



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 80:</i>	
<i>Report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies (concluded)</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly</i>	129
<i>Agenda item 74:</i>	
<i>Budget estimates for the financial year 1967 (continued)</i>	
<i>First reading (continued):</i>	
<i>Part V. Technical programmes: section 13. Economic development, social development and public administration; section 14. Human rights advisory services; section 15. Narcotic drugs control</i>	129
<i>Section 16. Special missions</i>	132

Chairman: Mr. Vahap AŞIROĞLU (Turkey).

AGENDA ITEM 80

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies (concluded)*

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.874 AND ADD.1)

The draft report (A/C.5/L.874 and Add.1) was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 74

Budget estimates for the financial year 1967 (continued) (A/6305, A/6307, A/6385, A/6457, A/C.5/1054, A/C.5/1055 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1056 and Corr.1, A/C.5/1060, A/C.5/1062, A/C.5/1065, A/C.5/1066, A/C.5/1074-1076, A/C.5/L.868, A/C.5/L.871)

First reading (continued)** (A/C.5/L.868, A/C.5/L.871)

PART V. TECHNICAL PROGRAMMES (A/6305, A/6307, A/C.5/1060): SECTION 13. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION; SECTION 14. HUMAN RIGHTS ADVISORY SERVICES; SECTION 15. NARCOTIC DRUGS CONTROL

1. The CHAIRMAN said that when the Secretary-General, in the budget estimates for the financial year

*Resumed from the 1135th meeting.

**Resumed from the 1137th meeting.

1967 (A/6305) had submitted his initial request for an appropriation of \$6.4 million under part V as a whole, the apportionment among the various sections had yet had to be dealt with by the Governing Council of UNDP and the Economic and Social Council; the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, in its main report (A/6307, para. 282), had concurred in the Secretary-General's proposal pending such action. On the basis of the decision taken by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1120 (XLI), the Secretary-General had proposed appropriations of \$6,105,000 under section 13, \$220,000 under section 14, and \$75,000 under section 15 (A/C.5/1060, para. 6). The Committee might discuss those sections concurrently.

2. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) stated that the Advisory Committee approved of the Secretary-General's proposals for the apportionment of the total amount recommended among the three sections of part V.

3. Mr. CISS (Senegal) pointed out that while the sums appropriated under part V had increased in the past few years, the increase had lagged far behind the growth of the budget as a whole. Indeed, the amount proposed under part V for 1967 showed no increase at all over the appropriation for 1966, which was very strange in view of the constantly growing needs of the developing countries. His delegation would like to know whether the Governing Council of UNDP had decided that a ceiling should be imposed on expenditure under part V, and what conceivable justification there could be for such a decision.

4. Mr. BAKOTO (Cameroon) supported the statement by the representative of Senegal. Even if the Governing Council of UNDP had taken the view that expenditure under part V should be held down, it was the duty of the United Nations to promote the economic development of the poorer countries; of all its activities, technical assistance most directly benefited the recipient countries. It was better that Member States should be asked to increase their contribution for technical programmes rather than for fruitless exercises such as the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. The Secretary-General had said that the proposals for country programmes under part V followed the priorities established by Governments (A/C.5/1060, para. 3). His delegation hoped that in future the Secretariat would take careful account of the priority aspect of the requests submitted by the developing countries.

5. So far from being restricted, the regular programme of technical assistance should be extended to new areas. For example, provision should be made for

training programmes in space activities, which had implications for meteorology and hence agriculture, a matter of vital concern to the developing countries. His delegation would vote for the appropriation requested under part V, but hoped that the Secretariat would in future pay more heed to the developing countries' wishes.

6. Mr. SANU (Nigeria) noted that the share of technical programmes in the regular budget was steadily decreasing, an unfortunate trend. The Maltese representative had suggested, at the 1138th meeting, that the reductions recommended by the Advisory Committee for the estimates as a whole should be added to the appropriation provided under part V; the delegations of Senegal and Cameroon had now suggested that the ceiling on expenditure under part V should be removed. He understood that, because the Governing Council of UNDP had already dealt with the appropriation for 1967, nothing could be done at the current session; but steps must be taken as soon as possible to correct the situation.

7. His delegation did not agree that technical assistance should be financed exclusively from voluntary contributions. Under Article 55 of the Charter the United Nations was pledged to assume a measure of collective responsibility for technical assistance; thus if some part of the technical assistance programmes was not financed under the regular budget the Organization would be abdicating that responsibility.

8. His delegation had always been sympathetic to the objections raised by some delegations as to the manner in which the regular programmes were administered. The Secretariat should make a greater effort to extend technical assistance on as wide a geographical basis as possible. As the United Nations recognized the needs of the developing countries, there must always be at least a token provision for technical programmes under the regular budget.

9. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would vote against the appropriation requested under part V. The regular budget was not suitable for the financing of technical assistance programmes. The separation of the regular programme from UNDP resulted, *inter alia*, in the waste of resources on small programmes of secondary importance and increases in administrative staff. In practice the regular programme was used as a means of covertly increasing the staff of the United Nations and the regional economic commissions by hiring advisers and consultants who were put to work collecting statistics and conducting unnecessary surveys. All too often, the decisive consideration in the recruitment of experts was not their qualifications but the desire to find jobs for retiring staff members. That led to a situation in which projects were devised to fit the available experts rather than the other way about.

10. The Soviet Union granted considerable assistance to the developing countries, both bilaterally and through international organizations. Under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, for example, the USSR had sent hundreds of experts to the developing countries and received numerous students from those countries. That situation was in

sharp contrast with the neglect of USSR specialists and technical experience under the regular programme: during the thirteen years from 1949 to 1962 only 7 Soviet experts had been sent out and only 15 scholarships in the USSR had been used. As a result, the USSR contribution was used to pay for technical assistance granted by other countries. That was caused by pro-Western bias on the part of the administrators of the regular programme. His Government had repeatedly stated its readiness to make experts available and it did not intend to pay for experts from Western countries whose activities did not meet the needs of the developing countries.

11. The fact that USSR contributions to EPTA had been made primarily in roubles had not prevented their being used. On the contrary, it had forced the pro-Western management of EPTA to draw on his country's potentialities. In 1963 his Government had accordingly decided to pay its contribution to the regular programme in roubles, so that there too the money might be spent on USSR specialists, fellowships and equipment. Despite repeated assurances that the possibility of making fuller use of the USSR contribution was under constant study, however, the pro-Western management of the regular programme continued to stand in the way, and the USSR contributions remained in fact untouched. The result of that discriminatory policy was that the few activities carried on in the Soviet Union under the regular programme were financed by the Secretariat from other sources, in circumvention of established procedure. The victims of that policy were the developing countries themselves. His delegation therefore hoped that the Secretariat would find ways of making effective use of the USSR contributions to the regular programme in accordance with the interests of the developing countries.

12. Mr. MTINGWA (United Republic of Tanzania) agreed with the representatives of Cameroon and Senegal that the appropriation of \$6.4 million requested under part V was grossly inadequate in relation to the developing countries' needs, and that there could be no justification for imposing a ceiling on that part of the budget estimates when expenditure under other parts was increasing from year to year. The developing countries were in their present position by accident, not by choice; they did not enjoy pleading for assistance, and hoped that one day they would no longer need to. Economic development was one of the principal purposes of the United Nations, and the time had come to reconsider the ceiling which had apparently been placed on the regular programmes of technical assistance. It was indeed unfortunate if facilities made available to the United Nations were not being used, and complaints to that effect should be thoroughly investigated.

13. Mr. Mohamed RIAD (United Arab Republic) endorsed the remarks of the African representatives. Economic activity was often more fruitful than political activity. The reservations expressed by certain delegations were not directed against part V as such, but rather concerned the manner in which the technical programmes were administered; he hoped the Secretariat would accommodate the Member States concerned and use the resources made available to the full.

14. Expenditure under part V should not remain at the level of \$6.4 million. However, it was too late to remedy the situation in regard to the 1967 budget and his delegation would accordingly support the appropriation request.

15. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that his country was of course not opposed to technical assistance. But Article 55 of the Charter did not mean that provision for technical assistance must automatically be made under the regular budget. Fulfilment of the Charter obligation to promote development could be organized differently. UNDP, for instance, was a model of multilateral co-operation to that end. Technical assistance should be voluntary; and its inclusion in the regular budget represented a kind of taxation. The USSR representative's remarks about the administration of the regular programme lent force to the argument that technical assistance should not be part of the regular budget.

16. The Hungarian delegation had always taken the view that the administration of the regular technical assistance programme was unnecessarily costly. But the \$6.4 million requested under part V did not represent all the technical assistance provided under the regular budget. A large and increasing portion of the budget was devoted to economic, social and human rights activities, which were, after all, but another form of technical assistance.

17. Since, in his delegation's view, Member States were under no obligation to accept taxation in respect of technical assistance, he renewed his Government's proposal that the technical programmes financed under part V of the regular budget should be united with UNDP. That would be preferable from the legal, political and administrative viewpoints, and the interests of the recipient countries would be better served.

18. Mr. FAKIH (Kenya) endorsed the request for an appropriation of \$6.4 million under part V, which would promote the aims of Article 55 of the Charter. An attempt had been made in the Governing Council of UNDP to increase the allocation for technical programmes, but the opposition had been such that it had been necessary to compromise on the figure of \$6.4 million.

19. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) endorsed the views expressed by other African representatives. The sum of \$6.4 million was small when one considered the needs of the developing countries and the exploitation and pressure to which they had been subjected by certain Powers.

20. Mr. S. K. SINGH (India) said that his delegation would vote for the recommended appropriation.

21. Three basic facts had emerged from the debate: there were differences of opinion about whether part V should be retained in the regular budget; owing to certain historical or fortuitous circumstances, certain countries wanted to make their contributions to part V in their national currencies or in some form other than cash; and certain countries alleged that the contributions were a form of taxation imposed by a poorer majority upon a richer minority. However, his delegation did not take such a pessimistic view.

In a statement made at the 37th meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies on 26 April 1966,^{1/} the Indian representative had said that certain countries, such as India, which were both recipient countries and donor countries, would wish to expand their assistance, if it could be computed in terms of goods and services and not necessarily in terms of cash contributions. According to the report entitled Economic and Social Consequences of Disarmament^{2/} the resources devoted annually to military purposes amounted to \$120 thousand million. An aggregate sum of \$450 million was being mobilized annually for multilateral assistance programmes by the United Nations and all the specialized agencies together. That sum was surely not too much to spend on achieving the aims of the Charter, especially the economic and social objectives, so eloquently enshrined in its Article 55.

22. Mr. ILIC (Yugoslavia) thought that part V should not be included in the regular budget. There was, however, a great need for technical assistance and the appropriations for that item accounted for only a very small percentage of the total budget. Yugoslavia would consider any proposal designed to make the appropriations under part V reflect the general growth in budget expenditures.

23. Mr. TAI (Malaysia) said that there was general agreement that the aim of assistance was to help the poorer countries to help themselves. Those countries wanted to be self-sustaining and they would have more chance of achieving that goal if they settled the differences among themselves. They preferred the experts provided under technical assistance programmes to work in conjunction with their own experts. What the Fifth Committee was discussing was the means to achieve the desired end—the mechanics of providing technical assistance.

24. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the appropriations requested under the three sections of part V as a whole.

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

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

In favour: Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos.

^{1/} The complete text of the statement was circulated as document A/AC.124/R.44 (mimeographed).

^{2/} United Nations publication, Sales No.:62.IX.1, para. 8.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Mongolia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Hungary.

The recommendation of the Advisory Committee (A/6307, para. 282) for an appropriation of \$6.4 million under part V was approved on first reading by 67 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

25. Mr. RIHA (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had voted against the recommended appropriation for the reasons it had stated in the general discussion at the 1129th meeting.

26. Mr. KIRKBRIDE (Secretariat), replying to points raised by the representatives of Senegal and Cameroon concerning the formulation of proposals regarding technical assistance, said that the Secretary-General had originally made specific proposals to the General Assembly on the appropriate levels of expenditure under part V. It had been thought that the regular budget should give some token recognition of the role of the United Nations in the provision of technical assistance, although the major role had been played by EPTA and the Special Fund. Then, in accordance with its resolution 1768 (XVII), the General Assembly had determined the level of the provision under part V for each year on the basis of the recommendations of the Technical Assistance Committee. General Assembly resolution 2029 (XX) had transferred the functions previously exercised by that Committee to the UNDP Governing Council. The present role of the Secretary-General was therefore to prepare detailed proposals for the technical assistance programme for submission to the Governing Council.

SECTION 16. SPECIAL MISSIONS (A/6305, A/6307)

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the budget estimates for 1967 (A/6305), the Secretary-General had proposed an appropriation amounting to \$2,993,000 for section 16. The Advisory Committee, in its main report, (A/6307, paras. 248 to 263), had recommended an appropriation of \$2,943,000.

28. Mr. TURNER (Controller) stated that the estimate for chapter III (United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan) represented a return to the situation which had prevailed before August 1965. There had been a change in presentation: salaries and other costs for mission staff had been included in section 16 instead of sections 3 (Salaries and wages) and 4 (Common staff costs) of the budget.

29. Mr. CISS (Senegal) pointed out that the figure of \$130,000 for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples given in table 18 of the Advisory Committee's main report was a purely nominal figure, since the financial implications of the Special Committee's programme of work had not yet been considered.

30. Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that the inclusion in the regular budget of appropriations for special missions and related activities was contrary to the provisions of the Charter and the financial regulations and

rules of the United Nations. Peace-keeping operations had a special status and were financed by a special system; the expenses concerned were not expenses of the United Nations within the meaning of Article 17 of the Charter; consequently, they could not be included in the regular budget and Member States could not be compelled to pay for them. The Fifth Committee was not empowered to decide on the continuation of peace-keeping activities.

31. Nothing had been done to implement the Advisory Committee's recommendations concerning the review of existing peace-keeping operations. Such a review was particularly necessary in view of the illegal nature of the expenses concerned and the fact that some anachronistic missions were maintained only by virtue of their inertia. The Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had not given due consideration to that problem, which it had left to the Fifth Committee. It was important to eliminate from the regular budget controversial items, which were not only hindering full co-operation but were diverting valuable funds to purposes other than economic and social development.

32. Mr. DINGLI (Malta) agreed with the Advisory Committee on the need for a periodic review of the administrative and organizational requirements of the special missions (some of which had been in existence for over eighteen years), and of the necessity for their continuation. A review would lead to reductions in the cost of running the missions and changes in their activities. Staff requirements for UNCURK and the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Amman seemed excessive and some reductions should be possible. The appropriations for staff travel were also over-generous. In connexion with the appropriations for the travel of military observers, he wondered whether the observers could not be appointed for a period of two years instead of one year.

33. Mr. ILIC (Yugoslavia) stated that his delegation was opposed to the allocation requested in chapter V (UNCURK), for reasons it had stated at previous sessions, and would vote against it if a separate vote was taken.

34. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) said that his delegation considered that some of the special missions and the United Nations Field Service, included under section 17, had been established in violation of the Charter and that the financial affairs of missions regularly established by the Security Council should be dealt with by that body. Hungary would therefore vote against sections 16 and 17 and would not make any contribution for section 16, chapters I (UNTSA) and V, or section 17.

35. It welcomed the Secretary-General's attempt to show the total cost of the various missions by including in section 16 the costs for staff temporarily detailed from the regular establishment. For the sake of completeness, however, all other costs of the special missions should be included in section 16, particularly those now appearing in section 17. The Field Service had not developed as originally intended into a United Nations military force and now included non-military personnel of various kinds, as indicated in paragraph 17.1 of the budget estimates for 1967. It

provided services not only for special missions, but also for the United Nations Office at Geneva and two of the regional economic commissions. It would therefore be only logical to include the cost of Field Service staff in the budget of the relevant mission or office and to abolish section 17 altogether. He hoped that would be done in the budget estimates for 1968.

36. Referring to chapter VI (Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Amman) of section 16, he observed that at the twentieth session (1076th meeting) his delegation had recommended that that Office should be abolished because the situation it had been established to deal with no longer existed. The corresponding military mission in Lebanon had been dissolved when foreign troops had been withdrawn from that country. Nothing had happened in the area which would make it necessary for the Special Representative to report to the General Assembly on developments requiring action by it. The Secretary-General was therefore recommending a reduction in the manning table from 8 posts to 4, but even those were too many. The General Assembly had established the Office and therefore was entitled to abolish it. Since the Assembly dealt with the matter only in the budget, the Fifth Committee was the appropriate organ to recommend such action. The Advisory Committee would no doubt be glad to have the need for the Office reviewed, as its comments in paragraphs 288 and 289 of its main report indicated. He therefore proposed that in the Fifth Committee's report to the General Assembly the Rapporteur should include a sentence to the effect that the Committees recommended the Assembly to make an appropriation of \$2,943,000 under section 16 with the understanding that the activities financed under chapter VI would be terminated by the end of 1967.

37. Mr. MTINGWA (United Republic of Tanzania) urged the Committee to be open-minded about the inclusion of an allocation for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. It was an essential task of the United Nations to secure freedom and independence for all peoples. While at first sight it might seem that petitioners from the countries in question should come to the United Nations, in practice they often could not afford to do so or were prevented by the administering Powers. It was therefore very useful for the Special Committee to be able to visit various countries and gain first-hand information by direct contact with the people.

38. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) pointed out that the First Committee had before it agenda item 93 (Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea). Its consideration of the item might result in a decision to dissolve UNCURK. It would therefore seem appropriate for the Fifth Committee not to vote on the allocation for the Commission under section 16, chapter V, and the related provisions in section 17 until after the first Committee had reached a decision. His dele-

gation would in any case vote against the estimates in question.

39. The CHAIRMAN remarked that there was no reason why the Committee should not take a decision on section 16, chapter V, on first reading of the budget estimates. If the First Committee decided that UNCURK should be dissolved, appropriate action could be taken on second reading.

40. Mr. KOUYATE (Guinea) said that his delegation would vote for sections 16 and 17, having in mind Article 1, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, of the Charter.

41. Mr. CHULUUNBAATAR (Mongolia) stated that his delegation, speaking in the general discussion (1136th meeting), had indicated its opposition to the inclusion of illegal items of expenditure, such as for UNCURK, in the 1967 budget estimates. It would therefore vote against sections 16 and 17 and would not make any contribution in respect of them. It hoped that the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee would pay heed to the objections raised by many delegations against those sections and eliminate them from future budgets.

42. Mr. SOLTYSIAK (Poland) said that for reasons it had stated in the past his delegation did not support the request for allocations for the United Nations Memorial Cemetery in Korea, UNTSO, UNCURK or the United Nations Field Service. It agreed with the comments made by the Advisory Committee in paragraphs 288 and 289 of its main report. Unnecessary activities should be eliminated and the resulting savings used for new programmes. As far as UNTSO was concerned, he noted from paragraph 16.21 of the budget estimates that 61 vehicles were to be sold in 1967 but that the estimated revenue from them given in table 16-2 was only \$24,000. That did not seem a very good price for vehicles only three or four years old and he would like some clarification of the matter. He would also like to know how many vehicles UNMOGIP intended to sell at what price in order to obtain the revenue of \$12,050 indicated in table 16-5 and whether the Indian regulations governing the sale of imported vehicles would apply to them. He would also like to receive similar information for the regional economic commissions and information offices. In that connexion, he drew attention to the Advisory Committee's comments in paragraph 291 of its main report. The inspection unit proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee would no doubt look into the matter.

43. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that the Secretary-General had the points raised by the representative of Malta very much in mind. He was also conscious of the position with regard to the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Amman raised by the representative of Hungary. The situation was a delicate one and it would be necessary to proceed in consultation with the Government of Jordan.

44. He was substantially in agreement with the representative of Hungary on the presentation of the estimates in section 17 and hoped that the latter's comments could be regarded as authorizing the Secretariat to adopt a more rational arrangement in the 1968 estimates.

45. Mr. VAUGHAN (Director of General Services), replying to the representative of Malta, said that the reason why military observers served for a period of only one year was that Governments were usually not willing to release them for a longer period, although some observers signed on for further periods.

46. Replying to the Polish representative, he said the price UNTSO expected to receive for its second-hand vehicles was about \$400 apiece. The reason for that low price was first that as semi-military vehicles they had been put to very hard use and, secondly, that they could not be sold in Jordan, and Israel had a tax of over 100 per cent on the sale of used vehicles, so that the cost to the purchaser was about \$800. The possibility of selling the vehicles at all was thus limited and sometimes they were sold for scrap instead, after the usable parts had been removed. In India, UNMOGIP expected to get about \$700. The sales would be subject to the restrictions normally imposed by the Indian Government.

47. Mr. Mohamed RIAD (United Arab Republic) proposed that the vote on section 16 should be postponed

so that the Committee might have time to consider the Hungarian representative's proposal for the inclusion of a passage in the Committee's report.

48. Mr. SILVEIRA DA MOTA (Brazil) was not convinced that the Fifth Committee could decide on the merits of the Hungarian proposal and said that the point raised by the delegation of Hungary might be met if the Committee endorsed the suggestion contained in paragraph 289 of the Advisory Committee's main report that political organs constantly kept the activities of the missions they had established and the necessity for their continuation under review.

49. Mr. CISS (Senegal) said that he could not see how that proposal would affect the vote on the estimate.

50. After some further discussion, Mr. PALAMAR-CHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

The proposal was adopted by 53 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.