



Monday, 3 December 1951, at 3 p.m.

Official Records

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

**C O N T E N T S**

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Budget estimates for the financial year 1952 : (a) Budget estimates submitted by the Secretary-General (A/1812 and Add. 1, A/C.5/448, A/C.5/451); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853, A/1981) |      |
| First reading ( <i>continued</i> ).....  | 105  |

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

**Budget estimates for the financial year 1952: (a)  
Budget estimates submitted by the Secretary-General (A/1812 and Add. 1, A/C.5/448, A/C.5/451); (b) Reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853, A/1981)**

[Item 41]\*

**First reading (*continued*)**

**PART VIII, SECTION 25. OFFICIAL RECORDS;  
SECTION 26. PUBLICATIONS**

1. The CHAIRMAN stated that, on the request of certain delegations, he had decided, subject to the Committee's agreement, to postpone until the next meeting the nomination of the members of the sub-committee which the Committee had decided to set up on the proposal of the Syrian representative (A/C.5/L.117/Rev.1), and he opened the discussion of sections 25 and 26 of the budget estimates. After drawing attention to paragraphs 332 to 343 of the second report of 1951 of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/1853) and to the Secretary-General's observations in paragraphs 36 to 39 of document A/C.5/448, he recalled that the Committee, by adopting the Syrian draft resolution, had approved the Advisory Committee's recommendations on section 26, chapter I, item (vi), relating to publications of the Department of Public Information.

2. Mr. CORDIER (Secretariat), Chairman of the Publications Board, stated that the estimates originally proposed by the Secretary-General for those two sections had amounted to \$1,970,700. The Advisory Committee had recommended their reduction to \$1,600,000. In the light of the Advisory Committee's observations, the Secretary-General in his statement (A/C.5/448) had submitted revised estimates in an amount of \$1,850,000. The Advisory Committee, it would be recalled, had

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

recommended that the Secretary-General should be authorized to transfer amounts between sections 25 and 26, and the Fifth Committee had also decided to authorize the Secretary-General to transfer amounts between the various sections relating to information services.

3. The Secretary-General and the Publications Board had developed a strict control system, based on objective criteria, which had enabled the publications programme of the United Nations to be stabilized.

4. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) was confident that the Secretary-General was in a position to provide detailed justification of each item in the 1952 list of publications; it would not be difficult to justify a list double that length. The Advisory Committee considered that the Secretariat had made a considerable effort to reduce expenditure to a minimum within the framework of the current publications programme. Nevertheless, it should be possible to make more substantial economies in that field by setting a ceiling to annual output and by seeing that delegations were more moderate in their requests for documents.

5. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, at the end of the discussion, sections 25 and 26 of the budget estimates be put to the vote as a whole.

*It was so agreed.*

6. The CHAIRMAN, replying to Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), stated that the Committee's decision relating to information services had the effect of decreasing the estimates for section 26 by \$80,000.

7. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the recommendations of the sub-committee which the Committee had decided to set up would involve financial implications, not in 1952, but only in 1953. His delegation considered it possible to reduce the appropriation for publications of the Department of Public Information, which the Com-

mittee had already cut by \$ 80,000, by a further amount of about \$ 20,000. He therefore reserved his right to submit further proposals on the subject on second reading. Subject to that reservation, he supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations on sections 25 and 26.

8. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) drew the Committee's attention to duplications in the issue of documents. The same statistical material was sometimes reproduced in documents of the Economic Commission for Europe, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Food and Agriculture Organization. Similarly, information concerning public health was often published both by the United Nations and the World Health Organization. Various social legislation texts were sometimes published *in extenso* both by the Department of Social Affairs of the United Nations and by the International Labour Organisation. He asked the Publications Board to avoid such repetitions by securing better co-ordination.

9. Mr. CORDIER (Secretariat) replied that considerable efforts had been made to avoid such duplications and that improvements had already been obtained. It was difficult absolutely to avoid all duplication in the issue of documents, for the various organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies might use the same body of information in very different ways.

10. In reply to the second question by the representative of Norway, he explained that close co-operation had already been established between the specialized agencies and the United Nations on the subject of legal texts, so as, in particular, to avoid any duplication in the matter of translation.

1. In conclusion, he said the Publications Board was considering the compilation of an index in which references to particular information or documents could be found.

2. Mr. GRAFSTROM (Sweden) approved the Norwegian representative's observations on duplication in the issue of documents. He also asked the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to explain how, in his opinion, delegations could be induced to display moderation in their requests for documentary material.

3. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) expressed the view that the General Assembly might, for example, impress the need for economy upon certain organs whose work involved the publication of a number of documents which was sometimes excessive. The General Assembly might also decide that no United Nations organ could propose the publication of any study before obtaining a report from the Secretary-General on the financial implications of the proposal. The Advisory Committee was not competent to make recommendations on that matter.

4. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) expressed the view that the mere submission of submitting a report on financial implications might not be very useful in practice. The total demand for publications had to be considered in the context of the resources available. He thought that direction should come from governments. He wondered whether a committee of government representatives might not be given the responsibility for such directions.

15. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) thought the Advisory Committee should not have too modest a conception of its responsibilities in the matter of budgetary control.

16. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), in reply to the representative of Australia, explained that he was not in favour of the establishment of new bodies. The existing administrative services could perform their functions if they enjoyed the support of the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly. The Committee, too, should not have too modest a conception of its responsibilities in budgetary matters.

17. Mr. RECHENDORFF (Denmark) suggested that the Secretariat should ask Member governments to indicate the extent of their interest in the various publications received from the United Nations and especially their opinion as to the importance of continuing the publication of such material.

18. Mr. CORDIER (Secretariat) explained that the Publications Board was constantly in touch with the permanent delegations in New York and sent out to governments only those documents which were requested by delegations.

19. He was glad to note that the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had suggested the adoption of a procedure which would make it possible to limit the number of studies the Organization was requested to publish. The Secretary-General had always tried to suggest all changes calculated to effect economies to delegations requesting the publication of a document; but he had obtained only very limited success in that respect.

20. The present list of documents was the result of six years' work carried out in accordance with the recommendations of various organs of the United Nations. The Publications Board and the Secretary-General would not relax their efforts in that direction. The measures adopted in the current year with regard to the length of summary records and the supplements, annexes and publications of the substantive departments had enabled the Secretary-General to propose a figure which was \$ 270,000 below that originally contemplated.

21. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) thought that, in view of Mr. Cordier's explanations, the Committee should formulate principles the application of which would enable the Secretary-General to resist excessive requests by delegations and United Nations organs in the matter of publications. So far as the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee was concerned, he was afraid there might be a temptation to effect economies by restricting the number of languages in which certain documents were published.

22. Mr. CORDIER (Secretariat) explained that after studying the Secretary-General's estimates, the Publications Board had concluded that there would be no change in the number of languages in which the various documents were currently published.

23. The Secretary-General was prepared to accept a further reduction in appropriations bringing down to \$ 1,700,000 the amount provided for sections 25 and 26. That would be \$ 100,000 more than the appropriations recommended by the Advisory Committee.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Secretary-General's revised estimates for sections 25 and 26

(\$1,700,000), which he held to constitute an amendment to the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

*The Secretary-General's revised estimates were rejected by 25 votes to 2, with 14 abstentions.*

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$1,600,000 for sections 25 and 26 was approved unanimously.*

25. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), in explanation of his vote, said that his delegation did not oppose the Advisory Committee's recommendations for sections 25 and 26, but reserved the right to submit new proposals at the second reading with regard to the publications programme of the Department of Public Information.

26. Mr. ADARKAR (India) asked whether, from the procedural point of view, the Secretary-General could submit an amendment to a proposal under consideration by the Committee.

27. The CHAIRMAN held that the Secretary-General's revised budget estimates could be regarded as constituting amendments to the Advisory Committee's recommendations. Moreover, the Secretary-General was entitled, under the Charter, to submit proposals.

28. Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) recalled the provisions of rules 100, 111 and 119 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure. Nothing in those rules of procedure authorized representatives of the Secretariat to submit amendments to proposals before the Committee. He had voted against the amendment submitted by the Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General for both substantive and formal reasons, and he could not agree that the Committee's vote, the irregularity of which he emphasized, constituted a precedent. In those circumstances he asked the Chairman to regard that vote as null and void.

29. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) pointed out that as a general rule the Committee adopted a decision on the Advisory Committee's recommendations; it had, however, quite frequently passed upon the Secretary-General's original or revised budget estimates. That was precisely what had happened in the case of the last vote.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General's budget estimates constituted proposals. Hence he could not agree to the Polish representative's request.

31. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) agreed with the Chairman. The Secretary-General, who was responsible for drafting the original budget estimates, clearly had the right to revise them. It would, however, be preferable if the Secretary-General or his representative would abstain from making arbitrary proposals and would in each case indicate why he had altered the amount of the appropriation for which he asked.

32. Mr. ADARKAR (India) recalled that when the Committee had adopted a decision on the Secretary-General's original budget estimates, it had done so on the initiative of one of its members. He agreed with the Brazilian representative that any change in the original budget estimates should be explained.

33. Mr. BUSTAMANTE (Mexico) pointed out that the Secretary-General's original budget estimates constituted the fundamental document before the Committee. That document served as a basis for the work of the Advisory Committee, which submitted recommenda-

tions independent of those of the Secretary-General. If the Secretary-General had the right to submit a complete budget, he could obviously revise certain parts of it during the discussion, although the Committee would be free to decide as it saw fit.

34. Mr. LEVI (Yugoslavia) recalled that at previous sessions of the General Assembly, the Committee had on several occasions pronounced on proposals put forward by the Secretary-General. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that anything that was not expressly provided for under the rules of procedure was not necessarily prohibited.

35. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) considered that the question raised by the Polish representative was purely academic since the Secretary-General's proposal had been quite decisively rejected. He asked the Polish representative to withdraw his request to the Chairman and put it again if ever an occasion arose when a decision on the point was necessary to the immediate conduct of the Committee's business.

36. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) saw no point in drawing up excessively rigid regulations. Where the rules of procedure were defective, as in the case of the question raised by the Indian and Polish representatives, it was only necessary to follow the ordinary rules of common sense and avoid a purely theoretical discussion.

37. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the Indian and Polish representatives had been right to point out that the Committee's procedure was not in strict accordance with the rules. It would therefore be apposite, in his opinion, to ask the Sixth Committee for an advisory opinion on the interpretation of the rules of procedure.

38. Mr. ADARKAR (India) agreed that the rules of procedure were defective and proposed that the matter should be referred to the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly.

39. The CHAIRMAN asked the Polish and Indian representatives to withdraw their proposals, on the understanding, however, that the Committee would consider the question they had raised at a later date and would refer it to the Sixth Committee if it thought necessary.

40. Mr. ADARKAR (India) and Mr. KRAJEWSKI (Poland) agreed to the Chairman's request.

#### PART IV, SECTION 20. UNITED NATIONS OFFICE AT GENEVA

41. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had already pronounced on chapter II (Geneva Information Centre) and had decided to consider chapter IV (Economic Commission for Europe) at the same time as the estimates for the two other regional economic commissions. The Advisory Committee's comments and recommendations with regard to the other chapters of the section were contained in paragraphs 248 to 261, 266 to 269 and 278 to 286 of its second report of 1951.

42. As regards those chapters, the Advisory Committee recommended reductions totalling \$40,000; that figure did not include the proposed cuts in the budget estimates for the Economic Commission for Europe and the reduction of \$6,700 already approved by the Committee for the Information Centre. The Secretary-General had accepted those recommendations, but the Committee would perhaps decide to

reconsider the reduction proposed for chapter V (Common staff costs) after reaching a decision on section 20a.

43. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that the United Nations Office at Geneva provided a striking example of good administration, and felt that the staff members responsible should be congratulated. The Office's budget estimates, however, could only be calculated very roughly in view of the uncertainty which obtained at the time they were drawn up as to the number of meetings to be held at Geneva. The bodies which normally met at Geneva should have first call on the services which the United Nations staff at Geneva could provide. Only expenditure relating to the meetings of those bodies should appear in the budget estimates, the estimates for the meetings of other United Nations bodies being submitted and approved separately; in that way the Committee would be able to exercise closer supervision.

44. Mr. ASHA (Syria) agreed with the Brazilian representative as to the high quality of the administration of the United Nations Office at Geneva. He asked Mr. Moderow, Director of the Geneva Office, whether the General Assembly might possibly hold a session at Geneva; what difficulties would there be? He also asked whether the supplementary estimates referred to in paragraph 249 of the Advisory Committee's report would be submitted to the Committee.

45. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) citing the example of the International Labour Organisation, asked whether the United Nations had concluded an agreement with the Swiss Government for the issue of stamps and whether the revenue from the sale of such stamps was included in the budget estimates. He also wished to know whether arrangements had been made to charge persons visiting the Palais des Nations an admission fee in order to cover any expenditure required for the operation of that service.

46. Mr. MODEROW (Director of the United Nations Office at Geneva) said that the Office's budget estimates had been drawn up on the assumption that non-Geneva-based bodies would not meet at the Palais des Nations; a small sum had, however, been set aside for one or two sessions of Headquarters-based bodies which would be attended by a small number of members.

47. The possibility of holding a session of the General Assembly at Geneva had been considered in 1948 and 1951. On each occasion the project had had to be discarded because of the almost insuperable difficulties it would have involved. There were not sufficient hotel rooms in Geneva to provide accommodation for all the members of the delegations and the Secretariat who would attend the session. Moreover, the Assembly Hall of the Palais des Nations provided only four seats for each delegation. To adapt the Assembly Hall would be a very expensive and, according to the architects consulted, a very difficult operation.

48. Replying to the Norwegian representative, he recalled that stamps bearing a surcharge were sold for the benefit of the United Nations. The revenue from the sale of those stamps was included in the budget estimates; it was estimated at \$15,000 for 1952. Lastly, visits to the Palais des Nations had been officially organized for two years. The numbers of visitors had exceeded 100,000 in 1950. The income from the orga-

nized visits went a considerable way towards balancing the expenses.

49. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway) felt that greater publicity should be given to the sale of stamps by the United Nations in order to increase the revenue.

50. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that chapter V (Common staff costs) and chapter VI (Common services) included certain estimates for the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees. The Committee could not therefore study those two chapters before it had taken a decision on section 20a; consideration of them would have to be postponed. If the Committee decided to deal with them immediately, he would have to vote against their adoption, since he felt that the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees had betrayed the fundamental interests of the United Nations by preventing refugees from leaving the countries where they were, instead of helping them to return to their countries of origin; in those circumstances, the USSR delegation would propose the deletion of section 20a and the relevant items, in chapters V and VI of section 20, should not be approved. With regard to the other chapters of section 20, it would vote for the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

51. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) requested the Secretariat to prepare a document containing all the estimates for the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees.

52. The CHAIRMAN stated that that would be done.

53. He proposed that the Committee should not take any decision for the time being on the recommendations in paragraphs 278 and 280 of the Advisory Committee's report, namely \$37,500 for chapter V and \$15,000 for chapter VI, or a total of \$52,500. Those estimates would be considered at the same time as section 20a. He therefore requested the Committee to take a decision on the recommendations of the Advisory Committee regarding chapters I, III, V, VI and VII of section 20, minus the sum of \$52,500 which he had just mentioned, the total thus being \$3,189,400.

*It was decided to adopt the procedure proposed by the Chairman.*

*The recommendations of the Advisory Committee were approved unanimously.*

#### PART I, SECTION 3. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

54. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to consider section 3 of the budget estimates drawn up by the Secretary-General concerning the Economic and Social Council and its Commissions and Committees. The Secretary-General had revised his original estimates, taking into account the decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its thirteenth session (A/C.5/451). The Advisory Committee's recommendations on those revised estimates appeared in its tenth report of 1951 (A/1981). After studying the financial implications of the Council's decisions, the Secretary-General had requested an appropriation of \$139,800 for section 3, which represented a reduction of \$44,900 on his original estimates. The Advisory Committee recommended that the revised figure should be reduced by \$9,500; the temporary assistance required for the 1952 session of the Commission on the Status of Women was in fact provided for in the budget of the Geneva Office. Subject to the decisions

of principle to be taken by the General Assembly on the relevant chapters of the Council's report (A/1884), the Advisory Committee recommended an appropriation of \$130,300 for section 3.

55. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) recalled that the Advisory Committee's recommendation might be changed by the decisions adopted by the General Assembly at the current session. The report should therefore be considered as a statement of the financial implications of the Council's decisions unamended by the General Assembly.

56. The Advisory Committee did not doubt the need for the temporary assistance required for the session of the Commission on the Status of Women, but it thought that the appropriations listed in section 20 (United Nations Office at Geneva) should be sufficient, since no other body normally situated at Headquarters would hold a session in Geneva in 1952.

57. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) asked whether the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee was connected with the abolition of certain of the Economic and Social Council's Commissions and Sub-Commissions. If so, it would be premature to adopt a figure which might be subsequently reduced.

58. The CHAIRMAN stated that the matter would be checked before the second reading of the budget.

59. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat), replying to Mr. ASHA (Syria), said that the Secretary-General was prepared to accept the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee.

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$130,300 for section 3 was approved by 35 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

60. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) stated that he had abstained from voting.

#### SECTION 4. THE TRUSTESHIP COUNCIL, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

61. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider section 4 of the budget estimates relating to the Trusteeship Council, Commissions and Committees. When the budget estimates for 1952 had been prepared, the Trusteeship Council had not taken any decision regarding the 1952 visiting mission. The original estimates had therefore included only a provisional appropriation of \$50,000 for the mission. The Advisory Committee had recommended (A/1853) that that amount should be approved on a provisional basis and that it should, if necessary, be revised when the itinerary and terms of reference of the mission had been definitely laid down by the Trusteeship Council during its winter session. However, the expenditure for visiting missions in previous years had varied only slightly — from \$47,000 to \$53,000. The Secretary-General therefore asked the Committee to approve the provisional estimate of \$50,000, on the understanding that he would submit revised estimates to the Advisory Committee if a larger sum should prove necessary.

62. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) had no objection to that proposal.

*The Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$50,000 for section 4 was approved unanimously.*

#### PART III, SECTION 17. COMMON STAFF COSTS

63. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider section 17 of the budget estimates, relating to common staff costs. The Advisory Committee's comments thereon were contained in paragraphs 225 to 233 of its second report of 1951.

64. The Advisory Committee recommended an appropriation of \$4,130,000 for section 17, which was \$44,400 less than the sum requested. The total reduction comprised \$5,000 on expenses for removal of household goods and \$11,000 in respect of commutation of annual leave earned by staff members but not taken at the time of separation. In that connexion, the Advisory Committee recommended that consideration should be given to a possible modification of staff rule 108 to provide that cash payments in lieu of annual leave should be limited to a period of thirty days. The total reduction also comprised \$15,000 in respect of staff training, \$5,000 on the item for interne training and approximately \$8,400 in respect of the proposed subsidy for the United Nations International School in New York. The Secretary-General had no specific objections to those reductions.

65. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) asked for further information about the implications of the Advisory Committee's recommendations on the International School.

66. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) explained that the Secretary-General had not objected to that recommendation by the Advisory Committee, because the subsidy did not directly concern the work of the United Nations. He regretted that the Advisory Committee had not thought it possible to support the proposal, which he had considered justified. If the subsidy were not granted, it was possible that the school might have to suspend its activities.

67. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) stated that the Advisory Committee, while aware of the value of the school, took the position that the United Nations could not act as a philanthropic organization towards its staff members. The rental for the school premises at Parkway Village represented an addition of about \$60 to the annual fees, but parents received in respect of each child a total of \$400 by way of children's allowance and education grant. Were it decided that, by means of a subsidy to the International School, financial help should be given to the parents of pupils attending that school, a similar measure of relief should also be granted to staff members whose children attended other schools in the Headquarters area.

68. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that the subsidy requested for the International School would be additional to the appropriations for education grants. It was essential that all officials should receive the same treatment.

69. Mr. ASHA (Syria) acknowledged that the Advisory Committee's comments were justified. If the subsidy were granted, the Organization would be exercising discrimination, to the detriment of parents whose children attended other schools. He considered, nevertheless, that it might be possible to meet the amount of the subsidy from other savings to be made in 1952, on the condition that such a gesture would not constitute a precedent.

70. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat) considered that it might be possible to save the amount of the subsidy from the total appropriation for section 17, but the Secretary-General wished the Committee to take a decision regarding the principle of the grant.

71. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) emphasized that neither the amount of the subsidy nor the number of years during which it should be granted were at issue. To grant such a subsidy would mean favouring a small group and that involved a question of principle.

72. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) agreed with the South African representative.

73. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat), replying to Mrs. DE RIEMAECKER (Belgium), stated that there was no space available for the school at permanent Headquarters. The subsidy requested would give the school a little more time in which to adapt itself to the new conditions.

74. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Secretary-General should endeavour to find the necessary funds for the subsidy to the International School in 1952.

75. Mr. ANDERSEN (Secretariat), replying to Mr. BRENNAN (Australia), stated that the sum of \$ 8,460 covered eighteen months' rental from 1 July 1951 to the end of 1952.

76. Mr. FOURIE (Union of South Africa) pointed out that in asking the Secretary-General to find the money for the subsidy, the Committee was adopting a course opposed to that which the Advisory Committee had recommended.

77. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) emphasized that the Committee's decision should not affect the current school year. He supported the Syrian representative's suggestion.

78. Mr. ARNALDO (Philippines) agreed with the Ecuadorean representative. The International School was very important as its establishment represented a novel experiment in international relations.

79. Mr. ADARKAR (India) was of the same opinion. He considered that the United Nations was already morally pledged to support the International School and that it should be possible to achieve economies in a way that would not make it necessary for the school to close down.

80. Mr. ABBASI (Pakistan) agreed with the representatives of India and the Philippines.

81. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should accept the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding section 17, while recommending that the Secretary-General should save the \$ 8,460 for the International School from the appropriation approved by the Advisory Committee.

82. Mr. ASHA (Syria) stated that he had not wished to grant the Secretary-General that authority. He had proposed that the Committee should grant the subsidy requested for a period of one year so that difficulties should not be caused to staff members whose children were attending the school, without going so far however as to encourage or discourage the school itself.

83. The CHAIRMAN asked members of the Committee who favoured the granting of a subsidy to the International School to submit a proposal on the subject.

84. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) considered that the Committee should make it plain that the United Nations was not maintaining a school. He was opposed to granting a subsidy which favoured only a part of the staff, on behalf of children who had not yet reached the age at which education grants were made.

85. Mr. ARNALDO (Philippines) stated that the junior professional trainee programme (chapter III, item (i)) was of very considerable importance as far as the underdeveloped countries were concerned, and he recommended that a larger proportion of trainees should be recruited from those countries. As regards interne training (chapter III, item (ii)), the Advisory Committee had suggested that a larger part of the expenses might be borne by the participating Members. The Philippines was so far from Headquarters that the travelling expenses for internes from that country were extremely high and consequently it was likely that it would be unable to participate in the programme to the extent that it had hoped, if the Advisory Committee's recommendation were adopted. He was therefore unable to support the reduction recommended by the Advisory Committee.

86. The CHAIRMAN assured the Philippine representative that the Committee would take note of his remarks.

*The recommendation by the Advisory Committee for an appropriation of \$ 4,130,000 for section 17 was approved by 34 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.