



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

AGENDA ITEM 76

Budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (*continued*)
(A/8322, A/8406, A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2 and Add.1
and Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2-3, A/8428 and Corr.1,
A/8446 and Add.1, A/C.5/1320/Rev.1 and Add.1,
A/C.5/1362, A/C.5/1364, A/C.5/1365, A/C.5/1366 and
Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, A/C.5/1372, A/C.5/1376,
A/C.5/1377, A/C.5/1380 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1381,
A/C.5/1383, A/C.5/1384, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.3 and
Corr.1, A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.8, E/5038)

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

SECTION 12. SPECIAL EXPENSES
(A/8406, A/8408 AND CORR.1 AND 2)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General, in his budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (A/8406) had proposed an amount of \$10,374,900 under section 12, and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in paragraph 218 of its first report (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2) on the budget estimates, had recommended a reduction of \$18,500 in that amount. The Fifth Committee would note that the estimate for chapter V of the section was of a provisional nature. Any change in the estimate in question resulting from future General Assembly action would be reflected in a revised estimate to be submitted towards the end of the session. On that basis, the Committee was asked to approve in first reading an amount of \$10,356,400 as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

2. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), referring to paragraph 210 of the Advisory Committee's first report said that the Advisory Committee had indicated in paragraph 211 that the full cost of jointly financed activities had been given but only the cost to be borne by the United Nations had been included in the budget.

3. It would be observed from paragraph 216 of the report that the costs for chapter IX had been maintained at the 1971 level but that the manning table was different: there had been a shift of emphasis from Professional to General Service posts.

4. The recommended reduction of \$18,500 related to the pay research unit, which would not be needed until the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System had completed its work. Nevertheless, since the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions

might require temporary assistance in order to provide research data to the Special Committee in 1972, the Advisory Committee had recommended that provision for that purpose should be made in an amount similar to that for 1971.

5. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that under chapter III of section 12, an appropriation of \$8,556,900 was requested to cover amortization of and payment of interest on the United Nations bond issue. As was well known, the entire proceeds of the bonds were used to finance peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East. The membership of the United Nations had repeatedly recognized that the procedure for meeting expenditure resulting from such operations should differ from that applicable to expenditures under the regular budget, in that the developing countries should be accorded more favourable treatment in the apportionment of such expenditure. In the opinion of his delegation, there was an inconsistency between the recognition of that fact and the apportionment of the expenditure for repayment of the bonds in accordance with criteria applicable to expenditure financed under the regular budget. His delegation therefore requested that chapter III of section 12 be put to the vote separately; it would vote against the estimate proposed under that chapter.

6. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that by buying United Nations bonds some Member States had demonstrated their confidence in and support for the goals of peace and economic and social progress which they pursued through the Organization. Those States should be given some credit for their action for by buying the bonds they had not only given priority to United Nations objectives over national goals, but they had immobilized capital which, if it had been invested at commercial rates and on the terms prevailing on the commercial market, would have brought them much higher returns. It would be seen, therefore, that they had participated in a financial operation designed to alleviate the liquidity crisis which was not directly related to the causes of the deficit. Members of the Committee should not underestimate the goodwill shown by the bond purchasers and the need to retain the confidence of the international financial community; the Organization might find it necessary one day to undertake another bond issue.

7. Mr. DE PRAT GAY (Argentina) said that for the reasons explained by the Brazilian representative, he would vote against chapter III of section 12.

8. Mr. ABRASZEWSKI (Poland) said that expenditures relating to the United Nations bond issue and the United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea resulted from actions which contravened the Charter and should not be included in the Organization's regular budget.

9. Referring to chapter IX of section 12 and to paragraph 45 of the Advisory Committee's first report, he said that the question of the use of the International Computing Centre at Geneva should be considered from the point of view of the need to co-ordinate the activities of the organizations of the United Nations system. It was difficult to understand, therefore, why the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, which was composed of the executive heads of all United Nations organizations and agencies, should first decide to set up common data-processing facilities and then show reluctance in using them. His delegation wondered whether, in deciding to establish the Centre, the ACC, the Advisory Committee and even the General Assembly had not over-estimated the need for common data-processing facilities. In the circumstances, however, the only constructive approach to the matter was to ensure that the fullest use possible was made of the Centre. His delegation therefore urged all agencies concerned, particularly those located in Geneva, to review their policies concerning the Centre. It was essential to ensure that the most effective use was made of funds provided by Member States for the specialized agencies whose membership was, for the most part, the same as that of the United Nations.

10. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that his Government had bought United Nations bonds in order to demonstrate its support for the Organization. It believed, however, that the principles governing contributions for purposes of amortization of and payment of interest on the bonds should be different from the principles governing contributions to the regular budget. His delegation fully endorsed the comments of the Brazilian representative on the matter and would vote against chapter III.

11. If a separate vote was taken on chapter I, his delegation would abstain for reasons which were well known and, in particular, because of recent events as a result of which the whole question should be viewed in a different context.

12. Mr. ABARA (Nigeria) said that if the section was put to the vote chapter by chapter, his delegation would vote against chapter I. The time had come for the United Nations to relinquish responsibility for maintenance of the Memorial Cemetery.

13. His delegation endorsed the comments of the Brazilian representative and would vote against the estimate under chapter III if the section was put to the vote chapter by chapter.

14. Turning to chapter IV, he asked how many African countries had participated in the Triangular Fellowship Programme, how many participants had come from each country and the year in which they had participated, and what criteria governed selection of country and participants.

15. Mr. JOHNSON (Togo) said that in the opinion of his delegation, the expenditures under chapter I were unjustified. Accordingly, Togo would vote against that chapter.

16. Mr. IZURIETA (Ecuador) endorsed the comments of the Brazilian representative concerning chapter III. A

solution to the problem, perhaps along the lines suggested by Mr. Hambro (see A/C.5/XXVI/CRP.8), should, however, be found as soon as possible.

17. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania), referring to chapter I, said that his delegation had always maintained, in the First and Fifth Committees, that credits for the maintenance of the Memorial Cemetery in Korea should not be included in the regular budget. In view of what had taken place in the General Assembly and of the financial crisis facing the Organization, inclusion of the item should be reviewed. If, therefore, chapter I was put to a vote separately, he would vote against it.

18. Referring to chapter III, he said that the criteria governing assessments for peace-keeping operations should be different from those governing expenses under the regular budget. Despite that reservation, however, his delegation had decided that until new criteria had been agreed upon, it should vote in favour of chapter III.

19. Referring to chapter VIII, he asked what progress had been made in the in-depth study being made of the accounting and expense-sharing procedures of the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund. Would the findings of the study be communicated to the Fifth Committee in 1971 or 1972?

20. Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, if the section was put to the vote chapter by chapter, his delegation would vote against chapters I and III.

21. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had always respected the principles of the Charter and had always, therefore, opposed the illegal United Nations bond issue, the purpose of which was to meet expenses incurred in violation of the Charter. Under the Charter, all questions concerning peace-keeping operations and their financing should be subject to a decision of the Security Council. Member States were not obliged to meet expenses resulting from a decision contrary to the Charter. His delegation still maintained that position of principle.

22. Expenses incurred in relation to the United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea were illegal and must be excluded from the budget.

23. His delegation objected to the inclusion in the 1972 estimates of \$92,000 in chapter VII for the Pay Research Unit. The Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System had a mandate to study the question of staff salaries and make recommendations to the General Assembly. Therefore, any proposal to establish another organ to deal with salary was premature and unjustified. There was a general rule that all expenses in the budget estimates must be based on a decision of a legislative organ. It would be interesting to know on what decision the provision in question had been included in the estimates.

24. It was strange that neither the Secretary-General nor the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had seen fit to comment on the unprecedented growth in the estimates for the Inter-Organization Board for information systems and related activities. Some explanation was necessary.

25. For all those reasons, his delegation was not in a position to vote in favour of the estimates proposed under section 12.
26. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) said that if chapter I was put to a vote separately, his delegation would abstain.
27. Mr. JEREMIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that for well-known reasons his delegation would vote against chapters I and III if they were voted on separately.
28. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that his delegation supported the inclusion in the regular budget of expenses under chapters I and III. Referring to the Brazilian representative's comments, he said that his delegation would regard as a matter for concern any suggestion that chapter III should be voted out before some alternative method to finance the bond issue had been devised. Such a procedure would leave questions concerning the deficit unanswered and would frustrate efforts being made to solve the financial crisis.
29. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) said that in view of the success of the seminar for radio broadcasters from broadcasting organizations in six African countries, his delegation was glad to learn that such seminars would be continued under the Triangular Fellowship Programme. It hoped that UNESCO and the United Nations would produce material for educational radio and television broadcasters. Algeria would vote in favour of the estimates under chapter IV and hoped that they would be increased in future years.
30. Mr. BENNET (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote in favour of chapters I and III if they were voted on separately.
31. Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen) said that his delegation would vote against chapter I if it was voted on separately.
32. Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta) requested a separate vote on chapter I.
33. Mr. BERTRÁN (Uruguay) said that his delegation would vote in favour of chapter I. The United Nations had been called upon to maintain peace and its forces had performed their duties to the best of their ability and had tried to protect the right of self-determination of various peoples. Uruguay would abstain in the vote on chapter III in first reading.
34. Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had serious objections to the inclusion in the regular budget of chapters I and III, and would therefore be obliged to vote against both, and against section 12 as a whole.
35. Miss WHALLEY (United Kingdom) said that her delegation's position on chapters I and III was well known; it would vote for both and entirely agreed with the Italian representative's comments on the bond issue. It was vital that the appropriation for the bonds should be retained unless and until there was a separate solution of the whole problem of the Organization's deficit.
36. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that, for the reasons given by the representatives of Brazil and India, his delegation would abstain in a separate vote on chapter I and would vote against chapter III.
37. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that his delegation fully agreed with the Italian representative's comments on the bond issue.
38. It also shared the concern expressed by many delegations with regard to the inadequate use of the International Computing Centre at Geneva and urged specialized agencies which were not using the Centre to make full use of its facilities.
39. Mr. KRONMANN (Denmark) said that, as in the past, his delegation would vote in favour of chapters I and III. The bond issue had been negotiated on certain terms which could not be changed unilaterally and involved a question of trust in the United Nations.
40. His delegation shared the general sense of frustration that the International Computing Centre was not being used as originally intended.
41. Mr. NARKHUU (Mongolia) said that, in keeping with its position of principle, his delegation would vote against chapters I and III and against section 12 as a whole.
42. Mr. DERWINSKI (United States of America) emphasized that his delegation had consistently supported chapters I and III. It would vote in favour of the whole section with the exception of chapter IX on which it would abstain, if a separate vote were taken. Its reservations on that chapter were related to the fact that the Committee was still awaiting the Secretary-General's report on the question of electronic data processing.
43. Mr. ROSS (Liberia) said that his delegation would be unable to vote on section 12 until the Controller had clarified various issues which had been raised.
44. Mr. FRANCIS (Jamaica) endorsed the comments of the representatives of Italy and Japan on chapter III.
45. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that his delegation, whose position was well known, would abstain in the vote on section 12 because it had become a cold war issue. It had always supported the bond issue and he would vote in favour of chapter III.
46. Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, like the representative of Sudan, his delegation opposed chapter III and would vote against it in a separate vote.
47. Mr. LENG SARIN (Khmer Republic) said that his delegation would vote in favour of chapters I and III, on which its position was well known.
48. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) reiterated his delegation's concern that, unless the International Computing Centre at Geneva was utilized to the full, it might be necessary to undertake a reappraisal to determine whether expenditure relating to it was warranted.
49. Mr. SUMANTERA (Indonesia) said that his delegation would abstain in a separate vote on chapters I and III.

50. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) said that while his delegation would vote in favour of the appropriation under chapter IX at that stage, the Committee should subsequently consider what action should be taken on the question of the International Computing Centre. The adoption of a draft resolution might be the most suitable course. In that connexion, he noted that the Advisory Committee was to return to the question of the Centre when additional information which it had requested became available (see A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 46).

51. The CHAIRMAN said that there would be an opportunity for a full debate on the question of the Centre when the Secretary-General's report on electronic data processing was available.

52. Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) said that his delegation welcomed the decrease in expenditure under chapter I and hoped it would continue until the chapter had been eliminated from the budget. In the meantime, it would abstain on the vote on that chapter and also on chapter III. He supported the Nigerian request for additional information on chapter IV, the Triangular Fellowship Programme.

53. Miss FORCIGNANÓ (Italy) said that her delegation shared the concern expressed in connexion with the International Computing Centre. She agreed with the representative of Brazil that the Committee should consider taking some action to ensure that the specialized agencies made full use of it. The Committee's position could well be expressed in a draft resolution. An unbelievably large sum spent on the Centre had produced only modest results.

54. Mr. FAUSTINO (Philippines) said that his delegation whole-heartedly endorsed the comments of the Brazilian and Italian representatives concerning the need for a draft resolution on the International Computing Centre.

55. Mr. TURNER (Controller), referring to the Nigerian representative's request for information on the Triangular Fellowship Programme, said that the necessary detailed data was not immediately available but would be assembled for an oral statement or a brief report to the Committee.

56. Replying to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, he said that it would be necessary to review the question of computer services provided for the Joint Staff Pension Fund in the light of new arrangements planned for 1972. In the judgement of the Secretariat, however, the estimate in chapter VIII represented a reasonable reimbursement for the services currently rendered. He pointed out that the Joint Staff Pension Fund secretariat serviced both the Fund itself and the United Nations Staff Pension Committee so that the allocation of costs was necessarily somewhat arbitrary.

57. As to the USSR representative's comments on section 12, he said that, while it was true that no provision was made for the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System *per se*, the secretariat of CCAQ had had temporary assistance in 1971 for pay research purposes to provide data which the Special Committee had needed. At one stage, there had been a proposal that a pay research unit should be established but the Advisory Committee had recommended, instead, that

the existing temporary arrangements should continue. The United Nations share of the cost of the temporary assistance made available in 1971 to the CCAQ Staff Office for research purposes amounted to some \$12,000. The Advisory Committee had proposed, and the Secretary-General had agreed, that the \$30,000 proposed for 1972 for the pay research unit should be deleted and the \$12,000 for temporary assistance retained to effect a reduction in United Nations budgetary provision of approximately \$18,000. When the Fifth Committee took up the interim report of the Special Committee (A/8428 and Corr.1), a statement of the financial implications of that Committee's work in 1972 would be made available to the Fifth Committee after it had been reviewed by the Advisory Committee.

58. In commenting on the sharp increase in expenditure under chapter VII, the USSR representative had presumably been referring to the increase in the cost of the Inter-Organization Board. The explanation was that the Board had been organized only recently and had functioned during the financial year 1971 on a partial basis and for a limited period. The estimate for 1972, however, was based on the assumption that the Board would be fully operational for the whole of that year.

59. The International Computing Centre had been the subject of much comment and a full report on the question was in an advanced stage of preparation. It would be issued in the near future after its examination by the Advisory Committee. He felt that the purposes of the Fifth Committee would best be served if comment by the secretariat was deferred until the full report was available.

60. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Controller had dispelled some but not all of his delegation's doubts concerning chapter VII. The expenditure on Inter-Organization Board salaries had increased by some \$50,000—almost double the amount for the financial year 1971. He could not understand why there should be additional expenditure of \$40,000 for consultants. If the Board was just beginning its work, the time had surely not come when consultants were absolutely necessary. Why then, had provision been made for consultants?

61. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that all members of the Special Committee for the Review of the United Nations Salary System had been most unhappy at the way in which CCAQ had serviced that Committee and hoped that more and better service would be available during 1972.

62. Mr. FAURA (Peru) said that, as Vice-Chairman of the Special Committee, he fully supported the Indian representative's remarks.

63. Mr. TURNER (Controller), replying further to the USSR representative, said that it was contemplated that the Inter-Organization Board would establish a number of task forces to consider the question of interagency co-operation in the field of computers. Those task forces would be staffed from the specialized agencies and by specialists recruited from outside the United Nations family. The whole question was fully covered in the report on the computer situation to which he had referred earlier. The

Secretariat would be able to provide a fuller reply when that report was issued.

64. Mr. ROSS (Liberia) said that the Controller had dispelled many of his doubts and his delegation would be able to participate in the vote on section 12.

65. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria) said that his delegation would support chapter IV but would abstain in a separate vote on chapter I.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put chapters I and III to the vote separately, as requested by the representatives of Upper Volta and Brazil respectively, after which section 12 as a whole would be put to the vote.

The Committee approved in first reading an appropriation in the amount of \$75,100 under chapter I by 41 votes to 21, with 24 abstentions.

The Committee approved in first reading an appropriation in the amount of \$8,556,900 under chapter III by 41 votes to 23, with 21 abstentions.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 218) for an appropriation in the amount of \$10,356,400 under section 12 was approved in first reading by 64 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

67. Mr. DRUMMOND (South Africa), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted against chapter III and had abstained on section 12 as a whole because of its opposition to payments from the regular budget for the purposes of the bond issue. Its views on the question of the United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea required no explanation and it had voted in favour of chapter I.

68. His delegation shared the concern expressed by many speakers concerning the apparent under-utilization of the International Computing Centre at Geneva.

69. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of section 12 as a whole, but would have abstained in the separate vote on chapter I.

SECTION 11—PRINTING (*concluded*) (A/8406, A/8408 AND CORR.1 AND 2 AND ADD.1 AND ADD.1/ CORR.1, A/C.5/1366)

70. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the lack of a quorum had prevented the Committee from voting on section 11 at its previous meeting and invited the Committee to proceed to the vote on that section.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 202) for an appropriation in the amount of \$3,228,700 under section 11 was approved in first reading by 84 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

71. Mr. GUPTA (India) said that his delegation's vote in favour of section 11 was provisional; its vote on that section in second reading would depend on the Committee's decision on his Government's proposal concerning printing costs relating to seminars.

SECTION 17—SPECIAL MISSIONS (A/8406, A/8408 AND CORR.1 AND 2)

72. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General, in his budget estimates for the financial year 1972 (A/8406), had proposed an amount of \$8,249,000 and the Advisory Committee, in its first report (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 290), had recommended a reduction of \$88,300 in that amount.

73. Mr. RHODES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee's proposal for a reduction of \$7,200 under chapter III reflected its view that it should be possible to reduce the staff of UNCURK. The other two reductions which it had proposed were provisional. That recommended under chapter V was made pending a decision on the appointment of a United Nations Commissioner for Namibia and that under chapter VII was made pending the formulation of plans for 1972 by the Special Committee on *Apartheid*. Having regard for the supplementary estimates for the budget for 1971 for chapters V and VII, the Advisory Committee's recommendations could not be regarded as particularly stringent.

74. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) said he wished to propose the deletion from section 17 of chapter III. There should be a separate vote on that item of expenditure, which related to the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The Commission had been established 21 years ago to legitimize the aggression against the people of Korea carried out under the cover of the United Nations flag, and was still being used as a means of foreign interference in the domestic affairs of the Korean people. It did not conduce to any slackening of tensions in Korea, and was damaging to the prestige of the United Nations. The General Assembly had decided not to discuss the question of Korea at the current session in order not to prejudice encouraging developments in that area. The Polish delegation had not agreed with that argument, believing that discussion of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the dissolution of UNCURK would foster such developments instead of hampering them. Poland would co-operate in the adoption of decisions that would contribute to a peaceful settlement in Korea without outside interference, and was convinced that most delegates would support such a decision. There was no justification for appropriating some \$300,000 to support such an illegal body when the Organization was in financial straits, particularly since the crisis was partly due to expenditure on such illegal activities. The money should be saved for useful United Nations activities by deleting chapter III from the budget.

75. Mr. GUTPA (India) said that for reasons India had made clear over the years, it would abstain from voting on chapters II and III if there was a separate vote on those items. He supported the views of the Advisory Committee given in paragraph 284 of its first report. Referring to the last sentence of paragraph 290 of the report, he said India's position was the same as the previous year—the matter was one for the appropriate Main Committees to deal with.

76. Mr. BERTRÁN (Uruguay) said that in view of the decision by the General Assembly, the sovereign organ of

the United Nations, not to discuss the Korean question at the current session, he did not understand how the Polish representative could attempt to embark on a discussion of the matter, which was not on the agenda, by raising it in the Fifth Committee. Uruguay would abstain from voting for the appropriation under chapter III.

77. Mr. BENDJENNA (Algeria), Mr. BARTUŠEK (Czechoslovakia) and Mr. AL-MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic), endorsed the views expressed by the Polish representative.

78. Mr. ALWAN (Iraq) said that his delegation had on several occasions made its views clear in the First Committee, and at the previous session had been a sponsor of a draft resolution to dissolve UNCURK.¹ He supported the Polish proposal for a separate vote on chapter III.

79. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) and Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen) said that if there was a separate vote on chapter III, they would vote against it.

80. Mr. MAROOFI (Afghanistan), Mr. FAKIH (Kenya), Mr. BENKIRANE (Morocco) and Mr. JOHNSON (Togo) said that they would abstain from voting on chapter III, but would vote for section 17 as a whole.

81. Mr. WOSCHNAGG (Austria) referred to paragraph 290 of the Advisory Committee's first report, and said he was pleased that that Committee should point out where savings could be made. It was correct that decisions on that question were for the Main Committees of the General Assembly to take, but he took the opposite view from that of the representative of India about the Advisory Committee's right to suggest possible areas for economy.

82. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) said that the Advisory Committee was exceeding its competence in the last sentence of paragraph 290 of its first report; the question of reducing special missions was one for the inter-governmental committees or organs that had established such missions. If a separate vote was taken on chapter III, he would abstain.

83. Mr. CLELAND (Ghana) said that he would abstain from voting on chapter III if it was voted on separately, because the composition of UNCURK did not accurately reflect the membership of the Organization.

84. Mr. SOTIROV (Bulgaria) said that in line with the position of principle taken by his Government, he would vote against chapter III. It had clearly been stated by over 20 delegations in the General Assembly and the General Committee at the beginning of the current session that UNCURK was an anachronism and had nothing to do with the rehabilitation and reunification of Korea. The United Nations flag had not sufficed to mask the presence of over 50,000 foreign troops in South Korea, which did not conduce to rehabilitation and reunification. He supported the Polish proposal.

85. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ (Cuba) said that UNCURK had been established in violation of the Charter, and was a cover

for the imperialist aggression of the United States against the Korean people over a period of 21 years. Cuba would therefore vote against the item, and supported the Polish proposal to delete it from the budget.

86. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that for many years his delegation had been saying in various United Nations organs that the regular budget of the United Nations was burdened with the cost of illegal activities in violation of the Charter, and one example of that was the existence of UNCURK. It was an inheritance from an imperialist aggression carried out under cover of the United Nations flag for which the United Nations was now paying. It was a tool of the policies of the State that continued to occupy Korea with its troops and was thus an obstacle to the peaceful and democratic reunification of Korea. He would therefore support the Polish proposal that the item should be deleted from the budget. If chapter III was left in the budget, despite the wish of many to delete what was a consequence of the cold war, his delegation would vote against section 17 as a whole.

87. Mr. DERWINSKI (United States of America) said the Uruguayan representative had adopted the right approach to the question. He understood that the statements by the Soviet Union and its supporters represented an annual comment, and he wished to balance those statements. The Soviet Union was free to rewrite history as it wished, but the source of the aggression in Korea was known to all. It was unwise for the pot to call the kettle black, and unwise of the Soviet Union, in view of its policy since the Second World War, to accuse others of imperialism.

88. Mr. TARASOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the United States representative, said that the latter had made undignified remarks concerning the policy of the Soviet Union. There was no need for the Soviet Union to rewrite history; its position on the United States aggression in Korea was well known, and that position had been held for many years. The Soviet Union had always strongly supported every proposal to withdraw the United States troops sheltering behind the United Nations flag; their continued occupation of South Korea prevented the peaceful and democratic reunification of the country. There was no rewriting of history there. He did not understand the reference to Soviet policies since the Second World War. Throughout its existence the Soviet Union had followed a consistent policy of peace and friendship with all peoples, and had opposed imperialist aggression. The United States should have followed such a policy, instead of its continuing aggression against Viet-Nam, Cambodia and Laos, and its support of the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries.

89. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania) said he had reservations concerning the reductions for chapters V and VII recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 287 and 289 of its first report. If there was a separate vote on chapter III, he would vote against it.

90. Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) said that although there appeared to have been a token reduction in the appropriation for chapter III for 1972, it should have been greater. He agreed with paragraph 290 of the Advisory Committee's first report, but if various special missions were to be

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 98, document A/8185, para. 15 (b).

reviewed, UNCURK should be the first. In future it should be excluded from the regular budget. There should be a separate vote on that item, and Tunisia would abstain.

91. Mr. ROSS (Liberia) said he would vote for the appropriation for chapter III since the Korean question had been raised in the General Committee and disposed of until 1972.

92. Mr. ARBOLEDA (Colombia) said he endorsed the view expressed by the Uruguayan representative. The items submitted by the Secretary-General had all been expressly authorized by the General Assembly. Colombia's position regarding the budget estimates and the financial crisis was well known. It supported all budget items that helped to secure world peace, the most important aims of the Organization.

93. Mr. HOLLIST (Nigeria) said that he would vote against chapter III. He agreed with the remark of the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania relating to the cut in the budget estimates for the United Nations Council for Namibia. Possibly a decision on chapter V could be postponed until it was verified that the Advisory Committee's assumptions were correct.

94. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said he would support the appropriation for chapter III. He regretted that the debate had become the occasion for statements that would have been more suitable in other bodies, if the General Committee and the General Assembly had decided that the question was to be discussed at the current session. The Uruguayan delegate had adopted the correct approach. In any case, the future of UNCURK was not a question for the Fifth Committee. As to the rewriting of history, the records of the United Nations had not been rewritten, and were there for anyone to consult. The records showed which countries had voted against UNCURK, and that some countries that now strongly opposed it had not voted against it originally.

95. Commenting on paragraph 290 of the Advisory Committee's first report, he pointed out that the Advisory Committee could draw attention to administrative and budgetary questions, but special missions would also involve political decisions that would not be within the competence of that Committee.

96. Mr. LENG SARIN (Khmer Republic), noting that the Soviet representative had referred to United States aggression in Cambodia, said that there was no such aggression; troops were merely repelling the invading forces of North Viet-Nam and the Viet-Cong.

97. The CHAIRMAN said that the vote on chapter V should not be deferred, as the representative of Nigeria had suggested; the Advisory Committee would be informed of any changes affecting chapters V and VII, and any necessary amendments to the estimates could be made in second reading.

98. He proposed that the Committee should first take the separate vote on chapter III requested by Poland.

99. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) asked that the Committee should vote on the proposal that chapter III should be deleted from the regular budget.

100. The CHAIRMAN said that a separate vote on chapter III would amount to the same thing, since the Fifth Committee could only delete financial provisions from the budget, and not items.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation for an appropriation in the amount of \$291,100 under chapter III was approved in first reading by 37 votes to 27, with 26 abstentions.

101. Mr. KALINOWSKI (Poland) and Mr. GONCHARENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that they would vote against section 17 as a whole because it included an appropriation for UNCURK.

The Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/8408 and Corr.1 and 2, para. 290) for an appropriation in the amount of \$8,160,700 under section 17 was approved in first reading by 71 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.

102. Mr. DRUMMOND (South Africa) said that he had abstained from voting for section 17, *inter alia*, because it included appropriations for activities that South Africa believed to be *ultra vires* the Charter. His country's views on that point had been made clear on previous occasions.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.