

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## SEVENTH SESSION

## Official Records



## FIFTH COMMITTEE, 365th

## MEETING

Monday, 17 November 1952, at 3 p.m.

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
Summary records of the Committee's meetings .....	149
Budget estimates for the financial year 1953: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2125 and Add.1, A/C.5/500, A/C.5/505, A/C.5/506); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2157, A/2250, A/2251, A/C.5/499) ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	149
First reading ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	149
Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1952: report of the Secretary-General (A/2256, A/C.5/507 and Corr.1) .....	153
Headquarters of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/2209) .....	155

*Chairman:* Brigadier-General Carlos P. ROMULO (Philippines).

## Summary records of the Committee's meetings

1. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said he felt bound to protest against the way in which the summary records of the Committee's meetings were prepared. They were devoid of all interest and value and did not in any way reflect what had taken place during the discussions. He did not even recognize his own statements. He gave up the idea of submitting corrigenda for it would mean his having to redraft whole passages of the summary records. The competent authorities might as well dispense with summary records altogether; the information given in the *Journal* was sufficient and at least had the merit of being accurate.

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1953:**  
(a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/2125 and Add.1, A/C.5/500, A/C.5/505, A/C.5/506); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/2157, A/2250, A/2251, A/C.5/499) (*continued*)

[Item 42]\*

### First reading (*continued*)

#### SECTION 20a. OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

2. The CHAIRMAN invited comment on the draft definition of the terms "administrative expenses" and

\* Indicates the item number on the agenda of the General Assembly.

"operational expenses" as given in paragraph 366 of the first report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the seventh session of the General Assembly (A/2157).

3. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (High Commissioner for Refugees) paid a tribute to the Advisory Committee's effort to reach a satisfactory definition, and said that he wished to make some comments.

4. As regards paragraph 366 (a), he pointed out that he was administering two distinct funds: The Refugee Emergency Fund and a fund which operated as the result of a grant from the Ford Foundation. Administrative expenses accounted for 1 per cent of the first, and for 2 per cent of the second of those funds. No expenditure could therefore be improperly charged to the regular United Nations budget.

5. As regards paragraph 366 (b), he said that a distinction should be drawn, firstly between administrative expenses and operational expenses, and, secondly, expenses chargeable to the United Nations and expenses not so chargeable. The costs related to the management of the activities referred to in paragraph (a) should be classed as administrative expenses, and not as operational expenses as the Advisory Committee suggested. If the costs incurred in operating the Office of the High Commissioner were to be entered under the heading of operational expenses, the heading "administrative expenses" would disappear. While not agreeing with the definition given in paragraph 366 (b), he did

agree that the costs to which it referred should not be a liability of the United Nations.

6. Commenting on paragraph 367, he thought that the Advisory Committee's recommendations were in keeping with the provisions of paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 57 (I) concerning the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

7. Subject to those reservations, he approved the Committee's recommendations regarding the apportionment of the expenditure among the various budgets. The Rapporteur might state in his report to the General Assembly that the Advisory Committee's definition should be studied further, but that it was a suitable yardstick for determining what costs were chargeable to the United Nations.

8. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) was sorry that the High Commissioner had had to make certain reservations. The Advisory Committee in drafting its definition had made the utmost allowance for the High Commissioner's position. He could not accept those reservations without consulting the Advisory Committee. He was pleased to note, however, that the High Commissioner agreed to the apportionment of expenditure as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

9. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) asked the High Commissioner to comment on the deviations, referred to in paragraph 304 of the Advisory Committee's report, between the administrative practices of the Office of the High Commissioner and those prevailing in other units of the Secretariat. He also enquired what was the exact significance of paragraph 364 of the Advisory Committee's report.

10. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (High Commissioner for Refugees) answering the Danish representative, explained that while the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraph 304 of its report might have been justified in the early days of the Office of the High Commissioner, such deviations would not recur in the future since the administration of the Office had been placed under the full control of the competent authorities at Geneva.

11. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee agreed to the Advisory Committee's recommendation regarding the distinction to be drawn between administrative and operational expenses, on the understanding that the Rapporteur would, in his report, refer to the High Commissioner's comments.

*It was so agreed.*

12. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) replied to the Danish representative's second question. The budget estimates for 1953 did not include any detailed justification for the proposed new branch offices. The mere approval of budgetary credits for branch offices in 1951 and 1952 did not automatically signify that all branch offices of the Office of the High Commissioner were, or would be, administrative in character.

13. The CHAIRMAN invited debate on paragraphs 301 to 306 of the Advisory Committee's report

(A/2157), concerning the Secretary-General's budget estimates for section 20a (A/2125).

14. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (High Commissioner for Refugees) said he would like to meet the wishes of the General Assembly which was anxious that the expenses relating to the Office of the High Commissioner should be kept as low as possible; but he had to satisfy the pressing requirements of his function. During the financial year 1952 he had succeeded in not spending all the funds allocated to him, but that had required a great effort on his part. Now, for 1953, the Advisory Committee was recommending a reduction of \$23,900 in the appropriations requested for the Office of the High Commissioner. The Fifth Committee should remember that it had taken the United Nations nearly seven years to attain something approaching stability in its budget. The Office of the High Commissioner had been set up so recently that its budget could not have made such strides. When the 1952 budget estimates had been prepared there had still been some unknown factors, and hence it had been impossible to estimate the needs accurately enough. In the case of the 1953 budget estimates those considerations no longer applied; the estimates had been prepared with the utmost strictness.

15. He spoke of the magnitude of his task, and explained briefly the action taken on behalf of about two million utterly destitute refugees whose only hope was the United Nations. The funds he had asked for represented only what was strictly necessary, and he hoped that the Committee would approve them. The resources required for his humanitarian task—and they were not great compared with the United Nations budget as a whole—ought to be placed at his Office's disposal.

16. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) moved that the appropriations requested in respect of section 20a of the budget estimates should be deleted. The function and purposes of such an agency, which had been set up illegally, were incompatible with the provisions of the Charter and General Assembly resolution 8 (I) which requested the early return of all refugees and displaced persons to their countries of origin. The refugees should have reached their countries of origin long before, instead of languishing in camps.

17. Mr. PSCOLKA (Czechoslovakia) recalled that the Czechoslovak delegation had more than once described the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees as an illegal creation that violated General Assembly resolution 62 (I). The Office was merely the servile tool of the aggressive bloc of Powers controlled by the United States of America. It opposed the repatriation of refugees from among whom it recruited spies and agitators to carry on subversive activities against the USSR and the people's democracies. The Czechoslovak delegation would therefore vote against any appropriation for the Office of the High Commissioner.

18. Mr. SHTOKALO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) supported the USSR motion. The Office of the High Commissioner had been set up illegally; not only had it done nothing to further the repatriation of refugees to their countries of origin, but it was recruit-

ing among them spies and cheap labour to be used by the imperialist Powers.

19. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) opposed the USSR motion. The Office of the High Commissioner had been set up and its Statute approved by the General Assembly in 1950 (resolution 428 (V)). The situation had not changed materially since then, and the New Zealand delegation would therefore vote for the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He would not trouble to disprove the accusations made by the USSR and certain other delegations.

20. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) supported the New Zealand representative.

21. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (High Commissioner for Refugees) was sorry that the USSR and certain other delegations had felt impelled to renew their entirely groundless charges. The Office of the High Commissioner was certainly not the servile tool of the Western Powers. It was simply trying to relieve the sufferings of the refugees, a purely humanitarian task. The Office was doing all in its power to assist those refugees who desired to return to their countries of origin, but was careful not to exert the slightest pressure on them in that respect.

22. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) associated herself with the remarks of the representatives of New Zealand and Denmark. The High Commissioner had said—and he had already given proof by his administration of the credits placed at his disposal for the current year that he sincerely meant it—that he was determined to administer his Office as economically as possible. Even so small a sum as \$23,900 could play an important part in a tightly calculated budget. Perhaps the High Commissioner might be asked to endeavour to carry out his task within the limits of the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee, on the understanding that he would be free to administer the amount as a whole and with the hope that the Advisory Committee would sympathetically consider any request made to it during the financial year for a transfer of funds if circumstances so required.

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR motion to delete the appropriations requested in respect of section 20a of the budget estimates.

*The USSR proposal was rejected by 41 votes to 5.*

24. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that transfers were permissible within any particular section of the budget. If the High Commissioner were unable, within the limits of the funds allocated to him, to cope with the demands made on his Office, the Advisory Committee would naturally be prepared to examine the position. A sound budget inevitably contained a certain element of risk; absolute certainty was not desirable. Besides, the amount under discussion was merely an insignificant part of the High Commissioner's total budget.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the particular explanations of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee would be mentioned in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly.

26. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) stated that he would support the Advisory Committee's recommendations

but assured the High Commissioner that that should not be interpreted as implying either an indifferent or a critical attitude towards the Office's humanitarian work. The Fifth Committee's approach was dictated by the desire not to increase the total budget. It was to be hoped that the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee would be adequate for the Office of the High Commissioner.

27. Mr. VAN HEUVEN GOEDHART (High Commissioner for Refugees) said he could not conceive how he could possibly carry out his work if the Committee were to adopt the Advisory Committee's recommendations. Furthermore, the amount at issue was not insignificant, since it represented 3 per cent of his budget. He would do his utmost to keep within the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee; however, he was glad to have the assurance that the Advisory Committee would give sympathetic consideration to any request for authority to make transfers that might be submitted to it during the financial year.

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation for approval of an appropriation of \$650,000 in respect of section 20a.

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 43 votes to 5 with 1 abstention.*

#### SECTION 1. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation for approval of an appropriation of \$640,000 in respect of section 1 (A/2157, para. 79).

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved unanimously.*

#### SECTIONS 1 AND 20. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION

30. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to an error in the Advisory Committee's report (A/2251): the reduction mentioned in paragraph 8(a) should be \$1,800 instead of \$2,400, and consequential adjustments would be required in paragraph 9.

31. Mr. PELT (Director of the United Nations Office at Geneva) referred to the reasons given by the Advisory Committee for recommending a \$10,000 cut in the funds requested for recruitment of temporary staff at Geneva (A/2251, para. 8(b)). He did not agree with the Advisory Committee's statement that the estimate had been prepared on too liberal a scale; unfortunately he had not been able to submit the detailed figures prepared by the Geneva Office to the Advisory Committee.

32. That Committee also said that insufficient account had been taken of the item for temporary assistance in the Geneva Office budget. In that connexion, he pointed out, first, that the provision for that item had been reduced from \$32,000 to \$25,000 during the first reading, in accordance with the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/2157, para. 271). Secondly, the budget document stated specifically that the estimate for temporary assistance had been based on the assump-

tion that there would be no more than one or two small meetings of non-Geneva-based bodies (A/2125, pp. 119-120). The Advisory Committee's report (A/2251) showed that the Geneva estimate included at least partial provision for one or two sessions of small or medium-sized bodies. In fact, the Geneva Office had never professed to be able to finance recruitment of temporary assistance for sessions of medium-sized bodies out of its regular budget. A commission such as the International Law Commission meeting for twelve weeks and using simultaneous interpretation could hardly, in budgetary terms, be classed as a "small" body requiring only little servicing. Furthermore, the Geneva Office would be servicing three other bodies meeting for only a short period (the Joint Staff Pension Board, the Committee on Migration and the Technical Assistance Board), in respect of which no supplementary provision had been requested; others were likely to be added to the list. In the third place, the Geneva estimates had been based on the belief that the session of the International Law Commission would last only eleven weeks whereas the Advisory Committee had based its report on a twelve-week session.

33. In the light of those considerations, the Geneva Office would find it impossible to provide the International Law Commission with the requisite services if the Fifth Committee were to approve the cuts recommended by the Advisory Committee.

34. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He was surprised that the International Law Commission had decided to meet for twelve instead of for eleven weeks. It was undoubtedly possible to speed up its proceedings and the work of the Geneva Office.

35. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that it appeared from paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/2251), which referred to article 12 of the Statute of the International Law Commission, that the General Assembly had largely compromised its budgetary powers to determine where a subsidiary organ should meet. He would like to have the views of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on that point.

36. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said it was impossible to draw up very accurate estimates and hoped that Mr. Pelt would accept whatever risks the Advisory Committee's recommendations involved.

37. In reply to the Australian representative, he recalled that the International Law Commission had met in New York in 1949 and at Geneva in 1950, 1951 and 1952 for periods of eight to ten weeks. Article 12 of the International Law Commission's Statute raised an important constitutional issue. It was a dangerous precedent; since the principle of the separation of powers had been adopted, such an organ should not have the power to decide as it pleased where to meet.

38. He was convinced, in common with the Norwegian representative, that the Commission's proceedings could be accelerated.

39. Mr. PELT (Director of the United Nations Office at Geneva) was prepared to take risks provided that they were calculated. The estimates drawn up by the Geneva Office already involved risks, which had

been realistically calculated. He agreed with the Norwegian representative that the International Law Commission's proceedings could undoubtedly be speeded up, which was why the Geneva Office had prepared its estimates on the assumption of an eleven-week session.

40. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Secretariat) said that the International Law Commission's forthcoming session would be the last to be attended by some of its members. The Commission wanted a longer session so as to be able to complete its work and submit a finished job to the General Assembly. In accordance with article 12 of the Commission's Statute, there had been consultations between the Commission and the Secretary-General. Each year, the Secretary-General had recommended the Commission to meet at Headquarters. Since 1950, however, the Commission had decided to meet each year at Geneva, among the reasons being the age of its members and the rigours of the New York summer.

41. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) did not feel that the reason given by the International Law Commission justified a longer session than usual; he contended that the Commission could speed up its proceedings.

42. Mr. STRAUCH (Brazil) said he gathered from Mr. Pelt's statement that the Geneva Office would be unable to provide the requisite services for the International Law Commission if the Advisory Committee's recommendations were adopted. Accordingly he would vote for the Secretary-General's estimates. In the first place, there was an understanding that the maximum use should be made of the Geneva Office. Secondly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights were to meet there, which would involve relatively higher costs. Since no great amount was involved in the revised estimates, there were no grounds for opposing the International Law Commission's decision.

43. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would vote against the Secretary-General's proposals as well as against the Advisory Committee's recommendations, for the Geneva Office had adequate resources to meet the requirements of the International Law Commission without any need for additional funds.

44. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) asked the Chairman to put paragraph 8 (c) of the Advisory Committee's report, relating to consultants, to a separate vote.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the item for consultants should be eliminated (A/2251, para. 8 (c)).

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 37 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.*

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation for an additional appropriation of \$22,000 in respect of sections 1 and 20.

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 39 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.*

SECTION 20. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR DECLARATIONS OF DEATH

47. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said he understood that, since no precedent existed, the figures given by

the Secretary-General in his report (A/C.5/506) were purely tentative. In 1953, the Secretary-General would possess data on which to base his estimates for 1954. The Norwegian delegation attached particular importance to the establishment of the Bureau, which met an undoubted international need.

48. Mr. LIVERAN (Israel) referred to the Advisory Committee's proposal that, where hardship would not result to the persons concerned, payment should be required for services which the Bureau rendered (A/2250, para. 2). That proposal was not in accordance with the spirit in which the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons had been concluded. Nor was the test of financial hardship easy to apply. The costs involved would presumably be insignificant, yet the fact that the Bureau would be dealing with interested parties not directly but through courts might cause them considerable waste of time and add to their costs. He was not convinced by the argument that the Bureau's work would serve to establish a legal interest in a missing person's estate. Actually, the interested parties would not know in advance whether the estate was divisible and it would be inconsistent with the dignity of an international organization to charge a contingent fee.

49. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said the representative of Israel was over-anxious. The Advisory Committee had not dissented from the recommendation of the Conference to make the United Nations responsible for the Bureau's costs. In all fairness, however, it would be reasonable to ask for payment from the interested parties, if they could afford it.

50. Mr. LIVERAN (Israel) said he agreed with the substance of paragraph 2 but pointed out that financial difficulties could take an entirely different form. They might arise, for instance, from exchange control regulations. In cases where a government had placed a general ban on payments abroad by its citizens, payment of a fee to the International Bureau might involve a good deal of red tape and waste of time.

51. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) was pleased to note that the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons had become operative. He agreed with the Norwegian representative that it would be desirable for the following year to have statistics concerning the Bureau's activities, and also information which might throw light on the problem raised by the representative of Israel.

52. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would vote against both the Secretary-General's proposals and the Advisory Committee's recommendations. At the fifth session of the General Assembly, the USSR delegation had opposed the establishment of the International Bureau on the grounds that the problem could be solved by means of direct communications between governments.

53. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) suggested that the Advisory Committee should be asked to study the matter and to report to the General Assembly at its eighth session.

54. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) pointed out that the International Bureau would be addressing its reports

to the Sixth Committee. It would certainly be very useful if the Fifth Committee could study those reports before funds were appropriated.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$12,500 for section 20 in respect of the International Bureau for Declarations of Death (A/2250, para. 4).

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation was approved by 40 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.*

## SECTION 2. THE SECURITY COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

56. The CHAIRMAN read the comments of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 80 of its report (A/2157).

*Section 2 was approved.*

## SECTION 17. COMMON STAFF COSTS

57. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) explained the reasons why the Secretary-General was unable to accept the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 247 of its report (A/2157).

58. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee whether he had any comments to offer on the statement of the representative of the Secretary-General.

59. The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. Andersen's statement should be circulated as a document<sup>1</sup> and that the consideration of section 17 should be postponed until the following meeting, when the Advisory Committee could offer its comments, if any, on the subject.

*It was so agreed.*

## Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1952: report of the Secretary-General (A/2256, A/C.5/507 and Corr.1)

[Item 41]\*

60. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to consider the Secretary-General's report on the supplementary estimates for the financial year 1952 (A/C.5/507 and Corr.1) and the corresponding report of the Advisory Committee (A/2256).

61. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the total supplementary funds required in fact exceeded the sum of \$2,442,420 mentioned by the Secretary-General; if the surpluses which had materialized in certain sections were disregarded, the amount was really \$2,917,000. The supplementary estimates should be presented differently so as to bring out more clearly what savings had been effected in certain sections.

62. The USSR delegation could not agree to an appropriation of \$1,650,000 for reimbursement of income-tax paid by members of the Secretariat who were nationals of the United States. In that connexion he referred to the text of paragraph 229 of the Advisory Committee's second report of 1951 to the General Assembly (A/1853). The United Nations should put a stop to such expenditure. Moreover the Secretary-General was asking for an appropriation of

<sup>1</sup> The complete text of Mr. Andersen's statement was subsequently issued as document A/C.5/L.198.



about \$470,000 for a number of political missions; the USSR delegation had protested against the establishment of those missions which it considered illegal; it would therefore vote against the appropriations requested. Nor could it vote for the supplementary expenditure relating to the sixth session of the General Assembly: the Secretariat should have avoided unnecessary expenditure. Accordingly, the USSR delegation would vote against the supplementary estimates for the financial year 1952.

63. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) noted that at its sixth session the General Assembly had decided to authorize the Secretary-General to grant a subsidy of \$8,640 to the International School if that sum could be found from savings under section 17 of the budget. He understood that the Secretary-General had advanced one half of the subsidy to the International School. It now appeared that section 17 would produce no surplus and that the International School had been asked to repay the sum advanced to it. The International School was unable to do so. He asked for the comments of the representative of the Secretary-General.

64. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) referring to the USSR representative's critical remarks concerning the presentation of the supplementary estimates, explained that the surpluses or deficiencies for each section of the budget were given in table III of document A/C.5/507.

65. He confirmed what the Australian representative had said about the International School: in view of the deficiency under section 17, it had become necessary to ask the International School for repayment of the advance, though it was hoped that economies would make that subsidy possible.

66. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said he would vote for the appropriations needed to refund to Secretariat members of United States nationality the income-tax paid by them. However, he asked for an inquiry into the financial implications of the new United States Immigration Act which was shortly to come into force, in particular how many staff members would be affected by it and how many would be liable to income-tax. It seemed that holders of permanent or immigration visas would be liable. He added that since the number of nationals of a given country employed in the Secretariat was roughly proportional to that country's rate of contribution and since the Committee had decided to reduce the assessment of the United States, the already excessive number of United States nationals employed in the Secretariat would therefore have to be reduced.

67. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) said he was prepared to approve the sums necessary to grant a subsidy to the International School. In any case, the amount involved was quite small. The International School represented a unique pedagogic experiment; the sum requested was minute by comparison with the accomplishments of the school and the Committee would be open to very serious criticism if it refused to approve the appropriation needed. Many governments were interested in the activities of the International School. His own Government had donated a complete collection of text books. It was the General Assembly's duty to support so remarkable an international experiment. Besides, the tenants at Parkway Village were faced with a steep rent increase, a further

reason why the General Assembly should concern itself with the future of the International School.

68. He would therefore vote for the necessary appropriation. He asked that for the eighth session of the General Assembly the Secretary-General should be requested to submit a complete report on the work of the International School and its requirements.

69. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) formally proposed an increase of \$8,460 in the supplementary estimates for the financial year 1952 so that the subsidy which the General Assembly had meant to grant at its sixth session could be paid to the International School. The Secretary-General should not be criticized for asking for repayment of the advance made to the school, for he had had no choice.

70. At first, the International School had occupied, rent free, a house on the Lake Success site. Now it had to pay rent. The school represented a unique educational experiment which should be continued and expanded. The parents of the children were keenly interested in the school, as was evidenced by the fact that they sent their children there despite the high tuition fees (\$540 per year per child). In any case, the subsidy requested from the United Nations accounted for only 8 per cent of the school's total budget.

71. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) supported the representatives of Australia and Uruguay and expressed willingness to help the International School. He would vote in favour of the Australian proposal.

72. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) concurred in the view of the preceding speakers and noted that at the sixth session of the General Assembly the delegations of Syria and Belgium had proposed that assistance should be given to the International School in the form of funds made available by savings under section 17 of the budget (common staff costs). Unfortunately it had proved impossible to affect those savings. The object was to make it possible for a very interesting experiment to continue and to succeed. The school was asking the General Assembly for only a small contribution so that it could surmount the difficulties of its organizational stage. Accordingly, the Belgian delegation supported the Australian proposal.

73. Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom) said he possessed no particulars relating to the International School, but he noted that the Committee was virtually confronted with a *fait accompli*; the United Kingdom delegation would therefore not press for repayment of the advance granted to the International School. It was, however, dangerous to establish a precedent by granting subsidies and it was most desirable that the Secretary-General should produce a report on which the Committee could express a considered opinion.

74. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) unreservedly supported the Australian proposal. He understood the United Kingdom representative's difficulties in making up his mind and asked whether the Secretary-General could submit the report requested during the current session of the General Assembly.

75. Mr. STRAUCH (Brazil), Mr. ASHA (Syria) and Mr. KIA (Iran) supported the Australian proposal and added that their delegations were prepared to assist the International School.

76. The CHAIRMAN stated that the report requested from the Secretary-General would be submitted in the course of the current session.

77. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) expressed the hope that the Secretary-General's report would describe the International School's plans for financing in the future. The vote on the Australian proposal would not prejudice the General Assembly's decision concerning the future of the International School.

78. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) concurred in the reservations expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Australian proposal to increase the supplementary estimates for the financial year 1952 by \$8,460 in order to make it possible to grant a subsidy to the International School.

*The Australian proposal was adopted by 40 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

80. Replying to a question by Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom), Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) explained that the Secretary-General's report would indicate how the International School operated; it would also contain a statement of the school's financial position and describe its plans for the future.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution contained in annex C of document A/C.5/507, subject to the increase resulting from the adoption of the Australian proposal.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to 5.*

#### **Headquarters of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (A/2209)**

[Item 47]\*

82. Lord CALDECOTE (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom delegation appreciated in full

measure the efforts made to complete the work on the Headquarters building. He praised the perfection and the precision of the technical installations and congratulated the Secretary-General and the Secretariat personnel who had contributed to the success of the undertaking.

83. Mr. BOTHA (Union of South Africa) also paid tribute to the efforts made; he congratulated the Secretary-General and the staff concerned on completing the work in time.

84. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) associated himself with the remarks of the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Union of South Africa. He wished to congratulate the Secretary-General on the very keen personal interest he had taken in the construction of the Headquarters. The Headquarters buildings might be regarded as a concrete manifestation of his energy and devotion. He also congratulated the City of New York which had spent a good deal of money on improving and embellishing the area adjacent to Headquarters. Finally, he congratulated the Headquarters Advisory Committee and Mr. Harrison, the Director of Planning.

85. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) associated himself with the tributes to the Secretary-General.

86. Mr. HALL (United States of America) joined in the congratulations addressed to the Secretary-General.

87. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution given at the end of the Secretary-General's report (A/2209).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.