

same heading for the staff of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

It was so decided.

71. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sum of 5,091,740 dollars, which represented the total amount of miscellaneous income estimated for 1950.

That sum was unanimously adopted.

72. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) stated that the sum of 42,282,773 dollars adopted by the Committee under the heading of budget estimates for 1950 was a gross sum from which the 5,091,740 dollars for miscellaneous income should be deducted, which would leave a net sum of 37,191,033 dollars. Finally, the sum of 2,351,365 dollars, representing the total of economies effected in 1948, as shown in document A/C.5/354, should be deducted.

73. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the Brazilian representative's statement and asked the Committee to give its decision on the amendment to paragraph 2 of the draft appropriation resolution for the financial year 1950 as submitted by the Advisory Committee (A/934, page 8). The figure of 4,946,490 dollars should be replaced by the figure of 5,091,740 dollars.

That amendment, and paragraph 2, thus amended, were unanimously adopted.

Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 were unanimously adopted.

74. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Committee would have to wait until it received information regarding the estimated expenses of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine before it could reach a decision on the draft appro-

priation resolution in the Advisory Committee's report (A/934, page 7).

Draft resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses

75. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) stated that that draft resolution had been amended as shown in Conference-Room Paper No. 5. The amendments, which were of little importance, had been made at the request of the International Court of Justice.

The Advisory Committee's draft resolution regarding unforeseen and extraordinary expenses (A/934, page 9), as amended in Conference-Room Paper No. 5, was unanimously adopted.

76. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) asked if the Secretary-General could prepare a brief summary of the decisions reached by the Committee at the current meeting. That summary should show the gross figure for the 1950 budgetary estimates, the 1950 income estimates, economies effected and the exact total of income envisaged under the Staff Assessment Plan.

77. Mr. GANEM (France) supported the Brazilian representative's proposal, but pointed out that the Secretary-General should emphasize the provisional nature of such figures. The decision reached regarding the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine might in fact have important financial implications and it would be advisable not to give the various Governments a false impression of the exact total of the budgetary estimates.

78. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) withdrew his proposal.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Wednesday, 7 December 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).

Establishment of an administrative tribunal

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the members of the Fifth Committee that under article 3, paragraph 2 of the statute of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, the members of the Tribunal should be appointed by the General Assembly for three years and might be reappointed; provided, however, that of the members initially appointed, the terms of two members should expire at the end of one year and the terms of two members should expire at the end of two years.

2. He drew attention to document A/C.5/L.45 containing a list of nominations which had been presented for membership of the Administrative Tribunal, and suggested that, in order that due account might be taken of the principle of geographical distribution, members of the Fifth Committee should first vote for the seven members to be appointed, and then should vote for the three members to be appointed for a period of three years, and afterwards for the members to be appointed for two years and one year respectively.

3. Mr. TARN (Poland) suggested that the nominees receiving the highest number of votes should be appointed for a period of three years.

4. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium), referring to the list of nominations for appointment as members of the Administrative Tribunal, requested the deletion of his name from that list as he had been recalled by his Government to occupy a post at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brussels. His duties in his new post would be too onerous to allow him to accept a position on the Administrative Tribunal. He thanked the delegations which had nominated him and asked them to vote for the French and Netherlands candidates.

5. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) felt that it would be wrong to elect the majority of members of the Administrative Tribunal from among those Member States which occupied permanent seats on the Security Council. The voting procedure followed in the United Nations was primitive and was not based on an arithmetical conception of an absolute majority.

6. The CHAIRMAN stressed the fact that the Fifth Committee was asked simply to recommend

members of the Administrative Tribunal and that such members would be appointed later by a plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

7. He felt that his suggestion as to the voting procedure to be followed was the most satisfactory, but asked for the opinions of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and of the Rapporteur.

8. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) supported the voting procedure suggested by the Chairman which had been followed by the Fifth Committee at previous sessions of the General Assembly.

9. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands), Rapporteur, also supported the voting procedure suggested by the Chairman.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Khosrovani (Iran) and Mr. Wollin (Sweden) acted as tellers.

Number of votes cast, 44;

Valid votes, 44;

Simple majority, 23.

Number of votes obtained:

Mrs. Paul Bastid (France), 37;

Lieutenant General His Highness Maharaja Jam Shri Digvijayasinhji Saheb (India), 37;

Mr. Omar Loutfi (Egypt), 37;

Sir Sydney Caine (United Kingdom), 34;

Mr. Emilio N. Oribe (Uruguay), 32;

Mr. Rowland Andrews Egger (United States of America), 31;

Mr. Vladimir Outrata (Czechoslovakia), 29.

The above seven nominees, having obtained the required majority of the members present and voting, were recommended for appointment as members of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal.

10. The CHAIRMAN announced that votes had also been cast in favour of Mr. Hsia (China), Mr. Koolen (Netherlands) and Mr. Ledesma (Philippines).

11. He asked the members of the Fifth Committee to vote for the three members of the Administrative Tribunal to be nominated for a term of three years.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Khosrovani (Iran) and Mr. Wollin (Sweden) acted as tellers.

Number of votes cast, 43;

Valid votes, 43;

Simple majority, 22.

Number of votes obtained:

Lieutenant General His Highness Maharaja Jam Shri Digvijayasinhji Saheb (India), 27;

Mr. Omar Loutfi (Egypt), 27;

Mrs. Paul Bastid (France), 23.

The above three nominees, having obtained the required majority of the members present and voting, were nominated for a term of three years.

12. The CHAIRMAN announced that the following votes had been received by the remaining members of the Administrative Tribunal:

Mr. Rowland Andrews Egger (United States of America), 17;

Mr. Emilio N. Oribe (Uruguay), 15;

Sir Sydney Caine (United Kingdom), 10;

Mr. Vladimir Outrata (Czechoslovakia), 10.

13. He then asked the members of the Fifth Committee to nominate two of the above-mentioned persons to serve on the Administrative Tribunal for a term of two years. The remaining two persons would serve for a term of one year.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Khosrovani (Iran) and Mr. Wollin (Sweden) acted as tellers.

Number of votes cast, 42;

Valid votes, 42;

Simple majority, 22.

Number of votes obtained:

Mr. Emilio N. Oribe (Uruguay), 25;

Mr. Rowland Andrews Egger (United States of America), 23.

Mr. Emilio N. Oribe (Uruguay) and Mr. Rowland Andrews Egger (United States of America) having obtained the required majority of the members present and voting were nominated for a term of two years. Sir Sydney Caine (United Kingdom) and Mr. Outrata (Czechoslovakia) were nominated for a term of one year.

Budget estimates for the financial year 1950

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE DELEGATION OF INDIA ON THE REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY QUESTIONS

14. The Jam Saheb of NAWANAGAR (India), introducing the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (A/C.5/L.44), paid a tribute to the work carried out by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Its work had been of inestimable value to the Fifth Committee and had simplified many of the complicated problems submitted for the latter's consideration. He also stressed the importance of the work carried out by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee who had had twenty-five years' experience in the international sphere.

15. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands), supporting the draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation, said his delegation held the Advisory Committee in high esteem. The work of that Committee was of the utmost importance to the Fifth Committee which could not carry out its work satisfactorily without the preparatory work done by the Advisory Committee.

16. Referring to the fact that certain recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in its various reports had not been discussed by the Fifth Committee owing to lack of time, he stressed that those recommendations deserved careful consideration by Governments and by the Secretary-General.

17. The Netherlands delegation had been disappointed to find that the Secretary-General had not been able to accept all the Advisory Committee's recommendations on the budget estimates. His delegation felt that those recommendations should have been accepted, in view of the fact that

the Advisory Committee had stated that it was ready to come to the Secretary-General's assistance in case the latter found that the actions of that Committee interfered with the essential activities of the United Nations.

18. He addressed special thanks to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee who had given the Fifth Committee the benefit of his broad, clear views and wise judgment, in which had been reflected his twenty-five years' experience in international affairs and his thorough knowledge of the needs of an international organization and its administration.

19. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said the Norwegian delegation could not support the Indian delegation's draft resolution as it felt that reports submitted to the General Assembly should not contain compliments addressed to certain committees.

20. He supported the tributes paid to the Chairman and members of the Advisory Committee, and felt it would be sufficient if such tributes were included in the records, as they would then have much more value than if they were voted upon by the General Assembly.

21. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) supported the remarks of the Norwegian representative. All members of a committee had a duty and should not be complimented just because they had performed that duty. He felt that his colleagues on the Advisory Committee would agree with his statement.

22. Mr. WEBSTER (New Zealand) said his delegation wished to support the Indian draft resolution, as it was deeply appreciative of the efforts made by the Advisory Committee. The New Zealand delegation was proud of the fact that it had been the only one which had never voted against the Advisory Committee's recommendations at the current session of the General Assembly.

23. He pointed out that although it appreciated the work of the Secretariat, the New Zealand delegation would insist at the fifth session of the General Assembly on a more proper presentation of arguments, and mentioned in that connexion document A/C.5/310 in which the arguments had been presented in a deplorable way.

24. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) said that the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of India had been prompted by what had happened early in the fourth session of the General Assembly regarding the Advisory Committee's reports. He had the greatest respect for the Advisory Committee although he frequently criticized its recommendations. He supported the remarks of the Netherlands representative regarding the work of that Committee and would vote for the Indian draft resolution.

25. Mr. TARN (Poland) suggested that the representative of India should withdraw his draft resolution and agree that the report of the Fifth Committee should refer to the tributes paid to the Chairman and members of the Advisory Committee.

26. The Jam Saheb of NAWANAGAR (India) said that, although he was averse to compliments, he felt that it would not be sufficient to mention in the report of the Fifth Committee that tributes had been paid to the work of the Chairman and members of the Advisory Committee. He asked, therefore, that his draft resolution should be put to the vote.

27. Mr. VANER (Turkey) did not consider that the purpose of the draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation was simply to compliment the Chairman and members of the Advisory Committee on their work — it was also an expression of the Fifth Committee's gratitude for the help it had received from the Advisory Committee.

28. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) asked that the draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation should be voted on in two parts. Although his delegation could support the second part of the resolution, it could not vote for the first part, as that part did not enumerate the reports submitted by the Advisory Committee.

29. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the first part of the Indian draft resolution referred to all the reports submitted by the Advisory Committee to the Fifth Committee during the current session of the General Assembly.

30. He put to the vote the first part of the Indian draft resolution, reading as follows:

"The General Assembly

"Takes note of the reports submitted to it in 1949 by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions."

The first part of the Indian draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

31. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the second part of the Indian draft resolution, reading as follows:

"Records its recognition of the high value of the work performed by the Advisory Committee in the interest of the United Nations."

The second part of the Indian draft resolution was adopted by 40 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Indian draft resolution as a whole.

The Indian draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 41 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

33. The CHAIRMAN asked the Rapporteur to make it quite clear in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly that members who had voted against the Indian draft resolution, or who had abstained from voting, did so not because they were opposed to the substance of that proposal, but rather to the form in which it was presented.

34. Mr. AGHNIDES (Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) thanked the members of the Fifth Committee who had shown appreciation of the work of the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee had tried to find the ideal solution in every case submitted to it and had done its best to serve the Fifth Committee, and it was gratifying and heart-warming to know that its work had been appreciated.

35. He felt that the compliments paid him by the representative of India and other members of the Fifth Committee should go rather to the members of the Advisory Committee, as his task as Chairman had simply been one of general supervision. He was glad of the opportunity to express his gratitude to the members of the Advisory Committee for their loyalty to him and to the United Nations.

36. He stressed that the Advisory Committee had been able to carry out its work in a satisfactory

manner because of the sense of collaboration and human fellowship shown by the Secretary-General and by the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services. The latter, in spite of the great difficulties attaching to his functions, had shown candour and a sense of loyal co-operation and deserved the respect of the Fifth Committee.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONCERNING ASSISTANCE TO PALESTINE REFUGEES

37. The CHAIRMAN read out paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1210) on the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/AC.31/12) concerning assistance to Palestine refugees. In those paragraphs the Advisory Committee emphasized the importance of Members making their contributions to the budget of the United Nations and to the Special Fund for the refugees early in 1950.

38. Mr. EL-KONI (Egypt) stressed the fact that the financial implications of the draft resolution would have no effect on the budget of the United Nations, since all expenses were to be met from the Special Fund. The United Nations would assist in implementing the resolution by technical advice and assistance only. The loan from the Working Capital Fund of not more than five million dollars was to be repaid by 31 December 1950. He hoped that the General Assembly would appeal to Members to make their contributions early, as recommended by the Advisory Committee, and thus enable the Secretary-General to make the loan available when it would be needed. In conclusion, he quoted from paragraph 5 of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution, showing that the money was urgently required to mitigate starvation and distress among the refugees.

39. Mr. ASHA (Syria) associated himself with the observations of the representative of Egypt. He asked the Secretary-General's representative whether he could give any assurance that every possible effort would be made to implement the resolution of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

40. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) strongly supported the report of the Advisory Committee (A/1210). The United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees was to continue until 1 April 1950, when the new agency was expected to assume its responsibilities. After that date it was possible that contributions from the United Nations Working Capital Fund would not be required. In view of the efficient manner in which the Secretary-General had carried out his responsibilities regarding the relief of Palestine refugees in the past months, however, he was confident that he would be able, if necessary, to bridge the difficult gap before 1 July 1950, provided Members assisted by making their contributions to the budget of the United Nations early in the year.

41. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services), in reply to the representative of Syria, said that the Secretary-General would do everything possible to implement fully the resolution of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Though it was unlikely that more than three million dollars could be made available from the Working Capital Fund before 1 July 1950, discussions with the offi-

cial responsible for the refugees had shown that that sum, together with the loan from the International Refugee organization, would probably be adequate.

42. Mr. ASHA (Syria) expressed appreciation of that assurance.

43. As the resolution had been passed without any dissenting vote in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it concurred in the opinion regarding the financial implications expressed by the Secretary-General and accepted by the Advisory Committee.

The Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/366), supported by the Advisory Committee, was concurred in unanimously.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONCERNING AN INTERNATIONAL RÉGIME FOR THE JERUSALEM AREA AND PROTECTION OF THE HOLY PLACES

44. The CHAIRMAN explained that the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/367) on the financial implications of the United Nations' responsibilities in Palestine for 1950, other than assistance to Palestine refugees, had been drawn up before the decision just taken in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee concerning the internationalization of the City of Jerusalem and the protection of the Holy Places. As a result of that decision, document A/C.5/367 had become obsolete, but the representative of the Secretary-General had prepared a new estimate which would be submitted orally.

45. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the Secretary-General's estimate in document A/C.5/367 contained two main items; one, amounting to 759,000 dollars, for the expenses of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, and the second, amounting to 300,000 dollars, as a minimum estimate of the sum which would be required in connexion with the protection of the Holy Places and the preservation of peace in Jerusalem. As a result of the new responsibilities assumed under the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution, the first estimate would be unchanged, but the second would be very greatly increased.

46. A rough estimate had been prepared of the cost of the entire administration of the City of Jerusalem, based on the expenditure during 1946 under the administration of the Mandatory Power. The estimate had been divided into three parts: municipal expenditure, Central Government expenditure, and the expenditure for a police force.

47. The municipal expenditure had been calculated on a population of 250,000, allowing for an increase over the 1946 figure of 185,000. During the last year of the Mandate, expenditure had amounted to 300,000 pounds sterling. Allowing for an increased population and a rise in price levels of 30 per cent, the annual expenditure was estimated at 1.3 million dollars, exclusive of expenditure on the police force.

48. The estimate provided for Central Government expenditure under the headings: General Administration, Legal and Judiciary, Social Services, Development Services, Public Works, Post and Telegraph, was based on expenditure under the Mandate administration, when Jerusalem's share on a *per capita* basis of the cost of the Cen-

tral Government amounted to 1.5 million pounds sterling. Allowing for increases in population and prices, the estimate now amounted to 2 million pounds sterling or 5.6 million dollars.

49. An estimate of 1,250,000 dollars had been prepared to allow for a police force of 500 men.

50. The total estimate for the administration of the City of Jerusalem would therefore amount to 8,150,000 dollars.

51. Mr. Andersen pointed out that the estimate contained no provision for extraordinary expenses which might arise in connexion with special security measures. Furthermore, it was to be assumed that there would be some revenue from local sources, but as it was possible that a new administration might find it difficult to collect that revenue, no provision for such income had been made to offset the first year's expenditure.

52. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) said that his delegation had pointed out in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee the political impracticability of establishing a fully international administration in Jerusalem, and the enormous financial and administrative responsibilities that would be involved, particularly in view of the opposition of the entire population of the city. He considered the estimate offered by the Secretary-General to be highly unreliable, since it was based on figures which were thirteen years old and bore little relation to present-day conditions. Furthermore, possible extraordinary expenditure for the maintenance of peace and security in the city was incalculable. His own delegation had prepared estimates for the implementation of an earlier plan proposed by the Conciliation Commission, which had shown that some 20 to 25 million dollars would be required to satisfy the administrative requirements of the city and area of Jerusalem. He was therefore unable to accept the rough and hastily-prepared estimate of 8,150,000 dollars submitted by the Secretary-General.

53. In reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) said that the estimates had been based on the expenditure of the Mandate administration for 1946, not 1936, as suggested by the Israel representative.

54. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) assumed that the Fifth Committee was required to inform the General Assembly of the cost of implementing the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution, and not to recommend a budgetary appropriation. He thought that the Secretary-General's estimate was unreasonably low, but felt strongly that the Committee should not be asked to consider it at such short notice, with so little concrete information and without a report from the Advisory Committee. In view of the financial difficulties experienced by so many countries, a sudden increase of the budget of the United Nations by 25 or 30 per cent on such data was unjustifiable. He proposed, therefore, that the Secretary-General's estimate should be submitted to the General Assembly with a statement from the Fifth Committee to the effect that there had been insufficient time for a proper examination.

55. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) asked whether the Fifth Committee was required to inform the General Assembly what the cost of implementing the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution would be, or whether, in fact, it was

intended to recommend a budgetary appropriation for such implementation. In either case he thought it was impossible for the Committee in a matter of minutes to make any reasonable decision on what the cost would be. The only possible course would be to request the Advisory Committee to examine the estimate as carefully as possible and to submit a report to the Fifth Committee urgently.

56. Mr. COOPER (United States of America) agreed with the Norwegian representative that the Committee could not take a responsible decision on the figures submitted by the Secretary-General. The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution had directed the Trusteeship Council to discharge the responsibilities of the Administering Authority and to amend the draft statute of Jerusalem in the direction of its greater democratization. The financial implications of such amendments could not yet be calculated, but might increase the Secretary-General's estimate still further.

57. Time was short, but he wished to refer the matter to his Government and other delegations presumably wished to do the same before they could vote on such a substantial sum. Until the estimates had been carefully examined by the Advisory Committee, he would therefore reserve his position.

58. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) said the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's important decision, fulfilling as it did the hopes and desires of the majority of the Members of United Nations by making the City of Jerusalem *de facto* and *de jure* the spiritual capital of the world, deserved the support of all Committees of the General Assembly. Objections had been raised in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to the internationalization of Jerusalem on the grounds that such a decision would be difficult to implement, and that, moreover, its financial implications would be too great for the United Nations to bear.

59. The Lebanese delegation on the Fifth Committee, while advocating the strictest economy where the administration of the United Nations was concerned, had always been ready to vote for appropriating money to any project likely to further the purposes and principles of the Charter; the proposal before the Committee met those requirements.

60. The specific figure to be appropriated would require careful study. But the Lebanese representative deprecated the attempt made, in both the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and the Fifth Committee, to introduce an element of confusion into the debate. The representative of Israel had stated that 8 million dollars would be insufficient and had suggested that a more correct estimate would be 25 million dollars or more. There had been an earlier tendentious rumour that the internationalization of the Jerusalem area under the United Nations would require the sum of 34 million dollars, obviously a gross exaggeration.

61. To sum up, he said that, first of all, Jerusalem was to the whole world a centre of spiritual life and of inspiration, and financial considerations should not stand in the way of keeping it so; secondly, that the cost of the administration of Jerusalem would be borne, not by the United Nations alone, but also, after certain initial difficulties had been overcome, by the city's population; and

thirdly, that 25 million dollars was a highly exaggerated estimate of the annual cost of administration, when it was considered that the State of Lebanon, a country with a million and a quarter inhabitants and with high educational, social and economic standards, did not require so much. He therefore appealed to the Fifth Committee not to place obstacles in the way of the implementation of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution, a resolution which embodied so many of the hopes of mankind.

62. The CHAIRMAN asked speakers, in view of the shortness of time, to confine themselves to the financial implications of the questions and not to repeat arguments previously advanced in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

63. Mr. HSIA (China) agreed with the representatives of Norway and the United States that the Committee was dealing with a very large sum of money; nor had the Committee ever been asked to decide on so large an appropriation in so short a time. He suggested, therefore, that the Secretary-General's estimates should be transmitted to the General Assembly without comment, since there was no time for such comment.

64. The only other solution would be for the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, to exercise his powers of drawing upon the Working Capital Fund; such a way was open to him even if the Fifth Committee made no recommendations.

65. Mr. VOYNA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee could hardly come as a surprise to anyone, for the same resolution had, only a few days earlier, been passed by Subcommittee 1 of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Had the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee been following those proceedings carefully they would have been able to furnish the Committee with correct estimates for the international régime, but such, unfortunately, was not the case.

66. The difficulties before the Committee, however, were not so great or so serious as to justify a panic or an attempt to avoid carrying out the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's recommendation by pleading lack of time. He felt that some delegations were anxious, not so much to carry out that recommendation, as to put obstacles in its way.

67. He was unable to agree with the representatives of Norway, the United States and Israel and certainly not with the statement that 25 million dollars might be required; such suggestions were merely intended to confuse. Instead of dealing in astronomical figures the Committee would do well to take as a basis a realistic estimate. The amount spent by the Mandate Administration in 1946 had been 1,500,000 dollars. It seemed clear that if the cost of administration had been excessive the Mandatory Power would have relinquished its task, nor would Israel be so anxious to avoid handing the area over to the trusteeship of United Nations. Nor must it be forgotten that a certain amount of revenue would be collected from Jerusalem itself.

68. The Ukrainian representative added that he felt inclined to disbelieve the Israel statement that the whole of the population of the Jerusalem area was opposed to the idea of a United Nations administration. No public opinion survey had been

taken which could justify such an assertion, which must, therefore, have been intended merely to intimidate the Committee.

69. The only solution to the problem was by way of objective calculation of the sum really required. The Secretary-General had some data at his disposal and in twenty-four hours could draw up estimates which the Advisory Committee would consider and on which it would report to the Fifth Committee.

70. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said the Fifth Committee was required, as the representative of Norway had pointed out, to report to the General Assembly on the probable effect on the budget of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution; but it must also act immediately, aware that unless the General Assembly promptly voted the appropriations required, that decision could not be implemented, since it would be quite impossible to meet such requirements from the Working Capital Fund.

71. The Secretary-General's estimates, together with the amount required for the Conciliation Commission, amounted to some 9 million dollars. It was unusual to find in the Fifth Committee a tendency to increase the Secretary-General's estimates, nor was it easy to believe that the implementation of the decision in question would require a sum three times the amount which the latter proposed; the Secretariat was, after all, experienced in making such estimates.

72. The question before the meeting was whether or not it should urge the General Assembly to grant the appropriations at the current session.

73. The CHAIRMAN shared the views of the Brazilian delegation.

74. Mr. BARTOS (Yugoslavia) pointed out that even those delegations which had opposed internationalization as a solution for the problem of Jerusalem must bear in mind that the resolution had, in fact, been adopted.

75. The figures submitted to the Committee were too uncertain, for they were based on the figures of 1946—those of a mandatory or, in effect, a colonial system. The international administration would be concerned not with maintaining a quasi-colonial system, half anarchist, half police-state, but with something entirely different, with raising the standard of living, and treating the people, not as natives under a colonial system, but as the population they were.

76. The first principles for such a society must be laid down before a financial policy could be established. The Secretary-General's estimates gave nothing but a list of headings, taking no account of the new development.

77. The Fifth Committee was responsible for the General Assembly's accounting, and in the case in question it could not decide what the financial implications were unless it received more reliable data.

78. Mr. ASHA (Syria) associated himself with the opinions expressed by the representatives of Lebanon and of the Ukraine. The decision in question was not unexpected, it was simply the reaffirmation of previous General Assembly resolutions, and had been adopted by a substantial majority. The Fifth Committee should show that

respect for the decision of other Committees of which it had so often spoken. The merits of the resolution were not in question and large sums had often been voted for other worthy causes. The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had asked for estimates of the financial implications of its decision and the Fifth Committee, under the rules of procedure, was bound to give such estimates.

79. The Syrian representative reminded the Chairman that the Fifth Committee had as yet held no night meetings and should be prepared to do so in order to expedite the work of the General Assembly.

80. He furthermore suggested that the Secretary-General might explore the question of revenue from the Jerusalem area, and also that the United Kingdom delegation might be asked to state whether Jerusalem under British administration had been in fact a bankrupt area, and whether it had cost from 8 to 10 million dollars annually to administer.

81. Mr. Asha subscribed to the Chinese suggestion, while feeling that in the cause of peace and security, and where such a city as Jerusalem was concerned, the Working Capital Fund might perhaps be raised from 20 to 25 million dollars. The United Nations had never been sparing of money in the cause of peace and security and should not be so now, where its own resolutions were concerned.

82. Mr. WITHERSPOON (Liberia) thought the procedure being followed was incorrect. The Committee had before it no documents officially apprising it of the decision of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, it had merely Conference-Room Paper No. 6 giving the Secretary-General's estimates. Mr. Witherspoon recalled that when the Committee had discussed the possibility of setting up an information centre in Liberia, it had insisted on all documents being circulated before a decision could be taken. Moreover, the Committee's usual procedure of referring the Secretary-General's estimates to the Advisory Committee for a report, had not been followed in the case under consideration.

83. The Administration of Jerusalem, moreover, was not in process of constitution; the United Nations was taking over a going concern which could not be taken over piecemeal. The sum of 8 million dollars would allow for only partial administration, and to adopt such a sum would be tantamount to saying that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's decision should not be carried out. The Working Capital Fund could not be drawn upon, since it would be diminished by other calls upon it.

84. The Liberian representative was of the opinion that the figures should be submitted to the Advisory Committee in the regular way; the Committee could not be expected to judge from figures based on assumptions, and on assumptions taken from material dating back to the mandatory period, whereas the future administration of Jerusalem would no longer be mandatory. Nor should it be forgotten that a war had been waged in that territory since the period for which the figures were valid, completely changing the situation.

85. For the above reasons the Liberian delegation supported the proposals of the delegations of Israel, the United States and Norway.

86. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Liberian representative that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's draft resolution had been circulated on 2 December 1949 as document A/AC.31/SC.1/L.7.

87. Mr. КНОВУШКО (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that there were two ways of solving the problem: one simple, swift and businesslike, namely, to follow the accepted procedure. The other was to drag out the discussion and try to wreck the decision when it came before the General Assembly in plenary. It was to be hoped that the Fifth Committee would follow the first course. He reminded the Committee of the earlier precedents of considering the financial implications of a decision before receiving the decision from the substantive organ; in such cases the Chairman of the Fifth Committee had referred the matter to the Advisory Committee directly, and there was nothing to prevent such a procedure now. He suggested that the Advisory Committee should be asked to hold a special meeting the following morning and to submit a report to the Fifth Committee. Delegations had settled their policies; those which had stated their position in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee would be unlikely to change it. Nor did they suspect the Secretary-General of submitting unnaturally low estimates — his tendency was more likely to be the opposite. The Advisory Committee, therefore, should have no difficulty in producing a report quickly.

88. It was clear that the figures of 20 and 25 million dollars had been advanced in order to persuade the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to reject the resolution. The Soviet Union delegation, therefore, was in favour of action to take the decision through the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly with all speed, and asked that the matter should be referred to the urgent consideration of the Advisory Committee. Nor should the revenue from the Jerusalem area, which had as yet not been taken into account by the Secretary-General, be forgotten.

89. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) pointed out that the Fifth Committee was a technical committee which, under rule 142 of the rules of procedure, must give a reasonable estimate of the financial implications of the decision before it.

90. There was even more reason for following, in the case of an amount as great as eight million dollars, a procedure which was followed for every small amount: reference to the Advisory Committee. Conference-Room Paper No. 6 should be referred to the Advisory Committee, to which the Secretariat should also submit any additional information which it might acquire. The Committee should not disregard its responsibilities because of the shortness of time at its disposal. He therefore supported the proposal made by the USSR delegation.

91. Mr. SHANN (Australia) felt that the Fifth Committee should confine itself to the financial implications of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's decision, without introducing irrelevant political considerations.

92. He agreed with the representative of Brazil that the General Assembly should decide the matter at the current session, but also thought that the Secretary-General and the Advisory Com-

mittee should submit documents as a basis for discussion.

93. The Secretary-General could not be empowered to draw upon the Working Capital Fund since the Chairman of the Board of Auditors had stated that by May 1950 the Fund would be at a low ebb.

94. The Australian representative suggested that the meeting should adjourn until more data were available, that is, until the Advisory Committee could present a report.

95. Mr. EL-KONI (Egypt) supported the Australian proposal for an adjournment of the meeting.

96. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel) also supported the Australian proposal.

97. Mr. TARN (Poland) asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee whether that Committee could present a report by the following day.

98. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that his Committee would meet the following morning and would do its best to present the Committee with a report, as adequate as the information at its disposal allowed.

99. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the President of the General Assembly had requested the Fifth Committee's recommendations by the following day; in view, however, of the feeling of the meeting that the customary procedure should be followed, he asked the Committee if it would meet the following afternoon to consider the Advisory Committee's report.

100. Mr. TARN (Poland) suggested that if the General Assembly was to finish the remainder of its agenda the following afternoon, the Fifth Committee might meet on Friday, 9 December, in the General Assembly, first constituting itself the Fifth Committee to approve the Advisory Committee's report and then reverting to a plenary meeting to adopt the Fifth Committee's recommendations.

101. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Polish representative that the General Assembly had other items to consider, among them the Fifth Committee's final reports.

102. Mr. LEBEAU (Belgium) expressed his support of the position taken by the delegations of the United States, Syria, South Africa, Australia and the Soviet Union.

103. The decision of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee was important enough to necessitate a change in the General Assembly's time-table. He deprecated any attempt to adhere rigidly to that time-table to the detriment of the draft resolution in question.

104. Mr. ASHA (Syria) repeated his suggestion for an evening meeting.

105. The CHAIRMAN agreed that such a meeting might be necessary.

It was unanimously agreed to refer the Secretary-General's estimates of the financial implications of an international régime for the Jerusalem area to the Advisory Committee, with the request that it report back to the Fifth Committee the following afternoon.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 8 December 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. KYROU (Greece).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1950

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE *Ad Hoc* POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONCERNING AN INTERNATIONAL RÉGIME FOR THE JERUSALEM AREA AND PROTECTION OF THE HOLY PLACES (*concluded*)

1. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, as requested at the previous meeting, had produced a report (A/1226) on the Secretary-General's estimates (A/C.5/367 and A/C.5/L.47) of the financial implications of the question under discussion. He drew particular attention to the fact that the Advisory Committee in its report proposed a reduction of 59,000 dollars in the appropriations for the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, a reduction which the Secretary-General had accepted.

2. The Chairman suggested that the draft appropriations under the heading of the Conciliation Commission should constitute a provision under section 6 of the budget, and that, pending adoption

by the General Assembly of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's draft resolution concerning an international régime for the Jerusalem area, no provision should be made in the draft appropriation resolution for expenditure with regard to Palestine other than for the Conciliation Commission. The Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly of the financial implications of the problem as a whole, in order to enable the Assembly to take its decision with a full knowledge of the facts. It was understood that if the General Assembly should adopt the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's resolution the budget appropriations would have to be adjusted accordingly.

3. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced his Committee's report (A/1226), emphasizing that it was necessarily preliminary and tentative in character, the Secretary-General having been able to make only "rough estimates", and having, moreover, taken no account of possible revenue from the Jerusalem area in 1950.

4. Mr. Aghnides drew particular attention to the assumptions on which the report was based, quot-