



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 64:</i>	
<i>Personnel questions (continued):</i>	
(a) <i>Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat (continued);</i>	
(b) <i>Proportion of fixed-term staff (continued).</i>	
(c) <i>Other personnel questions</i>	249
<i>Agenda item 62:</i>	
<i>Administrative and budgetary procedures of the United Nations: report of the Working Group appointed under General Assembly resolution 1620 (XV) (continued)</i>	253

Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).

AGENDA ITEM 64

Personnel questions (continued):

- (a) **Geographical distribution of the staff of the Secretariat (A/4776 and Corr.1, chap. IV; A/4794, paras. 31-40; A/4901, A/C.5/890, A/C.5/L.683/Rev.3, A/C.5/L.684, A/C.5/L.686, A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3, A/C.5/L.697) (continued);**
- (b) **Proportion of fixed-term staff (A/C.5/891) (continued)**

1. Mr. QUAO (Ghana) said that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3) had wished to assist the Acting Secretary-General and not, as had been alleged, to restrict his freedom of action. They regretted that some speakers should have tried to give the impression that that draft resolution would make the Acting Secretary-General's task harder, whereas the United States revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.3) would make it easier. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution were just as anxious as anyone else to give the Acting Secretary-General all the help they could in his difficult task. Since their proposal had already been presented, he would confine himself to commenting on the Soviet amendments (A/C.5/L.697).

2. The Fifth Committee need not approve all the recommendations of the Committee of Experts on the Activities and Organization of the Secretariat (A/4776 and Corr.1) in order to express its appreciation, if only of the time and effort the experts had devoted to their work. Furthermore, the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/890) showed that progress had been made, and it was only normal that that, too, should be noted with appreciation. Consequently, the sponsors of the joint draft resolution could not accept the first Soviet amendment.

3. The Soviet delegation also proposed the deletion of sub-paragraph 3 (a) of the operative part, arguing that there was no need to impose on the Acting Secretary-General a minimum number of staff members

per Member State; that the figure proposed was too high for some Member States; that the readjustments such a provision would entail would operate to the detriment of the socialist countries; and that any Member States not receiving satisfaction within a year would be bound to express criticism. His reply to those arguments was that a minimum number of posts was not a new idea and that the sponsors of the draft resolution had wished to improve on the proposal of the Committee of Experts, which they considered inadequate. Even if the target proposed could not be reached in a year, it would at least have been defined. It was true that some newly independent countries were not yet in a position to second five civil servants to the Secretariat, but that situation would not last forever because such States would very rapidly overcome a backwardness due only to the foreign domination they had long endured. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution were well aware that it would take time to give effect to such a provision, but once adopted it would dispel the doubts and fears of those countries which had none, or not enough, of their nationals in the Secretariat.

4. The third Soviet amendment was also unacceptable. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution had not intended their recommendation as a rigid mathematical formula. Their aim had rather been to ensure that the Acting Secretary-General endeavoured to take the population factor into account as well as contributions.

5. As to the fourth Soviet amendment, the Ghanaian delegation would have preferred the proportion of fixed-term staff to be increased to more than 25 per cent. Having accepted 25 per cent in a spirit of compromise, it could make no further concessions on that point.

6. By accepting the Soviet amendments, the United States had robbed its draft resolution of all value. On the pretext of preserving the Acting Secretary-General's freedom of action it had, in effect, left the solution of that difficult problem to him without giving him the slightest indication of the Fifth Committee's opinion on the report of the Committee of Experts. That meant that nothing was changed; the long procession of studies and reports would continue, and a specific solution was as far away as ever. It was the General Assembly's duty to convey its views to the Secretary-General; that would not encroach upon his prerogatives in the slightest. By failing to mention even the principle of a minimum number of staff members per Member State, the United States and the Soviet Union had dealt a severe blow to the hopes of countries inadequately represented in the Secretariat. Unhappily, the discussion on the geographical distribution of the staff was apparently being reduced to a struggle between those who sought to protect what they already had and those who were fighting for recognition of the rights due to them as equal Members of the United Nations.

7. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.5/L.689 and Add.1-3) rejected the amendments, not out of stubbornness, but because they wished to preserve intact the principles on which their proposal was based. The Committee had been informed at the 879th meeting, on the Acting Secretary-General's behalf, that if there was a consensus of opinion in the Committee on any of the major points involved, particularly on the method of determining the desirable range or the target figure, he would be glad to take it into account during the coming year and, on the basis of a year's actual experience, to report to the Committee at the seventeenth session on the practicability of any method proposed. Members of the Committee should take those words into account when they asked themselves which of the two draft resolutions was a bold attempt to solve a problem that had troubled the United Nations for fifteen years and that aroused so much mistrust among its Members.

8. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) felt that the spirit of the discussion was more important than the precise text of any proposals ultimately adopted, and that the Acting Secretary-General would find in the Committee's report full information on the points of view which had emerged.

9. His delegation's main concern was with the future of the international civil service as a whole; it feared the calibre of the service would decline if the morale of the existing staff was allowed to deteriorate, or if international organizations ceased to attract the best candidates. It was true that both the draft resolutions before the Committee reflected that concern, but the specific proposals in the joint draft resolution seemed arbitrary and disquieting inasmuch as they might restrict the Acting Secretary-General's freedom of judgement and action. For his part, he relied on the Secretary-General to make the most of the opportunities afforded by the turnover of staff, the creation of new posts and fixed-term contracts in order to effect a gradual improvement in geographical distribution—as all Member States wished—without interfering with permanent contracts. As to the future, it should not be forgotten that the Acting Secretary-General himself had asked for time to carry out the studies and to present his conclusions at the seventeenth session. Consequently, the best draft resolution was necessarily one couched in the most general and flexible terms.

10. One of the amendments proposed by the Soviet delegation to the United States draft resolution had deleted the words "with appreciation". His delegation supported that amendment, for both the report of the Committee of Experts (A/4776 and Corr.1) and the report of the Secretary-General (A/4794) expressed views to which it could not subscribe. For example, it could not accept the Experts' various suggestions for decentralization; on the other hand, it agreed with the Secretary-General regarding the risk involved in making the chief officers and staff of TAB and the Special Fund subject to geographical distribution.

11. U HLA OUNG (Burma) felt that the second revised version of the United States draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.2) had been of some value; he had hoped that it might have been amalgamated with the joint draft resolution. Unfortunately, the third revised version of the United States draft resolution, which took account of the Soviet delegation's suggestions, was disappointing, for it contained no positive recommendations and set no minimum number of staff per

Member State, so that it would have the effect of preserving the status quo. His delegation would therefore support the joint draft resolution which was fair to all Member States, large or small.

12. Mr. ARNOULD (Canada) observed that the two draft resolutions appeared to reflect very different attitudes: on the one hand, the understandable anxiety of certain States, especially the new Members of the United Nations, to see a quick change for the better, and on the other, the position of those States which attached great importance to the Secretariat's efficiency and to the need to avoid demoralizing the staff by seeking too drastic a remedy for the existing imbalance. Some representatives wanted to move forward quickly and vigorously, but others would prefer the Committee to convey its views to the Secretary-General and ask him to present his conclusions after making a thorough study of the subject. Neither of the two draft resolutions proposed seemed likely to win a large majority; in the circumstances, it would be better not to put them to the vote and, instead, to ask the Rapporteur to draft a text giving the Secretary-General an idea of the views expressed and reproducing the two draft resolutions; the points of agreement and the divergencies between those two texts were quite clear.

13. Mr. KAOURA (Niger) observed that the two draft resolutions had given great hope to the newly independent and under-represented nations. It was true that the founding States could not have foreseen such sweeping changes in the composition of the United Nations within fifteen years, and also that it was impossible to satisfy everyone immediately, but, although it was difficult to improve matters, it was not impossible. The number of staff from Asian and African countries at present fell far short of those countries' very modest desires. The joint draft resolution would satisfy them if the minimum number of staff was set at four per Member State. The United States draft resolution, as amended by the Soviet Union, would have been satisfactory if it had still stipulated that there should be a minimum of four staff members per Member State.

14. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) stated that the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had merely wished to give the Acting Secretary-General the directives experience had shown were needed if the existing imbalance in geographical distribution was to be corrected. Owing to the lack of any authoritative interpretation of the word "due" in the last sentence of Article 101, paragraph 3, of the Charter, the Secretary-General had in the past been forced to adopt the only available criterion, namely, the contributions of Member States to the Organization's regular budget, and, as was generally conceded, that had led to an imbalance. Should the Fifth Committee fail to give the Secretary-General guidance, he would have to apply the formula advocated by the Committee of Experts (A/4776 and Corr.1, para. 75) which was generally recognized to be rigid and unsatisfactory; it did not give adequate weight to the membership and population factors, while still placing too much stress on the contributions factor. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution, in recommending that equal regard be paid to those three factors, had sought not only to correct the existing imbalance but also to prevent its recurrence and to strengthen the impartial and international character of the Secretariat, which was obviously in the interest of the United Nations and of the majority of Member States. The small countries could

only hope that the great Powers would be prepared to make some sacrifices for the good of the Organization.

15. Referring to the amendments submitted by the USSR (A/C.5/L.697), the sponsors of the joint draft resolution could accept the first amendment, but not the remaining three. It was to be regretted that, despite their conciliatory attitude, the sponsors of the two draft resolutions before the Committee had been unable to reach a compromise and that the basic divergence of view still persisted on the weight to be given to each of the three factors. He recalled the reasons that had led the Indian delegation to submit his motion for priority at the 887th meeting, reasons which, in his opinion, were completely valid. The United States proposal—apart from its operative paragraph 3 which might take the place of operative paragraph 2 of the joint draft resolution—was much less precise than the latter proposal, and the Soviet amendments had made it vaguer still. It would be little help to the Acting Secretary-General and would merely serve to delay action on the problem without producing any improvement. Moreover, with regard to the statement in operative paragraph 1 (c) "that efforts should be made to reduce the proportion of staff members of the Secretariat holding permanent contracts", it was doubtful whether the United States and the Soviet Union had the same proportion in mind; their agreement on the matter might last no more than a year and would make no contribution to the settlement of the problem.

A vote was taken by roll-call on the motion for priority submitted by India (887th meeting, para. 65).

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

In favour: Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nigeria.

Against: Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic., Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua.

Abstaining: Philippines, Togo, Cameroun, Congo (Leopoldville), Mongolia, Niger.

The Indian motion was rejected by 47 votes to 26, with 6 abstentions.

16. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed to a vote on the United States revised draft resolution (A/C.5/L.683/Rev.3).

17. Mr. HODGES (United Kingdom) thought that some representatives would prefer to have time to reconsider the situation in the light of the statements that had just been made and of the results of the vote. Should the United States draft resolution be put to the vote at once, he wished to propose an amendment on a point of detail.

18. Mr. WILLOCH (Norway) and Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) agreed with the United Kingdom representative.

19. Mr. JAYARATNE (Ceylon) thought that the members of the Committee had already made up their minds.

20. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) considered that a consensus of opinion might perhaps be reached if the meeting were suspended.

21. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) hoped that any suspension would be short, for he shared the view of the representative of Ceylon that a prolonged suspension would serve no practical purpose. On the other hand, the Canadian proposal might hold out new prospects for agreement.

22. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) endorsed the view expressed by the United States representative and suggested that the meeting should be suspended briefly.

The meeting was suspended at 4.30 p.m. and resumed at 4.50 p.m.

23. Mr. ARNOULD (Canada) announced that the sponsors of the two draft resolutions had been unable to reach agreement. He formally proposed that neither of those draft resolutions should be put to the vote and that a decision should be taken on the suggestion that the Rapporteur should be asked to include in the report a statement covering the following five points: first, the Committee had considered geographical distribution an extremely important matter and had tried to achieve concrete steps to remedy the situation, which must be improved; secondly, its discussion had focused on two draft resolutions, the joint draft and the United States draft and, in spite of lengthy negotiations, no "marriage" of those two texts had proved possible; thirdly, after serious attempts to arrive at a consensus and a compromise, the two positions had still been marked by a difference in emphasis but had been in agreement on a number of approaches; fourthly, the Fifth Committee invited the Secretary-General to be guided by the contents of the two draft resolutions, which reflected the opinions of the Committee, and, lastly, to present his views to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session on the basis of the two drafts, which would be included in full in the report.

24. Mr. EPIE (Cameroun) supported the Canadian proposal.

25. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in the absence of a written text, he could take his stand only on the question of principle; he would support the Canadian proposal, subject to that reservation.

26. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) wondered whether the Committee could decide against putting a draft resolution to the vote in the event of its sponsors pressing for a vote.

27. Mr. ARNOULD (Canada) said that he was merely trying to facilitate the Committee's work. The procedure he had suggested was not based on any provision of the rules of procedure, but was not new; the Secretary of the Committee might be able to give precedence for it.

28. Replying to a question by Mr. GANEM (France), the CHAIRMAN said that the results of the roll-call vote that had just been taken would be recorded in the report.

29. Mr. ARNOULD (Canada), replying to a point raised by Mr. SANU (Nigeria), said that there was no connexion between the motion for priority and the Canadian proposal; any roll-call vote on a relevant issue necessarily had to be recorded in the report.

30. Mr. TAZI (Morocco) announced that his vote on the Canadian proposal would be dependent on the answer given to the Venezuelan representative.

31. The CHAIRMAN ruled that the Canadian proposal was admissible and that there was no objection to putting it to the vote. In the event of adoption, it would be included in the report. If any members of the Committee, including the sponsors of the draft resolutions found it unacceptable, they could vote against it.

The Canadian proposal was adopted by 64 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.

(c) Other personnel questions (A/4955, A/C.5/883)

32. Mr. HAMILTON (Director of Personnel) said that the fundamental principle governing the payment of the education grant had been that the grant should represent partial compensation for the extra expenses incurred by expatriated staff members in the education of their children. As a result of the fact that the maximum rate was now fixed at \$400, the grant covered the extra expenses in full in the case of a child attending school in a low-cost area, but only 25-30 per cent of those expenses in the case of a child being educated in a high-cost area. The Secretary-General's proposals that the grant should cover 75 per cent of the cost of tuition, up to a certain ceiling, and that the maximum amount of the grant should be raised from \$400 to \$800 a year were designed to correct such anomalies.

33. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had welcomed the recommendations of the Secretary-General (A/C.5/883) in its report (A/4955). It had declared itself in favour of uniform application of the principle of partial compensation, and stated that it would accept compensation at the rate of 75 per cent in the largest possible number of cases. It had, however, recommended that \$600 should be fixed as the maximum grant, as it did not think that too high a proportion of staff members would be affected if the ceiling were fixed lower.

34. A maximum grant of \$800, based on a partial compensation equivalent to 75 per cent of the cost, corresponded to annual schooling costs of about \$1,066 or £380 sterling. According to the Secretary-General's proposals, costs exceeding that sum would not be repayable. At present schooling costs with half-board at the United Nations International School in New York were \$1,000 per annum. Schooling costs and board varied between \$1,500 and \$3,000 per annum in private schools of the United States and between £350 and £400 in private schools of the United Kingdom, and stood at \$1,500 at the Geneva International School. For a staff member who had to spend £429 a year on his child's education, as had occurred, an education grant of \$600 would only represent a compensation of 50 per cent. Schooling costs in colleges and universities were obviously still higher.

35. From the figures which the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination possessed for the total costs of schooling and board for 1960, it had concluded that a ceiling of \$800 was high enough to allow the 75 per cent formula to be applied to most cases in all regions.

36. The difference between the financial implications of the Secretary-General's proposal and those of the Advisory Committee's recommendation had been estimated at \$35,000 per annum for the United Nations and \$25,000 per annum for UNESCO.

37. He feared that a ceiling of \$600 would be especially unfavourable to those staff members who had to bear the heaviest expenses: expatriate staff members, including technical assistance experts, who had to send their children to an educational establishment of their home country, usually in a region where the cost of living was high, perhaps extremely high. By contrast, staff members whose children could be educated in regions where the cost of living was low would not be likely to receive too high a grant if the ceiling were fixed above \$600, because the grant could not amount to more than 75 per cent of the actual cost.

38. He hoped that the Committee would consider the arguments he had just advanced, which he feared he had not stated with sufficient force in his talks with members of the Advisory Committee.

39. Mr. HODGES (United Kingdom) said that, for reasons essentially of principle, he could not support either the Secretary-General's proposal or the Advisory Committee's recommendation. It ought not to be forgotten that the United Nations was not obliged to relieve staff members of the normal financial burden of providing instruction for their children, and that the education grant should not represent more than partial compensation for the extra expenses incurred by expatriate staff members in their children's education.

40. The United Kingdom delegation could approve like the Advisory Committee, uniform application of the principle of partial compensation, but not the proposal to increase the education grant. United Nations staff members drawing children's allowance (\$300) and education grant (\$400) were in that respect in a generally more favourable position than United Kingdom diplomatic staff and a much more favourable position than United Kingdom civil servants and than other international staff of equivalent grade serving abroad.

41. The total of the salaries and allowances drawn by international civil servants had already been higher than the total remuneration of United Kingdom diplomats and civil servants of equivalent grade, serving abroad, even before the Fifth Committee's decision to raise the basic salaries of international civil servants by a proportion which the United Kingdom Government did not consider justified by the conditions prevailing outside the United Nations. Since the basic salaries had been increased, the United Kingdom delegation saw even less reason for raising the education grant to 75 per cent and fixing its ceiling at \$800 or even \$600. It would not oppose adjustments which would do away with anomalies in the present system, but could not approve any increase in the education grant, for reasons both of principle and of the financial situation of the United Nations.

42. Mr. FENOCHIO (Mexico) fully agreed with the United Kingdom representative. He pointed out that the Fifth Committee had just approved an increase in basic salaries from which all international civil servants would benefit and which threw a heavy burden onto States Members, half of whom did not even pay

an education grant to their officials with children serving abroad. The total costs of the United Nations, and in particular its staff costs, constantly increased; and the Mexican delegation regarded that as the chief consideration.

43. Mr. ULANCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the United Nations had no obligation to relieve the staff member of the normal financial burden of educating his child, and ought not to grant him more than partial compensation for the extra costs he had to bear for his children's education because he was expatriate. The education grant could vary with the total actual cost and the Organization's financial position. Thus far the ceiling of the grant had been fixed at \$400, which seemed quite adequate partial compensation, especially since the basic salaries of international civil servants had just been considerably raised. International civil servants therefore had higher salaries than the civil servants of many States Members, drew certain allowances, and enjoyed income tax privileges. The Soviet delegation could therefore approve neither the Secretary-General's proposal nor the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

44. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) cited the principles governing the education grant, and considered that the question should be considered not in isolation but together with the base salaries and all the allowances paid to international civil servants.

45. The Iraqi delegation approved the Secretary-General's proposal (A/C.5/883, para. 10) to abolish the anomalies of the present system by raising the proportion of partial compensation to 75 per cent for all beneficiaries. On the other hand, since the base salaries had been increased, it would be superfluous to double the maximum grant. Nevertheless, since the increase in education costs in nearly all regions justified an increase in the grant, his delegation would support the Advisory Committee's recommendation to raise the ceiling to \$600.

46. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Iraq.

47. Mr. GANEM (France) accepted the Advisory Committee's proposal as a very reasonable compromise, seeing that the United Nations ought to make a financial effort to help staff members to give their children an education enabling them to preserve their national culture.

48. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Director of Personnel had given the Advisory Committee the impression that the number of staff members who had to pay very high schooling and board costs was very small. Since the Fifth Committee had already taken several decisions improving the position of international civil servants, the Advisory Committee did not consider it necessary to double the maximum education grant.

49. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) proposed, to enable delegations to study the question more thoroughly, that the Committee should postpone until its next meeting the rest of the debate and the vote on the proposals before it.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 62

Administrative and budgetary procedures of the United Nations: report of the working group appointed under General Assembly resolution 1620 (XV) (A/4971) (continued)*

50. Mr. CHENG Paonan (China) regretted that the Working Group of Fifteen on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations had been unable to find a solution for the problem of financing peace-keeping operations, but he thought that the members of the Group had none the less succeeded in clarifying the problem confronting them. His delegation supported the positive proposal of the Working Group (A/4971, para. 25), which consisted of requesting an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice about the legal nature of financial obligations arising out of peace-keeping operations. It was to be hoped that when a decision was taken concerning the exact wording of the question, mention would be made not only of the applicability or non-applicability of Article 17, but also of the other Articles of the Charter dealing with the costs of the Organization.

51. With respect to the financing of peace-keeping operations, the discussions in the Fifth Committee concerning UNEF and ONUC had revealed that agreement had been reached on at least two points, namely, that the contributions of States Members should be in proportion to their capacity to pay, and, secondly, that the scale of assessments for the apportionment of costs connected with the maintenance of peace and security should be very different from the scale used for the apportionment of the costs covered by the regular United Nations budget. His delegation, which had always considered that all States Members were collectively responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and should all participate in financing peace-keeping operations, thought that the capacity to pay of the various countries should be determined in the light of five factors. Account should be taken not only of the national income and the *per caput* income, as well as of the rate of savings in each country, but also of the resources required for the country's development, which meant that the developing countries, i.e., those which were receiving technical assistance, should be given preferential treatment. The state of the public finances and the balance-of-payments situation in each country should also be taken into consideration. Countries which had difficulty in obtaining United States dollars should be able to make their contribution in other convertible currencies or even in kind, by furnishing troops, doctors or medical supplies, for example. And, just as the Committee on Contributions, in drawing up the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the regular costs of the Organization, took into account the disorganization caused by the Second World War, it would be necessary to take into account, for the purpose of apportioning peace-keeping costs, the special difficulties which might be encountered by certain States. He would not go into the question of the relative importance to be ascribed to those five factors until the members of the Committee had reached a certain measure of agreement concerning the very idea of capacity to pay.

52. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) wished to know when the Secretariat would be able to submit cost estimates for the two principal peace-keeping operations. Since

*Resumed from the 888th meeting.

the session was already well advanced, it might be better to consider those requests for appropriations at the same time as the report of the Working Group of Fifteen in order to avoid repetition.

53. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that the cost estimates for UNEF had already been given to the Committee; so far as ONUC expenditures were concerned, the Secretariat was running into very great difficulties

by reason of the developments. The Secretariat did not think that it could make any more specific statements than those which it had made in connexion with the requests for additional funds for 1961 (A/4931). Generally speaking, and subject to all reservations, the costs could be expected to continue to amount to an approximate average of \$10 million every month.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.