

XIV. PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS COMMITTEE

Officers

Chairman DR EDUARDO ZULETA ANGEL (*Colombia*)

Vice-Chairman MR L. D. WILGRESS (*Canada*)

Rapporteur MR NASROLLAH ENTEZAM (*Iran*)

New Zealand Representatives

RT HON. P. FRASER

MR R. M. CAMPBELL

MR J. V. WILSON

THE starting-point for this Committee's work was a recommendation of the Preparatory Commission that the permanent headquarters of the United Nations should be located in the east of the United States of America. The specific site was to be determined by the General Assembly at its First Session on the basis of recommendations to be prepared by an Interim Committee established by the Preparatory Commission.

The Interim Committee had set up an Inspection Group to examine two approved areas, the environs of Boston and New York: it was also to consider the most suitable arrangements for an *interim* headquarters, preferably near the site chosen for the permanent headquarters. The recommendation of this group was for the establishment of permanent headquarters in the North Stamford—Greenwich district, near to New York City. Facilities for interim headquarters might, they reported, be found in New York City itself; the buildings available were adequate, although rather widely dispersed.

While this report was under discussion in the General Headquarters Committee, the Legal Committee recommended that the Secretary-General, assisted by a Committee composed of representatives of Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Egypt, France, Poland, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, should be authorized to negotiate on behalf of the United Nations with the competent authorities in the United States, as host State, the arrangements made necessary by the establishment of the permanent seat in that country. It drew up a draft Convention to provide a basis for the negotiation, the result of which the Secretary-General would communicate to the General Assembly. (See page 40.)

In the General Headquarters Committee itself, the recommendations of the Interim Committee on the exact location of the site evoked a vigorous and protracted discussion. Objections raised included the failure of the Interim Committee to report on more than two areas; the climate of the area selected; opposition on the part of the inhabitants; and the enormous expense of the land. The proximity of a city of the size of New York seemed undesirable to some delegates. The French representative proposed that the decision on