

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

**TWELFTH SESSION**  
*Official Records*



**FIFTH COMMITTEE 639th  
MEETING**

*Friday, 6 December 1957,  
at 11 a. m.*

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 65:	
United Nations Emergency Force: report of the Secretary-General	
Cost estimates for maintaining the Emergency Force .....	215
Agenda item 50:	
Offer by the Government of Chile of land in Santiago to be used as office site for the United Nations and other international organizations. ....	218

**Chairman:** Mr. W. H. J. VAN ASCH VAN WIJCK  
(Netherlands).

**AGENDA ITEM 65**

**United Nations Emergency Force: report of the Secretary-General (A/3694 and Add.1, A/3761)**

**Cost estimates for maintaining the Emergency Force**

1. Mr. McCRAW (Secretariat), referring to paragraph 5 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/3761), informed the Committee that the Secretary-General would be pleased to carry out the suggestion of the Advisory Committee "that a formal budget for the [United Nations Emergency] Force in 1958 should be prepared and published at the earliest feasible moment", and gave an assurance that the budget estimates for the full year 1958 would be made available to the advisory Committee in time for review at that Committee's first session in 1958.

2. In the meantime, as suggested by the Advisory Committee, an initial budget covering the first half of 1958 would be prepared and issued within the next few weeks.

3. Mr. CARNAHAN (United States of America) felt that the usefulness of paragraph 5 of the General Assembly's resolution 1151 (XII) of 22 November 1957 was confirmed by the very sound and helpful recommendations contained in the Advisory Committee's report.

4. The United States delegation was glad to note that the Advisory Committee had supported the Assembly's judgement that \$30 million would be needed for the financial year 1957; and it also noted with satisfaction that savings could be effected under certain expenditure heads in 1958, while maintaining the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) at its present level in manpower and efficiency. It agreed with the Advisory Committee that expenses for the first six months of 1958 ought not to exceed \$9 to \$10 million, excluding extraordinary expenses. While congratulating the Secretary-General and the authorities concerned on the results achieved in the way of administrative orga-

nization and controls, it agreed with the Advisory Committee that the paramount need now was to make special efforts to ensure that the existing procedures were adequately implemented and enforced.

5. The United States delegation would, therefore, support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

6. Mr. TUOVINEN (Finland) said that Finland was one of the countries which had contributed troops to the Emergency Force. The Finnish delegation had already defined its position on the substance of the question in the General Assembly (720th plenary meeting). With respect to financing, under the provisions of paragraph 2 of resolution 1151 (XII), the United Nations should reimburse participating Governments first, for any special allowances paid to members of their contingents as a direct result of service with UNEF and secondly, in the event of a contingent's serving beyond an initial period of six months or of a replacement contingent being made available, for all extra and extraordinary costs incurred. In the case of Finland, all sums paid to the enlisted men and some of the non-commissioned officers came under special allowances; the Finnish contingent had been created solely for the purpose of UNEF by the recruitment of volunteers. With the exception of a few officers, it did not include any members of the Finnish army. Consequently, the sums paid were not basic salaries, as the term was used by the Secretary-General in his report (A/3694 and Add.1). If Finland had not been asked to put a contingent at the disposal of UNEF, none of the members of the contingent would have served in any military unit and, consequently, none would have received any pay. That also applied to all other costs arising from the establishment and operation of the Finnish contingent. For practical purposes, all the expenses incurred were "extra costs". The Finnish delegation had already pointed that out to the Assembly, but it seemed advisable to repeat it because of certain remarks made by the Advisory Committee in its report. While approving the report, his delegation wished it to be clearly understood that, in the case of the Finnish contingent, there was no difference between special allowances and basic salaries. It was with that understanding that it had voted for resolution 1151 (XII).

7. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) said that it was a source of gratification that the Emergency Force had helped to restore peace, but he thought that the total expenses were high for both 1957 and 1958. Assuming that they would amount to \$25 million in 1958, and in view of the fact that the UNEF numbered 5,977 men at the present time (A/3694, para.4), the cost per man would be \$4,850. The figure would be only \$4,464, if the Force was reduced to 5,600 men (A/3694, para.7), but, even so, it would still be much too high in the opinion of the Spanish delegation. The Force must,

of course, be properly cared for, but it was surely possible to reduce expenses by stricter and more careful financial control. Consequently, the Spanish delegation would support the Advisory Committee's recommendations. In particular, it approved the preparation and publication of budget estimates for the first six months of 1958 and it hoped that the total expenses for that period would not exceed \$9 to \$10 million—preferably \$9 million; the extremely heavy expenses of the United Nations, together with the financing of the UNEF, placed a tremendous burden on all the Member States.

8. Mr. LENNARD (Canada) said that at the Fifth Committee (541st meeting) of the General Assembly's eleventh session, the Canadian delegation had stressed the need for subjecting the expenses connected with the Emergency Force to the same strict and stringent control as other United Nations operations. It was therefore glad that the Advisory Committee had given its comments on the UNEF budget for 1957 and had reaffirmed the desirability of preparing and publishing a formal budget for 1958 as early as possible.

9. Since the initial emergency period had passed, the Canadian delegation thought that the administrators of UNEF could henceforth revert to the normal practices governing the purchase of supplies and the transport services, which should make it possible to lower costs considerably. It was aware that some savings had already been achieved under that heading, and was happy to note that the Secretary-General had indicated that certain expense items could be reduced still further, particularly the per capita food costs.

10. As it had stated in the General Assembly on 22 November (720th plenary meeting), the Canadian delegation considered that the figure of \$25 million for the financial year 1958 was an outside estimate. It seemed reasonable, therefore, to establish an overall limitation of \$9 to \$10 million to cover the expenses for the first six months of 1958, especially since that sum would not include extra and extraordinary expenses payable by the Organization in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1151 (XII). Since Canada had furnished large quantities of supplies, it was particularly pleased to note the General Assembly's decision on that point.

11. The Canadian delegation likewise supported the Advisory Committee's recommendation that a budget for the entire financial year 1958 should be submitted early enough to enable the Committee to consider it at its first session in 1958. That should be one of the Fifth Committee's first tasks at its thirteenth session.

12. The Canadian delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that as much use as possible should be made of local staff for non-military tasks. In addition, it would be advisable to discontinue the air lift based on Naples; the four aircraft in use there were large machines, expensive to maintain and operate. The other UNEF aircraft were lighter planes, which were much less expensive to maintain.

13. Before closing, he wished to point out that expenses connected with UNEF would have been even greater had it not been for the generosity of a large number of countries which had provided special assistance free of charge, as well as goods and services. Countries which had sent contingents, were not included in the list of States which had furnished

special assistance; yet, the costs involved had been substantial. Canada, for example, had borne the "in Canada costs" of the contingent it had assigned to UNEF (transport and per diem allowances to the point of embarkation, etc.), to an amount exceeding \$500,000, not counting the man-hours of those who had organized the contingent, or the maintenance of the contingent and the replacement of military personnel assigned to UNEF. Canada had been glad to provide those services, for it believed that the establishment of the Emergency Force was entirely in accordance with the Purposes and Principles listed in Chapter I of the United Nations Charter.

14. Mr. URABE (Japan) found it natural that considerations of efficiency should have taken precedence over considerations of economy during the initial phase of the UNEF operations. But since the operations would henceforth be in the nature of policing rather than military operations, it was time for considerations of economy to come into the foreground. The Japanese delegation therefore supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations without reservation, particularly with respect to the overall limitation of \$9 to \$10 million for the first six months of 1958, the practice of obtaining competitive bids for supplies and services, the employment of local personnel for non-military duties, and the saving to be effected on the cost of motor fuel and travelling expenses.

15. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had explained its attitude to the financing of UNEF at the eleventh session (596th plenary meeting) and at the twelfth session (720th plenary meeting). He would like to point out again that the General Assembly's action in establishing the Emergency Force contravened Chapter VII of the Charter, which gave exclusive competence in that field to the Security Council. In conformity with the principles of international law, the countries which should bear the political and financial consequences of their acts were the aggressor countries and no-one else.

16. The Soviet delegation would, therefore, vote against any resolution under which the Members of the United Nations were to bear the maintenance costs of UNEF.

17. Mr. UGO (Italy) gave unqualified support to those recommendations of the Advisory Committee whose purpose was to reduce the cost of the Emergency Force. It was most important that the budget for the first six months of 1958 should be prepared as soon as possible, and a special effort should be made to ensure that existing procedures in respect of administrative organization and controls were adequately implemented and enforced and that the system of competitive bids for supplies and services were introduced.

18. The Italian Government would not ask for reimbursement of the \$300,000 it had spent on services supplied to UNEF.

19. Mr. SERBAN (Romania), recalling that his delegation had explained its attitude on the question during the eleventh (593rd plenary meeting) and twelfth (721st plenary meeting) sessions of the General Assembly, said that resolutions 1089 (XI), 1090 (XI), 1122 (XI) and 1151 (XII) contravened the provisions

of Chapter VII of the Charter, since the Security Council alone was empowered to establish an armed international force. It would be a denial of the elementary principles of equity and international law to absolve countries which had committed aggression from all responsibility and to place the responsibility on other States which had fought against aggression and suffered losses in consequence. The Government of Romania was, therefore, not prepared to assume any financial obligation in respect of UNEF.

20. Mr. MONTERO BUSTAMANTE (Uruguay) was entirely in favour of the principle that the United Nations should have a police force at its disposal. But Uruguay, with its limited resources, was concerned at the high cost of maintaining that Force. It therefore welcomed the Advisory Committee's recommendation of an over-all limit of \$9 to \$10 million for the first six months of 1958. His delegation supported that recommendation and all the other suggestions made by the Advisory Committee for reducing the maintenance costs of UNEF.

21. Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia), after recalling that his delegation had explained its attitude to the financing of UNEF during the eleventh (591st plenary meeting) and twelfth (721st plenary meeting) sessions of the General Assembly, said that in conformity with the principles of international law, the maintenance of the Force should fall exclusively on the aggressor States. His delegation was not prepared to accept any other solution.

22. Mr. MORALES RIVAS (Colombia) was gratified to note that, according to the Advisory Committee, the authorization of \$30 million should be adequate for the first financial period ending on 31 December 1957. His delegation approved all the other recommendations of the Advisory Committee and more especially the recommendation which called for the preparation which called for the preparation of formal budget estimates for 1958.

23. Mr. GREKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that during the eleventh session (597th plenary meeting), his delegation had already made clear its attitude towards UNEF. UNEF had been established in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, and the Byelorussian SSR did not feel bound by any financial commitment in respect thereto.

24. Mr. GALVAO (Brazil) gave his full support to the Advisory Committee's very sound recommendations.

25. Mr. LILIC (Yugoslavia) said that his country had supplied a contingent to the Emergency Force, which was still performing a very useful function. He thought the most sensible solution was for Member States to share the cost of the Emergency Force among them in the same proportions as their percentage contributions for 1957. He approved the Advisory Committee's recommendations and suggestions.

26. Mr. AKBAY (Turkey) recalled that his Government had always adopted a constructive approach in the debates on UNEF in the General Assembly. In spite of its limited resources, Turkey had done all that could be done to contribute to the financing of the Emergency Force in 1957, but it regretted to have to give notice that, with the best will in the world, it would be unable to contribute more than \$75,000 for 1958, in view of its present financial position. It fully

approved all the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

27. Mr. HSIA (China) felt that the financing of the Emergency Force raised difficult problems. His remarks would be of a general nature; military experts would be better qualified to make detailed comments on such matters. He drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 7 of the report of the Advisory Committee, especially the last sentence. The paramount need was to ensure a very close control of actual expenditure, and the Committee should earnestly request the Secretary-General to do everything possible to achieve that.

28. Mr. NAIK (Pakistan) felt that the Advisory Committee had made very valuable observations and recommendations as to how over-all expenditure on UNEF could be reduced. His delegation did not wish to criticize what had been done in the past; the Secretary-General was doing everything possible to effect economies, as was proved by such measures as the gradual reduction in the number of liaison officers. It would like, however, to suggest three methods by which expenditure could be reduced. First, UNEF seemed top-heavy in regard to general staff. While it was obvious that UNEF's responsibilities were much greater than those of a brigade, its total strength was only equivalent to that of a brigade. There were usually eight general staff officers in a brigade, whereas the Emergency Force had twenty-nine (not counting the liaison officers in Cairo, Tel-Aviv and Naples). The civilian staff also seemed to be much larger than was necessary. Second, the Royal Canadian Air Force maintained a flight of transport planes at Naples and another at Abu Suweir; the aircraft which carried goods and personnel for Naples and Egypt made only a small number of flights each month. Maintenance (including crews) must cost more than it would to contract the service out to Italian or Swiss commercial lines. The rotation of troops was effected by commercial transport planes. Third, in so far as it was compatible with the system of replenishment, the existing stocks of rations should be cut down, with a view to reducing losses due to storage and pilfering and expenditure on guard duties by local employees.

29. Mr. PAREJA (Peru) pointed out that the establishment of UNEF had been a measure necessary for the maintenance of peace. The resulting financial implications were enormous, as the maximum amount of \$25 million, which the Secretary-General had been authorized to spend during the period ending 31 December 1957, was equal to nearly half the budget of the United Nations. He recalled the position taken by Peru in the General Assembly on 22 November (721st plenary meeting), when his delegation made a reservation to the effect that the major part of the cost should be borne by the countries which had not only the largest material resources but the heaviest responsibility for peace. It would accordingly be fairer to apportion the expenditure, not in accordance with the scale of assessments for 1957, but in accordance with a special scale, taking into account the economic and financial capacities of countries and their responsibility for the maintenance of peace; if that formula could not be put into application during the current year, he hoped it could be done the following year. Peru would support the recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

30. Mr. ANDONI (Albania) announced that for the reasons which his delegation had given the Assembly at the eleventh (595th plenary meeting) and twelfth (721st plenary meeting) sessions, the Republic of Albania would not contribute to the maintenance of the Emergency Force.

31. Mr. CLOUGH (United Kingdom) regretted that the Secretariat had not found it possible to submit to the Committee detailed budget estimates to assist it in reaching a proper decision. But he noted with satisfaction that the Secretary-General had agreed to produce a formal budget for 1958, and particularly, as the representative of the Secretary-General had said, that it would be ready within the next few weeks. He was also glad to know that the Advisory Committee at its first session in 1958 would have before it detailed budget estimates for the entire financial year 1958. His delegation fully supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the need for fully affective administrative organization and controls, and he noted in that connexion that the Committee had recommended an over-all limitation of \$9 to \$10 million for expenditure during the first six months of 1958, and that emphasis should be placed on obtaining competitive bids for supplies and services. The United Kingdom would likewise support all of the other recommendations of the Advisory Committee which were designed to ensure economy.

32. Mr. CARNAHAN (United States of America) was sorry to see that the USSR delegation continued to employ the well-worn arguments to justify its refusal to pay its share of UNEF costs. The Soviet delegation had insisted on the illegality of UNEF only since it had become necessary to finance UNEF. He was also surprised that Czechoslovakia and Romania, after offering to send contingents, should declare that the Emergency Force was illegal now that the time had come for payment. He regretted that a country which possessed an abundance of resources and had not voted against the establishment of the Emergency Force, was refusing to contribute, when other Members, weaker in resources, had demonstrated their willingness to pay. A negative vote would not relieve the USSR from responsibilities under Articles 17 and 19 of the Charter for payment.

33. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee was required only to examine the estimated expenditure for the maintenance of the Force. If he had permitted certain statements to be made, it was because they might be considered as an explanation of the manner in which some delegations would vote on the question before the Committee. The terms of reference of the Committee's discussion were, however, clearly established, and he hoped members would abide by them.

34. Mr. CHECHETKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, under those circumstances, he would have to confine himself to repeating that his country would not participate in financing the Emergency Force and that no State could compel it to do so.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the discussion was closed. He put to the vote the following draft resolution:

**"The General Assembly**

**"Takes note with approval of the observations and recommendations contained in the twenty-sixth re-**

**port (A/3761) of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the twelfth session of the General Assembly."**

The draft resolution was adopted by 45 votes to 10, with 6 abstentions.

36. Mr. LARREA (Ecuador) said that, in accordance with the position it had taken during the debate in the General Assembly (721st plenary meeting), his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

37. Mr. SERRANO (Chile) explained that, in keeping with the position it had taken at the 721st plenary meeting of the General Assembly, his delegation had abstained from voting, because it did not consider the distribution of the expenditure to be fair. Its attitude should not be taken as implying criticism of the Emergency Force, of the Secretary-General, or of the Advisory Committee.

38. Mr. MARGAIN (Cambodia) said he had voted in favour of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee as being sensible and likely to effect a saving. The Emergency Force had been in existence for over a year, and had to a large extent succeeded in restoring peace in the area, so that there was some justification for considering a reduction in its strength and activities. His country regretted that the Advisory Committee had not seen fit to recommend a progressive reduction in the strength of the Force, starting immediately. He hoped the Advisory Committee would not lose sight of that possibility when it came to examine the budget estimates prepared by the Secretary-General for the first six months of 1958.

**AGENDA ITEM 50**

**Offer by the Government of Chile of land in Santiago to be used as office site for the United Nations and other international organizations (A/3641 and Add.1, A/C.5/712, A/C.5/L.487)**

39. Mr. MONTERO DE VARGAS (Paraguay) presented the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.487) concerning the offer of land by the Government of Chile. The sponsors of the draft resolution were all Latin American nations, inspired by a common desire to see the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies rendered more effective. Hence, they attached special importance to the generous offer of the Chilean Government, which, as the Secretary-General pointed out in his report (A/C.5/712), would make it possible to accommodate the various United Nations units and specialized agencies working in Santiago. The work of all those units was of the utmost importance to the countries of America and to their economic and social development; if they were all accommodated in one building, it would facilitate their work and improve co-ordination. He accordingly hoped that the eighteen-Power draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

40. Mr. LAWRENCE (New Zealand) pointed out that the Secretary-General's recommendation for the acceptance of the Chilean Government's offer had financial implications. He therefore regretted that the Fifth Committee had before it no report by the Advisory Committee on the subject, in accordance with the usual procedure. His delegation asked that no decision should be taken until the Advisory Committee's views had been heard.

41. Mr. LENNARD (Canada) said he had noted the Chilean Government's generous offer with great interest and quite appreciated the enthusiasm it had aroused. It would be wise, however, to study that question thoroughly, since it was important and to submit it to the Advisory Committee. He therefore supported the proposal made to that effect by the New Zealand representative and hoped that a number of other questions with which his delegation was concerned would also be referred to the Advisory Committee.

42. The Secretary-General estimated that the construction costs would amount to \$800,000 to \$1 million. He asked to what extent that covered furnishings and heating and air conditioning units.

43. The Secretary-General stated (A/C.5/712, para. 12) that the proposed building would "provide appropriate conference facilities". He asked whether, in estimating needs in that respect, the Fifth Committee's draft resolution adopted at the 636th meeting concerning the location of the regular sessions of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and its subsidiary bodies would be taken into account. He wondered whether the areas indicated in paragraph 10 of the Secretary-General's report included the kitchens, bathrooms and corridor space referred to in paragraph 8; if so, it seemed unwise to take those unused areas into account in estimating future needs.

44. Once those points were clarified, the cost estimates should be calculated in order to obtain an accurate figure which would not leave a margin of error of \$200,000, or 25 per cent of the proposed minimum. Again, he would like to know whether the present estimates took into account possible fluctuations in construction costs.

45. The Secretary-General's report gave no indication of the probable maintenance costs for the proposed building. That was surely an item of expenditure that must be taken into consideration in any sound appraisal of the economic merits of the proposal.

46. With regard to present rentals, the \$3,700 annual rental of the offices of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), paid by the Chilean Development Corporation, should surely be deducted from the total annual rental of \$25,140, and the figure to be used in making valid comparisons, should be \$21,440. In that connexion, it was relevant to know whether the Chilean Development Corporation would continue to pay FAO's rental costs when FAO moved into larger premises in the proposed building.

47. Had FAO and the other bodies concerned shown a wish to occupy common premises? It seemed necessary to have assurances on that point before taking a decision.

48. Even if it were assumed that FAO would take up quarters in the new building, the available space would not all be used immediately, and some study should be made of the prospects of renting the space to other organizations.

49. The Canadian delegation noted with satisfaction the proposals of the ad hoc committee appointed by ECLA to look into the question of a building (A/C.5/712, annex) and, particularly, the recommendation that Member States should extend to the United Nations

interest-free loans to cover 75 per cent of the estimated costs. The committee had also proposed that the States members of ECLA which had advanced loans, should be reimbursed by instalments in the form of a deduction from their annual contributions to the United Nations budget, over a period of some years. The amount to be deducted, equivalent to the rental costs of comparable premises in Santiago, would be distributed *pro rata* among those various countries. The suggestion did not seem to be in conformity with accepted budgetary practice, and the Canadian delegation would like to have the Advisory Committee's views on that point also.

50. Mr. CLOUGH (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom delegation wished to congratulate warmly the Chilean Government on its very generous offer of a piece of land at Santiago. That would permit the erection of a building in which not only the staff of ECLA headquarters would be accommodated but also various other branch offices of the United Nations and other international organizations now scattered in different parts of the city. The United Kingdom had always supported measures likely to improve co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and the Chilean Government's very generous offer would materially contribute to an improvement in such co-ordination.

51. The Secretary-General's proposals for building on the site, as set out in document A/C.5/712, however, gave rise to a number of questions on which it would seem desirable to have the expert advice of the Advisory Committee. For example, if all existing units at Santiago were accommodated in a single building, it would seem logical to expect a reduction of present rental and maintenance costs. Under the Secretary-General's proposals, however, there would be an increase. Various other of the Secretary-General's proposals had financial implications which would which would seem to call for examination by the Advisory Committee before the Fifth Committee took a decision on the eighteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.5/L.487).

52. For those reasons, the United Kingdom supported the Canadian and New Zealand proposal. He felt, however, that, if the procedure they had suggested was adopted, very little delay would be entailed.

53. Mr. LILIC (Yugoslavia) paid a tribute to the Chilean Government's generous gesture, which reflected the Chilean people's faithful adherence to the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. Having represented his country in Chile, he knew that international officials were always warmly welcomed by the Chilean people; and the offer would help to improve the working conditions of those officials. The Yugoslav delegation associated itself with the thanks expressed by the Secretary-General, whose proposals it supported unreservedly. It would be glad to vote for the joint draft resolution.

54. Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) expressed his gratitude to the Chilean Government and said that his delegation would support the eighteen-Power draft resolution, which it felt to be important for the economic development of the Latin American countries.

55. Mr. CARNAHAN (United States of America) associated himself with the thanks addressed to the Chilean Government. He realized that there were problems

relating to the financing of the proposed building which remained to be solved, but he thought that the Secretary-General could be entrusted with the study of the question. It would be necessary that proposed expenses be included in future United Nations budgets, whatever the method of financing. In those circumstances, the United States delegation would vote for the joint draft resolution.

56. Mr. GANEM (France) said that his country, as a member of ECLA, thanked the Chilean Government for its generosity and was glad that the Latin American countries had submitted a joint draft resolution. In order to meet the views of the New Zealand, Canadian and United Kingdom representatives, whose misgivings he could well understand, he suggested adding, in paragraph 3 of the eighteen-Power draft resolution

after the phrase "together with final financial arrangements", the words "and such observations thereon as may be made by the Advisory committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions". He would like to hear the views of the sponsors of the draft on his proposal.

57. Mr. FUNES (Honduras) associated himself with the congratulations offered to the Chilean Government and people. With regard to the amendment proposed by the French representative to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, it hardly seemed necessary, since the General Assembly, when it examined the problem at the thirteenth session, would automatically have before it a report by the Advisory Committee, in accordance with the usual procedure.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.