

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION



MEETING

Tuesday, 18 December 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Official Records

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

Page

Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/L.145, A/C.5/L.148); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853)	
Draft appropriation resolution (<i>continued</i>)	197
Second reading	200

Chairman : Mr. T. A. STONE (Canada).

Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a) Budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/L.145, A/C.5/L.148); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853)

[Item 41]*

Draft appropriation resolution (*continued*)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the amendment submitted by the Canadian and United States delegations (A/C.5/L.145) to the draft appropriation resolution for the financial year 1952 contained in the second report of 1951 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853). He also drew attention to the Secretary-General's report summarizing the present budget situation (A/C.5/L.148), in paragraph 6 of which there was a mistake in the last sentence, which should read: "The total contributions ... would thus be increased by a sum of \$5,042,300 ... to \$43,021,160".

2. Mr. GANEM (France) thought that the procedure proposed in the Canadian-United States amendment was much better than that suggested by the Secretary-General, in that it imposed a ceiling for part XII of the budget and held out the hope that final assessments under that part might be less than the provisional assessments.

3. He wished however to submit three amendments to the Canadian-United States proposals, but would not insist on them if the Canadian and United States representatives did not accept them. He suggested, in the first place, that in view of the fact that the Committee had only been informed the previous day that the Secretary-General was requesting an extra one million dollars for the increased construction cost of

the permanent Headquarters and since his request had not yet been considered, still less approved, the title of section 33 should read simply "Investigations, inquiries and other activities" and make no specific mention of "building construction".

4. He also felt that it was unnecessary to specify, as was done in the proposed paragraph 3 of the Canadian-United States amendment, that the General Assembly's approval of the detailed estimates under part XII should be by two-thirds majority vote, since Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter provided that a two-thirds majority vote was required for the adoption of all important proposals, among which budgetary proposals were explicitly included.

5. In the third place, he suggested that it would be manifestly unwise to set the ceiling for appropriations under part XII too high and that the figure of \$5,500,000, proposed by the Canadian and United States delegations, might be replaced by \$5,000,000, which would be quite sufficient.

6. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that section 5, for which it was proposed to appropriate \$2,800,000, included several projects to which the USSR delegation objected, such as the grant of insignia for the so-called United Nations forces in Korea, the Conciliation Commission for Palestine and the Special Committee on the Balkans. His delegation's objections to the establishment of the United Nations Field Service (section 5a), which was not provided for in the Charter, and was indeed incompatible with it, had been explained at the third and fourth sessions of the General Assembly. The establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Commission on Prisoners of War was also incompatible with Article 107 of the Charter, and was, moreover, completely unnecessary, since all prisoners of war in the Soviet Union had been repatriated long since. In the Economic and Social Council the Soviet Union representative had pointed out that the unrepresentative character of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour vitiated its work, but his proposals for making it more representative had been rejected. The grant of a cost-

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

of-living adjustment at Headquarters required thorough study from all points of view before provision for it was made in the budget, even on a provisional basis. Similarly, the request for an additional appropriation to meet the increased cost of the permanent Headquarters had not yet been considered by the Headquarters Advisory Committee or by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and until it had been, even provisional approval of it might prejudice the General Assembly's subsequent consideration of the question. Moreover, he recalled that out of the original appropriation for the permanent Headquarters it had been possible to place a certain amount in reserve. If additional funds were really needed, the United States Government should be asked to increase the amount of its loan on similar terms to those existing.

7. For all those reasons he could not support the Canadian-United States amendment, which would increase the budget by \$5,500,000.

8. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) said that he would support the Canadian-United States amendment, and the amendments to it proposed by the French representative, provided they were acceptable to the Canadian and United States representatives.

9. He understood the USSR representative's attitude, but as matters stood at present, the Committee had no choice. The budget had to be approved, and there was no better way of approving it than that proposed in the Canadian-United States amendment. On the other hand, it must be clearly understood that such approval was provisional; the Norwegian delegation would doubtless raise objections to certain of the detailed estimates after the Christmas recess. And it was most regrettable that the General Assembly had been forced to adopt so unsatisfactory a procedure; he hoped that, in the event of its again meeting as late in the year, the practice followed by the League of Nations in similar circumstances would be borne in mind and the Fifth Committee convened one or two months before the General Assembly opened.

10. Mr. ADARKAR (India) said that he would vote for the Canadian-United States amendment, which was the only practicable proposal before the Committee and had the great advantage of leaving the General Assembly free to make any reductions it thought fit. The only point open to question was the amount to be taken as a maximum, and he supported the French representative in requesting the United States and Canadian representatives to reconsider the figure of \$5,500,000.

11. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) said that he had been anxious to place before the General Assembly the most precise estimate possible of the additional cost of construction of the permanent Headquarters. On the other hand, the Fifth Committee had been informed at the fifth session of the General Assembly that additional sums would be necessary, and the warning had been repeated in paragraph 15 of document A/1895, which had been distributed some time previously and had been approved by the Headquarters Advisory Committee prior to distribution; that Committee had been informed that the additional sums necessary would be between 4 and 5 per cent of the original total. In fact the Secretary-General was at present asking for an addi-

tional sum of rather less than 5 per cent. If the total appropriation for section 35, which was already nearly \$500,000 less than the total of the detailed estimates prepared by the Secretary-General, were reduced still further, the only possibility would be to subject the Working Capital Fund to even greater strain, since no further economies could be made on missions.

12. On the other hand, the Secretary-General was in complete agreement that the procedure which the special circumstances of the present session had made necessary was highly unsatisfactory.

13. Mr. HSIA (China) recalled that he had stated at the previous meeting that the procedure proposed by the Secretary-General was acceptable in principle. That proposed by the Canadian and United States delegations however was more precise and more practical, and he supported it.

14. He agreed with the French representative that it was unnecessary to specify that the General Assembly's approval of the detailed estimates under part XII should be by two-thirds majority vote, not only by reason of the Charter, but also because rule 84 of the rules of procedure was explicit on that point.

15. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) said that the Canadian-United States amendment entailed a very substantial increase in the budget, which would be reflected in substantially higher assessments for all Member Governments. In 1946 the United Nations budget had amounted to \$19,000,000; since then it had risen sharply each year. Now it was proposed overnight that it should be further increased by \$5,500,000.

16. The Secretariat had had more than a month to present firm estimates to the General Assembly. No more than a few working days now remained before the end of the financial year, and that was being made the excuse for rushing the Committee into approving proposals which it had not had sufficient time to consider properly. Although the explanations provided by Mr. Andersen at the previous meeting and by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/L.148 were rather vague, they showed plainly enough that a large proportion of the funds requested would go to purposes which were not in accordance with the United Nations Charter. As regards the increased cost of building the permanent Headquarters, he recalled that, when the original appropriation had been under consideration, both Mr. Price and Mr. Andersen had assured the Committee that it was quite sufficient. Indeed, the tender which had been accepted had quoted a considerably lower sum, and the balance had been set aside as a reserve. With regard to the cost-of-living allowance for Headquarters staff, it would have been useful to have had some clearer indication of how the Secretary-General proposed to distribute the \$1,330,000 which was asked for, especially since a rise in the cost of living would primarily affect the lower grades and it was the higher grades who had benefited most from the substantial increases voted by the General Assembly the previous year.

17. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) said that he accepted the French representative's first two suggestions. As regards the third he thought no delegation would impute extravagance to the Canadian delegation, and he was quite prepared to agree to the lowest maximum figure, which seemed reasonable to a majority of delegations and to the Secretary-General.

18. Mr. BUSTAMANTE (Mexico) felt that the criticism which had been levelled at the Canadian and United States delegations for proposing an unwarranted increase in the budget was unjustified; in point of fact they proposed a reduction of nearly \$500,000 on the most recent estimates submitted by the Secretary-General, those contained in document A/C.5/L.148. On the other hand, he agreed that those estimates should have been submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in the normal way.

19. Mr. VORYS (United States of America) said that, like the Canadian representative, he was prepared to accept the French representative's first two suggestions, although he proposed, with regard to the second, that the Committee's report should contain an indication that part XII, as proposed by the Canadian and United States delegations, related, *inter alia*, to the items listed as (a) to (h) in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/L.148.

20. He could not agree to the French representative's suggestion that the maximum appropriation should be reduced below \$5,500,000, which had been shown to be a reasonable figure in the light of the numerous explanations given.

21. The Canadian-United States amendment related to only a comparatively small proportion of the total budget, which it was the Committee's intention to approve that same day, and he hoped it could be disposed of rapidly.

22. Mr. ABBASI (Pakistan) said that, although he supported the Canadian-United States amendment, he was far from approving the manner in which the need for additional appropriations had been sprung on the Committee at the last moment. He could not understand why the League of Nations procedure, to which the Norwegian representative had just drawn attention, should have been overlooked.

23. Mr. LEVI (Yugoslavia) said that he also would vote for the Canadian-United States proposal. With reference to the French suggestions, he agreed that specific mention of a two-thirds majority vote was unnecessary, since the rules of procedure adequately covered the point. He was not, however, so sure that it would be wise to delete the reference to building construction. The total amount involved for that purpose was in the neighbourhood of \$3,000,000. It would not be good budgetary practice to call upon the Working Capital Fund for the whole sum. Nor was he in favour of reducing the total appropriation for section 33 to \$5,000,000. There was provision for adjustment in the event of any change in the appropriations approved (A/C.5/L.145, proposed paragraph 6). Accordingly, it was better that governments should over-budget than under-budget, and the figure might therefore well remain at the \$5,500,000 proposed by Canada and the United States.

24. The CHAIRMAN pointed out with reference to the United States representative's proposal, that the Committee's report should contain an indication that part XII covered the items listed as (a) to (h) in paragraph 6 of document A/C.5/L.148; that would meet the points raised by the representatives of France and Yugoslavia.

25. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that his delegation would accept the amendments proposed by Canada and

the United States and the figure of \$5,500,000 for section 33. That was a provisional appropriation, subject to later adjustment. Moreover, the procedure proposed did not involve any practical inconvenience, since hitherto no government had ever paid its contribution to the United Nations in the month of January.

26. In reply to a point raised by Mr. HSIA (China), Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) explained that, after the budget of the Organization had been finally approved, which was expected to be towards the end of January 1952, the Secretary-General would be in a position to inform governments of any reductions in their contributions due to changes in the provisional appropriations now up for approval. Most governments would not at that time have paid their contributions, so that any adjustments necessary would be made in 1952 and not in 1953, as the Chinese representative had assumed.

27. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) observed that her delegation was ready to support the joint Canadian-United States amendment, but on the express understanding that the appropriation of \$5,500,000 was provisional and that the separate items included therein would subsequently be open for discussion on their merits. She welcomed the French proposal to delete mention of building construction. The question of a two-thirds majority vote was covered by the rules of procedure. Hence, that reference might also safely be deleted.

28. The various items of additional expenditure given in documents A/C.5/475 and A/C.5/L.148, in connexion with matters still under consideration by the General Assembly, should not be regarded as an exhaustive list, and accordingly should not prejudice future decisions in regard to those matters.

29. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) supported the joint Canadian-United States amendment. He wished to associate himself with the observations of the Netherlands representative regarding the items covered by the appropriation for part XII. In making public the Committee's decision, its provisional nature should be stressed, so as to preclude any misunderstanding, particularly as regards the cost-of-living adjustment at Headquarters.

30. Mrs. DE RIEMAECKER (Belgium) said that she also would vote for the Canadian-United States amendment. She was not, however, prepared to accept such a procedure in the future. If similar circumstances should again arise, the possibility of following League of Nations practice, as mentioned by the Norwegian representative, should be given careful consideration.

31. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) considered it bad budgetary practice, in adopting a budget, to include items which had not yet received General Assembly approval. He was referring especially to the items for the cost-of-living adjustment and the increased cost of construction of the permanent Headquarters. It was not at all sure that either of those items would figure in the final budget of the Organization. Moreover, particularly substantial provision had been included for missions of investigation and inquiry; it was likewise not certain that the final appropriations approved would be of such magnitude. Had it not been for the difficulties involved for some governments, his delegation would have been obliged to oppose the joint Canadian-United States amendment; as it was, he would abstain from voting.

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint Canadian-United States amendment (A/C.5/L.145), as amended by the French representative.

The amendment was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Second reading

33. The CHAIRMAN then invited the Committee to proceed to a second reading of the budget estimates (A/C.5/L.148, annex A).

SECTION 1. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The section was adopted unanimously at \$1,401,500.

SECTION 2. THE SECURITY COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

34. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that no budgetary appropriation had been included.

SECTION 3. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

35. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the USSR proposal that trade unions should be represented on the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Forced Labour, set up by the Economic and Social Council, had been rejected. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting, since it objected to the appropriation of funds for a committee established on an unrepresentative basis.

Section 3 was adopted at \$130,300 by 41 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

SECTION 3a. PERMANENT CENTRAL OPIUM BOARD AND NARCOTIC DRUGS SUPERVISORY BODY

Section 3a was adopted unanimously at \$16,000.

SECTION 3b. REGIONAL ECONOMIC COMMISSIONS

Section 3b was adopted unanimously at \$50,300.

SECTION 4. TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Section 4 was adopted unanimously at \$50,000.

SECTION 6. EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Section 6 was adopted unanimously at \$465,700.

SECTION 6a. LIBRARY

Section 6a was adopted unanimously at \$440,000.

SECTION 7. DEPARTMENT OF SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS

Section 7 was adopted unanimously at \$743,800.

SECTION 8. MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE SECRETARIAT

Section 8 was adopted unanimously at \$131,200.

SECTION 9. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Section 9 was adopted unanimously at \$300,000.

SECTION 10. DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Section 10 was adopted unanimously at \$2,167,200.

SECTION 11. DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS

36. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the budgetary appropriation approved for section 11 had exceeded the Advisory

Committee's recommendation. His delegation would abstain from voting to mark its support for the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

Section 11 was adopted at \$1,605,000 by 41 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

SECTION 12. DEPARTMENT OF TRUSTEESHIP AND INFORMATION FROM NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

Section 12 was adopted unanimously at \$875,000.

SECTION 13. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

37. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation proposed a reduction of \$90,000 for the Department of Public Information and asked for a vote.

The USSR proposal to reduce by \$90,000 the appropriation for the Department of Public Information was rejected by 19 votes to 8, with 18 abstentions.

38. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a vote on the total figure for the Department of Public Information.

Section 13 was adopted at \$2,587,400 by 27 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions.

SECTION 14. LEGAL DEPARTMENT

Section 14 was adopted unanimously at \$428,000.

SECTION 15. CONFERENCE AND GENERAL SERVICES

Section 15 was adopted unanimously at \$7,275,000.

SECTION 16. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

Section 16 was adopted unanimously at \$2,800,000.

SECTION 17. COMMON STAFF COSTS

39. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) proposed that the Fifth Committee should authorize the Secretary-General to grant a subsidy of \$8,460 to the United Nations International School for 1951-1952 from the credits available under the section for common staff costs and to examine the possibility of transferring the school from Parkway Village to premises in, or at least near, the Headquarters building in Manhattan. The school answered a real need and should be assisted in the difficult period through which it was passing. The problem of educating their children was a vital one for international civil servants. His proposal implied no criticism of the educational system in the United States of America, but it was obvious that solely American schooling was insufficient for a non-American child who would later have to live outside the United States. Many delegations he had consulted held similar views. He was not submitting a formal resolution but, if the Committee agreed, he wished his proposal to be included in the record.

40. Mr. ASHA (Syria) recalled that during the discussion of section 17 he had asked whether the credit of \$8,460 could be used to cover a grant to the International School for 1952. He had made clear that that should be the last time a grant should be given and he was not in favour of it being continued in future years.

41. Miss WITTEVEEN (Netherlands) recalled that the matter had already been extensively discussed and considered that the suggestions just made should only be inserted as the views of the Belgian and Syrian representatives, unless a vote were taken upon them.

42. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that, in view of Mr. Andersen's statement, he was not in favour of the reduction of \$8,460 on the section in question, but thought that the Committee should show willingness to study the problem of the International School and was therefore prepared to accept the Syrian suggestion.

43. The CHAIRMAN proposed that a paragraph should be inserted in the Rapporteur's report to the effect that the Fifth Committee considered that, as an exceptional measure, the Secretary-General should be authorized to grant a subsidy \$8,460 towards the 1951-1952 expenses of the International School, provided that such a payment would only be made within the total funds appropriated for section 17 of the budget (Common Staff Costs) and provided also that all necessary expenditure of the Organization falling as a normal charge to the appropriation would be met in full.

The proposal was adopted by 30 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

Section 17 was adopted unanimously at \$4,130,000.

SECTION 18. COMMON SERVICES

Section 18 was adopted unanimously at \$3,572,900.

SECTION 19. PERMANENT EQUIPMENT

Section 19 was adopted unanimously at \$517,100.

SECTION 19a. IMPROVEMENTS TO PREMISES

Section 19a was adopted unanimously at \$91,500.

SECTION 20. UNITED NATIONS OFFICE AT GENEVA

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that he had received a proposal for a separate vote on the expenses in respect of the Economic Commission for Europe.

45. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as explained during the first reading, his delegation proposed that the appropriation in respect of the Frankfurt office of the Economic Commission for Europe should be deleted. The establishment of that office was the result of the policy of splitting Germany into two parts, of which his Government disapproved.

46. Lord WAKEHURST (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was obliged to abstain on the vote on the appropriations for the regional commissions for Europe, the Far East and Latin America, as it considered that there was not sufficient justification for the proposed increase in respect of them.

47. Mr. VORYS (United States of America) announced that his delegation also intended to vote against the appropriations for the regional economic commissions. Its reasons were different from those of the Soviet Union so far as the Frankfurt office of the Economic Commission for Europe was concerned, being purely reasons of economy.

48. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) proposed that, for reasons he had given on the previous day, the appropriation of \$1,052,700 for the Economic Commission for Europe should be reduced by \$30,000.

The Australian proposal was adopted by 13 votes to 11, with 18 abstentions.

The USSR proposal was adopted by 15 votes to 6, with 25 abstentions.

49. In answer to a question by Mr. LIVRAN (Israel), the CHAIRMAN stated that the USSR proposal affected only the Frankfurt office of the Economic Commission for Europe.

Section 20, chapter IV (Economic Commission for Europe) was adopted at \$1,008,920 by 32 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

50. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the appropriation for the Geneva Information Centre be reduced by \$20,000, on the grounds that the expenditure for that office exceeded the amount required to carry out the decisions of the second session of the General Assembly establishing the office, and that the appropriation in respect of common staff costs and common services in connexion with the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees be reduced by \$52,500.

51. Mr. LIVRAN (Israel), referring to the first USSR proposal, recalled the statement he had made during the first reading and announced that he would vote against the proposal for the reasons then expressed.

The USSR proposal to reduce by \$20,000 the appropriation for the Geneva Information Centre was rejected by 15 votes to 9, with 22 abstentions.

The USSR proposal that the amended appropriation for section 20 be reduced by a further \$52,500 in respect of common staff costs and common services in connexion with the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees was rejected by 32 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

Section 20 was adopted unanimously at \$4,340,820.

SECTION 20a. OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

52. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) referred to the statement made by his delegation concerning the section in question during the first reading of the budget. Its views were that the Office was failing to carry out the objective of early repatriation of refugees, as laid down by the first session of the General Assembly. He would therefore vote against the appropriation.

53. In answer to a question by Mr. ADARKAR (India), the CHAIRMAN stated that the figure of \$500,000 for the Office was a provisional one.

Section 20a was adopted at the provisional figure of \$500,000 by 35 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

54. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) explained that only the administrative expenses of the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees were to be carried on the budget of the United Nations; since the matter was still not at all clear he had abstained from voting.

SECTION 21. INFORMATION CENTRES

55. In answer to a request by Mr. LIVRAN (Israel) for a separate vote on the different centres, the CHAIRMAN said that according to customary procedure the budget must be voted section by section and items could not be taken individually.

56. Mr. LIVRAN (Israel) announced that he would therefore have to abstain, as his delegation was not satisfied that the Cairo Information Centre served the region it covered in the best and most economical way.

57. Mr. ROSHCIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that during the first reading the USSR had proposed a reduction of \$100,000 on the ground that the appropriation of \$892,300 exceeded the amount required to carry out the tasks of the information centres as set forth by the decision of the General Assembly at its second session. His delegation now proposed a compromise reduction of \$50,000, and stressed that the resulting appropriation would in any case be about \$150,000 more than that for 1950 and would not impair the activities of the centres, but merely help to avoid extravagances, for instance, in postal and cable expenditure.

The reduction of \$50,000 proposed by the USSR representative was rejected by 18 votes to 12, with 16 abstentions.

Section 21 was adopted at \$892,300 by 32 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

58. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) said that he had voted in favour of the appropriation on the basis of the explanation given in paragraph 308 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/1853).

SECTION 22. ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

59. Lord WAKEHURST (United Kingdom) asked for a vote in order to be able to register his delegation's abstention, for the reason stated earlier.

Section 22 was adopted at \$973,800 by 35 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

60. Mr. VOUGT (Sweden) explained that he had abstained from voting because he had voted on the previous day in favour of the Chilean and Burmese proposals to increase the appropriation for all regional commissions and, in the case of the Economic Commission for Europe, that increase had just been cancelled. His delegation's view was that the regional economic commissions should receive more generous appropriations.

SECTION 23. ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA

61. Lord WAKEHURST (United Kingdom) asked for a vote, for the reason already stated.

Section 23 was adopted at \$734,700 by 36 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

62. Mr. VORYS (United States of America), explaining his vote on sections 22 and 23, said that he had abstained in order to register his disapproval of the additional items introduced in those sections in the course of the previous meeting.

SECTION 24. HOSPITALITY

Section 24 was adopted unanimously at \$20,000.

SECTION 25. OFFICIAL RECORDS

63. Mrs. DE RIEMAECKER (Belgium) stressed the obligation to treat the French language on an equal footing with the other working language. Her remarks applied to section 13 as well as to sections 25 and 26. In answer to the Belgian delegation's statement made in the course of the first reading of section 13 (297th meeting), the Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Public Information had made an unsatisfactory reply, dealing with the matter on merely

commercial lines, as though French publications might have to be discontinued if they failed to sell as well as others.

64. The holding of the General Assembly in Paris was proof of the importance of French as an international language, if any proof were needed, but it was more correctly a question of carrying out a formal obligation, laid down in the Assembly's rules of procedure. It was therefore inadmissible to contemplate discontinuing certain French publications on pretexts of economy, for to fail to treat French on an equal basis was a violation of United Nations regulations; if any economies were necessary, they should be made uniformly on the publications in all languages.

65. The question of languages went far beyond the merely technical aspect of documentation, translation or interpretation; it was a political problem which included among others the matter of the recruiting of international civil servants, on which her delegation intended to speak later. She wished to point out that her delegation had consulted a number of Member States, which supported the views she was expressing, and she requested that the substance of her remarks should be included in the Rapporteur's report.

66. Mr. PRICE (Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services) said that, in view of the statements made concerning the French edition of the *United Nations Bulletin* during the first reading of the budget, the Secretary-General had authorized him to state that great importance was attached to all United Nations publications in French and everything would be done, within the means available, to give the highest priority to the continuance of the publication of the *Bulletin* in French.

67. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) associated himself with the remarks of the Belgian representative and added that a similar intention should apply to all of the official languages.

Section 25 was adopted unanimously at \$825,000.

SECTION 26. PUBLICATIONS

68. Mr. ROSHCIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed a reduction of \$20,000. The reduced amount would be sufficient for the normal requirements.

The USSR proposal was rejected by 17 votes to 5, with 22 abstentions.

Section 26 was adopted at \$850,000, by 31 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

SECTION 27. ADVISORY SOCIAL WELFARE FUNCTIONS

Section 27 was adopted unanimously at \$768,500.

SECTION 28. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Section 28 was adopted unanimously at \$479,400.

SECTION 29. INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR TRAINING IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Section 29 was adopted unanimously at \$145,000.

SECTION 30. TRANSFER OF THE ASSETS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Section 30 was adopted unanimously at \$649,500.

SECTION 31. AMORTIZATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS
CONSTRUCTION LOAN

Section 31 was adopted unanimously at \$1,000,000.

SECTION 32. INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Section 32 was adopted unanimously at \$639,860.

69. The CHAIRMAN announced that the adoption earlier in the meeting of the Canadian-United States amendment to the draft appropriation resolution contained in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/1853) had resulted in a new section 33, the sum involved being \$5,500,000.

70. He proposed that the Committee should vote on the total budget which, with the inclusion of the sum voted for section 33, amounted to \$48,096,780.

The total budget, amounting to \$48,096,780, was adopted by 36 votes to 5, with one abstention.

71. Mr. ROSHCIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that, although on previous occasions his delegation had merely abstained from voting the

budget as a whole, for the present year it felt bound to vote against it. It contained a number of expenses with which his delegation could not agree, such as those for the Field Service, the decorations for the so-called United Nations Forces in Korea and certain commissions of investigation and inquiry. It also included a few items which had not yet been discussed, the inclusion of which his delegation disapproved. Moreover, it had been increased beyond the \$35,000,000 net which his delegation considered an adequate amount.

72. Mr. DONOSO (Chile) explained that he had abstained because the decision to adopt the proposal for an increase in the appropriation for the Economic Commission for Europe, of which he was a co-sponsor, had been reversed.

73. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Committee for its co-operation, which had enabled the second reading of the budget to be completed in time for presentation to the General Assembly before the Christmas recess, as planned.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.