners
29 still employed.

Contributions by insured persons:

None (Article 42).

Contributions by the Union

None for the pension of the official, but 15% as a contribution to an insurance fund for survivors.

- Guarantee by the Union for the lasting performance of the tasks incumbent upon the Provident Fund.
- Right to pension: the same conditions as for members of the Pension Fund (Article 43).
- Survivors' Pensions: by voluntary insurance (Article 44) at the expense of the insured persons to place them in the same position as members of the Pension Fund.

c) Savings Fund (Article 2)

Members : non permanent officials ;
 permanent officials who entered the service of
 the Union after the age of 60.

General remarks

- The whole system of the Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds is based on the principle of capitalization (Article 48) namely, on the setting up of the necessary mathematical reserves for the pensions.

- Capital of the Pension Fund at 1.1.1952 : 1,350,000 Sw.frs.
" of the Provident Fund at the same date : 2,900,000 Sw.frs.

This capital is invested in trustee securities on which the net interest should be 3%; if it is not, the Union brings it up to 3%.

At present (1953 budget) this system is costing :

out of 3,340,175 Sw. frs. of salaries proper
754,115 Sw. frs., of which 20,900 Sw. frs. are operating expenses,
i.e., the item providence and insurance amounts to more than 22.5% of the amounts of salaries proper.

Let us now examine the questions which interest us. The whole of the Superannuation and Benevolent Funds works on a capitalization system. For such a system to be entirely sound, the contributions, calculated on a purely actuarial basis, must be paid in toto.

This seems to have been done strictly so far for the Pension Fund.

It has not been done for the Provident Fund which has been in permanent deficit as regards these contributions for many years, which is not surprising since the Union pays no regular contribution to that fund.

At the Atlantic City Conference, this deficit was estimated at 670,000 Sw. frs. on the basis of the salary scale in force at that time and it was decided to pay it off in annual instalments of 150,000 Sw. frs.

So as not to exceed the fiscal limit, the Council was obliged to reduce these payments and 551,000 Sw. frs. only were paid in, which is 119,000 Sw. frs. too little ($670,000 - 551,000 = 119,000$ Sw. frs.).

Since then a new deficit has arisen for various reasons (given on page 9 of the report by the Chairman of the Management Board of the Staff Superannuation and Benevolent Funds).

In any case, the present deficit is :

$119,000 + 45,134 + 334,280 + 300,000 = 798,414$ Sw. frs., in round figures 800,000 Sw. frs.

This deficit must be paid off by annual instalments, as at Atlantic City and it is proposed that this should be done by the payment of 100,000 Sw. frs. a year.

A N N E X 2

PROPOSAL OF WORKING GROUP 2 (GT/2)

The adoption of this proposal would have the effect of reducing the ordinary expenses of the Union by approximately 360,000 Swiss Francs for the 1953 financial year and by 381,600 Swiss Francs for the 1957 financial year.

DRAFT RESOLUTION

The Buenos Aires Plenipotentiary Conference,

considering

that the ordinary expenses for staff amount to approximately 80% of Union expenses,

that the expenses for staff included in the 1953 budget amount to 4,538,790 Swiss Francs, including 3,340,175 Swiss Francs for salaries as such and 710,215 Swiss Francs for payments to the Staff Superannuation and Provident Funds, namely 21.3% of the total for salaries,

that the magnitude of the payments to the Staff Superannuation and Provident Funds arises mainly from the strict application of the capitalization principle, adopted for granting pensions and based on the setting up of reserves mathematically necessary to this end,

that the principle of capitalization is not generally adopted in this matter by the Governments of the Member Countries of the Union, and that the countries that have adopted it do not generally strictly apply it,

that the Union, which guarantees the lasting performance of the tasks which are incumbent upon it in the matter of pensions, must also be able to demand a minimum of confidence from its staff,

that it is difficult to determine, without allowing an excessive margin of security, the real actuarial bases for a staff as reduced in numbers as that of the Union,

that at 1 January 1952, the Provident Fund and the Pension Fund already had at their disposal 2,900,000 Swiss Francs and 1,350,000 Swiss Francs respectively,

that the rehabilitation of the Provident Fund on the present bases would entail considerable expense,

that it is essential to maintain the fiscal limit on the ordinary expenses of the Union at the lowest possible level,

resolves

provisionally to hold in abeyance the strict application of the capitalization principle and to adopt the following measures:

Payments to be made by the Union to the Pension Fund are suspended until further notice; nevertheless, members of the staff concerned continue to contribute to the fund as in the past.

As a measure of conservation, no deductions shall be made from the capital of the Provident Fund or the Pension Fund which will be used as a guarantee for the payment of pensions.

Until further notice, pensions will be paid from

- the funds produced by the Provident Fund and Pension Fund,
- the ordinary budget of the Union, if the above funds prove insufficient.

The Regulations governing the Savings Fund, which was created for the benefit of temporary employees, shall not be amended and the amounts standing to the credit of such employees will continue to be transferred to the Pension Fund when they are appointed permanent officials.

Further, the Union will continue to meet all other obligations that are not explicitly mentioned in this resolution

instructs the Administrative Council

to re-examine the present bases of the pensions' system of the Union and to submit its proposals on the subject to the next Plenipotentiary Conference.

(Ann.2 to Dec.389-E)

Provisional suspension of payments by
the Union to the Pension Fund

1. Capital of the Provident Fund and Pension Fund

	<u>1953</u>	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u>
Provident Fund	2.900.000	2.900.000	2.900.000	2.900.000	2.900.000
Pension Fund	1.350.000	1.460.000	1.575.000	1.680.000	1.785.000

N.B. The staff will have to continue to pay all the contributions at present envisaged (5% regular contribution, single contribution for each salary increase, and entrance fees).

	<u>1953</u>	<u>1954</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u>
2. <u>Amounts produced by the capital shown above</u>					
Interest on Provident Fund Capital	98.600	98.600	98.600	98.600	98.600
Interest on Pension Fund Capital	47.000	51.000	55.000	58.800	63.000
Totals	145.600	149.600	153.600	157.400	161.00
Totals of pensions to be paid	126.000	126.000	170.000	180.000	180.000
	+ 19.600	+ 23.600	- 16.400	- 22.600	- 18.400

Difference to be charged, if necessary, to the ordinary budget

	16.400	22.600	18.400
--	--------	--------	--------

3. Amounts taken into consideration in drawing up the budgets 1953-1957 and which should no longer be taken into account

Payments to Pension Fund	260.000	270.000	280.000	290.000	300.000
Rehabilitation of Pension Fund	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000
	360.000	370.000	380.000	390.000	400.000

4. Reduction on Budget Estimates (1953 - 1957) Document No. 278

<u>3 - 2</u>	360.000	370.000	363.600	367.400	381.600
--------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Buenos Aires, 1952

EIGHTH REPORT

BY COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Subject: Text proposed for Article 8 of the Convention - International Consultative Committees.

At its 28th Meeting, the Committee examined the text drawn up by its Working Group 1 for Article 8 of the Convention (Document No. 363). Following this examination, it adopted the text attached hereto (Annex) which it submits for the approval of the Plenary Assembly.

C. Ribeiro

Chairman of Committee 3

Annex: 1

A N N E X

Article 8

INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

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

(2) The duties of the International Telephone Consultative Committee (C.C.I.F.) shall be to study technical, operating and tariff questions relating to telephony and to issue recommendations on them. (unchanged)

(3) The duties of the International Radio Consultative Committee (C.C.I.R.) shall be to study technical radio questions and operating questions, the solution of which depends principally on considerations of a technical radio character and to issue recommendations on them. (unchanged)

2. The questions studied by each International Consultative Committee, on which it shall issue recommendations, are those submitted to it by the plenipotentiary conference, by an administrative conference, by the Administrative Council, by another Consultative Committee or by the International Frequency Registration Board. A Consultative Committee shall likewise issue its recommendations on questions, the study of which has been decided upon by its Plenary Assembly or requested by at least twelve Members or Associate Members in the interval between two meetings of the Plenary Assembly concerned.

3. The International Consultative Committees shall have as Members (existing text):

- a) of right, the administrations of all Members and Associate Members of the Union;
- b) all recognized private operating agencies which, with the approval of the Member which has recognized them, express a desire to have one or more of their representatives participate in the work of these Committees.

4. Each Consultative Committee shall work through the medium of:
- a) the Plenary Assembly, meeting normally every three years;
 - b) Study Groups, which shall be set up by the Plenary Assembly to deal with questions to be studied; (unchanged)
 - c) a Director, who shall be appointed by the Plenary Assembly for an indefinite period, but with the reciprocal right of terminating the appointment; the Director of the Radio Consultative Committee shall be assisted by a Vice-Director specializing in broadcasting, appointed under the same conditions; (unchanged)
 - d) a specialized Secretariat, which assists the Director; (unchanged)
 - e) laboratories or technical installations set up by the Union. (unchanged)
5. (1) Consultative Committees shall observe the Rules of Procedure in the General Regulations annexed to this Convention. (unchanged)
- (2) The Plenary Assembly of a Consultative Committee may adopt such additional Rules of Procedure as may facilitate the work of the Committee if they do not conflict with the General Regulations. (unchanged)
6. The working arrangements of the Consultative Committees are defined in Part II of the General Regulations annexed to this Convention. (unchanged)

International
Telecommunication Union

Document No. 391-E
4 December 1952

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CORRIGENDUM No. 1 TO DOCUMENT No. 369

Page 4 : at the bottom of the page replace the figure

755 Units by 756 Units

Page 5 : replace the figure

39 Units by 38 Units

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

PLENARY ASSEMBLY

NINTH REPORT BY COMMITTEE 3

(Convention)

TO THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Subject: text proposed for Article 15 of the Convention.

At its 28th meeting, Committee 3 considered the draft text of Article 15 of the Convention (Languages), appearing in Document No. 354. The text appearing in the annex was adopted by 40 votes to 8.

Some delegations were against adoption of the attached text, particularly objecting to sub-paragraphs 1 (1 bis), 2 (2), 3 (2), and to paragraphs 3 bis, 4 and 6, on the grounds that they did not place the five official languages of the I.T.U. on an equal footing.

C. Ribeiro

Chairman, Committee 3

Annex: 1

ANNEX

Article 15

Languages

1. (1) The official languages of the Union shall be Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. (No change)

(1 bis) The working languages of the Union shall be English, French and Spanish. (New)

(2) In case of dispute, the French text shall be authentic. (No change)

2. (1) The final documents of the Plenipotentiary and Administrative Conferences, as well as their final acts, protocols and resolutions shall be drawn up in the official languages of the Union in versions equivalent in form and content. (Old paragraph 2 with drafting changes)

(2) All other documents of these conferences shall be issued in the working languages of the Union. (Old paragraph 3 (1) transferred, with drafting changes)

3. (1) The official service documents of the Union as prescribed by the Administrative Regulations shall be published in the five official languages. (Old paragraph 3 (2), with drafting changes)

(2) All other documents for general distribution prepared by the Secretary General in the course of his duties shall be drawn up in the three working languages. (Old paragraph 3 (3), with drafting changes)

3 bis. Any of the documents referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 above may be published in languages other than those there specified, provided that the Members and Associate Members requesting such publication undertake to defray the whole of the cost of translation and publication involved. (New)

4. At conferences of the Union and whenever it is necessary at meetings of its permanent organs, the debates shall be conducted with the aid of an efficient system of reciprocal interpretation between the three working languages. (Old paragraph 4 (1), with drafting changes)

5. (Deleted)

6. (1) At conferences of the Union and at meetings of its permanent organs, languages other than the three working languages may be used:

- a) if an application is made to the Secretary General or to the Head of the permanent organ concerned to provide for the use of an additional language or languages (oral or written), provided that the additional cost so incurred shall be borne by those Members and Associate Members which have made or supported the application; or
- b) if any delegation itself makes arrangements at its own expense for oral translation from its own language into any one of the three working languages.

(2)a) In the case provided for in sub-paragraph 6 (1) a) above, the Secretary General or the Head of the permanent organ concerned shall comply to the extent practicable with the application, having first obtained from the Members and Associate Members concerned an undertaking that the cost incurred will be duly repaid by them to the Union;

b) In the case provided for in sub-paragraph 6 (1) b) above, the delegation concerned may, furthermore, if it wishes, arrange at its own expense for speeches to be translated orally into its own language from one of the three working languages. (New)

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 393-E
5 December 1952

COMMITTEE 8

6th SERIES OF TEXTS

TRANSMITTED TO THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

TEXTS SUBMITTED TO THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE BY COMMITTEE 3

Mr. J. Laffay,
Chairman of the
Editorial Committee

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that Committee 3 has submitted proposed texts of the following Articles of the Convention to the Plenary Assembly for consideration :

- in its fifth report (Document No. 361), Articles 12 and 13,
- in its 6th report (Document No. 375), Article 9,
- in its 7th report (Document No. 388), Articles 2, 3, and 4,
- in its 8th report (Document No. 390), Article 8,
- in its 9th report (Document No. 392), Article 15.

Under the arrangement we made at the 28th meeting of Committee 3, I would request you to regard the above texts as ipso facto submitted to the Editorial Committee for examination.

Chairman of Committee 3,
C. Ribeiro

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 2

(Credentials)

Summary Record of the 5th Meeting

Thursday, 4 December 1952 at 10 o'clock a.m.

Chairman : Sir Bertrand JERRAM (United Kingdom
of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

The summary record of the 4th meeting (Document No. 277) was approved without comment, except for a slight drafting amendment pointed out by the Chairman, on page 4. "The Assistant Secretary General" should read : "a representative of the Secretary General".

The credentials of the following delegations were read out and approved as being in due and proper form :

Syrian Republic (credentials authorizing the Egyptian Delegation
to represent Syria)

Turkey

Peru

Ethiopia (credentials authorizing Mr. Krishna Prasada
(India) to represent Ethiopia)

Saudi Arabia.

The Committee thereupon considered the credentials presented by the Delegate of British East Africa (Associate Member), who had arrived on 1 December. They were considered to be in due and proper form.



The credentials of certain additional delegates representing the

following Members of the Union were then read out :

Chile
Cuba
Colombia
Egypt

and were considered by the Committee to be in due and proper form.

The Chairman then submitted the draft Second Report by the Committee to the Plenary Assembly (Document No. 324).

This report was approved, after the necessary amendments had been made therein for it to cover the decisions taken at the 5th meeting of the Committee.

A list of names of the delegates qualified to sign the Acts of the Buenos Aires Conference would be published and distributed as a conference document. Any errors or omissions would have to be brought to the Secretary General's notice immediately, and would appear in a corrigendum.

The Chairman said that in all probability the Committee would not meet again, since only the credentials of Costa Rica were still outstanding. If those credentials arrived early enough, they might be considered by the Plenary Assembly direct.

He thanked the Vice-Chairman, the reporters, the Secretary General's representatives, the members of the Committee, and the interpreters, for their help in bringing the work of the Committee to a successful conclusion.

The Delegate of France, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Chairman, and congratulated him on the skill with which he had directed the Committee's debates.

Reporters :

J. de la Chevrelière
H.J. Dreyer
Adolfo Zatcrrre

Chairman :

C. B. JERRAM

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE 2

CREDENTIALS

The first report of the Committee (Document No. 197), adopted by the Plenary Assembly on 6 November 1952 (Document No. 221), indicated in Annex 2 that the credentials of the following six Members of the Union, participating directly or by proxy in the Conference, were awaited:

Saudi Arabia	Peru
Costa Rica	Syria
Ethiopia	Turkey

In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, the Secretary General duly addressed reminders to the six delegates concerned and at its 5th meeting on 4 December, the credentials of the following Members were available:

Syria (proxy to the Egyptian delegation)
Turkey
Peru
Ethiopia (proxy to Shri Krishna Prasada of the
Indian delegation)
Saudi Arabia

The credentials of the above-mentioned five countries were examined by the Committee and were found to be in order.

Thus the only credentials still awaited are those of Costa Rica. As mentioned in Annex 2 to Document No. 197 a telegram from Costa Rica was provisionally accepted by the Committee pending presentation of full powers. The Committee recommends that the Secretary General be asked to address a further reminder to the delegate of Costa Rica urging him to deposit powers in proper form at the earliest possible moment.

At its 5th meeting the Committee also examined credentials deposited by Chile, Cuba, Colombia and Egypt in respect of additional delegates, and found them to be in order.

The Committee also examined, at its 5th meeting, the credentials presented by the delegate of British East Africa (Associate Member) who arrived on 1 December. These credentials were found to be in order.

In accordance with the proposal contained in the last paragraph of the First Report of the Committee, the rapporteurs of the Committee, assisted by a representative of the Secretary General, have drawn up a list of delegates empowered to sign the Final Acts of the Conference. It was agreed to complete this list after the approval of the present report and to circulate it as a Conference document.

C. B. Jerram
Chairman

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 5

(I.T.U. Finances)

Summary Record of the 16th Meeting

Thursday, 4 December 1952

Chairman: Mr. Krishna Prasaḍa (India)

The meeting began at 9 a.m.

The Chairman submitted Document No. 340 (Summary Record of the 13th meeting, 28 November 1952) for approval.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asked for the deletion of the 4th paragraph on page 1. He also asked for his Proposal No. 211 to be discussed in Committee 5.

The Chairman said that the subjects on the Committee's agenda were as follows:

- 1) Contributory units;
- 2) Report by Working Group 1;
- 3) Document No. 371;
- 4) Proposal No. 211.

As a result of notifications received, the number of contributory units had fallen to 694. For the adoption of the scale, the following Proposals had been made:

- a) the status quo
- b) Proposal No. 228 (Italy)
- c) Proposal No. 270 (France).

Varying views had already been expressed. The Delegate of Portugal had wanted intermediate classes, and the Delegate of Sweden had had proposed that the number of units in the class should be used to designate the class.

The Delegate of France recalled the procedure proposed in Document No. 270, and wondered if it would not be well to consider the two scales - the Italian, (No.228), and the French (No.270). The 0.5 unit class should be done away with, so that the lowest class would contribute for one unit - either that, or the half-unit class should be reserved for very few countries, three or four at the outside. If the new scale were adopted - and it was less rigid - a new consultation might be advisable to ascertain which classes the countries would choose.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, supporting the French proposal, nevertheless thought that Class 14 ought to be reserved for Associate Members, recognized international organizations, and scientific or manufacturing concerns collaborating with the I.T.U.

The Delegate of Yemen wanted Class 14 maintained.

The Delegate of France did not object, provided that Members would be assigned to that class only as an exceptional measure.

The Delegate of Sweden seconded the French proposal. With 13 classes there would be but few applications for change of class. He recalled once more his proposal that classes be numbered in accordance with the units they contained.

The Delegate of Egypt did not agree that certain Members should stay in the same class. All Delegations should be asked what class they wished to take in the new scale adopted. Every country should be free to choose its class. A 100-class scale, which would give greater flexibility, was perfectly imaginable. Thus, the anomalous situation would be avoided in which, for example, the United States of America paid only three times Egypt's contribution, while Egypt paid ten times more than Yemen.

Accordingly, he proposed the following scale:

Class 11	1 unit
10	2 units
9	3 units
8	5 units
7	7 units
6	10 units
5	15 units
4	20 units
3	30 units
2	45 units
1	60 units

The Delegate of Brazil said that of all the scales, that of Atlantic City seemed the best to him. Too many scales were being discussed, and time was short. He proposed to keep the status quo and to take the vote at once.

The Delegate of France thought that the time for improvisation was past. The French proposal was designed to bring about a more equitable apportionment of contributions. In the existing scale, if no further applications for lower classes were received, the Unit contribution would increase by 12%. The French scale might enable intermediate classes to be chosen without too heavy a loss of units.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia said it would be well to decide as to what proportion should be maintained between the highest and the lowest classes.

The Delegate of Japan supported the French proposal.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic was prepared to accept the French scale minus class 14, which would be used only in very exceptional cases.

The Chairman, speaking as the Delegate of India, agreed.

The Delegate of Belgium was unable to accept the French proposal.

The Delegate of the United States of America supported Brazil and the status quo.

The Delegate of Italy, comparing the French and the Italian scales, thought that the Italian scale offered a chance of bringing contributions into line with the financial resources of Members. However, if there was any objection, he would not insist, but would reserve the right to revert to the matter in the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of Portugal could not accept a new half-unit class, either as a permanent or an exceptional institution.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that if there was a class 14, there should be no restrictions for special cases. Associate Members should be free to choose it. Otherwise, he would revert to the matter in the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"My Delegation has no objection to the scale proposed by the French Delegation. But the French proposal will not, we consider, contrary to the hopes placed in it, lead to an increase in the overall number of contributory units because of the intermediate classes introduced into the existing scale. Choice of intermediate classes by several countries may well lead to a decrease, and not to an increase in the number of contributory units as at 2 December 1952.

"We must bear in mind the obvious tendency of countries to move down the scale in view of the sharp rise in the fiscal limit set on I.T.U. ordinary expenses. Hence it would be preferable if the existing scale were kept.

"As regards the proposal that class 14 (half a unit) should be reserved especially for Associate Members, private agencies, and manufacturing concerns, we cannot but disagree with it. We are against the creation of a special class for contributors of any kind. All Members and Associate Members, and other contributors, should be free to choose any class in the scale. There should be no special classes for any particular category of contributor.

The Delegate of Yemen supported the French proposal if class 14 were kept.

The Delegate of Japan supported the French proposal, if the amendment by Yemen were taken into consideration. He thought that the proposed restriction in connection with that class should be submitted for approval by the Conference.

The Delegate of Egypt called for a vote on whether the scale should run from 1 to 60 or from 0.5 to 30.

The Delegate of the United States of America called for a vote on maintenance of the status quo, which would be in accordance with the decision taken by the meeting of Heads of Delegations.

The Chairman agreed, if the authors of proposals would accept.

The Delegate of France thought that a principle or an abstraction should not be voted upon. It should be a scale, i.e., something specific.

The Delegate of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, agreeing, supported the French proposal, provided class 14 were open for all.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic called for a vote first of all on the maintenance of the status quo, and then, if necessary, on the French proposal minus class 14, which could be considered later.

The Delegate of Italy expressed his willingness to give up his proposal, if France would multiply the No. of units by two. Class 14 would be open to all.

The Delegate of Brazil thought that a decision ought to be taken on class 14.

The Delegate of France, who had been in agreement with the Italian proposal to multiply the French scale by two, changed his mind and maintained his proposal as initially submitted.

The Delegate of Portugal observed that two amendments to the French proposal had been submitted and had to be put to the vote:

- 1) deletion of class 14;
- 2) maintenance of class 14 as an exception.

The Delegate of the United States of America, disagreeing, said that first of all a decision had to be taken about the status quo.

The Committee approved of the proposed procedure. The result of the vote by show of hands being doubtful, (21 for to 17 against), there was a vote by roll call, which gave the following results:

For the status quo	22
Against	22
Abstentions	6

The Delegate of Italy said that, according to the Rules of Procedure, maintenance of the status quo had been rejected, whereupon the Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics refused to admit that maintenance of the status quo could be considered as a proposal. The vote that had just taken place was merely designed to guide the proceedings, and could not be interpreted as a rejection of the status quo.

The Delegate of the Argentine Republic said that, under Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure, that status quo had indeed been rejected. A good many delegations being absent, the Committee might decide to refer the matter to the Plenary Assembly. But the vote was entirely valid.

The Chairman decided, for the above mentioned reasons, to proceed with the study of the French proposal.

The Delegate of France was likewise of the opinion that the status quo had been rejected. Consideration of the French proposal would provide a basis for the Plenary Assembly. But it was urgent to call a meeting at which countries could be asked what class they had chosen. If that were not done, the work accomplished would have been wasted.

The Chairman agreed.

The Delegate of Sweden recalled what the Delegate of Portugal had said in connection with class 14.

The Delegate of Denmark felt that the results of the vote would have been different if the creation of a half-unit class had been linked with the maintenance of the status quo. Hence he proposed the status quo plus that class.

The Delegate of the United States of America, disagreeing, said that first of all the French proposal should be put to the vote.

Taking up the French proposition, the Chairman dealt first with the amendment to the effect that class 14 should be open to countries which desired to elect it.

16 voted in favour of the amendment, 29 against it with 3 abstentions.

The amendment was thus lost and the Committee decided that members shall not normally be admitted to class 14, and that admission to that class should be at the discretion of the Administrative Council and that too in only exceptional circumstances.

The Delegate of Italy thought that, since the Council was not due to meet until April, requests for Class 14 should be examined by the Conference itself on this occasion.

The Delegate of Egypt considered that the vote which had just been taken did not cover Associate Members, private operating agencies and the international organizations.

The Delegate of Lebanon said that the decision which had just been taken was unjust, since it put the smaller countries in an inferior position. He supported the Italian proposal to submit the requests to the Plenipotentiary Conference for examination.

The Delegate of Italy recalled that his formal proposal concerning class 14 applied to all cases.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland asked for the case of the Associate Members to be examined before that of the other organizations.

The Delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considered that the question of voting on the admission of Associate Members into Class 14 was not clearly put, since they could equally well ask for another class. It would be simpler to say: "Who is in favour of admitting Associate Members into Class 14 only?"

The Chairman put the following question to the vote: "Can Associate Members on request be admitted to Class 14 if they were unable to choose a higher class. The voting was as under:

In favour	:	23
Against	:	17
Abstentions	:	3.

In connection with the recognized private operating agencies, scientific and industrial organizations, the Delegate of France thought that ~~they~~ should not be admitted to class 14 until the Administrative Council had examined the matter and given its approval. The Committee seemed to be of the view that the private operating agencies and scientific and industrial organizations might be admitted to class 14 if they did not choose a higher class. The Chairman put the proposal to the vote with the following result:

In favour	:	19
Against admission	:	14
Abstentions	:	13

The French proposal, taking into account the decisions already reached, was approved as under when put to the vote:

In favour : 23

Against : 10

Abstentions : 3

The Delegate of Cuba explained that he had voted against the proposal because, time being short, it was difficult to take action for the selection of classes for the countries of the Union.

The Delegate of Italy asked on what date the new scale would come into force.

The Delegate of Belgium made the following statement:

"The Belgian Delegation, in view of the new increased fiscal limit for the Union and the cases of down-grading already announced which will impose on its country higher financial burdens which it cannot accept, is obliged to state forthwith that its country will notify a lower class for its contributions."

The Delegate of Portugal thought that the question raised by the Delegate of Italy did not concern Committee 3. If an annexed protocol had to be envisaged, it was for the present Committee to introduce it. There would certainly be some difficulties of implementation if the new scale were to come into force in 1953 as contributions were payable in advance.

The Chairman pointed out that in Document No. 256 the date 1 January 1953 had been provisionally inserted in para. 1. It was for the Committee to take a decision concerning that date. Likewise, a decision would have to be taken on the date by which the notices of change of classifications could be received, as well as the "de-freezing" date.

The Delegate of the United States of America supported the date of 1 January 1953 for the first paragraph of Document No. 256.

The Delegate of Italy said he could not accept 1 January 1953 and suggested 1 April 1953.

The Secretary-General pointed out to the Committee that after the spring session of the Administrative Council, the apportionment of expenses had been made in accordance with the Atlantic City scale, within the budgetary framework of 4 millions. However, the Administrative Council had had to draw up a supplementary budget. Therefore, it might seem illogical to make a new apportionment different from the one already made. In the circumstances, he suggested that the implementation of the new scale should coincide with the effective date of the Convention, i.e., 1 January 1954. The date of classification should be as near as possible to the next session of the Administrative Council.

The Delegate of Sweden thought that delegations could not leave Buenos Aires without knowing what they would have to pay in the coming years.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia pointed out that under paragraph 5 of the existing Article 14, countries had the right to choose their class between the end of the Buenos Aires Conference and the coming into force of the Convention. It would be difficult for the Secretary-General from the administrative point of view, if the date was set for 31 December 1952. A reasonable lapse of time was necessary.

The Chairman considered that if the effective date of the Convention, i.e. 1 January 1954, could be taken as a basis, then they would have to set the date on which the French proposal should come into force and also the date after which no change of class could be allowed.

The Delegate of France pointed out that the 1953 budget had been prepared by the Administrative Council subject to its approval by the Plenipotentiary Conference. For that budget, he felt that the Atlantic City scales should be retained. For the 1954 budget, the new scale should be used. Paragraph 1 of Document No. 236 became pointless.

The important thing was to find out what classes had been selected by means of a roll-call vote in Plenary Assembly. Thus there would be a sort of gentleman's agreement at Buenos Aires, which would later become the final classification.

The Delegate of Italy also preferred the date of 1 January 1954. As regards the provision that there should be no change of class between two conferences, it seemed possible to accept up-grading before the opening of the following conference. Paragraph 5 of Article 14 would in that case have to be amended.

The Delegate of Portugal agreed to the procedure described in Document No. 270. The Portuguese Delegation would endeavour to maintain the classification it had notified to the Conference.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland recalled that paragraph 5 of Article 14 had already been accepted in Plenary Assembly. It could only be amended by the Plenary Assembly. He agreed that the old bases should be followed for 1953 and the new scale should be applied for 1954.

The Delegate of Sweden asked what would happen to the requests for down-grading. In this connection, the Delegate of Portugal considered that applications received before or during the Conference should be dealt with immediately.

The Delegate of Belgium thought that the old and the new scales should apply respectively to 1953 and 1954 unless, in a plenary meeting, the countries indicated the class chosen.

The Delegate of Argentina suggested 1 January 1954 as a starting point, the Atlantic City provisions remaining in force until that date.

Requests for a lower class would be taken into consideration in January 1954 since, in accordance with Article 14, the 1953 contributions had almost all been paid.

The Delegate of Portugal agreed with the Argentine proposal.

The Delegate of Cuba said that the Argentine proposal solved the problem. However, if the status quo were maintained for 1953, without taking the notifications into account, how would the countries know the increase per unit?

The Delegate of Belgium did not agree with the Argentine proposal. Since the beginning of the Conference, any country could make a request for a lower class.

The Delegate of China regretted that he could not support the Argentine proposal.

The Delegates of the U.S.S.R. and Italy were not in favour of the Argentine proposal.

The Delegate of the U.S.A. proposed that the notifications appearing in Document No. 369 should serve as a classification for 1953.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. pointed out that France had proposed that requests for a lower class received before or during the Conference should be applied to the Atlantic City scale for 1953.

The Chairman pointed out that it was not a firm proposal, but merely a suggestion.

The Delegate of France said that there was no reason to assume, from paragraph 5 of Article 14, or from the resolution, that account had to be taken of the requests for 1953. He supported the Argentine proposal, which was simple. Since all Administrations had already established their budgets for 1953, it would be very difficult, from the administrative aspect, to make alterations in them to allow for requests for a lower class.

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. thought that such requests should be taken into account for 1953.

In view of the late hour, the Chairman decided to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

Rapporteurs:

J. Arregui
H. Bouchon
M. Caws

Chairman:

Krishna Prasada

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 21st Meeting

25 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. Tsingovatov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman opened the meeting and stated that it was necessary to speed up the work. In directing the debates, he would proceed according to the last decision of the Steering Committee, i.e. a vote would first be taken on the status quo, whenever appropriate; discussion of proposals and amendments would take place only if the status quo were rejected.

Discussion continued on Document No. 253.

Rule 6

The Delegate of Italy reverted to this Rule, which had been adopted at the preceding meeting and requested that recognized private operating agencies be included.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia accordingly submitted a text, but at the request of the Delegates of Argentina and Switzerland, withdrew it in favour of the pertinent provisions of Atlantic City.

The Committee decided to add paragraph 2, points (1) and (2) of Rule 7 of the Atlantic City Rules of Procedure to Rule 6 of Document No. 253. The Working Group would have to make the references in point (2) conform with the new situation.

Rule 6 thus amended was approved.



The Delegate of Italy drew attention to Rule 9 of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations and requested that the possibility of including that Rule in the draft Rules of Procedure should be studied.

The Chairman took note of that request, which would be considered later.

Rules 7, 8, and 9

Adopted without comment.

Rule 10

The Chairman asked for the Working Group to examine paragraph 5 of that Rule with a view to replacing the phrase "et peut on exposer les motifs" by a more categorical phrase such as: "et doit être autorisé à en exposer les motifs". (French text only). The Committee saw no objection to that proposal.

Rules 11 and 12

Adopted without comment.

Rule 13

Since that Rule was very long, the Chairman proposed to discuss it point by point.

Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 were adopted without comment.

Paragraph 4:

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he had some comments to make on the succeeding points and requested the Chairman to postpone discussion of that paragraph until decision had been taken on the succeeding paragraphs.

The Chairman agreed and passed on to paragraph 5.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. suggested that the text be replaced by:

"During the discussion of a question a Delegation may, at any time, (but only after the speaker who has the floor has finished his statement) propose that the meeting be temporarily suspended or adjourned giving reasons for his proposal. If this proposal is seconded, the floor must be given to two delegations to oppose the proposal, whereafter the proposal shall be put to the vote."

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia supported this proposal.

The Delegate of Brazil suggested that it should read "two delegations who wish to express themselves exclusively against the proposal."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. accepted that amendment.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that although it would be preferable to maintain the text of Document No.253, he would not oppose the U.S.S.R. proposal as amended by Brazil.

The Delegate of Argentina suggested that the brackets should be deleted. Although such a case had occurred once in the history of the Union, it should be regarded merely as a regrettable accident and it did not justify a special provision in the Convention.

The Chairman, in answer to the Delegate of Argentina, said that unfortunately during the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference held in Geneva in 1951, a case had arisen when during the speech of a Delegation, another Delegation had interrupted to request that the meeting should be immediately adjourned and the Chairman of the Committee, under the pressure of that Delegation, had immediately adjourned the meeting. The case was inadmissible and such incidents should have no place in I.T.U. conferences.

Since the Argentine Delegation had stated that such methods should be deplored, as incompatible with normal procedure, the Chairman considered that the statement of the Argentine Delegate, with which the Committee undoubtedly agreed, should be consigned in the summary record.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that if the condemnation expressed by the Delegate of Argentina were included in the summary record of the meeting, he would not oppose the deletion of the phrase between brackets from the text he had submitted.

The Delegate of Mexico suggested that the words "at any time" should be deleted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. accepted that amendment.

The Chairman put the U.S.S.R. proposal as amended to the vote and it was adopted by

19 votes for
13 votes against
11 abstentions

Paragraphs 6, 7, and 8

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

"My Delegation's views on paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Rule 13 were expressed with adequate clarity when the Rules of Procedure were being considered. That being so, my Delegation wishes once more to point out that paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Rule 13 are designed, not to ensure free discussion in which all delegations might take part, but to restrict discussion in connection with problems in the consideration and solution of which a good many delegations are interested.

"These restrictive paragraphs prevent delegations from explaining their points of view on this or that question, and also reduce the number of those wishing to take part in debates.

"Such a position runs counter to the normal democratic principles and traditions of the Union.

"My Delegation, taking its stand on the principle of cooperation and on the democratic rule that each delegation should be able, without let or hindrance, to take part in the work of Union conferences and meetings, proposes that paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations be deleted, on the grounds that they run counter to those principles."

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia seconded that proposal.

The Delegate of the United States of America opposed the U.S.S.R. proposal.

The Chairman put to the vote the deletion of those three sub-paragraphs.

The proposal was rejected by

27 votes against
10 votes for
2 abstentions

The Chairman put paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 to the vote.

Those paragraphs were approved by

38 votes for
9 votes against
0 abstentions

The Delegate of Poland asked for the summary record to include the fact that he had voted against the inclusion of those three paragraphs.

The Chairman then put to the vote paragraph 4 which had been left in abeyance.

It was adopted by

35 votes for
9 votes against
0 abstentions

Paragraphs 9, 10, and 11

Adopted without comment.

Rule 14

Consideration postponed until the Working Group had finished its study of Chapter 3 of the General Regulations.

Rule 15

The Rule was considered point by point.

Paragraph 1

Adopted

Paragraph 2

At the request of the U.S.S.R. Delegation, the Committee decided after a brief discussion, to defer consideration of the paragraph until Committee 3 had reached a decision on Article 1 of the Convention.

Paragraphs 3 to 8

Adopted without amendment.

Paragraph 9

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed the deletion of the last words of item 1, "unless the Assembly decides to the contrary".

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. seconded that proposal.

The Delegates of Argentina and France opposed it.

The amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. was put to the vote and rejected by

35 votes against

9 votes for

0 abstentions

Paragraph 9 was thus adopted by the Committee by:

35 votes for

10 votes against

0 abstentions

The Delegate of Brazil pointed out that the English and Spanish texts of item 2) of the paragraph should be brought into line with the French text. The words "a decision may be taken" should be replaced by "the Assembly shall decide".

Paragraph 10

Adopted

Rule 16

Adopted

Rule 17

The Chairman thought it would be advisable to replace paragraph 2 of the text by paragraph 2 of Rule 18 in Chapter 6 of the Atlantic City General Regulations which applied to both plenipotentiary and administrative conferences.

The Delegate of Switzerland drew attention to Swiss Proposals Nos. 469 and 470. Several conferences, particularly the E.A.R.C., 1951, had shown that there was considerable confusion concerning reservations. The provisions proposed were aimed at putting some order into the position of countries wishing to sign an agreement with reservations. They also defined the position of countries which felt unable to sign an agreement.

The Delegate of Italy supported the principle of the Swiss proposal but felt that the examination mentioned in paragraph 2 should be carried out by the Plenary Assembly.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia was opposed to the amendment.

The Delegate of Cuba asked for the deletion of the second paragraph of the Swiss proposal, whereupon the Delegate of France, agreeing, suggested that paragraph 3 should begin with the words : "Reservations to appear in the Final Acts shall be assembled....."

Several Delegates spoke against the Swiss proposal as encroaching on delegations' sovereignty.

The Delegates of the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Belarussian S.S.R. made the following statements for inclusion in the minutes :

U.S.S.R. :

"Swiss Proposal No. 470 advocates the addition of a new Rule 18-bis to Chapter 6 of the General Regulations. Paragraph 2 thereof lays down that a special committee shall be set up to consider all reservations which are to appear in the Final Acts.

"My Delegation objects to such a procedure for submission of reservations on the grounds that the delegation of each country Member of the I.T.U. has a sovereign right to make such reservations if it is of the opinion that any of the decisions taken runs counter to the position taken up by its country and would render it difficult for that country to sign the Final Acts, or would make it difficult for its government to approve or ratify them.

"This is an incontrovertible right of I.T.U. Members - a right which all delegations are entitled to invoke.

"The submission of reservations, be they of a temporary or a permanent nature, cannot be made subject to the decisions of any special committee. No committee can settle the questions connected with reservations, no matter whether they relate to drafting or to substance.

"That is a right which can only rest with delegations themselves.

"Hence my Delegation objects to Swiss Proposal No.470, and proposes that the Committee keep, in the General Regulations, the existing text of Rule 18, Chapter 6 of the General Regulations."

Ukrainian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation objects to Swiss Proposal No.470, since that proposal restricts the sovereign right of each country to submit reservations."

Bielorussian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation considers the Swiss proposal unacceptable, since countries have a sovereign right to make reservations. Such reservations cannot be considered by any committee."

"Hence my Delegation will vote against the Swiss proposal and proposes that the status quo be maintained."

The Delegate of Switzerland replied that his country had not had the slightest intention of laying any restrictions on delegations' rights.

The Chairman then put to the vote the maintenance of the status quo, i.e. the maintenance in the new General Regulations of the provisions of Rule 18, paragraph 2, of the existing General Regulations, Chapter 6.

The status quo was maintained and the Swiss proposal rejected by:

32 votes in favour

2 votes against, and

5 abstentions.

The texts adopted were: for paragraph 1, the text of Document No 253; for paragraph 2, the text of Rule 18 of the Atlantic City General Regulations.

The Delegate of France observed that a text mentioning ratification of the Convention and approval of the Regulations was wrong. The Working Group would change it to read: "ratify the Convention and Regulations".

Rule 18, paragraph 4, and Rule 19, paragraph 1 (3)

The Chairman proposed that the words "with the utmost discretion" be replaced by "with discretion", or "with moderation".

The two rules, thus amended, were approved.

Rules 20 and 22

Approved.

Rules 21 and 23

The Delegate of France, for reasons of symmetry, proposed that the two Rules should begin by: "The texts of the Final Acts".

After a short discussion, the following wording was adopted: "The texts of the Convention or Regulations, and of the other Final Acts".

Rule 24

Since the credentials mentioned in this Rule were dealt with in Chapter 3 of the General Regulations, still being discussed by the Working Group, the drafting of the whole of Rule 24 was referred to the Working Group.

Rule 25

Adopted.

Rule 26

After a short discussion, the wording appearing in Document No.253 was adopted by 18 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

The Chairman then reverted to the inclusion of Rule 9 of the Atlantic City Rules of Procedure, raised by the Italian Delegation. He proposed that the provision should be completely omitted. This was approved by 16 votes to 0 with 12 abstentions.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland drew attention to the note appearing under No. 407 in the collected proposals. The Rules of Procedure for conferences should be declared also applicable to C.C.I. meetings.

The Chairman recalled that Sub-Committee 4A had issued its findings as a document: "Draft Text for the Rules of Procedure, second part", relative to the C.C.I.s.

It was by discussing that draft text, and more particularly paragraph 2 of Chapter 7, that the United Kingdom note could be taken into account.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed, and drew attention to Proposal No. 428, which was in favour of giving the sanction of the General Regulations to the Budget Control Committee. However, he would not insist on the proposal being discussed. He would be satisfied if the Committee approved its principle.

The Chairman thought that the proposal by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was already put into practice, in substance, by conferences. Thus Proposal No. 428 introduced nothing essentially new.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared himself satisfied, and withdrew Proposal No. 428.

Rapporteurs:

A. Wolf
G. R. Brandon

Chairman:

I. Tsingovatorov

COMMITTEE 4

(General Regulations)

Summary Record of the 21st Meeting

25 November 1952

Chairman: Mr. I. Tsingovarov (U.S.S.R.)

The Chairman opened the meeting and stated that it was necessary to speed up the work. In directing the debates, he would proceed according to the last decision of the Steering Committee, i.e. a vote would first be taken on the status quo, whenever appropriate; discussion of proposals and amendments would take place only if the status quo were rejected.

Discussion continued on Document No. 253.

Rule 6

The Delegate of Italy reverted to this Rule, which had been adopted at the preceding meeting and requested that recognized private operating agencies be included.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia accordingly submitted a text, but at the request of the Delegates of Argentina and Switzerland, withdrew it in favour of the pertinent provisions of Atlantic City.

The Committee decided to add paragraph 2, points (1) and (2) of Rule 7 of the Atlantic City Rules of Procedure to Rule 6 of Document No. 253. The Working Group would have to make the references in point (2) conform with the new situation.

Rule 6 thus amended was approved.

The Delegate of Italy drew attention to Rule 9 of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations and requested that the possibility of including that Rule in the draft Rules of Procedure should be studied.

The Chairman took note of that request, which would be considered later.

Rules 7, 8, and 9

Adopted without comment.

Rule 10

The Chairman asked for the Working Group to examine paragraph 5 of that Rule with a view to replacing the phrase "et peut en exposer les motifs" by a more categorical phrase such as: "et doit être autorisée à en exposer les motifs". (French text only). The Committee saw no objection to that proposal.

Rules 11 and 12

Adopted without comment.

Rule 13

Since that Rule was very long, the Chairman proposed to discuss it point by point.

Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 were adopted without comment.

Paragraph 4:

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that he had some comments to make on the succeeding points and requested the Chairman to postpone discussion of that paragraph until decision had been taken on the succeeding paragraphs.

The Chairman agreed and passed on to paragraph 5.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. suggested that the text be replaced by:

"During the discussion of a question a Delegation may, at any time, (but only after the speaker who has the floor has finished his statement) propose that the meeting be temporarily suspended or adjourned giving reasons for his proposal. If this proposal is seconded, the floor must be given to two delegations to oppose the proposal, whereafter the proposal shall be put to the vote."

The Delegate of Brazil suggested that it should read "two delegations who wish to express themselves exclusively against the proposal."

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. accepted that amendment.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland said that although it would be preferable to maintain the text of Document No.253, he would not oppose the U.S.S.R. proposal as amended by Brazil.

The Delegate of Argentina suggested that the brackets should be deleted. Although such a case had occurred once in the history of the Union, it should be regarded merely as a regrettable accident and it did not justify a special provision in the Convention.

The Chairman, in answer to the Delegate of Argentina, said that unfortunately during the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference held in Geneva in 1951, a case had arisen when during the speech of a Delegation, another Delegation had interrupted to request that the meeting should be immediately adjourned and the Chairman of the Committee, under the pressure of that Delegation, had immediately adjourned the meeting. The case was inadmissible and such incidents should have no place in I.T.U. conferences.

Since the Argentine Delegation had stated that such methods should be deplored, as incompatible with normal procedure, the Chairman considered that the statement of the Argentine Delegate, with which the Committee undoubtedly agreed, should be consigned in the summary record.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. said that if the condemnation expressed by the Delegate of Argentina were included in the summary record of the meeting, he would not oppose the deletion of the phrase between brackets from the text he had submitted.

The Delegate of Mexico suggested that the words "at any time" should be deleted.

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. accepted that amendment.

The Chairman put the U.S.S.R. proposal as amended to the vote and it was adopted by

19 votes for

13 votes against

11 abstentions

Paragraphs 6, 7, and 8

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed the total deletion of those three sub-paragraphs which, in his opinion, were aimed at restricting free expression.

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia seconded that proposal.

The Delegate of the United States of America opposed the U.S.S.R. proposal.

The Chairman put to the vote the deletion of those three sub-paragraphs.

The proposal was rejected by

27 votes against

10 votes for

2 abstentions

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

"My Delegation's views on paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Rule 13 were expressed with adequate clarity when the Rules of Procedure were being considered. That being so, my Delegation wishes once more to point out that paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Rule 13 are designed, not to ensure free discussion in which all delegations might take part, but to restrict discussion in connection with problems in the consideration and solution of which a good many delegations are interested,

"These restrictive paragraphs prevent delegations from explaining their points of view on this or that question, and also reduce the number of those wishing to take part in debates.

"Such a position runs counter to the normal democratic principles and traditions of the Union.

"My Delegation, taking its stand on the principle of cooperation and on the democratic rule that each delegation should be able, without let or hindrance, to take part in the work of Union conferences and meetings, proposes that paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 of Chapter 6 of the General Regulations be deleted, on the grounds that they run counter to those principles."

The Chairman put paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 to the vote.

Those paragraphs were approved by

38 votes for

9 votes against

0 abstentions

The Delegate of Poland asked for the summary record to include the fact that he had voted against the inclusion of those three paragraphs.

The Chairman then put to the vote paragraph 4 which had been left in abeyance.

It was adopted by

35 votes for

9 votes against

0 abstentions

Paragraphs 9, 10, and 11

Adopted without comment.

Rule 14

Consideration postponed until the Working Group had finished its study of Chapter 3 of the General Regulations.

Rule 15

The Rule was considered point by point.

Paragraph 1

Adopted

Paragraph 2

At the request of the U.S.S.R. Delegation, the Committee decided after a brief discussion, to defer consideration of the paragraph until Committee 3 had reached a decision on Article 1 of the Convention.

Paragraphs 3 to 8

Adopted without amendment.

Paragraph 9

The Delegate of the U.S.S.R. proposed the deletion of the last words of item 1, "unless the Assembly decides to the contrary".

The Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. seconded that proposal.

The Delegates of Argentina and France opposed it.

The amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. was put to the vote and rejected by

35 votes against

9 votes for

0 abstentions

Paragraph 9 was thus adopted by the Committee by:

35 votes for

10 votes against

0 abstentions

The Delegate of Brasil pointed out that the English and Spanish texts of item 2) of the paragraph should be brought into line with the French text. The words "a decision may be taken" should be replaced by "the Assembly shall decide".

Paragraph 10

Adopted

Rule 16

Adopted

Rule 17

The Chairman thought it would be advisable to replace paragraph 2 of the text by paragraph 2 of Rule 18 in Chapter 6 of the Atlantic City General Regulations which applied to both plenipotentiary and administrative conferences.

The Delegate of Switzerland drew attention to Swiss Proposals Nos. 469 and 470. Several conferences, particularly the E.A.R.C., 1951, had shown that there was considerable confusion concerning reservations. The provisions proposed were aimed at putting some order into the position of countries wishing to sign an agreement with reservations. They also defined the position of countries which felt unable to sign an agreement.

The Delegate of Italy supported the principle of the Swiss proposal but felt that the examination mentioned in paragraph 2 should be carried out by the Plenary Assembly:

The Delegate of Czechoslovakia was opposed to the amendment.

The Delegate of Cuba asked for the deletion of the second paragraph of the Swiss proposal, whereupon the Delegate of France, agreeing, suggested that paragraph 3 should begin with the words: "Reservations to appear in the Final Acts shall be assembled....."

Several Delegates spoke against the Swiss proposal as encroaching on delegations' sovereignty.

The Delegates of the U.S.S.R., the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Bielorussian S.S.R. made the following statements for inclusion in the minutes:

U.S.S.R.:

"Swiss Proposal No. 470 advocates the addition of a new Rule 18-bis to Chapter 6 of the General Regulations. Paragraph 2 thereof lays down that a special committee shall be set up to consider all reservations which are to appear in the Final Acts.

"My Delegation objects to such a procedure for submission of reservations on the grounds that the delegation of each country Member of the I.T.U. has a sovereign right to make such reservations if it is of the opinion that any of the decisions taken runs counter to the position taken up by its country and would render it difficult for that country to sign the Final Acts, or would make it difficult for its government to approve or ratify them.

"This is an incontrovertible right of I.T.U. Members - a right which all delegations are entitled to invoke.

"The submission of reservations, be they of a temporary or a permanent nature, cannot be made subject to the decisions of any special committee. No committee can settle the questions connected with reservations, no matter whether they relate to drafting or to substance.

"That is a right which can only rest with delegations themselves.

"Hence my Delegation objects to Swiss Proposal No. 470, and proposes that the Committee keep, in the General Regulations, the existing text of Rule 18, Chapter 6 of the General Regulations."

Ukrainian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation objects to Swiss Proposal No. 470, since that proposal restricts the sovereign right of each country to submit reservations."

Bielorussian S.S.R.:

"My Delegation considers the Swiss proposal unacceptable, since countries have a sovereign right to make reservations. Such reservations cannot be considered by ~~any~~ committee."

"Hence my Delegation will vote against the Swiss proposal and proposes that the status quo be maintained."

The Delegate of Switzerland replied that his country had not had the slightest intention of laying any restrictions on delegations' rights.

The Chairman then put to the vote the maintenance of the status quo, i.e. the maintenance in the new General Regulations of the provisions of Rule 18, paragraph 2, of the existing General Regulations, Chapter 6.

The status quo was maintained and the Swiss proposal rejected by:

32 votes in favour

2 votes against and

5 abstentions.

The texts adopted were: for paragraph 1, the text of Document No. 253; for paragraph 2, the text of Rule 18 of the Atlantic City General Regulations.

The Delegate of France observed that a text mentioning ratification of the Convention and approval of the Regulations was wrong. The Working Group would change it to read: "ratify the Convention and Regulations".

Rule 18, paragraph 4, and Rule 19, paragraph 1 (3)

The Chairman proposed that the words "with the utmost discretion" be replaced by "with discretion", or "with moderation".

The two rules, thus amended, were approved.

Rules 20 and 22

Approved.

Rules 21 and 23

The Delegate of France, for reasons of symmetry, proposed that the two rules should begin by: "The texts of the Final Acts".

After a short discussion, the following wording was adopted: "The texts of the Convention or Regulations, and of the other Final Acts".

Rule 24

Since the credentials mentioned in this Rule were dealt with in Chapter 3 of the General Regulations, still being discussed by the Working Group, the drafting of the whole of Rule 24 was referred to the Working Group.

Rule 25

Adopted.

Rule 26

After a short discussion, the wording appearing in Document No. 253 was adopted by 18 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

The Chairman then reverted to the inclusion of Rule 9 of the Atlantic City Rules of Procedure, raised by the Italian Delegation. He proposed that the provision should be completely omitted. This was approved by 16 votes to 0 with 12 abstentions.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland drew attention to the note appearing under No. 407 in the collected proposals. The Rules of Procedure for conferences should be declared also applicable to C.C.I. meetings.

The Chairman recalled that Sub-Committee 4A had issued its findings as a document: "Draft Text for the Rules of Procedure, second part", relative to the C.C.I.s.

It was by discussing that draft text, and more particularly paragraph 2 of Chapter 7, that the United Kingdom note could be taken into account.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed, and drew attention to Proposal No. 428, which was in favour of giving the sanction of the General Regulations to the Budget Control Committee. However, he would not insist on the proposal being discussed. He would be satisfied if the Committee approved its principle.

The Chairman thought that the proposal by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was already put into practice, in substance, by conferences. Thus Proposal No. 428 introduced nothing essentially new.

The Delegate of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared himself satisfied, and withdrew Proposal No. 428.

Rapporteurs:

A. Wolf
G.R. Brandon

Chairman:

I. Tsingovatov

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 398-E

5 December 1952

COMMITTEE 5

FINAL REPORT BY WORKING GROUP 2 TO COMMITTEE 5

At its meeting on 5 December the Working Group gave definitive form to the following draft resolutions and recommendations which it submits to Committee 5:

1. Draft resolution relating to salaries, cost of living allowance, and expatriation allowance (Annex 1).
2. Draft resolution relating to a reclassification of duties of Union staff (Annex 2).
3. Draft resolution relating to a study of salaries of Union staff (Annex 3).
4. Draft resolution relating to the grant of a children's education allowance (Annex 4).
5. Draft resolution relating to the Provident Fund and Pension Fund (Annex 5).
6. Draft recommendation relating to recruitment of Union staff (Annex 6).

The Group has thus complied with the terms of reference that were issued to it.

Chairman of W/G 2

R. Vandenhove

Annexes: 6

ANNEX 1

RESOLUTION No. 1

SALARIES, COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES
AND EXPATRIATION ALLOWANCES

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference:

resolves:

that members of the I.F.R.B. and officials of the Union shall be paid according to the following salary scale, which shall enter into force on 1 January 1953:

<u>Swiss francs per year</u>			
Class A			51,600
Class B			45,150
Class C			38,000
Class D			32,000
Class 1	17,000	to	25,800
Class 2	12,600	to	21,500
Class 3	11,400	to	17,200
Class 4	10,100	to	14,900
Class 5	8,700	to	13,500
Class 6	7,400	to	12,200
Class 7	6,500	to	10,800
Class 8	6,200	to	9,000

Further resolves, that in addition to salaries

- A temporary allowance, not subject to deductions for the Pension Fund, the details of which shall be decided upon by the Administrative Council, shall be granted to staff in Classes 1 to 8, with effect from 1 January 1953, with the object of provisionally adjusting the salaries of officials to the increase in the cost of living in Switzerland since 1947. To this end, an amount equal to 3% of salaries properly so called for Classes 1 to 8, has been included in the fiscal limit on ordinary expenditure.

- A temporary cost-of-living allowance, not subject to deductions for the Pension Funds, the details of which shall be decided upon by the Administrative Council, may be granted to members of the I.F.R.B. and to officials of the Union when fluctuations in the cost of living in the country where the Union has its headquarters render this necessary. To this end only a credit of 200,000 Swiss francs, not included in the fiscal limit on I.T.U. ordinary expenditure, shall be placed at the disposal of the Administrative Council.

- No change shall be made to the system or amounts of the expatriation allowance envisaged in Article 8 of the I.T.U. Staff Regulations.

ANNEX 2

RESOLUTION No. 2

RECLASSIFICATION OF DUTIES OF UNION STAFF

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference,

Considering:

that a reclassification of certain qualifications for employment of Union Staff in the sense of a better, more rational distribution of duties in the different classes in the salary scale is necessary;

that this reclassification should be effected prior to any measures for the adjustment of salaries and should take effect as from 1 January 1953,

Resolves:

to include a credit of 100,000 Swiss francs for the financial year 1953 and 65,000 Swiss francs for the financial years 1954, 1955, 1956 and 1957, in the fiscal limit on I.T.U. ordinary expenditure, to cover supplementary expenses resulting from a reclassification of staff, with effect from 1 January 1953, both as regards salaries and payments to the Staff Superannuation and Provident Funds,

Instructs:

the Administrative Council to undertake the reclassification, being guided by the results of a study to be made by the Secretary General in collaboration with the organs concerned.

A M M E X 3

RESOLUTION No. 3

STUDY OF THE SALARIES OF UNION STAFF

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference,

Considering :

that before any revision of the basic salary scales of Union staff, a thorough study of the qualifications required for the various posts is essential;

that the data available have been insufficient for it to undertake this study;

Instructs :

the Secretary General to make a thorough study of this matter with the organs concerned, and to submit the necessary proposals to the Administrative Council;

And resolves :

that should the Administrative Council consider that a change in the basic salary scales envisaged in Resolution 1 is justified, the following provisions shall apply :

the Council shall transmit to Members and Associate Members of the Union proposals in which the financial effects (salaries and pensions) are clearly set forth;

that Members and Associate Members shall be asked whether they accept the Council's proposals;

if a majority is in favour, the new salary scale shall be put into effect on the date set by the Council, the extra expenditure involved being granted over and above the fiscal limit on I.T.U. ordinary expenditure.

A N N E X 4

RESOLUTION No. 4

CHILDREN'S EDUCATION ALLOWANCE

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference,

Resolves :

that from 1 January 1953, an allowance of 856 Swiss francs per annum shall be granted to Union officials entitled to an expatriation allowance :

- for each child under the age of 22 studying in his country of origin;
- for each child under 13 years of age at an international school in Geneva.

Further, in the first case mentioned above, the Union shall refund the cost of one return journey a year, to enable the child to join his family in Geneva.

A N N E X 5

RESOLUTION No. 5

PROVIDENT FUND AND PENSION FUND

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference,

Considering that :

- the pension system in force in the Union is a heavy drain on the budget, since it is based on the principle of capitalization;
- the constitution of the requisite actuarial reserves is effected in accordance with actuarial assumptions implying an excessive margin of security;
- the system of buying-in fees involves a heavy outlay for the Union;
- the staff itself frequently experiences difficulty in meeting the expense to which it is put for buying-in fees;

Resolves :

the Administrative Council shall review the present pension scheme. In so doing, it shall take the necessary expert advice (from actuaries and others) in order to lighten the burdens entailed by this system, with a view to the possibility of bringing another, and less burdensome, pension scheme into force as soon as practicable;

And further resolves :

that pending any change in the existing pension scheme :

- a) rehabilitation of the Provident Fund shall continue by annual payments of 100,000 Swiss francs, until the process is completed;

(Ann.5 to Doc.398-E)

- b) the sums required to cover the increases in single payments made by officials more than 40 years of age shall continue to be posted in the annual budgets;

And having considered the questions :

- of affiliating temporary staff to the Pension Fund;
- of granting a cost-of-living allowance to pensioners;
- of ~~alignement~~ of pensions;

Resolves that :

- affiliation of temporary staff to the Pension Fund is inadmissible, since such affiliation would run counter to the statutes of that Fund;
- cost-of-living allowances may, if circumstances warrant, be granted to pensioners. In such cases, such allowances shall be financed by withdrawals from the ordinary budget;
- ~~alignement~~ of pensions is at the present time inadmissible, being incompatible with the principle of capitalization.

A N N E X 6

RESOLUTION No. 6

RECOMMENDATION

RELATIVE TO RECRUITMENT OF UNION STAFF

The Buenos Aires International Telecommunication Conference,

Considering :

- Article 9, paragraph 5, of the Convention;
- the expense entailed for the Union by recruitment on a geographical basis;
- that such recruitment is required only for certain posts;

Recommends :

that in principle only posts in Classes A to 3 be considered as of an international character.

International
Telecommunication Union

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE

Buenos Aires, 1952

Document No. 399-E

5 December 1952

COMMITTEE 5

CORRIGENDUM

TO DOCUMENT No. 389

Page 5 : Replace the text under the heading "Contributions by the Union" by the following :

Contributions by the Union.

No percentage contribution for the pension of the official but 15% as a contribution to an insurance for survivors.

Since Atlantic City, the Union has limited its action to discharging by annual payments the deficit in the capital of the Fund resulting from insufficient mathematical reserves.

L I S T O F D O C U M E N T S

No. 301 to No. 399

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
301	25 Nov.	Turkey	Draft Resolution	
302	25 Nov.	Committee 5	4th Report of Committee 5	
303	25 Nov.	Sub-Committee 3 A	2nd Report to Committee 3	
304	25 Nov.	Chairman	Method of electing Members of the Administrative Council	See Corrigenda 306 and 310
305	26 Nov.	Committee 8	Agenda for meeting held on 27 Nov.	
306	26 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Document No. 304	
307	26 Nov.	Working Group - Committee 6	Report by the Group	
308	26 Nov.	General Secretariat	Request for Change of Class : Dominican Republic	
309	26 Nov.	Plenary Assembly	1st series of texts transmitted to the Editorial Committee	
310	26 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 2 to Document No. 304	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
311	26 Nov.	Working Group 4/1	2nd Report by the Group	See Corrigendum Document No. 350
312	27 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of 11th Meeting	
313	27 Nov.	Committee 5	Summary Record of 12th Meeting	See Corrigendum No. 366
314	29 Nov.	Committee 7	Summary Record of 6th Meeting	
315	26 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of 22nd Meeting	
316	26 Nov.	Working Group 5/4	Report by the Group	
317	26 Nov.	Pakistan	Proposal relative to Article 6	
318	26 Nov.	Plenary Assembly	Texts approved by the 8th Plenary Assembly	See Corrigendum No. 325
319	26 Nov.	Plenary Assembly	2nd series of texts transmitted to the Editorial Committee	
320	27 Nov.	Denmark	Proposal No. 722	
321	27 Nov.	United Nations	Draft Resolution	
322	27 Nov.	General Secretariat	Applications for lower contributory classes : Union of South Africa	
323	27 Nov.	United Kingdom	Proposal No. 734	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
324	27 Nov.	Committee 2	Draft of 2nd Report	
325	27 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 318	
326	27 Nov.	Committee 3	Summary Record of 23rd Meeting	
327	27 Nov.	United Kingdom	Withdrawal of proposals	
328	27 Nov.	Committee 6	Agenda for 2nd Meeting	
329	27 Nov.	Cuba	Proposal relative to Doc. No. 304	
330	28 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Doc. No. 298	
331	28 Nov.	Working Group 5/2	2nd report by the Group	
332	28 Nov.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc.No. 292	
333	28 Nov.	Plenary Assembly	Election of Members of the Administrative Council	
334	28 Nov.	Secretariat	Meeting of the Heads of Delegations, 2nd Meeting	
335	28 Nov.	Secretariat	Schedule for week 1 to 6 December	
336	29 Nov.	Committee 5	5th report of Committee 5	
337	29 Nov.	Committee 7	Agenda for 7th Meeting	
338	29 Nov.	Secretariat	Final Corrigendum to the Minutes of the 6th and 7th Plenary Meetings	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
339	30 Nov.	Plenary Assembly	3rd Series of texts transmitted to the Editorial Committee	
340	2 Dec.	Committee 5	Summary Record of 13th Meeting	
341	3 Dec.	Committee 5	Summary Record of 14th Meeting	
342	29 Nov.	Working Group 5/1	Final Report by the Group	
343	7 Dec.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 8th Plenary Meeting	
344	7 Dec.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 9th Plenary Meeting (Part One)	
345	-	Secretariat	Minutes of the 9th Plenary Meeting (Part Two)	
346	2 Dec.	Secretariat	Minutes of the 10th Plenary Meeting (Part One)	
347	-	Secretariat	Minutes of the 10th Plenary Meeting (Part Two)	
348	30 Nov.	General Secretariat	Classification of Members and Associate Members of the Union	See Docs. Nos. 355 and 356
349	1 Dec.	Committee 3	Summary Record of 24th Meeting	
350	1 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Document No. 311	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
351	1 Dec.	Committee 4	3rd report by Committee 4	
352	1 Dec.	General Secretariat	Payment of Contributions and entrance fees to the Pension Fund	See Corrigendum Doc. No. 367
353	1 Dec.	Union of South Africa	Withdrawal of Proposal	
354	1 Dec.	Working Group of Committee 3	Draft Text of Article 15	
355	1 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Doc. No. 348	
356	1 Dec.	General Secretariat	Classification of Members and Associate Members of the Union	Addendum to Doc. No. 348
357	2 Dec.	Committee 5	Draft Resolution	
358	2 Dec.	Secretariat	Agenda for 11th Plenary Meeting	
359	2 Dec.	Plenary Assembly	4th series of texts transmitted to the Editorial Committee	
360	6 Dec.	Committee 8	Texts submitted to the Plenary Assembly for 1st reading (1st series)	
361	2 Dec.	Committee 3	5th report by Committee 3	
362	2 Dec.	Working Group 3/2	Report ¹ by the Group	
363	2 Dec.	Working Group 3/1	Draft of Article 8	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
364	2 Dec.	Argentina, United States, France, Portugal and United Kingdom	Proposal No. 735	
365	2 Dec.	Committee 4	Draft Text of Chapters 7 and 17 General Regulations	
366	2 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Doc. No. 313	
367	2 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Doc. No. 352	
368	5 Dec.	Working Group 5/3	3rd and final report by the Group	
369	3 Dec.	General Secretariat	Results of the 2nd consultation classification of Members and Associate Members of the Union	see Corrigendum Doc. No. 391
370	3 Dec.	Committee 5	Summary Record of 15th Meeting	
371	3 Dec.	Committee 5	Draft Resolution	
372	3 Dec.	Working Group 5/2	3rd report by the Group	
373	3 Dec.	Committee 4	Summary Record of 17th Meeting	
374	4 Dec.	General Secretariat	Reservations to the Convention and Regulations	
375	3 Dec.	Committee 3	6th report by Committee 3	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
376	4 Dec.	Committee 3	Summary Record of 25th Meeting	
377	4 Dec.	Committee 3	Summary Record of 26th Meeting	
378	4 Dec.	Working Group 5/6	Report by the Group	
379	4 Dec.	Committee 6	Report by the Committee to the Plenary Assembly	
380	4 Dec.	China	Statement made at the 13th Meeting of Committee 4	Annex to Doc. No. 282
381	4 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 283	
382	4 Dec.	Committee 7	3rd report	
383	4 Dec.	Committee 7	5th series of texts transmitted to the Editorial Committee	
384	4 Dec.	Committee 7	Summary Record of the 7th Meeting	
385	4 Dec.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 18th Meeting	
386	4 Dec.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 19th Meeting	
387	4 Dec.	Committee 4	Summary Record of the 20th Meeting	
388	5 Dec.	Committee 3	7th report by Committee 3	

Number	Date	Source	Subject	Remarks
389	4 Dec.	Working Group 5/2	4th report by the Group	See Corrigendum Doc. No. 399
390	4 Dec.	Committee 3	8th report by Committee 3	
391	4 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum No. 1 to Doc. No. 369	
392	5 Dec.	Committee 3	9th report by Committee 3	
393	5 Dec.	Committee 3	6th series of texts trans- mitted to the Editorial Committee	
394	5 Dec.	Committee 2	Summary Record of 5th Meeting	
395	5 Dec.	Committee 2	2nd report by Committee 2	
396	5 Dec.	Committee 5	Summary Record of 16th Meeting	
397	5 Dec.	Committee 4	Summary Record of 21st Meeting	
398	5 Dec.	Working Group 5/2	Final Report by the Group	
399	5 Dec.	Secretariat	Corrigendum to Doc. No. 389	