

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TENTH SESSION
Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 528th
MEETING**

*Friday, 9 December 1955,
at 10.50 a.m.*

New York

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 38: Budget estimates for the financial year 1956 (<i>continued</i>)	235
Agenda item 60: Establishment and maintenance of a United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea.....	237
Agenda item 41: Headquarters of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General	237

Chairman: Mr. Hans ENGEN (Norway).

AGENDA ITEM 38

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1956
(A/2904 and Add.1, A/2921) (*continued*)**

***Permanent headquarters of the International
Telecommunication Union and the World Me-
teorological Organization in Geneva (A/3025,
A/C.5/627/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.353, A/C.5/L.373/
Rev.1, A/C.5/L.376, A/C.5/L.377) (con-
cluded)***

1. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said that he supported the Canadian revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.373/Rev.1) and the Australian amendment (A/C.5/L.377).

2. Mr. CHECHYOTKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would like to know on what basis the figure of \$200,000, given in paragraph 1 (a) of the Canadian draft resolution, had been calculated. It seemed to him, moreover, that the Belgian draft resolution (A/C.5/L.376) was actually an amendment to the Canadian draft resolution. He asked what effect the adoption of the Australian amendment would have on the Belgian draft resolution.

3. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) replied that the adoption of his amendment would have no effect whatever on the Belgian draft resolution.

4. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) asked that the draft resolution proposed by his delegation should be treated as an independent proposal and not as an amendment to the Canadian draft resolution.

5. Mr. WEIR (Canada) said that the figure of \$200,000 referred to by the USSR representative was simply a limit imposed upon the Secretary-General with regard to his negotiations with the Swiss Government.

The Australian amendment (A/C.5/L.377) was rejected by 13 votes to 8, with 6 abstentions.

The Canadian draft resolution (A/C.5/L.373/Rev.1) was adopted by 28 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

6. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) presented the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (A/C.5/L.376). As some delegations had questioned the need to make

any provision at present for additional offices for the United Nations, he would like Mr. Pelt, the Director of the European Office, to give the Committee some particulars about the existing situation.

7. Mr. PELT (Director of the United Nations European Office) said that when he had entered upon his present duties, in 1952, the number of reserve offices set aside for the secretariats and delegations of the visiting and other conferences held at Geneva had been 148. They had been so grouped together as to ensure the best possible servicing of the conferences. The number of offices had gradually fallen to 138. That was not a serious decrease, but the offices were no longer in the same place. Those temporarily assigned to the secretariats and delegations of the various conferences had been increasingly dispersed throughout the building. The conferences were consequently not serviced with the same efficiency, with the result that they cost more.

8. There was doubtless no immediate need at present for additional office accommodation at the European Office since conferences could still be served. It should be borne in mind, however, that at some future and perhaps not distant date additional services might be transferred from Headquarters to the European Office. Moreover, if eighteen new members were admitted to the United Nations, ten of them, being European, would be members of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) and the secretariat of that body would gradually have to be enlarged. The construction of an additional wing in the years 1957-59 thus presented an opportunity of providing the United Nations with sixty additional offices at a moderate cost, whereas in later years the cost of building additional offices would certainly be a great deal higher.

9. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that the intention of his delegation in proposing its draft resolution had been to give effect to the wise recommendation made by the Secretary-General in his report (A/C.5/627/Rev.1). The explanation of the Director of the European Office had shown that in so doing the Belgian delegation had acted with foresight. Before long Geneva would have regained its importance as a centre for international meetings. The number of United Nations Members might rise from sixty to seventy-eight and ten new European members be admitted to ECE. If that were so, the European Office would need more space. It would be foolish not to take advantage of the opportunity to build additional office accommodation. The Belgian proposal would have no financial implications in 1956, nor would it have any in the future if the International Telecommunication Union and the World Meteorological Organization rejected the United Nations offer. If they accepted the offer, the financial implications would be limited to a ceiling of \$220,000. His delegation had included that figure in its draft resolution in order to take into account the United Kingdom representative's views.

10. In reply to a question by Mr. FRIIS (Denmark), Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the Secretary-General had stated in his report that it was impossible at the moment to foresee the extent of the future needs of the European Office or how much it would cost to meet those needs. That being so, there was no way of knowing how many offices the European Office would need in a few years. Furthermore, the present programme of conferences would remain in effect until 1957, at which time it might be modified. For all those reasons, the Advisory Committee had thought it better that no decision should be taken at present on the construction of additional offices for the United Nations.

11. Mr. CLOUGH (United Kingdom) thanked the Belgian representative for having consented to set a limit of \$220,000 in his draft resolution. Nevertheless, he would be obliged to vote against the resolution.

12. Mr. CHECHYOTKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that, in the light of the Advisory Committee's observations (A/3025) and inasmuch as it was not known what decision the two specialized agencies concerned would take or what would be the outcome of the negotiations to be entered into with the Swiss Government, it would be better not to take any decision at present. He accordingly asked the Belgian representative to withdraw his draft resolution, on the understanding that he could resubmit it at the following session.

13. Mr. GANEM (France) was glad that the Canadian draft resolution had been adopted by a substantial majority. That resolution concerned a matter of principle; the Belgian draft resolution, on the other hand, was of a different order, in that it constituted an act of foresight. No one, of course, knew yet what the requirements of the European Office would be in a few years, but there would certainly be more meetings held there, since the United Nations would inevitably grow. The French delegation accordingly felt it would be unwise to reject the Belgian draft resolution. It would be an act of sound administration to take advantage of the opportunity offered to the United Nations to set aside office space in the plans for the new wing to the Palais des Nations, for otherwise within a few years Member States would be obliged to appropriate a much larger sum in order to add a whole new wing to the building.

14. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) said that he endorsed the observations made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and would vote against the Belgian draft resolution.

15. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) thanked the French representative for his support but noted with regret that he had been the only representative to speak in favour of the Belgian draft resolution. In consideration, therefore, of the USSR representative's appeal, the Belgian delegation would bow to the opinion of the majority and withdraw its draft resolution. It hoped, however, that the opinions expressed in the debate would be set forth at some length in the Rapporteur's report.

16. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he would not like to give the impression that the Advisory Committee opposed the construction of new offices in principle. It simply considered that a

decision on the matter would be premature and that it would be better to wait some time before taking one.

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE (A/C.5/L.372)

17. Mr. TURNER (Controller) pointed out that the Committee's decision would relate solely to the figure of \$3,050,800 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/L.372), which represented the amount of revenue taken as an appropriation in aid of budgetary expenditures, the other revenue being paid into the Tax Equalization Fund.

18. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the new procedure followed automatically from the Committee's decision regarding the establishment of the Tax Equalization Fund.

19. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should approve the sum of \$3,050,800, which was the total revenue excluding staff assessment revenue, as the estimate of miscellaneous revenue for the financial year 1956.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

Second reading (A/C.5/L.367, A/C.5/L.374)

20. Mr. MERROW (United States of America) felt that the Committee should not proceed with the second reading of the budget estimates for 1956 before examining all the supplementary estimates in the first reading. The Committee would still have to decide on the financial implications of the draft resolution the Fourth Committee might adopt on a plebiscite in Togoland and the financial implications of the possible admission of eighteen States to the United Nations.

21. He therefore suggested that the Committee should authorize the Advisory Committee to make a preliminary study of those two items and should request it to submit a report as soon as the study was completed. The Committee could study the Advisory Committee's recommendations at a later meeting and then pass to the second reading of the budget.

22. The United States delegation had prepared some proposals which would necessitate a vote on certain sections of the budget during the second reading. It thought that all delegations which had similar proposals to submit should hand them to the Secretariat at the earliest opportunity. The Committee would then be able to examine all those proposals when it came to the second reading of the budget.

23. Mr. TURNER (Controller), replying to Mr. CHECHYOTKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. GANEM (France), said that there was no objection to that procedure. The Secretariat could provide the Advisory Committee with all the necessary information on the relevant financial implications forthwith.

24. Mr. CLOUGH (United Kingdom) and Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) supported the United States proposal.

25. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should postpone the second reading of the budget estimates for 1956 until Tuesday, 13 December, in accordance with the United States representative's suggestion.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 60

Establishment and maintenance of a United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea (A/3074, A/C.5/653, A/C.5/L.371)

26. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the measures contemplated by the Secretary-General, as set forth in document A/C.5/653, had been approved by the Advisory Committee. In adopting the fourteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.371), the Committee would be authorizing the Secretary-General to include the necessary appropriations in the budget estimates.

27. Mr. CLOUGH (United Kingdom) said that his delegation considered it an honour to be among the fourteen delegations which had submitted a draft resolution on the establishment and maintenance of a United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea.

28. The Committee would note that in paragraph 5 of document A/C.5/653 the Secretary-General proposed that the costs arising from the adoption of the draft resolution should be met under the resolution relating to unforeseen expenses. In paragraph 3 of its thirty-second report (A/3074) the Advisory Committee had approved the procedure and had taken note of the Secretary-General's estimates.

29. The United Kingdom delegation was confident that the Committee would give its full support to the draft resolution.

30. Mr. MERROW (United States of America) said that the United States delegation warmly supported the establishment and maintenance of a United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea. The gallant men who remained buried in that cemetery had been members of the forces which had fought against aggression in Korea under the aegis of the United Nations. That fact alone entitled the proposal for a memorial cemetery to the Committee's support. The action in Korea had been historic in its implications for the Organization and its future, and indeed for the future of the entire world; the establishment of the memorial cemetery would give recognition to that fact.

31. Mr. ERHAN (Turkey), Mr. ALS (Luxembourg), Mr. GANEM (France), Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines), Mr. MONTERO BUSTAMANTE (Uruguay), Mr. BUNCHOEN (Thailand), Mr. FENAUX (Belgium), Mr. CHAPMAN (New Zealand), Mr. WEIR (Canada), Mr. CARRIZOSA (Colombia), Mr. AGEDE (Ethiopia), Mr. TSAMISIS (Greece) and Mr. CUTTS (Australia) associated themselves with the ideas and feelings which had given rise to the draft resolution. They paid a warm tribute to those who had died for the cause of peace and freedom and said that they would support the draft resolution in document A/C.5/L.371.

The draft resolution (A/C.5/L.371) was adopted by 34 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 41

Headquarters of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/2948, A/2997)

32. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider the draft resolution in paragraph 11 of the Secretary-General's report (A/2948). In its seventh report (A/2997), the Advisory Committee had stated its approval of the Secretary-General's statements.

33. Mr. CHECHYOTKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled his delegation's criticisms at earlier

sessions of the manner in which the construction work was being carried out. He noted that the Secretary-General, in his report, proposed that 31 August 1956 should be set as the final completion date and stated that the balance of \$508,039 under the item "Construction of Headquarters" would be used to meet the cost of the projects mentioned in paragraph 5.

34. He seemed to remember that at the ninth session the Secretary-General had announced that construction would be officially completed by 31 December 1955. That being so, he thought it would be better if the accounts were closed on that date and if the Secretary-General were to submit to the Committee specific proposals concerning any other projects he had in mind.

35. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) questioned the advantage of reserving part of the North Delegates' Lounge for representatives.

36. Mr. MENDEZ (Philippines) thought that there should be more washrooms in the first basement of the Conference building.

37. Mr. CHAPMAN (New Zealand) thought that more writing-rooms should be set aside for the use of members of delegations.

38. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) agreed with the New Zealand representative. It would also be an advantage if there could be more telephones in the General Assembly Hall. He was pleased to note that the quality of the meals served in the dining-room had improved considerably.

39. Mr. GREZ (Chile) congratulated the Secretary-General on the success of the extension of the dining-room and cafeteria. He was afraid, however, that those rooms would still not be large enough if the admission of new Members brought about an increase in the number of patrons.

40. Mr. KHALAF (Iraq) wondered whether any arrangements could be made for serving hot meals to delegation drivers.

41. Mr. VAUGHAN (Director of General Services), replying to the USSR representative, explained that the Secretary-General had not said at the ninth session that the construction of Headquarters would be completed in 1955; at that time, he had not set a final completion date. He was now able to do so and proposed that the date should be 31 August 1956. The Secretary-General hoped to submit a final report on the matter to the next session. There seemed no point in giving the Committee details of the projects to be undertaken in 1956, since the expenses had already been incurred and in most cases the work had already been begun, with the consent of the Advisory Committee. In the case of other projects, the Secretariat could make only hypothetical estimates, since the cost depended on the specifications that would be received.

42. He agreed with the Australian representative that the lounge reserved for delegates was not often used; it had, however, been placed at their disposal in response to many requests and it would be better to maintain the *status quo* until another room could be set aside for the purpose. On the other hand, the tea-room adjoining the North Delegates' Lounge had been the subject of much favourable comment and would be retained on a permanent basis as from 1956.

43. In regard to the comments of other representatives concerning telephones in the General Assembly Hall, washrooms and writing facilities, the necessary steps

would be taken to improve the existing facilities before the next session of the General Assembly. The Secretariat would welcome any suggestions representatives might make about the dining-room. He informed the Chilean representative that the new dining-room and cafeteria facilities would be adequate even if eighteen new Members were admitted to the United Nations; if that happened the Secretariat would take the necessary action to avoid overcrowding at certain times. The Secretariat would do all it could about meals for delegation drivers but it would be too costly to provide extra facilities in the part of the building where the drivers usually congregated.

44. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution in the Secretary-General's report (A/2948) to the vote, paragraph 1 being amended to read:

"1. Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the Headquarters of the United Nations and of the observations thereon of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions set forth in its seventh report to the tenth session of the General Assembly (A/2997)."

The draft resolution was adopted as amended by 39 votes to none with 3 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.