



Chairman: Mr. E. Olu SANU (Nigeria).

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Woschnagg (Austria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE
THIRD COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8430/ADD.1
CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 59 (concluded)
(A/8408/ADD.18, A/C.5/1409 AND CORR.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN invited those members of the Committee who wished to do so to explain their votes at the previous meeting on the Chairman's proposals concerning the post of disaster relief co-ordinator.

2. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) said that the voting procedure had not been clear. In his view, the adoption of a favourable decision on the first and second proposals of the Chairman had not implied any decision on the third; consequently a vote should have been taken on that proposal as on the other two. His delegation therefore considered that no decision had been taken on the third proposal and that it was still an open question whether, as he considered logical, one of the existing Under-Secretaries-General should be appointed as co-ordinator, or whether, as some delegations had suggested, a new and additional Under-Secretary-General should be appointed; the second alternative would obviously have financial consequences. He wished his opinion to be reflected in the records of the Fifth Committee and in its report to the General Assembly.

3. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he had abstained from voting on whether a new post should be established. He believed that it was immaterial whether the job was done by a new appointee or by one of the existing Under-Secretaries-General. He had voted in favour of the proposal that the new co-ordinator should hold the rank of Under-Secretary-General because that point had been decided by the Third Committee. He had abstained from voting on the third proposal of the Chairman to be consistent with his abstention on the first.

4. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he fully concurred with the views expressed by the Polish representative. He also wished to add, for the record, that during the consideration in the Fifth Committee of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution on assistance in cases of natural disaster, many serious errors had been committed, involving violations of the rules of procedure. As a result many delegations had not had the opportunity of voting as

they had wished to vote, as had been pointed out in the statements made by a number of representatives.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the views of the Soviet representative would be included in the records of the Fifth Committee.

6. Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia) said that his delegation had voted against putting the third proposal of the Chairman to the vote because he believed that once the Committee had approved the creation of the new post, the third proposal should have been eliminated. His delegation had voted against the establishment of a new post for a co-ordinator; however, a majority of members had voted for it, thus approving a new item in the budget estimates to cover the cost of a new post, with new functions. The third proposal was identical with that of the Advisory Committee (A/8408/Add.18, para. 8), which Colombia had supported. However, since, by the vote on the first proposal, the Committee had approved the new post, he had cast a negative vote regarding the third proposal.

AGENDA ITEMS 81 AND 12

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (continued)* (A/8447/Rev.1, A/8490, A/8538, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35)

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters XXI and XXII) (A/8403, A/C.5/1394)

7. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked if the Tanzanian representative would accept an amendment to his proposal (A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.35). He proposed that the words "application of those methods to similar" should be replaced by the words "reduction in expenditure on the holding of"; the end of the text would then read: "... and report as appropriate to the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session on the possible reduction in expenditure on the holding of conferences and meetings held by United Nations bodies away from Headquarters".

8. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he had selected the wording of the last part of his text after much thought. The Secretary-General was being asked to enquire into the methods of financing certain IAEA meetings and the possible reduction of expenditure was only one of the aspects to be studied. The wording proposed by the Soviet Union would prejudice the Secre-

* Resumed from the 1476th meeting.

tary-General's findings; consequently he could not accept the amendment and hoped that the Soviet representative would not press it.

9. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he was not prepared to withdraw his amendment.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee could not vote on the Tanzanian proposal or the Soviet amendment, as there was no quorum.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION II SUBMITTED BY THE SECOND COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/8578 CONCERNING AGENDA ITEM 12* (A/8408/ADD.19, A/C.5/1399 AND CORR.1)

AGENDA ITEM 76

Budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (continued)**
(for the documentation, see the 1472nd meeting)

*First reading (continued)***
(A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.3 and Corr.1)

PART VI. TECHNICAL PROGRAMMES: SECTION 13. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, HUMAN RIGHTS ADVISORY SERVICES AND NARCOTIC DRUGS CONTROL; SECTION 14. INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (A/8406 AND CORR.1 AND 3, A/8408 AND CORR.1 AND 2)

11. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the statement by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/1399 and Corr.1) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution II submitted by the Second Committee (A/8578, para. 44), concerning regional advisory services, and to the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/8408/Add.19). He said that the Fifth Committee was required under rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to advise the Assembly of the financial implications of adopting the Second Committee's draft resolution.

12. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the substantive question for the Fifth Committee was dealt with in paragraphs 3 and 10 of the Advisory Committee's report, in which it reiterated the view that appropriations under the part of the regular budget relating to technical programmes depended on policy decisions taken by the General Assembly in the light of over-all budgetary considerations, and that consequently the Advisory Committee had no comments to offer on the size of the proposed new section or on the allocations to individual regional economic commissions. The rest of the report dealt with the problem of the division of responsibilities between the Fifth Committee and the other Main Committees of the General Assembly.

13. At the previous meeting, during consideration of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution of the Third Committee (A/8430/Add.1, para. 9), the Indian representative had raised the question of a possible contradiction between paragraphs 7 and 8 of the report. Paragraph 7 reverted to the views expressed by the Advisory Committee at the twenty-second session,¹ but it embodied the same principle: if any of the Main Committees dealt with matters falling within the competence of the Fifth Committee, the latter should have the opportunity to comment and make recommendations on the budgetary aspects. At the twenty-second session, the recommendation of the Second Committee had been to provide a new section for technical assistance for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and the General Assembly had received a different recommendation on the subject from the Fifth Committee. If possible, such differences should be resolved before recommendations went to the General Assembly. Consequently, when a question within the Fifth Committee's field of competence was raised in another Main Committee, it should also be taken up in the Fifth Committee, which should report back on it to the Committee in which it had originated. While that procedure would not ensure that the differences were resolved, at least it would provide an opportunity for resolving them.

14. Mr. NAUDY (France) referred to paragraphs 3 and 10 of the Advisory Committee's report. It was surprising to find the Advisory Committee so sparing in its comments on a proposal to appropriate some \$2 million under the regular budget of the United Nations. The main reason for the anomaly was well known: it was the total lack of co-ordination between the organs which voted to adopt programmes and those which exercised budgetary control. Like other members of the Fifth Committee, he hoped that the situation might be improved by the adoption of programme budgeting. The representative of India had made some useful comments in that connexion at the 1475th meeting. For the time being, the situation could not be changed. Nevertheless, without challenging the principle underlying the Second Committee's draft resolution, the Fifth Committee had the right to ask on what basis the proposed figure of \$1,825,000 had been calculated. What budget document had been used as the source? Was the figure a final one, and how was it broken down? What was the total figure for advisory services in 1970 and 1971? How had those services been used, and what agencies had approved distribution of the funds and controlled their use? Could the aims of the draft resolution be achieved at a lower cost? The Fifth Committee had the right to ask such questions.

15. Similar questions could be asked concerning the use of the appropriations for restoring section 13 to its existing level. What programmes were envisaged for 1972? The Fifth Committee was entitled to be given that information when it involved expenditure of \$1,825,000 and the information must exist. There was no reason why, without questioning the principle of technical assistance programmes, the Fifth Committee should not try to ensure that the programmes were well conceived, and executed

* Report of the Economic and Social Council.

** Resumed from the 1474th meeting.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 39, document A/6931, para. 8.

and administered in the best interests both of the beneficiaries and of the United Nations, in accordance with the rules of sound administrative and budgetary management.

16. His delegation agreed with paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the report, concerning the competence of each of the Main Committees of the General Assembly and the encroachment by some Committees on the powers of the Fifth Committee. He agreed with the comments of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, and would like to hear the comments of the Secretary-General's representative particularly regarding the application of paragraph 2 of operative section I of the Second Committee's draft resolution, in the light of regulation 10 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations.

17. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the question under discussion was part VI: Technical programmes, including the proposal of the Second Committee. He wished, therefore, to take the liberty of referring to the whole question of technical programmes, not merely to the matter raised by the proposal of the Second Committee. In the first place, his delegation considered it necessary to state once again that the system under which technical assistance activities were financed from the regular budget was illegal. Under Article 17 of the Charter, the United Nations regular budget was to be used for administrative purposes only; it was not intended to finance technical assistance activities, which should be provided on a voluntary basis. Decisions to finance technical assistance activities from the regular budget could not be regarded as binding on Member States.

18. The Soviet Union had upheld the developing countries' endeavours to develop their economies. Under existing agreements, it provided economic and technical development assistance to more than 40 developing countries, in which it was building more than 690 industrial plants. In helping the developing countries to develop their national industries, it respected the wishes of those countries. At the request of the developing countries, the Soviet Union had granted them long-term credits totalling 5,000 million roubles.

19. One of the most acute problems facing the young independent States of Asia, Africa and Latin America was the lack of trained technical personnel. The Soviet Union was therefore providing those countries with assistance in training national staff by enrolling their nationals for study in institutions of higher learning and in technical colleges in the Soviet Union. Its assistance also consisted in setting up industrial concerns and national training institutes in the developing countries. More than 120 institutions of higher learning, technical and secondary schools and training centres had been established in the developing countries with USSR assistance. In addition, more than 100,000 students from developing countries and socialist countries were being educated in USSR institutions, where training was provided free of charge. The students also received scholarships at the expense of the USSR. Despite the many costly projects it had to carry out in its own country, the USSR was prepared to continue providing technical assistance to the developing countries by sending experts, supplying equipment and material and training nationals from the developing countries in USSR institutions.

20. It was clear, therefore, that in the opinion of his delegation any assistance, including that provided through United Nations technical assistance programmes, must be granted solely on a voluntary basis. His delegation was utterly convinced that United Nations technical assistance should be financed by UNDP, not the regular budget. It was surprised, therefore, that the Second Committee—and, furthermore, by attempting to circumvent the Fifth Committee—should have adopted a draft resolution introducing changes in part VI of the budget. Like the French delegation, his delegation could not understand how the Second Committee could have adopted such a draft resolution. It, too, would like to know what criteria and calculations had governed the decision. In the circumstances, his delegation endorsed the views expressed in the report of the Advisory Committee concerning what might be termed a violation of the procedures of the General Assembly and of the prerogatives of the Fifth Committee.

21. In conclusion, he had been authorized to state that, in view of its position of principle that technical assistance activities should be financed on a voluntary basis and not through the regular budget, his Government would, if the Fifth Committee approved the Second Committee's draft, be obliged as in the past to deduct an amount, as appropriate, from the roubles it provided for technical assistance purposes in part VI and the proposed new section of the budget.

22. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that there had been an extensive discussion on the draft resolution in the Second Committee prior to its adoption. At that time, questions like those raised by the French delegation had been answered in detail by certain delegations and by the Secretariat. His delegation had no objection to that procedure being repeated in the Fifth Committee but, given the nature of the Advisory Committee's report, the debate should be short and a conclusion should be reached as soon as possible. If the French delegation insisted on answers to its questions, his delegation suggested that a representative of the Office of Technical Co-operation should be invited to answer them.

23. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that the provisions of paragraph 1 of operative section I and those of section II of the resolution in question were clearly within the competence of the Fifth Committee. His delegation endorsed the comments of the Advisory Committee and suggested that perhaps rule 41 of the rules of procedure, which related to the General Committee's role in co-ordinating the proceedings of all Committees, should be brought to the attention of the Second Committee.

24. Commenting on the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union, he said that although his delegation had great admiration for the technical assistance provided by the USSR on a bilateral basis, it nevertheless considered that there was also room for multilateral technical assistance. In forming that opinion, his delegation had been guided by the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 3, and of Article 13 of the Charter. It would appear from those Articles that if technical assistance was removed from the regular budget, the United Nations would be divested of one of its essential functions.

25. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that although the Advisory Committee had produced some very good reports, it had been miserly with its advice concerning the financial implications of the Second Committee's draft resolution, which the Secretary-General had indicated in his note (A/C.5/1399 and Corr.1). He hoped that the Advisory Committee's reticence did not herald a new trend. The only recommendation the Advisory Committee had made was in paragraph 8, of its report (A/8408/Add.19), which referred to the respective competence of the Fifth and other Committees, and the Brazilian delegation endorsed that paragraph. At the previous meeting, and on other occasions, lack of advice from the Advisory Committee had led the Fifth Committee into confusion. The Advisory Committee might have stated that if the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, an additional appropriation of \$1,825,000 would be required under section 13. Or it could have said that the Second Committee had encroached upon the competence of the Fifth Committee, and that the General Assembly should not adopt the draft resolution. Or it could have said that it considered the estimates of the financial implications incorrect. As things stood, it was difficult for the Fifth Committee to take a position, since it had not been advised as to the consequences of any decision it might take on the Advisory Committee's report. Apparently, all the Fifth Committee could do was to approve the conclusions in paragraph 8 of the report. Nevertheless, the Fifth Committee wanted to know whether the Advisory Committee accepted the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in his note.

26. Mr. PICK (Canada) said that he wished to make three points. Firstly, his delegation was concerned about the developments relating to questions of budgetary presentation and financial control. The Second Committee had decided that a separate section should be added to the budget; that was not an orderly procedure and his delegation had said so in the Second Committee.

27. Secondly, it would seem necessary to exercise caution in expanding those technical assistance activities which were covered by the regular budget. His delegation was in favour of regional and subregional activities, but it would be more appropriate if any expansion of those activities was handled through UNDP. Canada's support of multilateral assistance was evidenced by the fact that in 1970 and 1971 it had occupied fourth place among UNDP donor countries, having contributed \$15 million and \$16 million, respectively, in those years; in 1972 it would contribute \$18 million but would slip to fifth place, one of the major donor countries having increased its contribution. It should be noted, moreover, that Canada's contributions were paid in convertible currencies and with no strings attached.

28. His third point was that it seemed singularly inappropriate at a time when the Organization was on the brink of financial disaster to add to the budget new expenditure in an amount of almost \$2 million under a new section. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution in the Second Committee. It was uncertain how the matter would be dealt with in the Fifth Committee but, consistent with the position it had adopted in the Second Committee, his delegation would, in some suitable way, vote against inclusion of the appropriation in the new section.

Mr. Sanu (Nigeria) took the Chair.

29. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the statements made by the Canadian, French and Soviet delegations seemed to indicate that the substantive debate on the question was being reopened. That debate had been completed in the Second Committee, which had taken a decision. Many members of the Fifth Committee had attended the debate in the Second Committee and had expressed their views on the question. His delegation was grateful to the representative of Italy for having shown why technical assistance should be financed through the regular budget.

30. In its report the Advisory Committee questioned the competence of the Second Committee to decide to establish a new section in the budget. It would seem, however, that the Second Committee had made a technical mistake. Its primary concern had not been to establish a new section in the budget but merely to make provision in the budget for a special entity for regional and subregional advisory services. The suggestion was a reasonable one and, if adopted, would facilitate the administration of funds.

31. It was regrettable that the last paragraph of the Advisory Committee's report was so passive. His delegation had hoped that the Advisory Committee would emphasize that, in view of inflation, to maintain the regular programme at a fixed monetary level was tantamount to reducing the service provided under that programme. It was known for instance that whereas in 1966 the cost of an expert had amounted to approximately \$18,000, it was currently estimated at \$30,000. It would be interesting to know why the comments in the last paragraph of the Advisory Committee's report were so noncommittal.

32. In conclusion, he said that he hoped that the Fifth Committee would endorse the Second Committee's draft resolution.

33. Mr. LOGVIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that as his delegation had made clear in the general discussion on agenda item 76, technical assistance activities should not, in its opinion, be financed under the regular budget. Contributions for technical assistance should be provided on a voluntary basis; any attempt to make them mandatory would lead to a deterioration in the accumulation of funds. Technical assistance should be removed from the regular budget and merged with UNDP.

34. His delegation could not, therefore, accept the comments made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 10 of its report. It was unable to support part VI of the budget for 1972. If that part was approved and additional expenditure was voted under the regular budget, his delegation would pay its assessed contribution in Soviet roubles.

35. Referring to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Advisory Committee's report, he said that the practice whereby other Main Committees adopted decisions on matters within the purview of the Fifth Committee was a matter of concern to his delegation.

36. Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden) said that her delegation would continue to support the United Nations regular programme for technical co-operation, and its expansion, because it agreed with the Italian delegation that

the Organization had a specific role to play in co-operating with the developing countries. The regular programme should have a definite identity and not duplicate the work of other United Nations bodies, including UNDP. Her delegation hoped that the programme would continue to help the least developed of the developing countries, whose needs had been stressed in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. It was regrettable that the combination of fixed ceilings and rising costs had resulted in a watering down of the regular programme. Some of the restraints resulting from that situation should be removed, thus enabling the United Nations to play its full role in helping the developing countries.

37. In the Second Committee, her delegation had intended to suggest that consultations should be arranged between the Second and Fifth Committees with a view to reconciling the substantive and budgetary aspects of the questions. In the early days of the Organization such consultations had been common practice, but they had been discontinued because of practical difficulties. From time to time such consultations were still held and her delegation had understood that one of the sponsors of the Second Committee's draft resolution had been appointed to consult with members of the Fifth Committee on the matter. So far as it was aware, the consultations had taken place.

38. Mr. GUPTA (India) pointed out that it was the Economic and Social Council, not the Second Committee, which had suggested the creation of a separate section of the budget. If delegations represented in the General Committee had considered that the draft resolution under discussion was pertinent to the Fifth Committee, they should have said so when sections of the Council's report were being allocated to the Main Committees for discussion.

39. Referring to the comments made by the representative of Sweden, he said that he had approached the Chairman and the Secretary of the Fifth Committee and asked that arrangements should be made for a joint meeting between the Second and Fifth Committees. He had been told that for practical reasons that was impossible and had informed the Second Committee accordingly.

40. He had been surprised by the observations of the representative of Brazil on the Advisory Committee's role in commenting on the draft resolution and the financial implications thereof. In his opinion, the attitude adopted by the Advisory Committee, as described in paragraph 10 of its report, was correct. To the extent that its role was considered passive, he agreed with the representative of Sudan that it should have emphasized that in money terms appropriations for technical programmes amounted to less than \$5.4 million.

41. The Secretary-General's estimates of the cost of the proposal had not been based on fantasy. The Second Committee's intention had been that the amounts currently being spent on regional and subregional advisory services should be earmarked for a unified system of such services. The Secretariat had totalled the amounts and arrived at the figure of \$1,825,000.

42. Mr. DERWINSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation felt that insufficient attention had been given to the link between part VI of the budget and the current liquidity crisis.

43. The USSR in particular had, since 1963, been making its contribution to part VI of the budget in inconvertible roubles, i.e. in a form which had not been requested and was not utilizable by the United Nations. Therefore, there had consistently been a gap between what the General Assembly had authorized to be expended and the amount contributed by Member States. That gap, together with certain other well-known cases of the withholding of funds, had resulted in the liquidity crisis.

44. In his aide-mémoire submitted to all delegations earlier in the year, Mr. Hambro, Permanent Representative of Norway to the United Nations, had drawn attention—as one of the elements required for the solution of the cash deficit situation—to the need for a settlement acceptable to a majority of Members, both developed and developing, and particularly to the principal contributors to the United Nations regular and extraordinary programmes, of the problem posed by part V, now part VI, of the budget.

45. That problem deserved serious consideration before the next session. A solution might be to move part VI from the budget and redistribute its components elsewhere, both within the budget and outside it. For example, narcotic drugs control could be funded from the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control, the technical assistance activities could be funded from UNDP and the various other sections of part VI might be distributed elsewhere in the United Nations budget.

46. Meanwhile, his delegation would oppose the additional appropriation of some \$1.8 million. If that amount was included in part VI, his delegation would vote against the entire part.

47. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that his delegation very strongly supported paragraph 8 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/8408/Add.19), regarding the competence of the Fifth Committee. He suggested that an encroachment on its competence might be avoided if the Second Committee, when considering resolutions of the Economic and Social Council, dealt with those parts that fell within its competence and left the remaining parts to the other organs concerned.

48. With regard to the reference, in paragraph 9 of the Advisory Committee's report, to regulation 10.2 of the Financial Regulations of the United Nations, he had the impression that, in the view of the Advisory Committee, the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions could not incur additional obligations without authorization from the Secretary-General under that regulation, even though the draft resolution of the Second Committee would authorize the use of funds earmarked for regional and subregional advisory services.

49. He considered the statement by the representative of Brazil to be most reasonable. The Advisory Committee's approach had perhaps been rather tentative; it could have given clear recommendations for action by the Fifth

Committee in connexion with the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee. According to the statement by the United States representative, there would appear to be no clear agreement among the major contributors on a long-term over-all solution to the financial problem.

50. While the Second Committee's infringement of the Fifth Committee's competence was regrettable, the debate could not now be reopened. Yet the Fifth Committee could not ignore its wider responsibilities concerning the financial crisis as a whole; something needed to be done before the close of the current session.

51. Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia) said that he supported the Indian representative's view that the Second Committee had not encroached on the Fifth Committee's competence. As to technical assistance, his delegation considered that voluntary contributions were not sufficient. If the provision in the regular budget for technical assistance were eliminated, as the USSR advocated, the programmes of the developing countries would be seriously affected. His delegation fully supported the draft resolution of the Second Committee, although it agreed with the representative of Brazil that there should be a clearer indication of the financial implications to avoid any misunderstanding that might arise in the General Assembly.

52. Mr. MURPHY (Ireland) said that the draft resolution in question was intended to carry through a sensible rationalization of administrative arrangements in line with current trends in the administration of the regional and subregional services. His delegation considered that the proposed additional appropriation was a long-overdue increase largely caused by rising costs in New York and elsewhere. Certain urgent projects desperately needed initiation or completion; it would be paradoxical to introduce cuts—which would be the effect of a failure to provide resources that were additional only in the sense that they compensated for inflation. The draft resolution was a modest proposal for an overdue financial equalization in an essential part of the aid programme, and had the support of his delegation. In that connexion, he wished to reiterate his delegation's view that the budgetary deficit was due not to excessive expenditure by the United Nations but to the refusal of certain countries to pay their contributions for what they regarded as reasons of principle. His delegation felt that the regular budget should not suffer as a result.

53. Miss WHALLEY (United Kingdom) said that her delegation fully endorsed the view of the Advisory Committee contained in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of its report, namely, that the Second Committee's proposals regarding the format of the budget fell within the competence of the Fifth Committee. In that connexion, her delegation concurred with the French delegation that additional information would help members of the Fifth Committee to discharge their responsibilities. The Advisory Committee's views were welcome whenever available.

54. Her delegation sympathized with the view of the USSR and Ukrainian delegations that technical assistance programmes should not be included in the regular budget. It was able to accept their inclusion only in so far as they provided for experimental pilot projects, and considered that the expansion of technical assistance services on the

scale called for in the draft resolution should be met from voluntary programmes; the United Kingdom delegation in the Second Committee had indicated that additional services of the kind envisaged should be met from UNDP funds. In that connexion, her Government had recently announced a very substantial increase in its contributions to UNDP for 1972, with continuing support for 1973, and was therefore disturbed that regional services should be financed from the regular budget, entailing increased contributions from Member States. Those considerations might affect its future attitude regarding the level of its voluntary contributions to UNDP. Furthermore, in current circumstances, when the financial problems of the United Nations were unresolved, there was no justification for such an increase in the budget. Her delegation would therefore oppose the proposed increase as it had done in the Economic and Social Council and the Second Committee.

55. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) said that his delegation wished to stress that technical assistance activities in the economic, social and human rights fields were a fundamental obligation of the United Nations under the Charter and under the terms of several General Assembly resolutions. Moreover, it always favoured the dual method of financing technical assistance; the two programmes were complementary, since in view of the steadily increasing number of requests for assistance, it was essential that, in addition to programmes financed by voluntary contributions, assistance should be provided out of the regular budget.

56. Furthermore, regardless of the total amount of voluntary contributions to technical assistance programmes, his delegation took the view that the existence of a regular programme indicated the readiness of the Organization to meet its economic and social responsibilities.

57. The sections of part VI formed the very basis of the regular technical assistance programme, and, if the total amount of the budget increased, it was natural to expect a proportionate increase in appropriations under part VI. In that connexion, his delegation noted that the percentage of funds requested under part VI was smaller for 1972, namely, 2.7 per cent of the total budget, than for 1971 when it had been 4 per cent.

58. Under Article 55 of the Charter, the United Nations had assumed some responsibility for technical assistance; and if part of the technical assistance programme was not financed from the regular budget, the Organization would be abdicating that responsibility. As a developing country, Algeria would oppose any attempt to exclude technical assistance from the regular budget or to finance it entirely from voluntary contributions to UNDP, and would therefore unreservedly support the appropriations requested under the sections of part VI.

59. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that, in view of the serious financial crisis, it was necessary more than ever for the Fifth Committee to exercise financial restraint. Not only was the proposed appropriation of \$1.8 million a considerable sum, but in addition the budgetary justifications were hardly clear for increasing, in effect, by that amount, the budget level for the technical assistance programme for other than advisory services. While the additional appro-

priation might very usefully be expended, the Committee required further specific information before approving that expenditure.

60. Members were well aware that part VI was unfortunately one of the sources for the accumulation of debts. The proposed appropriation would inflate that deficit. If a separate vote was taken on that additional appropriation, his delegation would vote in accordance with the considerations expressed.

61. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that, despite the moral obligation of Member States to assist other Members, his delegation felt that assistance must be an expression of their readiness to help rather than a kind of taxation. Nothing in the Charter provided that the budget should be used for any purpose other than to cover the administrative expenses of the United Nations; not even Article 55 could be interpreted as an order to provide technical assistance from the budget, and his delegation resolutely refused to accept any such interpretation.

62. The technical assistance activities of the United Nations should be based only on voluntary contributions; insistence on the current mandatory character of technical assistance did more harm than good to international technical co-operation.

63. The appropriation in part VI amounted to 3 per cent of UNDP assistance and to one tenth of 1 per cent of the assistance made available through bilateral and multilateral channels. But what was at stake was the principle rather than the amount involved. His delegation maintained its position that part VI must be removed from the regular budget and combined with UNDP. Apart from political considerations, the management and effectiveness of technical assistance would thereby be improved. The adoption of the draft resolution of the Second Committee would cause a further increase in the regular budget, more duplication in technical assistance programmes and more difficulties in programme management. Far from strengthening the leading role of UNDP, the draft resolution would have the opposite effect.

64. While his delegation favoured the decentralization of the administrative functions of the United Nations, it opposed the decentralization of the budgetary authority of the Secretary-General, which would give rise to waste and make it difficult to supervise programme implementation. His delegation would therefore vote against part VI of the budget and the financial implications of the draft resolution.

65. Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden) said that her delegation considered that United Nations activities financed from the regular budget in no way duplicated those of UNDP—to which her country, too, was a large contributor. The United Nations had an obligation under the Charter to provide funds for the regular technical assistance programme. In any case, it could not count entirely on the generosity of Member States' contributions to UNDP. Countries dependent on development planning projects financed from the regular budget should not have to rely on voluntary contributions.

66. Commenting on the so-called expansion of the regular programme by \$1.8 million, she pointed out that the budget had remained the same for many years; that increase would merely help to compensate for inflation. The financial crisis would not be solved by providing less than its due share to the regular programme. She recalled that the Secretary-General had pointed out that regardless of the level of resources available, development activities must continue to be assisted according to their merits.

67. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said, in reply to the representative of Brazil, that if any trend was discernible, it was a trend towards the encroachment by other Committees on the prerogatives of the Fifth Committee. However, in order to allay the Brazilian representative's fear that there might be a trend towards passivity in the Advisory Committee's reports, he wished to assure the Committee that his concern on that account was unwarranted. The Advisory Committee's previous report on the same subject² had been equally passive, the reason being that there were certain policy matters—and the question before the Committee was one of them—on which the membership of the Fifth Committee, and not the Advisory Committee, must take decisions.

68. With regard to the view expressed by the representative of Sudan that the Advisory Committee could have been more forthcoming in its report, he acknowledged that the Advisory Committee had experienced difficulties when considering the draft resolution, which was a rather curious one. The whole of the preamble concerned the regional and subregional aspect of technical assistance; operative section I also concerned the regional economic commissions, yet it contained no financial implications, but merely concerned the transfer to a separate section of the regular budget of the existing regional advisory services currently under section 13 of the budget; and it was only operative section II that contained any financial implications, namely, the amount of \$1,825,000, which it was proposed to transfer back to section 13.

69. Clearly, the Fifth Committee could not be relieved of the necessity of taking a policy decision.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

70. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/BUR/178, in which the President of the General Assembly suggested that the General Committee should consider recommending the adoption of certain measures in order to make it possible for the General Assembly to complete its work before Christmas.

71. While it might be necessary to postpone the close of the session by two days—a view held by the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs—the target date for closure remained 21 December.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 74, document A/7776.