

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION
 Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 819th
 MEETING**

Thursday, 15 December 1960,
 at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 49:</i>	
<i>Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1960 (continued)</i>	
<i>United Nations activities in the Congo (ONUC) for the period 14 July to 31 December 1960 (continued)</i>	333
<i>Agenda item 27:</i>	
<i>United Nations Emergency Force:</i>	
<i>(a) Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force</i>	338

Chairman: Mr. Mario MAJOLI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 49

Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1960 (A/4492, A/4507, A/4508, A/4580, A/4632, A/C.5/816, A/C.5/836, A/C.5/849, A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.639, A/C.5/L.642) (continued)

United Nations activities in the Congo (ONUC) for the period 14 July to 31 December 1960 (A/4580, A/C.5/836, A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1, A/C.5/L.639, A/C.5/L.642) (continued)

1. Mr. ROSHCIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, unless the Polish amendments (A/C.5/L.642) were adopted, his delegation would be unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 because, as several delegations had pointed out, ONUC was not under truly international leadership. That situation had already led the United Arab Republic, Morocco, Guinea, Yugoslavia, Ceylon and Indonesia to announce that they would withdraw their troops from the United Nations Force in the Congo. He had drawn attention at the 815th meeting to the contradiction, identified by the Yugoslav Government, between the practical conduct of ONUC and the terms of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and to the one-sided composition of the military staff set up by the Secretary-General in the Congo. The Australian representative had rightly rejected, at the 818th meeting, the idea that Member States should pay only for operations which they regarded as successful; but operations which—owing to the dominating influence of the NATO countries—conflicted with the governing resolutions, and which were not truly international in character, were a different matter.

2. At the 817th meeting the United Kingdom representative had implied, incorrectly, that the USSR position on the current item was that Belgium should pay the entire expenses of ONUC. The USSR position was that, while Belgium bore the principal responsibility for creating the situation which had produced those expenses, ONUC had been conducted predominantly under the direction of the United States. The United

Kingdom itself, which had engaged in more exploitation and had waged more colonial wars in Africa than any other Power, had shared in guiding ONUC in a direction contrary to the interests of the legitimate Government headed by Mr. Lumumba, and should therefore share the expenses of ONUC on the same footing as the other responsible Powers. The USSR position was clearly shared by the delegations of many socialist and neutral countries; it had not been surprising to hear it misinterpreted by the delegations of the countries mainly responsible for diverting ONUC from its proper course.

3. Mr. BLOIS (Canada) said that it was incumbent on the United Nations to assume full responsibility for the 1960 costs of ONUC and those costs should be apportioned according to the scale of assessments. If a number of States were unwilling to contribute according to that scale, they should have raised the matter at the fourth emergency special session of the General Assembly. If it had proved impossible to reach agreement on the apportionment of the costs at that time, then the United Nations Force would have had to have been withdrawn. The expenditure could not be avoided at present, as commitments had already been made. His delegation believed that, since there had been no decision to the contrary, no Member was obliged to contribute more than its share under the scale of assessments. If a Member should nevertheless offer to pay a larger share, then it was quite proper for it to make its offer conditional.

4. The United States Government had made its offer on the assumption that its contribution would be used to ease the burden on those Member States with the least capacity to pay. His own country's offer to forgo certain airlift costs would result in an increase of almost 45 per cent in the contribution which it would otherwise have had to pay under the scale of assessments. When his Government had made that offer, it had assumed that the General Assembly had accepted financial responsibility for the supplementary estimate in respect of the 1960 costs of ONUC. It considered that the peace-keeping ability of the United Nations—and indeed all aspects of the latter's work—would be jeopardized if the Organization were to renounce financial responsibility for commitments already incurred. His Government could justify the waiving of its airlift costs only on the assumption that the other medium and small Powers showed a willingness to accept full financial responsibility for the 1960 costs of ONUC by regarding them as expenses of the Organization under Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter. Consequently, if neither draft resolution A/C.5/L.639 nor the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 received the support of those Powers, his Government would have to reconsider its offer to forgo its claim in respect of its airlift costs.

5. His delegation had been impressed by the example set by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.639

in urging all Member States to set aside their principles in order that the General Assembly might arrive at an agreed, effective solution. It would therefore support draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1, but reserved the right to support the other draft resolution if it came before the Committee later. It believed that a vote against the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 would be tantamount to a vote against the draft resolution as a whole. He would have preferred a milder wording for operative paragraph 6. Contributions from parties closely involved might be invited, but it was unrealistic and impractical to rely on such parties to finance United Nations peace-keeping operations, because contributions from them were rarely forthcoming. Reliance should be placed on disinterested parties. For purely non-political budgetary and financial reasons, therefore, his delegation could not support operative paragraph 6. However, it would not vote against it.

6. The Polish proposal to delete the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 was clearly designed to put contributions towards the Congo expenses on an entirely voluntary basis. If that were done, the financial basis of the operation in the Congo as well as of other aspects of the work of the United Nations would be seriously jeopardized.

7. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) said that his country had had a direct interest in the Congo question from the outset, being a member of the Security Council, which had initiated the Congo operation, and a contributor of personnel for the United Nations Force. It had hoped that the Congo operation would last only a short time and that the legitimate Government in the Congo would soon be able to restore peace and order in that country.

8. Unfortunately, however, the presence of United Nations forces in the Congo had neither helped the newly liberated Congolese people nor enhanced the prestige of the United Nations. His Government, like many others which had initially had high hopes for the operation, had been greatly disappointed as a result and had decided to withdraw its contingent.

9. It had been argued that there could be no question of refusing to pay for those United Nations operations which proved unsuccessful and agreeing to pay only for those which were successful. However, the Congo operation could not be considered a total failure from the point of view of some United Nations Members. Only time would tell whether the operation had been to the advantage of the Congolese people, but from the point of view of the collectivity of United Nations Members the operation had not achieved its purpose. There was therefore no justification for a mandatory requirement that States should pay for work with which they were dissatisfied. Consequently, his delegation could not accept the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 and would vote in favour of the first Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.642). As it considered that the expenses of the Congo operation should be met by voluntary contributions, it would also vote in favour of the third Polish amendment. It would abstain on the other Polish amendments, as it would prefer the former Administering Power and the new Member States themselves to indicate voluntarily what contribution they proposed to make. That question should be left to their conscience and their coffers.

10. His delegation hoped that a solution along the lines suggested by the Polish amendments would prove ac-

ceptable to the Committee. If that method were not adopted, it would be necessary to choose between two alternatives: the solution proposed in draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1, or no solution at all. His delegation would not vote against that draft resolution, but would abstain, for the sole reason that it wished to facilitate reimbursement of the costs incurred by those countries which had contributed contingents for the United Nations Force in the Congo.

11. Mr. HILLIS (United Kingdom) said that the USSR representative's false and palpably absurd charges against the United Kingdom clearly showed that the USSR was bankrupt of arguments in justification of its intention to default, not for the first time, on its manifest obligations to the United Nations; his delegation rejected those charges.

12. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that that statement was typical of the United Kingdom delegation's groundless misrepresentations.

13. Mr. VENKATARAMAN (India) said that the objections he had voiced at the 817th meeting to the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 should not be construed as indicating any unwillingness on India's part to meet its financial obligations; India honoured all its obligations, whether political or financial. His delegation, however, was unable to commit its Government to the principles set forth in the paragraph in question; it would therefore vote in favour of the first Polish amendment and, if that amendment was rejected, would abstain on draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 as a whole.

14. Mr. DA CUNHA D'EÇA (Portugal) said that his delegation would support the first Polish amendment because it was more realistic than the third preambular paragraph which it sought to delete from draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1. If, by adopting that preambular paragraph, the Committee acknowledged the expenses of ONUC as expenses of the United Nations, the provisions of Article 19 of the Charter would be applicable to any Member State which failed to pay its assessed share of those expenses. It was already known that a certain great Power would not pay its share; if, therefore, the paragraph in question was adopted, the General Assembly would be obliged either to apply Article 19 to that great Power—an unlikely course—or to condone a breach of the Charter.

15. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) requested a roll-call vote on the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1; on that draft resolution as a whole; and on operative paragraph 6 of that resolution if it was put to the vote separately.

16. Mr. WIDDOWSON (Union of South Africa) asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 6 of that draft resolution.

17. Mr. DA CUNHA D'EÇA (Portugal) said that his delegation would oppose operative paragraph 6 because it considered that Belgium was not alone in its responsibility for the situation in the Republic of the Congo. The main cause of the crisis in that country was the struggle between two great Powers, which were responsible for the cold war that overshadowed international relations.

18. Mr. CAMARA Maurice (Guinea) said that, since the USSR representative had mentioned Guinea's decision to withdraw its contingent from the United

Nations Force in the Congo, he wished to acquaint the Committee with the reasons for that decision. He read to the Committee two cables in which Mr. Touré, the President of Guinea, stated that Guinean troops had been sent to the Congo solely in order to support the people and the lawful Government of that country and that they were being withdrawn because the United Nations was acting against Congolese interests. The United Nations had sided with elements without constitutional authority; as a result, the Congolese Parliament had ceased to function and the leaders of the lawful Government had been arrested.

19. The United Nations was looking on helplessly while imperialism returned to the Congo. The Deputy Representative of the Secretary-General in the Congo had already drawn attention to the gravity of the attacks made by Congolese soldiers, under the command of Colonel Mobutu, against United Nations military and civilian personnel. The Committee should consider from what source Colonel Mobutu's régime derived its material support; the presence of Belgian military and para-military personnel in the Congolese National Army and of Belgian advisers to the ruling Commissioners were symptoms of foreign intervention which threatened peace and called for drastic steps by the United Nations. The inability of the Organization to take such steps was illustrated by the Western bloc's rejection in the Security Council, of the USSR draft resolution calling for the withdrawal of Belgian personnel from the Congo.^{1/} When the United Nations determined upon resolute action to eliminate imperialism from the Congo, Mobutu and the Commissioners would be swept away.

20. For the reasons advanced by the Indian representative at the 817th meeting, his delegation supported the Polish amendment for the deletion of the third preambular paragraph from draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1. Moreover, the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs were inappropriate. As his delegation saw it, the expenses of ONUC should be borne by those Member States which were responsible for, and which benefited from, the situation in the Republic of the Congo; there was consequently no occasion for the General Assembly to note with appreciation the waiver of certain claims to reimbursement, or the provision of voluntary contributions, by those Member States. One of them was the main customer for Congolese uranium; its contributions should be regarded merely as the payment of a reward to the United Nations for pursuing a timid course which had well served the industrial monopolies in the Congo. Mr. Lumumba, who represented an obstacle to the economic enslavement of the Congo, would probably soon be murdered; if those now in power reconsidered their position, and put their people first, they would suffer the same fate. He reviewed the participation of Belgium, the United Kingdom and the United States in the exploitation of Congolese natural resources; the motives prompting financial assistance to ONUC from that quarter were patent.

21. His delegation endorsed operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1. It would vote against operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 and in favour of the fifth Polish amendment. Belgium was indebted to the Congo for its wealth and, indeed, its way of life; and there was a direct connexion between the support it

received from its NATO partners and the uranium it had been able to supply from the Congo. The Belgian representative, instead of instructing the Committee on the humanitarian aims of colonialism, should tell it whether the Congo had ever asked to be colonized, and how the latest profits from that country compared with the investments made there. The secession of Katanga was explained by the fact that the large share in the Union Minière which, on the attainment of independence, should have been vested in the Central Government of the Republic had instead been vested in the Government of Katanga.

22. The whole world knew what Member States were responsible for, and benefited from, the situation in the Congo; it also knew that the United Nations was being used to screen the corruption, crime, blackmail and brutality through which the Congo was being recolonized on behalf of Belgian, United Kingdom and United States trusts. The newly emancipated Member States, other Member States which had known foreign domination, and the justice-loving world as a whole should require those responsible for the Congo situation to pay the resultant expenses. Those who were determined to end colonialism should seek to free the United Nations from financial difficulties which could only compromise its impartiality. Guinea therefore supported unreservedly the Polish amendments (A/C.5/L.642).

23. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that his delegation would refrain from entering into a political discussion at the present time and would not add to the statement which it had made at the 818th meeting in exercise of its right of reply.

24. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation believed the expenses of the United Nations in the Congo should be provided for in a special account and not in the regular United Nations budget. It would therefore have to vote against draft resolution A/C.5/L.639. It could not approve draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 either, because the solution which it proposed was not an equitable one. It proposed that all Member States should be assessed to meet the cost of the Congo operation and stated that all Members had a binding legal obligation to pay, without making any distinction between them. His delegation considered that a mixed assessment formula was required, taking into account the special privileges and responsibilities of certain Members. While accepting a legal obligation to pay a part of the cost of the operation, his delegation rejected the idea that the only factor which should make his country's contribution differ from that of a permanent member of the Security Council was capacity to pay.

25. His delegation also criticized the draft resolution for refraining from naming the former administering Power of the Republic of the Congo, when that country had been specifically named in the security Council's resolutions.

26. Since the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 might nevertheless serve to alleviate the financial difficulties with which the United Nations was faced, his delegation would not oppose it but would abstain when it was voted upon. It would also abstain in the vote on the amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.642, as they would not have the effect of improving the draft resolution.

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifteenth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1960, document S/4579.

27. Mr. CALINCASAN (Philippines) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the first Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.642) and would also vote in favour of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1. If the third preambular paragraph of that draft resolution was retained, his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole. Its position was based on purely budgetary considerations.

28. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) warned the Committee that peace in Africa was in jeopardy and pointed out that decisions similar to that with which the Committee was faced at present might well have to be taken again if such a situation arose elsewhere.

29. Mr. ANDONI (Albania), supported by Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) and Mr. CHELLI (Tunisia), requested that the Polish amendments should be voted upon first, each amendment being voted upon separately.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the first Polish amendment (A/C.5/L.642).

At the request of the Sudanese representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chad.

Against: Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada.

Abstaining: Chile, China, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Niger, Peru, Somalia, Spain, Togo, Venezuela, Argentina, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun.

The first Polish amendment was rejected by 40 votes to 27, with 17 abstentions.

31. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that, in view of the decision taken on his delegation's first amendment, his delegation withdrew the remaining amendments contained in document A/C.5/L.642.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1.

At the request of the Sudanese representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United

States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria.

Against: Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco.

Abstaining: Peru, Somalia, Spain, Togo, Venezuela, Argentina, Belgium, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroun, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia.

The third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 was adopted by 40 votes to 27, with 17 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Ghana, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 70 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Ceylon, a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 4.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 50 votes to 17, with 16 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Sudan, a vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 6.

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

In favour: Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Cameroun, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea.

Against: Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Union of South Africa, Belgium, France.

Abstaining: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Greece, Guatemala.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 30 votes to 7, with 48 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1, as a whole.

At the request of the representative of Sudan, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey.

Against: United Arab Republic, Yemen, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Iraq, Lebanon, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Cambodia, Cameroun, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, France, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines, Spain, Togo, Union of South Africa.

Draft resolution A/C.5/L.638/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 45 votes to 15, with 25 abstentions.

34. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the co-sponsors, withdrew draft resolution A/C.5/L.639.

35. Mr. ARAMBURU (Peru) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that his Government's assessed share would be kept as low as possible. He therefore hoped that countries more directly concerned with the situation in the Congo would make further voluntary contributions to reduce the assessments of the Member States referred to in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph 5 of the resolution. His Government reserved its freedom of action with regard to ONUC expenses in 1961.

36. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) said that his delegation had voted for operative paragraph 6 because it was the only part of the draft resolution which assessed correctly, if only indirectly, the party responsible for the situation in the Congo.

37. He had voted against the draft resolution as a whole because the retention of the third preambular paragraph excluded a much more important aspect of the issue, namely, the clear and indisputable responsibility of Belgium. Some representatives seemed to regard the obligations of Member States as purely financial. They lost sight of the fact that the primary obligation of a Member was to comply with the Security Council's decisions and to fulfil its duty under the Charter by doing everything possible to help carry out those decisions. There was extensive documentation, some of which had appeared over the signature of the Secretary-General, which proved that Belgium had done everything in its power to impede the United Nations action in the Congo and to make it as hard as possible for ONUC to succeed. The aforementioned representatives would have done better to remind Belgium of its obligations and should have brought public and private pressure to bear on the Belgian Government to conform to the Security Council's resolutions. It was wrong to discuss the consequences of an action and not to determine responsibility therefor.

38. Mr. XENOS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it believed that the United Nations action in the Congo was the result of valid decisions unanimously reached by the Security Council and endorsed by the General Assembly. He also emphasized that his country believed in the principle of universality of participation in such expenses. He made, however, a formal reservation concerning the amount of his Government's contribution to the expenses of ONUC, pending specific instructions from his Government.

39. Mr. ILIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had voted against the third preambular paragraph because it felt that a legal obligation could not be imposed in the present case. He had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole for the reasons his delegation had given at the 816th meeting.

40. Mr. OWONO (Cameroun) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because he had not yet received specific instructions from his Government. He was, however, generally in favour of its terms.

41. Mr. EL HAKIM (United Arab Republic) endorsed the views expressed in explanation of his vote by the Iraqi representative.

42. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation's amendments (A/C.5/L.642) had been designed to bring the draft resolution into line with the provisions of the Charter and international law. Accordingly, his Government did not consider itself legally bound by the provisions of the resolution which had been adopted.

43. Mr. PATHMARAJAH (Ceylon) said that, although his Government could not agree with the United Nations action in the Congo, and therefore did not feel obliged to contribute to its cost, his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. He emphasized that his delegation's position concerned only the 1960 cost for ONUC and it had strong views regarding any continuation of ONUC operations in 1961. He referred to the communiqué issued on 8 December 1960 by Mrs. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon, in which she had said that her Government had decided, as a mark of its profound dissatisfaction with the course of events and of its wish to dissociate itself from the things that were happening, to recall immediately the small contingent of army officers which it had sent to the Congo as a token of its faith in the ability of the United Nations to carry through the concrete task required by the Security Council resolutions, in the formulation of which Ceylon had played some part.

44. Mr. SUPARDAN (Indonesia) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution for the reasons given in his statement at the 817th meeting.

45. Mr. CAMARA Maurice (Guinea) said that the vote on operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution had shown the extent of the support for his delegation's view that Belgium was responsible for the situation in the Congo.

46. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia) said that he had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 6 because he felt there had not been a formal indictment of the former administering Power of the Republic of the Congo and he was therefore unable to express any opinion on the matter. He did feel, however, that the former adminis-

tering Power had a moral obligation to contribute in a substantial measure to the costs of the Congo operation.

47. Mr. DA CUNHA D'EÇA (Portugal) said that his delegation, having voted against the resolution, wished to enter a formal reservation regarding its obligation to pay its assessed share.

48. Mr. MONTERO BUSTAMANTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation had been guided in its voting solely by the wish to preserve the United Nations, whose failure would cost untold suffering for all mankind.

49. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) said that he could not accept the allegations made by the representatives of Iraq, the United Arab Republic and Guinea. He rejected the Guinean representative's interpretation of the vote on operative paragraph 6, and referred him to the discussion on the political aspects of the Congo question in plenary meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 27

United Nations Emergency Force:

(a) Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force (A/4396, A/4409, A/4486 and Add.1 and 2)

50. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished to know whether the decision to be taken on the cost estimates for the maintenance of UNEF would be dependent on the result of the discussion on agenda item 27 (b)—Progress report on the Force.

51. The CHAIRMAN said that a reply would be given at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.