

United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOURTEENTH SESSION
Official Records

RECEIVED
18 DEC 1959
GENERAL ASSEMBLY LIBRARY



FIFTH COMMITTEE, 757th MEETING

Thursday, 3 December 1959,
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 51:</i>	
<i>United Nations International School: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	249
<i>Agenda item 46:</i>	
<i>Report of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds</i>	252

Chairman: Mr. Jiří NOSEK (Czechoslovakia).

AGENDA ITEM 51

United Nations International School: report of the Secretary-General (A/4293, A/C.5/L.598) (continued)

1. Mr. H. P. MARTIN (Union of South Africa) said that his delegation was in sympathy with the purposes of the International School and followed with interest the work of all those who were trying to achieve them. For some years, he had personally been concerned with an establishment in Europe comparable in all respects with the International School, except that school fees had been its only source of income and it had therefore had to be entirely self-supporting.
2. His delegation rejected the view that the General Assembly was under any obligation to finance the School. The United Nations had its Headquarters in a large city which offered many and varied educational opportunities. Members of the Secretariat received adequate salaries and, by providing an education grant—which appeared to be adequate—the General Assembly had furnished them with all that could reasonably be expected. The General Assembly could not really be expected to assume any financial responsibility for the education of the children of members of the permanent missions or of children whose parents were not associated with the United Nations, the last-named group being the largest.
3. The suggestion put forward in the Secretary-General's report (A/4293) was interesting and in view of the part played by the Secretariat in the organization and management of the Gift Centre, his delegation would have been glad to consider the possibilities of using all or part of the revenue from the Centre to provide aid to the School, on two conditions: it would be understood, in the first place, that the revenue from the Centre would be accounted for on a strictly commercial basis, with due allowance for rent, and, in the second place, that the General Assembly would then accept no further requests for financial aid for the School. Unfortunately, the documents submitted to the Committee had been circulated too late for delegations to be really in a position to consider that possibility.
4. The joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.598) provided for the contribution, for a period of five years, of

continuing financial assistance, and, in his delegation's opinion that was a commitment which the Assembly should not lightly undertake so near the end of the session. He would abstain from voting on operative paragraph 2, providing for the establishment of an International School Fund which would be destined primarily to receive the appropriation proposed in paragraph 3, and would vote against paragraph 3. He would also abstain from voting on paragraph 6, which seemed to be an implicit invitation to the International School to request the General Assembly for financial assistance, and he would vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

5. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) paid a tribute to the admirable work that was being done by those responsible for the management and operation of the International School, which met an undeniable need and was doing a very good job. During the past year the chief concern of the School's Board of Trustees had been to comply with the wish expressed by the General Assembly in its resolution 1297 (XIII) and to take steps to make the School available to the children of the greatest possible number of persons associated with the United Nations; his delegation welcomed the progress made in that connexion. It was proper that the United Nations, which displayed such continuing interest in the needs of children, as was evidenced by the activities of UNICEF, should help the International School to find funds to surmount the serious financial difficulties it was at present facing.

6. Accordingly, he could only thank and congratulate the sponsors of the draft resolution for the understanding and conciliatory spirit which they had shown in preparing the text before the Committee, although he felt certain doubts as to the effectiveness of the proposed measures for financing future contributions. There were several ways of building up the Fund which the Board of Trustees of the School was invited to establish, ways that should enable the School to become a self-supporting and economically viable undertaking. The method suggested in the Secretary-General's report and mentioned in paragraph 6 (b) of the draft resolution was the least desirable of those ways. The idea of applying the revenue from certain regular activities to meet special expenditures was falling more and more into disfavour at both the national and international levels, both for reasons of principle and on practical grounds. It would, accordingly, be better that the Fund should be built up by grants and contributions from the over-all sums—annual contributions and revenue—available to meet the expenditure of the United Nations. His delegation was, however, anxious to assist the International School and, despite those misgivings, would support the joint draft resolution.

7. Mr. DEVAKUL (Thailand) felt that the United Nations should assist the International School by all the means it could properly use. The Secretary-

General's report made it clear that the financial position of the School had improved during the past year largely owing to increased attendance at the School in Manhattan, that an increase in the number of enrolments would cause a reduction of the budget deficit, that the school fees were still too high for many members of the Secretariat and of delegations, and that the establishment of a scholarship programme would make it possible for a larger number of children to attend the School. In order to help the School solve its financial problems, the Secretary-General had proposed a wholly reasonable solution which the Fifth Committee could properly accept.

8. It had been pointed out that paragraph 4 of the draft resolution provided for a contribution of a considerable sum of money in 1960. He would point out that for Member States whose assessment was 0.04 per cent—i.e., for countries with the least resources—the sum payable in respect of that contribution would be about \$40, an almost negligible amount. Another objection made to the draft resolution was that about 50 per cent of the pupils of the International School were children whose parents were not associated with the United Nations. But it should not be forgotten that the presence of such children—Negro, Jewish, Chinese-American etc.—did much to create the special atmosphere of the School and was, moreover, for the time being necessary to keep the School going.

9. If no assistance was forthcoming from the United Nations, the International School might be obliged to close down. That meant that by adopting the draft resolution, the Committee would be taking a praiseworthy decision. His delegation, for its part, would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

10. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) observed that if the documents submitted to the Committee had been distributed earlier, delegations would have been in a position to give the proposals more sympathetic and also perhaps more realistic consideration. Undoubtedly, neither the Secretariat nor the Board of Trustees was to blame, but the delay was certainly to be regretted in the case of a question of the kind before the Committee. His delegation considered also that the information in the report was incomplete and was grateful that the Canadian representative had been able to fill certain gaps in that respect. It would also have been desirable to have the opinion of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions on the advisability of making a contribution of \$100,000 in 1960. That sum exceeded the actual needs of the School for the year and had not been expressly requested by the Board of Trustees.

11. His delegation would have objections to a grant exactly covering the School's needs and, accordingly, opposed the proposal that the School should be granted a greater amount than was needed and that the Assembly should undertake to give financial assistance beyond 1960. He would therefore be unable to support the draft resolution.

12. Sir John CARMICHAEL (United Kingdom) said that he must oppose the joint draft resolution, which was not, in his opinion, the proper approach to the problem of the International School's financial security and independence. If the Assembly assured the School of substantial and continuing aid before it was satisfied with the current financial arrangements, it would be putting the cart before the horse.

13. Most private schools depended on fees as their only income and there was no reason why fees at the International School should be considerably below those of other private schools. If the grant to the School were increased, the contributions of Member States would be affected. Among the beneficiaries were families of permanent missions as well as other families which were not directly associated with the Organization. Those two categories comprised a little over 50 per cent of the total enrolment of the School, and there was no reason why the United Nations should subsidize them. In the case of children of members of permanent missions, the Governments concerned would surely prefer to give financial aid directly to their own staff: that would be not only more satisfactory but also less costly.

14. If the fees were increased, it would obviously be reasonable to increase the education grant paid to members of the Secretariat. The Board of Trustees of the School should go into the question of the level of fees. He hoped that at the fifteenth session the Advisory Committee would submit a report on the relationship between the fees at the International School and the education grant. That was an important question as many Secretariat members did not send their children to the International School.

15. He realized that he had already made those points in the Committee, but so far they had not been answered. It was to be regretted that the Secretary-General's report had not been submitted to the Committee earlier. The International School had been in existence for ten years, but the Committee had had only ten days to study completely new proposals and the case had not been convincingly presented. The Secretariat had not replied to his delegation's request for information concerning the negotiations with a view to finding permanent premises for the School. In conclusion, he categorically rejected two arguments which had been put forward during the discussion: first, that the Committee could save itself the embarrassment of debating the question every year by foregoing receipts of nearly \$140,000 a year in favour of the School; secondly, that the Committee should adopt the joint draft resolution unanimously. The proposals contained in the joint draft resolution could not be regarded as a satisfactory and final solution.

16. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) thought that the level of fees at the International School, which had steadily risen, prevented many members of permanent missions and less well paid Secretariat members from sending their children to the School. It was not fair to compare the International School with other private schools in the New York area, whose facilities and material resources were much superior and whose pupils came from families in the higher income brackets.

17. The enrolment of pupils whose parents were not directly associated with the United Nations was fully justified. The children of members of the Secretariat and of the permanent missions could not be brought up in a vacuum, isolated from the community in which they lived. However, in order to decrease the number—or rather the proportion—of children whose parents were not associated with the United Nations, it would be necessary to lower the fees and undertake a long-term programme for the general improvement of the School in order to attract more children of members of the Secretariat and of the permanent delegations.

18. The question whether the United Nations should or should not consider itself responsible for the International School was a question of principle which each country must decide for itself. He would point out, however, that many missions representing smaller countries or under-developed countries could not set up special schools in New York for the children of their employees. For such countries, the International School represented a common denominator and thus offered a solution that was consistent with the purposes and functions of the United Nations. He earnestly hoped that the Committee would adopt the joint draft resolution.

19. Sir John CARMICHAEL (United Kingdom) noted with regret that divergent views were being expressed without adequate information to support them, as the information received had been communicated too late and was not sufficiently detailed. The Iraqi representative's remarks seemed to imply that the United Kingdom delegation showed certain lack of sympathy towards the members of the United Nations staff. The Iraqi representative considered that it would be unfair to increase the International School fees to a level comparable to that of other schools in the New York area. However, the terms of service of staff were related to conditions in the New York area, and his delegation had already expressed its sympathy for a reconsideration of the education grant if the fees were increased. His delegation felt, however, that greater regard should be paid to the financial implications of the problem. Perhaps the Governments which most warmly supported the proposal to establish a continuing Fund for the International School might find it appropriate to make a voluntary contribution to the Fund if it was set up.

20. Mr. DE THIER (Belgium) said that the International School met the needs of members of the Secretariat and of delegations and could be regarded as a centre of international understanding, and certainly deserved assistance. In the past his delegation had always supported proposals to assist the School, but the proposal at present before the Committee provided for much more far-reaching measures. It was no longer a matter of giving relatively modest assistance of an apparently temporary nature; the decisions which the Committee was invited to take would broaden the Organization's responsibilities towards the School, would establish closer relations between the United Nations and the School, and might ultimately entail making the School an organ of the United Nations instead of a private institution. The problem was so complex and involved such important questions of principle that it could not be decided in the course of a brief discussion at the end of the session.

21. It would in any case be unwise to enter into a commitment for five years at the present time and it would be preferable not to prejudice future decisions of the Assembly. He wondered whether it was necessary to make a contribution of \$100,000 in 1960, when the total deficit to be covered had been estimated at \$65,400.

22. In view of those considerations his delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution.

23. Mr. LAWRENCE (New Zealand) said that no delegation seemed to be opposed in principle to the establishment of an International School Fund nor

with the concept of an economically viable undertaking. But agreement went no further than that: some delegations thought of the Fund as a means of financing, *inter alia*, the School's ordinary expenses; others, including his delegation, saw it as a means for meeting special needs; but considered that the International School should cover operational expenses without recourse to other sources of revenue. The Canadian representative had quoted figures to show that the fund might be dissipated to little good purpose. Indeed, nearly 60 per cent of the pupils were from families which were not directly associated with the United Nations and which had no basic claim to a subsidy from the United Nations budget. The scale of fees should be readjusted, at least for that category of pupils, and perhaps also for the children of Secretariat members. In the case of the latter group, the amount of the education grant should be reviewed. Alternatively, his delegation would not object to the present scale of fees being maintained in the case of children of members of the Secretariat and the balance met by way of scholarships. That concept of scholarships should not extend throughout the whole school at present.

24. He could not accept the last preambular paragraph of the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.598). The proposal in operative paragraph 3, whereby the General Assembly would contribute financial assistance to the International School Fund for a period of five years, seemed premature since the School's Board of Trustees had not yet studied the various suggestions put forward during the discussion. His delegation also could not accept operative paragraph 4 in its present form, and would be obliged to vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

25. Mr. DORANTE (Venezuela) said that the International School was not only a necessity and an admirable undertaking, but also a challenging educational experiment which deserved the support of the General Assembly. The terms of the draft resolutions and of the Secretary-General's recommendations confirmed that view. It would seem logical that the proceeds of an undertaking such as the Gift Centre, which was the product of the initiative of Secretariat members, should be used to finance another initiative of the staff. It should be possible to reconcile the differences of opinion in a spirit of give-and-take, an example of which had been given by the representatives of the United States and Argentina. His delegation would support the joint draft resolution.

26. Mr. HAMILTON (Director of Personnel), replying to the United Kingdom representative's question, referred to paragraph 7 of the Secretary-General's report (A/4293), which said that if a continuing International School Fund was established, "it would ensure that the School could plan for the future". He took that to mean that the Secretary-General had already explored the possibility of constructing a permanent building for the School.

27. Mr. MARSCHIK (Austria) requested a separate vote on the last preambular paragraph and on each of the operative paragraphs.

28. Mr. EL HAKIM (United Arab Republic) recalled that in an earlier statement (756th meeting) he had suggested an amendment to the draft resolution proposing that the Board of Trustees study the scale of fees at the School and make arrangements either to

reduce the fees or to grant scholarships to pupils whose parents were United Nations staff members. He asked the sponsors of the joint draft resolution whether they would be prepared to incorporate that suggestion in their text.

29. Mr. HAMILTON (Director of Personnel) assured the representative of the United Arab Republic that the Secretary-General would do his utmost to ensure that the matter of fees was settled in the best interests of the parents. The suggestion made by the United Arab Republic might perhaps be included in the Committee's records.

30. Mr. EL HAKIM (United Arab Republic) accepted that assurance and said that he would not submit an amendment.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Ecuador, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Peru, Poland, United States of America and Uruguay (A/C.5/L.598).

The paragraph was adopted by 32 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN next put to the vote, successively, each of the operative paragraphs and the draft resolution as a whole.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 32 votes to 22, with 6 abstentions.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 40 votes to 6, with 12 abstentions.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

Paragraph 6 was adopted by 44 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The ten-Power draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 38 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions.

33. Mr. HAMILTON (Director of Personnel) said that the International School and its Board of Trustees were grateful to the Committee for the understanding it had shown in its discussion of the question. He thanked the Committee for having responded to the Secretary-General's appeal. The Board of Trustees would give particular attention to the provisions of operative paragraph 2 of the resolution. The School's financial situation was at present sufficiently secure to enable it to undertake long-range plans, to introduce the teaching of several languages, etc. It offered guarantees of solvency that would make it easier to obtain grants from private sources. The most immediate task of the Board of Trustees was to set up a scholarship programme and to review the scale of fees. No reform of any scope could be made in that area, however, until the School had permanent premises. The Board of Trustees would also undertake a detailed study of the questions of principle that had been raised during the debate, and he hoped that he would be able to give constructive answers at the next session. He asked the members of the Committee to excuse the Board of Trustees for having submitted its report at such a late date. The main reason for the delay was

the appointment of a new Principal of the School, a situation which would not recur in the future.

34. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan), explaining his delegation's vote, said that it had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because operative paragraph 3 raised a question of principle; he did not believe that the Assembly could be committed for five years on a question with financial implications. Furthermore, his Government had not had time for careful study of the various proposals submitted to the Committee. His delegation had, however, had no hesitation in approving annual grants-in-aid and it had voted in favour of paragraph 4. It had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole for another reason: operative paragraph 3 prejudged the outcome of the procedure envisaged in operative paragraph 6 (b). It would have been preferable to have the opinion of the Advisory Committee before deciding on the principle of financing an International School Fund; the Advisory Committee might have proposed solutions other than those contemplated by the sponsors of the draft resolution or by the Secretary-General.

35. Mr. URABE (Japan) said he had voted against the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and had abstained on operative paragraph 2 for reasons explained at the 756th meeting. It was of primary importance to define formally the relationship between the International School and the United Nations. The procedure suggested in operative paragraph 6 seemed to provide an excellent opportunity for a detailed study of that relationship. However, sub-paragraph 6 (b) indirectly referred to the Gift Centre and his delegation would have preferred the phrase in question to be deleted. It had intended to submit an amendment to delete from sub-paragraph 6 (b) the words "on future contributions to the Fund and on means of financing such contributions, including the suggestion contained in paragraphs 8 and 9 of his report" and to substitute the words "to be offered to the Board of Trustees for its consideration, regarding the future solvency of the United Nations International School". However, he had voted in favour of paragraph 6 in the hope that the General Assembly would have an opportunity of examining carefully the problem of the relationship between the School and the United Nations at its fifteenth session.

36. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) stated that the adoption of the ten-Power draft resolution augured well for the future of the International School which represented the most successful international venture of its kind in the modern world.

AGENDA ITEM 46

Report of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds (A/4267, A/C.5/L.597 and Add.1)

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Arnould, Chairman of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds, took a place at the Committee table.

37. Mr. ARNOULD (Chairman of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds) explained that the Negotiating Committee had had to adopt in 1959 a slightly different procedure from that followed in the two previous years. At its eleventh session the General Assembly had set up an *ad hoc* Committee of the whole Assembly where voluntary contributions for the two refugee programmes were to be pledged

(resolution 1091 (XI)). At the present session, the Assembly was to take a formal decision on the future of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) but it had not yet done so. The Negotiating Committee had, however, decided to arrange for a single meeting of the ad hoc Committee for the pledging of contributions to the two programmes, in order not to detract from the importance of the conference. Furthermore, 1960 being World Refugee Year, the Committee had felt that it was necessary to convene an appropriately formal conference at which Governments would announce their two contributions and would describe the efforts made in their respective countries in connexion with the World Refugee Year.

38. It had been impossible to carry out the recommendation adopted in 1958 (resolution 1296 A (XIII)) that the ad hoc Committee should meet at the beginning of the session and the Negotiating Committee was therefore unable to submit a supplementary written report on the results of the conference. For that reason, having briefly summarized the Committee's initial report (A/4267), he was submitting the supplementary report orally. The pledging conference was to be held on 9 December provided the Assembly had concluded the item on UNRWA. Although the Negotiating Committee was unable to analyse the results of the pledging conference, it had been able, on the basis of the results of the preceding one, to recommend the convening of another such conference at the fifteenth session. The Committee hoped that the Assembly would be able to endorse the three principles set forth in paragraph 21 of its report. It had decided to request the Assembly to extend its terms of reference. If the Assembly decided to continue the Committee next year, the Committee would plan to proceed with its visits to delegations and would hope that they would continue to co-operate with it as they had done during the present year.

39. Lastly, he emphasized that it was not enough to set up a committee or to renew its terms of reference; all Member States should give their financial support to the funds and programmes they had created.

40. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) introduced the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of Argentina, Canada, New Zealand and Pakistan (A/C.5/L.597). Part A recommended that the existing procedure regarding the ad hoc Committee of the whole Assembly should be continued. The meeting of that Committee at the thirteenth session had not yielded all the desired

results but it was clear from the report of the Negotiating Committee that the latter would redouble its efforts to obtain the necessary funds to satisfy the minimum needs of the refugee programmes.

41. The sponsors of the draft resolution also recommended that the ad hoc Committee should meet as soon as possible after the opening of the fifteenth session of the Assembly, at a time when many Ministers of Foreign Affairs were usually in New York. They also requested that the greatest possible advance publicity should be given to the meetings of the ad hoc Committee which would be scheduled at a time when no other meetings were held. It was to be hoped that that recommendation could be put into practice.

42. Part B of the draft concerned the renewal of the Negotiating Committee's terms of reference for a period of one year.

43. The sponsors of the draft resolution realized that the question of the Palestine refugees was still before the Special Political Committee, but it seemed certain that the Assembly would decide to continue the programmes for their welfare and a large majority of representatives had already requested that UNRWA's mandate should be extended.

44. The sponsors hoped that their text would be unanimously approved.

45. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) endorsed the Negotiating Committee's report. He was convinced that earnest efforts had been made to secure the desired aims. He wished particularly to thank Mr. Arnould, the Chairman of the Committee, for his devoted work.

46. Mr. MATTAR (Lebanon), after noting that his delegation had a representative in the Negotiating Committee, associated himself with the sponsors of the draft resolution.

47. Mr. SOKIRKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked for a separate vote on the phrase "but members of one or more of the specialized agencies" in Part A, operative paragraph 2.

That phrase was adopted by 44 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole (A/C.5/L.597 and Add.1) was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.