



Chairman: Mr. E. Olu SANU (Nigeria).

AGENDA ITEM 76

Budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (continued)
(for the documentation, see the 1464th meeting)

First reading (continued) (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.3 and Corr.1)

SECTION 7. CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, IMPROVEMENT AND MAJOR MAINTENANCE OF PREMISES (continued) (for the documentation, see the 1465th meeting)

1. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) said that, having heard the replies by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to some of the questions raised at the previous meeting by the representative of Chile, his delegation was ready to support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paras. 10 to 12 of its report on the United Nations building in Santiago, Chile (A/8408/Add.11). However, it hoped that replies would be given to the remaining questions raised by the representative of Chile.

2. With regard to paragraphs 19 to 23 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1396), his delegation wondered whether, in addition to the improvements costing \$950,000 already carried out, any improvements had been made to the cafeteria and the conference room on the second floor. The cafeteria could barely accommodate 100 people at the same time and therefore presented a problem when meetings were held at the headquarters. Since the earlier suggestion to include a cafeteria in the new building had unfortunately been abandoned, it was necessary to consider improvements to the existing cafeteria. Furthermore, the conference room required additional seats and other improvements, since the number of meetings to be held at Santiago was expected to increase.

3. There was also a problem of transportation between Santiago and the ECLA building: the Secretariat should approach the Santiago municipal authorities with a view to securing the extension of public transportation to serve the headquarters.

4. Mr. BENDER (United States of America), referring to the Secretary-General's report and the report of the Advisory Committee on the proposed United Nations building in Santiago, Chile, said that a question of substance had arisen, namely, whether the United Nations should continue to house the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning, and if so, for how long and

on what terms. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that the question must be resolved before new construction in Santiago could be approved. However, it took the view that the question was so important that the results of the study recommended by the Advisory Committee should be reported to the General Assembly for decision at its twenty-seventh session; until then, no funds should be appropriated for new construction in Santiago. That course would be in line with the procedure suggested by his delegation with respect to new construction in New York, namely, that no funds should be appropriated until there was a firm decision to proceed with construction. Accordingly, his delegation could not support the inclusion in section 7 of an appropriation of \$500,000 for new construction in Santiago.

5. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there had been nearly three years' delay in the construction of the extension of the Palais des Nations at Geneva with the result that costs had more than doubled as compared with the initial estimate. The explanation was simple: first, there was a continuation of the inadmissible practice of introducing major changes, involving considerable financial implications, into a project approved by the General Assembly. Many of those changes had received the prior approval of neither the General Assembly nor the Advisory Committee. Over \$600,000 in extra costs had been incurred in order to "enhance the aesthetics" of the building: the material of the panels for the faces had been changed and the whole structure had been moved 20 yards, with resulting complications. No strict control had been exercised over the progress of construction work, while there had been repeated delays due to the late submission of drawings by the architects and engineers, lack of manpower and the failure to estimate steel requirements correctly.

6. His delegation was surprised that consideration was being given to the request for an increase in fees payable to the architects and engineers, who were themselves largely responsible for the delays and the increased cost of construction. It fully endorsed the Advisory Committee's reservations on that matter.

7. Earlier, the Advisory Committee and certain Member States had requested the Secretary-General to ensure that further cost increases were avoided and to take the necessary measures to protect the United Nations from consequences for which it was not responsible; however, that request had not been heeded. It was now expected that construction would be completed by the middle of 1973, as compared with the original date of May 1970. From the original estimate of \$15 million, costs had now risen to \$29.4 million, and if account was taken of the interest on

the loan and the upward revaluation of the Swiss franc, the total cost reached \$33.7 million.

8. His delegation firmly believed that the Secretariat must ensure the strictest economy and the speediest completion of the construction work. Furthermore, it considered that supplementary expenditure on the construction work both in Geneva and Santiago, Chile, should be met from the 1972 budget—in other words, not from supplementary contributions from Member States but from the unused provision of \$2 million in the 1971 budget which had originally been intended for the new construction in New York. If the requests for supplementary expenditure on the construction work at Geneva (A/C.5/1389 and Corr.1 and 2 and 1390 and Corr.1) were put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

9. With regard to the proposed new building in Santiago, his delegation endorsed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the understanding that \$500,000 would be met from the unused \$2 million to which he had just referred.

10. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) paid a tribute to the generosity shown by Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia (A/C.5/1392, para. 2) in transferring to the United Nations the title to the existing buildings occupied by the United Nations at Addis Ababa, to the lands on which they stood and to an additional plot of land for new construction. His delegation looked upon the sum of \$6.2 million earmarked for the construction project at Addis Ababa (*ibid.*, para. 11) as an investment for peace and progress and the project had the full support of his Government. His delegation shared the concern expressed by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 3 of its report on the matter (A/8408/Add.8) that any delay in completion of the project might result, at a time of rising prices, in the estimates being exceeded. In that connexion, his delegation had in mind the high costs resulting from certain misunderstandings over the plans for the extension of the Palais des Nations at Geneva.

11. Mr. VAUGHAN (Assistant Secretary-General for General Services), in response to a question raised by the representative of Chile at the previous meeting, said that the proposal to make the new building earthquake-resistant had been one originally submitted by the College of Architects at Santiago, which had participated in the competition for the original construction project, and had therefore been included in the plans for the new building.

12. With regard to the question raised by the representative of the Philippines, he pointed out that the Santiago building was intended to serve as ECLA headquarters, rather than as a conference centre; hence the limited accommodation. Additional meetings held from time to time would be provided for on an *ad hoc* basis.

13. Replying to the question raised by the representatives of the USSR and Kenya, he said every effort would be made to ensure that the construction project was completed within the level of appropriations for 1972 and within the original time-limit.

14. The CHAIRMAN suggested that a vote be taken on the various proposals before the Committee.

EXTENSION OF THE PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA (concluded) (A/8408/ADD.10, A/C.5/1389 AND CORR.1 AND 2)

The recommendations of the Advisory Committee (A/8408/Add.10, paras. 25 and 26) were adopted by 61 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

15. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed that the Fifth Committee agreed to the suggestion of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 23 of its report (A/8408/Add.10) for the establishment of a small *ad hoc* committee to give guidance during the remaining stages of the Palais des Nations project.

It was so decided.

PROGRAMME OF MAJOR MAINTENANCE OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA (concluded) (A/8408/ADD.10, A/C.5/1390 AND CORR.1)

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the suggestion of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 7 of its report (A/8408/Add.10), and should recommend to the Assembly that it: (a) authorize the Secretary-General to continue with the programme, at an estimated cost of \$6,773,847; and (b) authorize an appropriation of \$1,238,000 under section 7 chapter VII for 1972. He suggested that the Committee might also wish to draw the Assembly's attention to the observations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 4 to 6 of its report.

The suggestion of the Advisory Committee (A/8408/Add.10, para. 7) was adopted by 61 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee's decision be reflected in an appropriately worded draft resolution to be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly on that item.

It was so decided.

UNITED NATIONS BUILDING IN SANTIAGO, CHILE (concluded) (A/8408/ADD.11, A/C.5/1396)

18. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee approve the recommendations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of its report (A/8408/Add.11).

The Advisory Committee's recommendations were adopted by 72 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

19. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee's decision be reflected in an appropriately worded draft resolution for inclusion in its report to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

UNITED NATIONS BUILDINGS IN BANGKOK AND
ADDIS ABABA (*concluded*) (A/8408/ADD.8, A/C.5/1392)

20. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it should (a) take note of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/1392); (b) express its gratitude to the host Governments; (c) take note of the observations of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraph 3 of its report (A/8408/Add.8); (d) agree to modify the schedule of budgetary payments for the two projects endorsed in General Assembly resolution 2745 (XXV); and (e) approve the new schedule for financing the two projects as set forth in paragraph 4 of the Advisory Committee's report.

It was so decided.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that an appropriately worded draft resolution on the question would be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

HEADQUARTERS ACCOMMODATION (*concluded*)*
(A/C.5/1381, A/C.5/L.1063, A/C.5/L.1064/REV.1,
A/C.5/L.1071)

22. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation took the view that the Committee should pay special attention to the question of Headquarters premises at the current session since its decisions on that subject exerted considerable influence on the work of the Organization.

23. At the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, under the heavy pressure of many other important questions with which the Committee still had to deal, it had been compelled to consider the question of new construction in New York towards the very end of the session. Furthermore, it had received only one proposal for the solution of the space shortage, and had no choice but to approve or reject that proposal. It had not been provided with information on alternative solutions and consequently could not even compare the advantages and disadvantages of various possible locations for the proposed new construction, despite the fact that many delegations had drawn attention to the numerous negative factors affecting the work of the Organization and of the Permanent Missions to the United Nations in New York. Furthermore, an unjustified enthusiasm had been created in the Committee over the allegedly extremely favourable terms for financing the proposed construction in New York, although the Committee had been fully aware of more favourable offers made in the past by certain Governments regarding accommodation for secretariats of other international organizations. He wished to draw attention in that connexion to the pressure that could be exerted on the Committee when the interests of certain countries were affected. The General Assembly had accordingly authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the execution of the project despite the obscure financial arrangements, and the results of such a decision could easily have been foreseen. Many delegations had voted in favour of the new construction on condition that the factors adversely affecting the work of Permanent Missions would be eliminated; it was significant, in that connexion, to note that the problem of security of missions had now reached a critical stage.

* Resumed from the 1461st meeting.

24. In his statement at the 1444th meeting, the United States representative had left no room for hope that the United States contribution would be forthcoming; nor could he state whether those funds would be available in the future. In view of the recent decision by the United States Congress not to make the contribution to the construction project, there was no justification for assuming that the Congress would authorize the appropriation in 1972. At that same meeting, the United States representative had stated that it would be advisable to abandon, for the time being, any plans for construction at Headquarters; furthermore, the Controller had said that in his view the prospects for the 1969 plan were remote. His delegation therefore took the view that the Secretary-General should be authorized to discontinue the execution of the plan, and that the postponement of action as proposed in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063 was unjustified and could not be supported. Furthermore, the discussion on the question indicated that many delegations that had voted in favour of the new construction had already regretted that decision. Any decision taken by the Committee should reflect the present situation and make it possible to work out alternative solutions and concrete proposals. Failure to clarify the situation regarding the unrealistic plan for the new construction, might hamper the preparation of alternative solutions.

25. The proposal for a limited construction in New York to solve the space shortage could not be supported by his delegation, which, like the delegations of Cuba, Algeria and Upper Volta, advocated decentralization. In that connexion, the new construction in Geneva, Santiago (Chile), Bangkok and Addis Ababa might alleviate the situation to some extent. The new offices at Geneva could accommodate certain services now located at Headquarters, particularly those engaged in activities closely related to the specialized agencies. His delegation greatly regretted that the report on the relocation of units of the Secretariat would not be available until 1972; the Secretariat should be requested to expedite that report.

26. The accommodation problem had been aggravated by the steady growth in the number of unjustified posts in the Secretariat, and he regretted that his delegation's proposal to freeze the number of posts at the 1971 level had not received sufficient support.

27. He hoped that delegations which advocated decentralization would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1.

28. Mr. PERWINSKI (United States of America) proposed that the \$2 million appropriated for 1971 under section 7 for the proposed new construction at Headquarters should be applied against section 7 of the 1972 estimates, and the sum of \$1 million allocated for new construction at Headquarters in the estimates for 1972 should be deleted. Since the new construction in New York evidently could not begin in 1972, that seemed the best course. His proposals were similar to those in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1, but they were being submitted separately by the United States because that draft resolution suggested, *inter alia*, an intention to bar new construction in New York in the future, a position the United States could not support.

29. He would vote for draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063, proposing that the question of new construction and major alterations at Headquarters should be postponed until the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly after submission of a detailed study of the situation by the Secretary-General.

30. He felt that as a member of the United States Congress, he should warn the Committee not to assume, from what they read in the press, that there was any move in Congress to renege on its basic obligations to the United Nations. In 1972 the Administration would, as in the past, request funds for the United Nations Headquarters building, and those funds might be forthcoming. He believed that although there had recently been an anti-United Nations mood in Congress, it had now been dissipated.

31. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/L.1071, proposing that a maximum amount of \$10,000 from the surplus voluntary funds of the World Youth Assembly should be spent on a mural for the United Nations Headquarters in New York to commemorate the World Youth Assembly. It had been heartening to see the gathering at Headquarters in the spring of 1970 of young people from over a hundred countries, representing many different ideologies and political systems. Those young people, who would shape the future, all upheld the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations or they would not have chosen Headquarters as the site of their meeting. While some regarded modern youth as too radical, it should be recognized that some degree of non-conformity was inevitable if they were ever to break away from the antiquated patterns of the past.

32. In 1970, fears had been expressed that the World Youth Assembly might result in a deficit, and he had accordingly co-operated with the Secretariat and the Committee on the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations to arrange for a youth medal and a youth poster to sell to visitors to the United Nations. He had been informed that those projects must have sponsors or the funds would go into the regular budget, and UNICEF and the United Nations International School had accordingly sponsored them. The arrangements were that the funds would go first to meet the World Youth Assembly deficit, and that any surplus would go to the two sponsors. He understood that the amount received currently stood at about \$69,000, and might well be \$100,000 by 1972.

33. He accordingly wished to propose a third step to commemorate the World Youth Assembly, in addition to the medal and poster: the painting of a mural at Headquarters. Now that the deficit had been covered and there was a surplus, he thought \$10,000 could be spared for that purpose. Many Member States and non-governmental organizations had given, for example, paintings and sculptures to Headquarters, and in some cases those gifts had been accepted without prior official consultation with the Member States concerned. It would therefore not be inappropriate for the Member States themselves to decide to allocate the small sum of \$10,000, from surplus voluntary funds, for a commemorative mural. The Secretary-General had agreed that the proposal had merit, but had considered that authority should be obtained from some intergovernmental organ. It had therefore been

decided to submit the proposal to the Fifth Committee under the heading of Headquarters accommodation.

34. A mural of the type proposed, by a reputable artist, would normally cost about \$40,000, but Mr. Lumen Winters had consented to do it for a modest fee. As the designer of the youth medal, he had been responsible for generating revenue of some \$70,000. It was to be hoped there would be no opposition to spending the small sum of \$10,000 on what many delegations considered a worthy cause, and that those who did not wish to support the proposal would abstain from voting instead of voting against it. The Controller would be able to assure the Committee that no funds from the regular budget would be committed.

35. Mr. PICK (Canada) said that the Saudi Arabian proposal was highly original; the draft resolution did not indicate whether a particular artist was to be commissioned or a competition was to be held, and whether the artist's work would be judged either by a special committee or by the United Nations Arts Committee, consisting of leading figures from the art world and representatives of the Secretariat.

36. He rather doubted that young people, who lived in the present and had their eyes on the future, were in favour of monuments and memorials; they were more concerned with the relief of human misery and the elimination of social injustice than with the commemoration of past events.

37. A similar proposal had been submitted by the Saudi Arabian representative to the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations a few months earlier; it had not prospered, and he understood that the profits from the sales of the youth medal would be divided between UNICEF and the United Nations International School. He expressed appreciation for the initiative taken by the Saudi Arabian representative in suggesting the medal, which had proved profitable for the Organization.

38. The expenses of the World Youth Assembly, other than conference servicing costs, had been met from the voluntary contributions of Governments and private sources and had included air transportation provided by Governments and airlines free of charge. He understood that the books had been kept open for late payments until the end of June 1971, but had now been closed, leaving a credit balance of about \$30,000, which would either revert to the United Nations as general income, or go to UNICEF and the International School. Thus, the Committee was in effect being asked to allocate up to \$10,000 from the financial resources of the United Nations. The fact that there had been voluntary contributions to the World Youth Assembly might no longer be very relevant. If the Committee decided to approve the expenditure, it would still remain to be decided who should be commissioned to do the mural, whether it would be accepted and where it would be placed. It might be better if such a gift were made by a Member State which had not already made a gift of art to the United Nations. Gifts had also been made by non-governmental organizations, individuals, anonymous donors, and in one case, by Secretariat employees. There was no instance where the United Nations had used its own funds for a work of art on its own premises. If the gift was

made by a Member Government or a non-governmental organization, the United Nations Committee of Arts would still have to decide whether to accept it. The Secretary-General could not, any more than the great museums and art galleries of the world, accept everything that was offered to the United Nations as a work of art.

39. If some delegations did not wish the surplus voluntary funds to revert to the general funds of the United Nations, the best solution would be for them to go to the International School, which was a living monument to youth, particularly in view of the urgent appeal for funds the Fifth Committee had heard from the Chef de Cabinet at the 1461st meeting of the Fifth Committee.

40. Mr. STEENBERGER (Denmark) said that he was in sympathy with the motives underlying the Saudi Arabian proposal because he recognized that the hopes of the United Nations must to a great extent be founded on the youth of the world. However, he believed that the surplus funds from the World Youth Assembly could be better used for young people, and associated himself with the conclusions of the Canadian representative.

41. Mr. DERWINSKI (United States of America) said that much as he sympathized with the aims of the Saudi Arabian proposal, he agreed with the Canadian representative that there were better ways of using the surplus funds of the World Youth Assembly, and that both the International School, which badly needed funds, and UNICEF should be considered. It would be better to give money to two United Nations activities concerned with education and children than to spend it on a mural.

42. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that Ghana strongly believed in the useful role that young people could and should play both in their own countries and in the United Nations. The Saudi Arabian representative had submitted a similar proposal to the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations and it had been rejected.

43. Mr. BARODY (Saudi Arabia), speaking on a point of order, said that his first proposal had been left in suspension by the Committee concerned; it had not been rejected.

44. The CHAIRMAN said that the Saudi Arabian proposal now before the Fifth Committee would be considered in the light of the discussion in the Committee.

45. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that the Saudi Arabian proposal that had failed to prosper in the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations was now being revived in the Fifth Committee. Ghana's position was unchanged; it was that the surplus funds should go to UNICEF or the International School. That would be a way of helping young people to fulfil the role the United Nations expected them to play.

46. Mr. TURNER (Controller), replying to requests for a statement of the Secretariat's views on the Saudi Arabian proposal, said that the cost of the mural would be met from a special account opened for the receipt of voluntary contributions to the World Youth Assembly. As of the closing of that account in mid-1971, there had been an

amount of \$9,000 of unpaid Government pledges which, for the most part, would probably not be easy to collect, and a cash surplus of \$24,000 derived wholly from non-governmental contributors—private individuals, companies, foundations and the like.

47. There was a question whether that cash surplus should revert to Governments in the form of credits against the assessments of Member States. The Secretariat would regard that as an inappropriate procedure whose morality might be called into question and believed that the surplus should be disposed of in a way fully consonant with the purposes for which it had been contributed in the first place. The Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations had taken no final decision on the question. It had, however, directed that receipts from the sale of medals and posters issued in connexion with the World Youth Assembly should be allocated to the International School and UNICEF and that had been done, the lion's share going to the School. The Secretary-General considered that a mural would be in keeping with the purposes of the non-governmental contributions to the special account but felt that some proper legislative authority, namely, the Fifth Committee, should be consulted. The Secretary-General had so advised the representative of Saudi Arabia, who had accordingly introduced draft resolution A/C.5/L.1071. The amount involved was some \$8,000-\$10,000 and the issue was open as to how the balance of the \$24,000 cash surplus in the special account should be used. There was room for a difference of opinion regarding priorities but the question was one which, in normal circumstances, would be within the Secretary-General's discretion.

48. Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia) said that his delegation enthusiastically supported the Saudi Arabian proposal; a mural would be a suitable and practical tribute to world youth, the leaders of the society of tomorrow, and an appropriate addition to the valuable collection of works of art at Headquarters. The Controller's statement that a mural would be in keeping with the purposes of the non-governmental contributions had confirmed his delegation in its intention to vote for the Saudi Arabian proposal. It had always recognized the importance of youth activities and had contributed to the World Youth Assembly.

49. Mr. GONTA (Indonesia) recalled that the General Assembly had recently adopted resolution 2770 (XXVI), which concerned youth and its participation in social development and emphasized the awareness of the United Nations and the specialized agencies of the need to increase their contribution to the education of youth and to enlarge their programmes directed to youth. The proposed mural would serve as a constant reminder to youth that it, too, should be actively engaged in social and economic development, the promotion of human rights and the achievement of world peace, justice and progress. His delegation was heartened to find that the mural was to be financed from surplus funds and would have no difficulty in supporting the Saudi Arabian draft resolution. He proposed that, in the first preambular paragraph, the words "in commemoration" should be replaced by "within the framework" because the World Youth Assembly had been only part of the commemoration of the Organization's twenty-fifth anniversary. He further proposed that, in the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "and that such understanding may"

should be replaced by “designed to”, to make the tenor of the text more positive.

50. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) accepted the Indonesian amendments.

51. Mr. REFSHAL (Norway), turning to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063, of which his delegation was a sponsor, said that he had little to add to the Brazilian representative's introductory remarks (1459th meeting) but would emphasize that the proposal was procedural rather than substantive. It did not in any way involve the question of how to use the appropriation of \$2 million under section 7 pertaining to new construction and expansion of premises at Headquarters; the Committee's freedom to decide that would be unimpaired by its adoption. The text merely proposed that any substantive decision on the question of Headquarters accommodation should be deferred until all data necessary for such a decision was available. The data required included the studies proposed in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of General Assembly resolution 2618 (XXIV). The decision would have far-reaching, long-term effects and certainly could not be taken lightly.

52. The Saudi Arabian proposal was attractive. Much lip service was paid to the need to provide for the greater participation of youth in solving contemporary problems and the World Youth Assembly had been a step in that direction. A mural would be a token of the wish to associate the Organization with a segment of the world population which was soon to assume responsibility for it.

53. Mr. AL-QANDI (Kuwait) said that his delegation supported the idea of a symbolic mural and would vote in favour of the Saudi Arabian proposal. The expenditure involved was small and would in any case be met from a cash surplus.

54. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that while the Saudi Arabian proposal was attractive, it raised certain difficulties for his delegation. He was by no means sure that the Fifth Committee was competent to decide on the disposal of funds which had been contributed voluntarily. The proper forum for such a decision would have been the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations, after consultation with the contributors to the fund. His delegation would prefer that the cash surplus should be given to UNICEF or the International School. Moreover the mural itself raised a number of questions. When would it be completed? Did the \$10,000 represent a fee or materials? Where was it to be placed? Would it be subject to tender? His delegation would abstain in the vote on the proposal because of its views concerning the Committee's competence in the matter.

55. Mr. VAN DER GOOT (Netherlands) said that he fully agreed with the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that a decision on the disposal of the cash surplus was outside the Committee's competence. He also agreed with the comments of the representatives of Canada, Ghana, Denmark and the United States. At the same time, his delegation understood the motives underlying the Saudi Arabian proposal. His Government recognized the importance of stressing the role of youth and had, in fact, made a financial contribution to the World Youth Assembly. He

felt sure that no Government which had contributed funds for that purpose expected them to be spent in part on a mural. The decision should have been taken by the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations but, in the circumstances, he hoped that the vote on the Saudi Arabian proposal would be delayed to enable his delegation to obtain instructions from its Government.

56. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) said that his delegation supported the Saudi Arabian draft resolution. The International School had benefited from the medals issued in connexion with the World Youth Assembly and a mural would be a permanent reminder of the role of youth.

57. Mr. BENKIRANE (Morocco) expressed surprise that so small a sum as \$10,000 should have led to such lengthy debate. The draft resolution was entirely appropriate and consonant with the ideals of the Organization. His delegation was pleased to support it.

58. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that his delegation understood the intention of the Saudi Arabian proposal but hesitated to support it for three reasons. First, it would be well to wait until a decision had been taken regarding new construction at Headquarters so that a suitable place for the mural could be found. Second, having regard to the Organization's current financial situation a mural would, after all, be a luxury. Third, the project should be viewed from the standpoint of youth and not from that of the “establishment”. Young people wanted not monuments but schools, hospitals, houses and food for the hungry. If the funds were donated to the International School, he felt sure that youth would approve.

59. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that his delegation would prefer to have the Committee express appreciation of the World Youth Assembly by allowing the surplus funds to be used for the purposes of the International School. He therefore could not support the Saudi Arabian proposal.

60. Mr. MARRON (Spain) expressed support of the Saudi Arabian proposal, endorsed the remarks of the Colombian and Indonesian representatives and welcomed the Controller's statement regarding the financing of the mural.

61. Mr. GUPTA (India) associated his delegation with the Norwegian representative's remarks on the Saudi Arabian proposal.

62. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that he was currently preparing a scheme to generate \$100,000 to \$150,000 for the United Nations International School.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that the Fifth Committee was free to take a decision on the Saudi Arabian proposal because the Committee for the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations no longer existed and, in any case, the General Assembly itself would have to take the final decision. He therefore invited the Committee to vote on the Saudi Arabian draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1071).

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 27 votes to 19, with 32 abstentions.

64. Mr. NAUDY (France), turning to draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063 on Headquarters accommodation, acknowledged the conciliatory nature and moderate tone of the text, which dealt with a controversial subject. He recalled that his delegation had abstained in the vote on General Assembly resolution 2618 (XXIV), which had been a compromise. Like many other delegations, it had not formally opposed the financial package proposed in that resolution but that did not mean that it favoured the project, having regard to the need for decentralization, the circumstances peculiar to New York City and certain unsatisfactory technical aspects. The financial package had not been realized and even the United States delegation considered it unlikely that it would come to anything in the near future. The project should therefore be abandoned; any other solution would be unrealistic.

65. In the circumstances, draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063 was unrealistic in that paragraph 2 requested a study of the prospects of executing the project referred to in resolution 2618 (XXIV). Draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1, on the contrary, took a clear stand on that point and he was, moreover, grateful that in paragraph 4, the sponsors had requested the Secretary-General to submit the studies requested of him in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of resolution 2618 (XXIV). His delegation awaited with interest the outcome of those studies—which were also required under the terms of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063.

66. For reasons which his delegation had stated on many occasions, the question was one of great importance. His delegation was sure that, on the impending completion of the extension of the Palais des Nations at Geneva, the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management and the Administrative Management Service would have an opportunity to contribute to the studies in question. Their participation was an assurance for his delegation that the studies would be carried out with the maximum efficiency and impartiality.

67. Mr. RUIZ DE GAMBOA (Chile) said that, in reviewing the background of resolution 2618 (XXIV), his delegation had been surprised to note that, practically from the outset, the Headquarters accommodation had been too small, with the result that alterations had repeatedly been needed to provide more space. Obviously, it could not have been otherwise as the original premises had been designed for only 70 delegations. The current membership was almost double that figure and might reach 150 in the near future. The same situation had prevailed in the case of the Headquarters staff, which had increased from 2,664 to its current level of 3,890, while United Nations programmes had grown to the point where premises had to be rented outside the Secretariat building. In 1963, the Secretary-General had proposed a project for the expansion of Headquarters, which the General Assembly had deferred. It had been postponed again in 1966 to allow time for studies of a proposal by a group headed by the Mayor of New York City for a building to the south of the Headquarters premises. In 1968, the Secretary-General had explained that the estimated cost of such an undertaking would be \$50 million. In 1969, \$250,000 had been allocated for a detailed technical study of the project. In 1970, the estimated cost had risen to \$73,399,000. The latest information from the Secretary-General was that, excluding

the cost of the site, the estimated cost would be \$80 million (A/C.5/L.1381, para. 2). The project had been contingent upon a firm commitment in the form of a financial package which had never materialized. The Organization thus found itself in the same situation as in 1963. His delegation was discouraged to note, therefore, that there were delegations which were proposing yet another postponement of the project for the construction of new accommodation at Headquarters.

68. Given the background of the project and having regard to the fact that the estimated cost had reached \$80 million, his delegation wholeheartedly supported draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1 and, in particular, the provisions in paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of that text.

69. Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia) said that it was sad, in the light of resolution 2618 (XXIV), to consider the time and money that had been wasted on plans that would never be carried out, while the situation regarding office space at Headquarters had steadily deteriorated. Although his delegation had not supported that resolution, feeling that further construction in a city beset by so many problems would be unwise, it could not but express surprise at the reliance placed by the Secretariat on uncertain plans and at its failure to consider alternative solutions. Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of resolution 2618 (XXIV) remained unimplemented and it would be difficult to make up the time that had been lost. However, there was the advantage that the United Nations would be able to make plans for construction in more suitable cities and also save funds at a time when economies were necessary. His delegation accordingly supported the proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1.

70. Mr. ESONO MICA (Equatorial Guinea) said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1, of which his delegation was a sponsor, sought to set before the Committee the series of events that had resulted in the non-implementation of resolution 2618 (XXIV). It would be interesting to know, through the Secretariat, the views of the Administrator of UNDP and the Executive Director of UNICEF on the ill-fated Headquarters expansion project and any decisions they proposed to take in the light of the new situation created by the withdrawal of one of the parties that was to have participated in the financing of the project. It was important for the developing countries to know the immediate plans of those agencies for the funds which had been earmarked for the project and which would otherwise have been spent on projects to promote development and child welfare in the context of the Second United Nations Development Decade. His delegation would welcome some information on that point.

71. Those in favour of reconsidering the project at the twenty-seventh session seemed not to take account of the statement made by the United States representative at the Committee's 1444th meeting. If the United States Government expected construction costs to increase in the United States, a more substantial contribution to the project would be required from the agencies concerned, and hence from Member States, and it therefore seemed logical to assume that, as time went by, the possibilities of carrying out the project would become increasingly remote. His delegation felt that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1 reflected the

views of the majority of delegations and also provided a realistic analysis of the situation. It therefore hoped that it would be adopted by a large majority.

72. Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia) recalled that in the general discussion his delegation had spoken in favour of postponing any non-essential expenditure and approving projects that would be of benefit to the developing countries. The two draft resolutions before the Committee represented commendable efforts to find a solution and were in agreement at least on one point—namely that the Secretary-General should be requested to submit to the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly the studies and enquiry called for in resolution 2618 (XXIV). The idea that consideration of the matter should be postponed was fully compatible with his delegation's position. The matter of most concern to his delegation, however, was not the deletion of the budget items in question but the tripartite nature of the financing of new construction. It was true that the United States Government had not specified when its contribution would be forthcoming but his delegation thought that there was hope that it would not be too long delayed. Moreover, before the Committee took a final decision on the question, it must know the opinions of the other parties involved and he therefore proposed that a vote on both draft resolutions should be deferred until the Committee had been officially informed of the views of UNDP and UNICEF.

73. Mr. GONCHARENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1 was very timely and reflected the actual state of affairs regarding the question of Headquarters accommodation. From the financial viewpoint, the project for the expansion of Headquarters in New York was not feasible and, from other points of view, it was now undesirable. The \$2 million appropriation should accordingly be used for construction work in other cities, such as Santiago, Chile, or Geneva.

74. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063.

The draft resolution was adopted by 39 votes to 20, with 11 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the decision just taken by the Committee, it might be superfluous to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1, which differed from the resolution adopted only in the provision concerning the \$2 million budgetary appropriation.

76. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) considered that there were a number of substantive points on which the two texts differed. He therefore requested that the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1) co-sponsored by his delegation should be put to the vote.

77. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) supported the request of the representative of Cuba.

78. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that he could agree that there were a number of differences between the two texts. That meant that the Committee had had a clear option before it and it had already made its choice.

79. Mr. NAUDY (France) also considered that the two texts did not cover exactly the same ground. He agreed with the representatives of Cuba and Poland that draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1 should be put to the vote.

80. Mr. TRAORE (Ivory Coast) pointed out that if draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1 was adopted, it would not be possible to implement operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063 which had been adopted.

81. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) felt that the two draft resolutions were contradictory in substance. He therefore proposed that the Committee should decide by a vote whether or not to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1.

82. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba), referring to the point raised by the representative of the Ivory Coast, said that if the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1, the situation at the twenty-seventh session would be very simple. The General Assembly would complete its consideration of the question after having clarified the issues arising as a result of the United States Government's decision to withdraw from the financing of the Headquarters expansion project. It was only logical that the United Nations should consider the consequences of that new development before taking a decision. A vote should therefore be taken on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that he was still of the opinion that if the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1, it would be nullifying its earlier decision, contained in draft resolution A/C.5/L.1063. In accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, therefore, he invited the Committee to decide whether or not to vote on draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1.

The Committee decided, by 36 votes to 27, with 9 abstentions, not to vote on the draft resolution A/C.5/L.1064/Rev.1.

84. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the United States proposal that the amount of \$1 million should be eliminated from the 1972 budget estimates under section 7 chapter I, and that the amount of \$2 million unspent in that chapter in 1971 should be applied to the estimates under chapters II to V of section 7 in 1972.

The proposal was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.