



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 66:	
Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 (<i>continued</i>)	
Administrative and financial arrangements for the United Nations Emergency Force (<i>continued</i>) ..	75
Agenda item 65:	
The over-all total of the United Nations annual budget expenditure (<i>continued</i>)	78

Chairman: Mr. Omar LOUTFI (Egypt).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Calogeroopoulos-Stratis (Greece), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 66¹

Question considered by the first emergency special session of the General Assembly from 1 to 10 November 1956 (A/3383 and Rev.1, A/3402) (*continued*)

Administrative and financial arrangements for the United Nations Emergency Force (continued)

1. Mr. HUSSEINI (Saudi Arabia) was opposed to the Secretary-General's proposal as contained in A/3383, paras. 5 to 7, and as outlined by the Controller at the 541st meeting, that the cost of establishing and maintaining the United Nations Emergency Force should be borne by all Member States of the United Nations. He was afraid that the adoption of that proposal would set a serious precedent which might have far-reaching results. The Emergency Force had been created by the General Assembly with a view to keeping the peace after it had been disturbed by aggressors. Of the seventy-nine Member States of the United Nations three had concerted together to perpetrate aggression which had been condemned and deplored by the world. It was only fair that they alone should pay for the Force. His country was not responsible for what had happened in the Middle East. It had not shelled or bombed another country, attacked citizens, damaged property, or blocked the Suez Canal. Neither had its army been used as a tool for the invasion of Egypt. On the contrary his country, too, had suffered from the aggression committed. It was unfair that all Member States should be asked to bear the cost of aggression; it was even worse that Egypt, the victim of aggression, should be required to contribute. Such a request was morally and logically unfounded. He emphasized that his Governments' position was dictated by moral rather than financial considerations.

¹ Considered by the Fifth Committee in accordance with paragraph 4 of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its 596th plenary meeting on 26 November 1956.

2. Mr. LIVERAN (Israel) noted that certain matters which had been ruled irrelevant by the Chairman were still being discussed, although they were manifestly still irrelevant. He was referring in particular to the use of the word "aggression", since that word was not to be found in any of the documents before the Committee—and incidentally the General Assembly had not used the term—all arguments based on it were irrelevant and out of order. Aggression was a relevant question in another context and had been raised by his delegation at the first emergency special session and even earlier in respect of certain events which occurred in 1948. In the Committee, however, members should limit themselves to the items under discussion. He wished to make it clear that his silence when similar phrases had been used after the Chairman's ruling (545th meeting) did not reflect a change of mind on his part, but was due only to his respect for that ruling.

3. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) proposed that before the Secretary-General's proposal was put to a vote the Secretariat should prepare a further report taking into account the various points of view that had been expressed during the debate. It was not proper that the regular scale of assessments for 1957 should apply to such abnormal expenses as the United Nations Emergency Force and the Secretary-General should be requested to suggest another formula. Two factors might be borne in mind: firstly, the fact that permanent membership of the Security Council implied a greater responsibility for the Member States concerned and, secondly, that the Emergency Force was serving the interests of all Member States, large and small. It would therefore be more reasonable for the expenses of the Force to be shared on the following basis: 50 per cent to be paid by the permanent members of the Security Council and 50 per cent by all the Members of the United Nations, including the permanent members of the Security Council.

4. Mr. DIEGUEZ (Guatemala) said that the problem confronting the Committee was very serious and might have profound economic repercussions in countries with limited and under-developed economies, such as his own.

5. As the Spanish representative had said, many interesting views had been expressed during the discussion and might well form the basis for a compromise solution which the great majority of the members of the Committee could support. He therefore proposed that the Committee should request the Secretary-General to take into account the various opinions expressed during the discussion of the financing of the Emergency Force and study some other formula which might reconcile those points of view and lead to a more just and equitable solution. He would submit a formal draft resolution to that effect.

6. Mr. TURNER (Controller) emphasized that the Secretary General had not lightly come to the conclusion that he had presented to the Committee (541st meeting). He had given every single facet of the problem his most serious and continual attention over a long period. His proposal therefore represented his carefully considered view of the most equitable and practicable solution to an admittedly complex problem.

7. The Secretary-General and the members of the Secretariat were always at the disposal of members of the Committee to render any assistance they could, and they would hold themselves in readiness to give whatever advice the representatives of Spain and Guatemala might request in formulating a draft resolution. He must make it quite clear, however, that the Secretary-General was not in a position to put forward with conviction any proposal other than the one he had already submitted. The implication of the Guatemalan representative's proposal was that the Secretary-General should seek to find an alternative arrangement which would be more equitable and just than the one which he had already represented as the most equitable, just and reasonable arrangement he could suggest. With the utmost reluctance, he must inform the members of the Committee that, if the Secretary-General were asked to comply with the Guatemalan representative's request, he would be placed in a difficult if not impossible situation.

8. In the absence of any formal proposal other than the Secretary-General's, it would be more proper for the Committee to come to a decision on that proposal first. If it were rejected, the Secretary-General and the Committee as a whole would then be responsible for finding an alternative solution. In the first instance, however, the responsibility was one the Committee itself must assume; it could not expect the Secretary-General to shoulder it.

9. Mr. DIEGUEZ (Guatemala) said that he had the greatest respect for the Secretary-General and the manner in which he was carrying out a difficult task. He had not meant in any way to imply that the Secretary-General's proposal was not just or equitable, but only to suggest that the views expressed in the Committee might perhaps point the way to some other alternative solution. He would, however, omit the reference to a more just and equitable solution from the text of his draft resolution.

10. Mr. RAJAPATHIRANA (Ceylon) noted that many speakers had referred to the necessity of establishing the United Nations Emergency Force to maintain international peace, to their contribution to the Force and to the efforts made by those non-member States which had contributed services and transport facilities. He was sure that all the members of the Committee were prepared to accept their full share of the responsibility for maintaining peace. That, however, was not the problem before the Committee. The problem was whether the \$10 million which the General Assembly had authorized the Secretary-General to spend should be apportioned among all Member States on the basis of the 1957 scale of assessments. That question must be considered in the light of all the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the Force in question.

11. His delegation would not like to do anything which would handicap the Secretary-General in his efforts to bring about peace in the Middle East; on the

contrary, it wished to do all it could to help him. On the other hand, the \$10 million necessary to maintain the Force had already been appropriated by the General Assembly. All that was now required was to decide how that amount should be replaced on the United Nations books. It was open to question whether the Secretary-General's proposal represented the most reasonable way of achieving that end.

12. He tended to agree with the Saudi Arabian representative's statement that adoption of the proposed procedure might put a premium on aggression. The need for legislative sanction had also been mentioned. The Middle East crisis had resulted in considerable economic and financial loss for his part of the world and it would be difficult to convince some legislatures of the appropriateness of the Secretary-General's proposal. Moreover, the Committee had not yet decided on the 1957 scale of assessments. Lastly, his delegation would like to be quite clear that the Secretary-General's proposal referred only to the expenses of the Emergency Force and not to the other expenses arising out of the Middle East situation, such as those involved in the clearing of the Suez Canal.

13. For all those reasons, his delegation would welcome an opportunity to consider any other alternative suggestions, including that put forward by the Spanish representative. He therefore supported the Guatemalan representative's proposal. Its adoption should have no adverse effect on the Secretary-General's activities in the Middle East, as there was nothing to prevent the Secretary-General from spending the \$10 million that had been appropriated.

14. In conclusion, he emphasized that he was sure that no Member State would be unwilling to share its part of the expenses of a United Nations force when one was established, particularly as such expenses would presumably be included in the regular budget. The Emergency Force, however, was a special force that had come into existence in particular circumstances.

15. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand) wholeheartedly supported the views expressed by the representative of the Secretary-General. All members of the Committee were anxious to help the Secretary-General in the performance of his responsible and difficult functions. With the greatest respect to the representatives of Guatemala and Spain, he did not think that their proposals would have that effect. They would only impose on the Secretary-General a task beyond even his great capacity and result in financial disarray and even chaos.

16. His delegation felt that it was entitled to advance its views, as New Zealand had been among the first to offer troops to the Emergency Force and, having contributed troops to the United Nations forces in Korea, it had some idea of the financial problems involved.

17. The Committee might well consider certain analogous situations in the past. The General Assembly had on more than one occasion established special commissions, entailing considerable expense, to examine conditions in a particular country or the conduct of a particular State. There had never been any suggestion, nor would such a suggestion have been accepted, that the financial obligations incurred as a result of the establishment and maintenance of those

bodies should be borne by the State with whose conduct they were concerned. Secondly, there was the case of Korea. The cost of the military action in Korea had been relatively high and it had fallen on the few countries which had contributed troops. That had confirmed his delegation's view that the cost of any similar action in the future should be more widely distributed among all Member States. Although the General Assembly had specifically named the aggressor in Korea, namely, the People's Republic of China, it had never been suggested that that country should be held financially responsible.

18. Certain features of General Assembly resolution 1000 (ES-I) establishing the Emergency Force must be borne in mind. Firstly, the principal function of the Force was to keep the peace between Egypt and Israel. In that respect, it represented an extension of the admittedly inadequate measures the United Nations had taken to that end in the past. Secondly, there was no essential relation between the future activities of the Emergency Force and the immediate presence in Egypt of United Kingdom and French troops. Thirdly, the United Kingdom and France had welcomed the establishment of the Force and given it every assistance. The case might have been different could it have been shown that they had attempted to thwart the Force and that it had been established to deal with their transgressions. As matters stood, however, the whole General Assembly was responsible for the resolution and it was only fair therefore that all Members should bear the costs. As the scale of assessments was based on capacity to pay, it seemed the fairest way of apportioning costs. To ask the five great Powers to pay substantially more than the rest would be grossly unfair and tantamount to imposing sanctions on them.

19. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), replying to the last point, said that his proposal should not be construed as imposing sanctions on the five great Powers, but rather as conferring on them a great honour.

20. Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay) reaffirmed his view that the solution suggested by the Secretary-General was not only just and equitable but appropriate to the circumstances. He merely wished to add to what had been said by the Controller and the New Zealand representative that it would be extremely difficult for the Secretary-General to recommend any other solution to the problem which would be in conformity with Article 17 of the Charter. Once the General Assembly had decided to establish an Emergency Force and to authorize the Secretary-General to set up a Special Account in the amount of \$10 million, the solution compatible with Article 17 was that all Member States should bear a proportion of the expenditure in accordance with the normal scale of assessment, which had been recommended by a body appointed for the purpose by the General Assembly. Thus, the Guatemalan proposal would place the Secretary-General in a very difficult position and would impose upon him tasks and responsibilities which he ought not to be asked to bear. Any alternative suggestion should come from the Fifth Committee in the form of a draft resolution sponsored by a delegation or group of delegations, such as the one proposed by Spain, with which, incidentally, the Uruguayan delegation could not agree. If the Guatemalan representative desired an alternative solution, therefore, he should amend his proposal in such a way that the responsibility for finding a different

method of financing was not imposed on the Secretary-General.

21. The Uruguayan delegation would vote for the Secretary-General's proposal. Although it would not support any alternative solutions, it had no objection to their being considered by the Committee.

22. Mr. JONES (United States of America) sympathized with those delegations which had expressed misgivings about their ability to pay their share of the cost of the Force. The additional contribution would no doubt be a real burden for many countries, but the United States delegation shared the view of many others that it was an obligation that must be faced in compliance with the Charter. The Force had been established by an overwhelming vote, and Member States now had to support their words and their votes with deeds.

23. The United States delegation supported the principle of dividing the expenditure in accordance with the scale of assessments. It was out of the question that the Secretary-General should be asked to recommend alternative scales which would involve political considerations. Agreement by all States to the allocation of the expenditure in accordance with the scale of assessments would be a sign of the maturity of the United Nations. The United States delegation could not accept the stand taken by some delegations that they would not be bound by any action of the General Assembly with respect to the United Nations Emergency Force. That was the responsibility of all Members. The United States would vote in favour of the Secretary-General's proposals.

24. Mr. JOUBLANC RIVAS (Mexico), speaking on a point of order, proposed, under rule 117 of the rules of procedure, that the debate on the question should be adjourned to the following meeting to give the members of the Committee time to study the various proposals that had been submitted.

25. Mr. DIEGUEZ (Guatemala), Mr. DE PINIES (Spain), Mr. COLOMA (Ecuador) and Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay) supported the Mexican proposal because of the complexity of the question and because it would give them time to study the Guatemalan proposal.

26. Mr. CERULLI IRELLI (Italy) opposed the Mexican proposal, because he considered that the Secretary-General's proposals should be put to an immediate vote. The Committee should examine those proposals first and determine whether they were acceptable. If it decided that they were not, it could then proceed to consider the alternatives.

27. The Italian delegation also believed that the Committee's hesitations would reflect on the status of the Force and adversely affect the first attempt by the United Nations to implement the idea of an international police force. It would therefore vote against the Mexican proposal and hoped that the Secretary-General's draft resolution would be put to the vote without further delay.

The motion for adjournment of the debate was adopted by 35 votes to 12, with 17 abstentions.

28. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) explained his note in favour of the proposal.

AGENDA ITEM 65

The over-all total of the United Nations annual budget expenditure (A/3202, A/C.5/678, A/C.5/L.408 and A/C.5/L.409) (continued)*

29. Lord LOTHIAN (United Kingdom) said that, in his delegation's revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.408), the General Assembly was asked, first, to change its procedure for examining the budget, on an experimental basis, by fixing an over-all ceiling for expenditure before examining and approving the estimates in detail, and, second, to accept a ceiling of \$50 million for the 1957 budget, which was reasonable in the light of estimates already presented.

30. The revised draft resolution reflected his delegation's acceptance of the view that the procedure should be adopted on an experimental basis and for one year only instead of for two, as originally proposed.

31. If all delegations bore only those two points in mind, most, if not all of the objections that had been expressed would disappear. The proposal could not lead to slovenly budgeting, because the estimates had already been prepared. It could not lead to rigidity and stagnation, because it was to be applied for one year only. The figures themselves made it clear that the fear that assistance projects to under-developed countries might be prejudiced by the proposal was groundless, since the total estimates of \$50.6 million included only \$13-\$14 million in respect of economic and social activities, the remainder being for general administration and services, and for undistributed common costs.

32. The aim of the proposal was merely to set a figure which would be reasonable for 1957 in order to provide a yardstick for the Committee's consideration of the budget items and to ensure more efficient use of United Nations resources, for example, by reducing the flow of documents, as the Austrian representative had suggested at the 543rd meeting. The Secretary-General's efforts in the direction of economy merited high praise, but the proposed experiment in additional control would indicate whether an even more disciplined approach would not be advantageous.

33. Many delegations, while expressing doubts and fears about the proposal, had appreciated that it was a constructive approach, and the United Kingdom delegation hoped that they would now realize that most of their fears had been phantoms. The United Kingdom fully supported the aims of the Charter with regard to assistance to under-developed countries; indeed, with the possible exception of the United States of America, the United Kingdom had done and was still doing more than any other nation for the advancement of the people of the under-developed countries.

34. Mr. GANEM (France) introduced a French amendment (A/C.5/L.409) to the United Kingdom draft resolution.

35. Although the French delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal, it felt that the provision in the annex excluding "appropriations which may subsequently become necessary in respect of unforeseen and emergency expenditure" from the application of the ceiling represented a loophole. When the supplementary estimates had been discussed at the 536th meeting many delegations, particularly that of the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics, had expressed concern at the high level of those estimates, for which no provision had been made by Governments. The French amendment accordingly was to delete the phrase referring to unforeseen expenditure from the annex and to add a third operative paragraph to the draft resolution recommending a ceiling of \$52 million.

36. If the amendment was adopted, Governments would know in advance that supplementary expenditure would not exceed \$2 million. The Secretary-General's power to draw on the Working Capital Fund would ensure that funds were available for any unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure connected with the maintenance of peace and security.

37. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that, as he had understood it, the French amendment was designed to set a ceiling on unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure as well as on the general budget. His immediate reaction, on behalf of the Secretary-General, was that such an arrangement would be unwise and unworkable. No one could foresee what extraordinary and unforeseen expenditures might arise, particularly in connexion with the maintenance of peace and security. He felt that to set a ceiling for such expenditure would be contrary to the Charter and likely to frustrate the implementation of the purposes of the United Nations.

38. Mr. GANEM (France) felt that the Controller was taking an unduly pessimistic view. The French proposal was not directed against the use of additional funds for the maintenance of peace and security, since the Secretary-General would retain his right to draw on the Working Capital Fund for such purposes. The intention was to ensure that the many supplementary estimates would not total more than \$2 million. The French delegation did not believe that its proposal would have the effect of hampering the Secretary-General's activities.

39. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) opposed the French amendment, which he found quite unacceptable. As the proposal stood, it meant that if unforeseen expenditure amounted to \$4 million, the general budget would have to be reduced by \$2 million in order not to exceed the ceiling.

40. The Indian delegation still did not favour the United Kingdom proposal to set a ceiling, even for a single year. It fully agreed that every attempt should be made to economize on all budget items, but the Fifth Committee could scarcely do more in that direction than the Advisory Committee had been doing for over five years. The Advisory Committee had succeeded in making considerable savings, for example, in connexion with expenses at Headquarters and with contractual printing. Increases in the budget had been mainly due to the technical assistance programmes, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

41. The Indian delegation would vote against both the United Kingdom draft resolution and the French amendment to it.

42. Mr. ASHA (Syria) pointed out that a budget ceiling was not a new concept in the United Nations. It had been proposed before on several occasions and had been decisively rejected. If such a ceiling were adopted, the function of the Fifth and Advisory Committees would virtually be reduced to that of rubber-stamping, and he did not think that that was their

* Resumed from 544th meeting.

proper purpose. The United Nations had been growing, and it was common knowledge that more new Members would probably be joining it in the very near future. He could not therefore support either the United Kingdom draft resolution or the French amendment.

43. Mr. TURNER (Controller) apologized for his apparent misunderstanding, in his previous statement, of the French representative's intention. He still maintained, however, that it would be imprudent and unworkable to impose a ceiling on unforeseen and extraordinary expenditures, especially those covered by General Assembly resolution 980 (X), which specifically authorized the Secretary-General, for 1956, to enter into commitments not exceeding a total of \$2 million, provided he certified that they related to the maintenance of peace and security or to urgent economic rehabilitation. If the Secretary-General were inclined to question the wisdom of imposing a ceiling on the regular budget expenditure, he would *a fortiori* be compelled to oppose a similar ceiling on unforeseen expenditure, which it was impossible to estimate.

44. Mr. DAVIN (New Zealand) said that the doubts voiced earlier by his delegation on the United Kingdom proposal had not been resolved by the revised draft, nor by the French amendment. It was difficult to see why an arbitrary limit of \$50 million should be selected beforehand. The figure could perhaps be borne in mind as a possible target, but there could be no sense in committing the Assembly to a total which might subsequently have to be modified.

45. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands) regretted that the revised draft resolution still did not meet the objections which had been raised to the original proposal (A/C.5/678), despite the praiseworthy efforts of its sponsor. Since the adoption of the proposal would raise the question of priorities in an acute form, it might have many undesirable results. For example, projects of particular interest to certain countries might be allotted all the funds they needed, while other equally deserving projects, because they lacked sufficiently powerful champions, were granted nothing. The outcome might well be an unbalanced budget, and for that reason he could not support the United Kingdom proposal.

46. He was nevertheless grateful to the United Kingdom delegation for the salutary effect which its efforts had produced in drawing the Committee's attention to the importance of dealing with first things first. The maxim should be constantly remembered when the Committee came to its consideration of the various budget items in the course of the present session. If those items were consistently viewed in that light, the ultimate total might be less than \$50 million.

47. Mr. EL-MESSIRI (Egypt) said that his delegation continued to be opposed to the United Kingdom draft resolution, and would also vote against the French amendment.

48. Mr. GREZ (Chile), expressing his satisfaction at the statements by the Controller and the Cuban representative, said that he was still unable to support the United Kingdom proposal, despite his sympathy with its objectives. As a compromise, however, he suggested that the Committee should ask the Advisory Committee to study the proposal and to include its

conclusions in its report to the twelfth session. In particular, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions should try to ascertain how far a system of priorities could be made workable.

49. Mr. RAJAPATHIRANA (Ceylon) said that the new draft resolution did nothing to alter his already expressed contention that the disadvantages of an over-all budget ceiling outweighed the advantages. Neither was he able to support the French amendment.

50. Mr. HAMDANI (Pakistan) thought that the French amendment was a contradiction in terms, because it categorically attempted to impose a ceiling on unforeseen expenditure, which by definition could not be estimated. His delegation would abstain from voting on the United Kingdom draft resolution, although it welcomed the use of the words "on an experimental basis" in the first operative paragraph. He would not press the suggestion he had made at the 544th meeting, that there should be a sliding scale of \$59 to \$51 million, but might submit it in the future.

51. Mr. BLANCO (Cuba), while admitting that the revised United Kingdom proposal was a considerable improvement on the original, said that his delegation could still not support it, as it found the principle of a budget ceiling unacceptable. Neither could it endorse the amendment proposed by the French representative. United Nations finances were at present in an emergency situation, and it would perhaps be advisable for the Committee to make a thorough study of methods of securing an over-all budget reduction by decreasing the number of meetings, projects and other activities.

52. Mr. BRAVO CARO (Mexico) said that in view of the general feeling expressed in the Committee, the Mexican delegation could support neither the United Kingdom draft resolution nor the French amendment.

53. Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay) said that although in principle his delegation was not opposed to the fixing of an *a priori* budget ceiling, it nevertheless shared many of the misgivings which had been expressed in regard to its application. The revised text of the United Kingdom proposal was an improvement, inasmuch as it would provide a ceiling for 1957 only, but in practice it would entail a system of priorities for Economic and Social Council projects and, as the Netherlands representative had pointed out, there was a danger that some projects might be given undue priority through pressure from certain delegations, while other projects might be neglected. It was useful to have raised the matter in the Fifth Committee, but perhaps the twelfth session would be a better time for consideration of the problem as a whole. He would abstain from voting on the United Kingdom draft resolution.

54. With regard to the French amendment, he agreed with the Controller that it was not practical, convenient or prudent to attempt to impose a ceiling on unforeseen expenditure.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the French amendment (A/C.5/L.409) to the United Kingdom draft resolution.

The paragraph was rejected by 42 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

At the request of the United Kingdom representative, a vote was taken by roll call on the first operative

paragraph and the annex of the draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom (A/C.5/L.408).

Iran, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Hungary.

Against: Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Indonesia.

Abstaining: Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Greece.

The first operative paragraph and the annex were rejected by 30 votes to 23, with 11 abstentions.

56. Lord LOTHIAN (United Kingdom) said that he would not ask for a vote on the remainder of the draft resolution.

57. The CHAIRMAN asked the French representative whether he intended to submit as a formal pro-

posal his suggestion that the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee should study the question of setting up a system of priorities and submit a report to the twelfth session.

58. Mr. GANEM (France) replied that he had intended only to make a suggestion which he hoped the Committee could accept without the necessity for a vote, and which could be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

59. Mr. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK (Netherlands), Mr. RANSHOFEN-WERTHEIMER (Austria), Mr. GREZ (Chile), Mr. RAEYMAECKERS (Belgium), Mr. FORTEZA (Uruguay), Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. CERULLI IRELLI (Italy), Lord LOTHIAN (United Kingdom) and Mr. BLANCO (Cuba) expressed their warmest support for the French representative's suggestion.

60. Mr. EL-MESSIRI (Egypt) felt that the Committee's report should include a reference to the fact that the main objection to a budgetary ceiling arose out of the question of priorities.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee appeared to support the French representative's suggestion, which would certainly be incorporated in the Committee's report.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.