

that the Force was an essential ingredient in the maintenance of peace and quiet along the Armistice Demarcation Line. He also suggested that further economies were possible, without altering the composition of the Force and without large-scale reductions in its size, but that they could only be obtained as a result of negotiations with the participating governments.

Canada, Denmark, Norway and Sweden submitted a draft resolution which would provide funds for the Force in 1964, using the same formula as that adopted at the fourth special session. This draft resolution met with the expected Soviet objection that the costs of UNEF should be borne by the parties responsible and that, in any case, the Security Council was the only legal organ with responsibility in the peace-keeping field. Several Latin American countries considered the formula inequitable, even though the costs of peace keeping in 1964 were to be substantially lower than in 1963. These countries favoured the adoption of a financing formula which would reduce, in both absolute and relative terms, the financial contribution of the developing countries. As a result of informal consultations, the four co-sponsors agreed to revise their text to enable it to obtain the widest possible degree of support. The revised text appropriated \$17,750,000, of which, after the first \$2 million had been assessed at the regular budget rate, the developing countries would be assessed 42.5 per cent of their normal rates on the balance. The resolution [1983 (XVIII)] was adopted by 77 votes in favour (Canada), 11 against, with 20 abstentions.

The Assembly referred the question of the desirability and feasibility of establishing a Peace Fund and the question of administrative and budgetary procedures relating to peace keeping to the Working Group of 21 for further study. The period of sale of United Nations bonds was extended for a second time [Resolution 1989 (XVIII)], so that bonds might be sold in whole or in part up to December 31, 1964.

#### Administrative and Personnel Questions

Many delegations, including Canada, considered that the Secretary-General had done a commendable job in reducing inequities in the geographical distribution of staff and believed that he should be requested to continue his efforts using the guidelines contained in Resolution 1852 (XVII). Some delegations were concerned about the increasing percentage (29.7 per cent) of staff on fixed-term contracts, while others believed it would be useful to draw to the attention of the Secretary-General the remaining imbalances, particularly at the senior levels. This was done in a resolution [1928 (XVIII)] adopted by 86 votes in favour (Canada), none against, with 11 abstentions. In a separate resolution [1929 (XVIII)], a number of rules and regulations concerning United Nations personnel were amended.