

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 904th
 MEETING**

Friday, 15 December 1961,
 at 11 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 60:</i>	
<i>Report of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds</i>	323
<i>Agenda item 56:</i>	
<i>Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly (continued):</i>	
(d) <i>Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointments made by the Secretary-General</i>	323
<i>Financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/5026 on agenda item 21.</i>	323
<i>Financial implications of draft resolution I submitted by the Fourth Committee in document A/5044 on agenda item 47</i>	324
<i>Agenda items 55 and 26:</i>	
<i>United Nations operations in the Congo: cost estimates and financing (continued)</i>	324
<i>United Nations Emergency Force:</i>	
(a) <i>Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force (continued)</i>	324
<i>Agenda item 53:</i>	
<i>Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1961 (concluded)</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly</i>	328
<i>Agenda item 54:</i>	
<i>Budget estimates for the financial year 1962 (continued)</i>	
<i>United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas</i>	
<i>Draft report of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly</i>	328

Chairman: Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).

AGENDA ITEM 60

Report of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds (A/5031)

1. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland), Chairman of the Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds, introduced the report (A/5031), and paid a tribute to the members of the Committee and the representatives of the voluntary programmes for their work. The report followed the usual pattern in giving an account of the Committee's work and of the results of the pledging conferences, but the draft resolution in paragraph 24 departed from the usual procedure. First, the Committee had felt that enough experience of pledging conferences had now been gained for the General Assembly to meet as an

ad hoc Committee of the Whole every year; that recommendation was to be found in operative paragraph 1. Secondly, the Committee had felt that its other functions might be carried out conveniently and more economically by the Secretariat and the executive heads of the extra-budgetary programmes; its recommendation to that effect was to be found in operative paragraph 3.

2. The Committee had completed its task for 1961 and had not recommended that a new Negotiating Committee should be appointed for 1962, because, although appreciation of the Committee's work had been expressed, it had not been satisfied that the same results could not be achieved in other ways.

3. The CHAIRMAN suggested, in the absence of any proposals, that the Fifth Committee should approve the draft resolution in paragraph 24 of the report (A/5031).

It was so decided.

4. On the proposal of Mr. GABITES (New Zealand), the CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should express its appreciation of the work done by the Negotiating Committee on Extra-Budgetary Funds.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 56

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary bodies of the General Assembly (continued): *

(d) *Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointments made by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/911)*

5. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to paragraph 4 of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.5/911), containing the names of the five persons for whose appointment confirmation was required. The appointments had already been approved by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

6. In the absence of any proposals, he suggested that the Committee should recommend the General Assembly to confirm the appointments made by the Acting Secretary-General set out in paragraph 5 of his report.

It was so decided.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE FIRST COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/5026 ON AGENDA ITEM 21** (A/C.5/909)

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee, under rule 154 of the rules of procedure, to consider the financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee (A/5026, para. 9) calling on the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer

* Resumed from the 901st meeting.

** Report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Space to undertake a number of new tasks in 1962. As stated in paragraph 5 of the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/909), if the draft resolution was adopted by the General Assembly, any additional costs which might arise in respect of the matters referred to in paragraph 4 of the note would be covered under the terms of the resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for 1962. That procedure had the approval of the Advisory Committee.

8. In the absence of any proposals, he suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee might give rise to additional expenditure, to be met under the terms of the resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

It was so decided.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION I SUBMITTED BY THE FOURTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/5044 ON AGENDA ITEM 47*** (A/C.5/910)

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee, under rule 154 of the rules of procedure, to consider the financial implications which might result from the implementation of draft resolution I submitted by the Fourth Committee (A/5044, para. 46). As indicated in paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/910, it would be the intention of the Secretary-General, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, to request a supplementary appropriation of \$46,000 under section 18—Special missions—for expenditures arising under operative paragraph 2 (a) of the draft resolution and to enter into any additional commitments under the terms of the resolution relating to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. The Advisory Committee had concurred in that procedure.

10. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) said it should be understood that if the Committee approved the proposed supplementary appropriation of \$46,000, the funds would be used to cover the expenses of the visit of the proposed Special Committee to the Territory of South West Africa.

11. The CHAIRMAN suggested, in the absence of any proposals, that the Committee should inform the General Assembly that the adoption of draft resolution I would give rise to an expenditure of \$46,000 under operative paragraph 2 (a) and to other expenses which would be met under the terms of the resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEMS 55 AND 26

United Nations operations in the Congo: cost estimates and financing (A/4931, A/4943, A/5019, A/C.5/904, A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1) (continued)

United Nations Emergency Force:

(a) Cost estimates for the maintenance of the Force (A/4784, A/4812, A/C.5/L.708/Rev.1) (continued)

12. Mr. CUTTS (Australia) said that the military operations in the Congo had been imposing a severe

strain on the Organization for the last eighteen months in terms both of manpower and of cost. In resolution 1619 (XV), the General Assembly had decided that the expenses of the operation should be apportioned among Member States in accordance with the scale of assessments for the regular budget, subject to adjustments in the assessments of certain Members. In the view of his delegation, the General Assembly had taken proper action in relation to those costs under Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

13. No funds had yet been provided to cover the expenses incurred after 31 October 1961, although the Acting Secretary-General had been authorized to continue expenditure until 31 December at the current rate of \$10 million a month. By its resolution of 24 November 1961^{1/} the Security Council had reaffirmed the policies and purposes of the United Nations with respect to the Congo and clarified its directives to the Secretary-General. No member of the Security Council had opposed that resolution. There had therefore been a clear-cut decision by the competent organ that the operation should be continued.

14. It was now incumbent on the General Assembly, under Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter, to apportion the anticipated expenses of the operations among Member States on whatever basis it considered reasonable and just. As had already been pointed out, the Charter did not impose any particular formula for the apportionment of expenses; that must now be decided upon.

15. It had been argued by some delegations that, under Article 17, paragraph 2, the General Assembly was empowered to apportion only regular or administrative expenses, and that other methods must be found to cover expenses such as those in the Congo. By draft resolution A/C.5/L.702 and Add.1 and 2 the Committee had decided, under agenda item 62, to ask the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion on that point. The matter might therefore be considered to be sub judice, so that legal arguments would seem to be out of place. However, without prejudging the Court's decision, he wished to state that Australia continued to hold the view that the costs of the operations in the Congo were related to a primary function of the United Nations—the maintenance of peace and security—and that they were extraordinary only because of their magnitude; they were therefore covered by Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter and any decision by the General Assembly regarding the apportionment of those expenses imposed binding obligations on Member States.

16. The Secretary-General had stated (A/C.5/904, para. 8) that he was not in a position to submit the detailed cost estimates for ONUC in 1962 or to predict when the tasks given him by the Security Council and the General Assembly would have been successfully accomplished. In the view of the Secretary-General, there was no sound basis for anticipating that they would fall below \$10 million a month in the near future. He therefore sought authority to continue spending at that rate and asked the General Assembly to make appropriate financial arrangements. In its report the Advisory Committee expressed agreement with the Secretary-General's view of the level of the costs and suggested, on practical grounds, that the authorization should be limited to the period preceding

*** Question of South West Africa:

- (a) Report of the Committee on South West Africa;
- (b) Assistance of the specialized agencies and of the United Nations Children's Fund in the economic, social and educational development of South West Africa; reports of the agencies and of the Fund;
- (c) Election of three members of the Committee on South West Africa.

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1961, document S/5002.

the earliest possible date on which the General Assembly could be expected to resume consideration of the question (A/5019, para. 5).

17. Draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 followed the main lines of the resolutions on the operations in the Congo adopted at the fifteenth session and provided for the appropriation of \$80 million for the period 1 November 1961 to 30 June 1962. That implied that the General Assembly would meet again to consider the question before the latter date, which was in accordance with the Advisory Committee's suggestion and had the support of the Australian delegation. Australia also supported the provision for the apportionment of the \$80 million according to the regular scale of assessments for 1962 and the provisions relating to reductions and voluntary contributions. It had only one minor reservation; it questioned whether it was appropriate to single out a particular Member State and call upon it to make a substantial contribution.

18. However, the draft resolution did not offer a solution to the critical financial problem facing the Organization; it merely provided for the continuation of the present system of financing the Congo operations, which had brought the United Nations to the verge of bankruptcy, mainly because many Member States had failed or refused to pay their assessments. Judging from the tenor of the debate at recent meetings, payments were unlikely to improve significantly over the next few months. The Acting Secretary-General had already warned that the Organization would be faced with a deficit of over \$108 million by the end of 1961. By the middle of 1962, that deficit would have increased to \$170 million, and the United Nations would be forced not only to end the Congo operations precipitately, but to curtail some of the activities under the regular budget. It would be unable to pay for the assistance it was receiving from Member States for the operations in the Congo and even to meet its regular expenses. If the view he had expressed was too pessimistic, the Controller would correct him.

19. His delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 in the expectation that careful consideration would be given by the Acting Secretary-General and by delegations to the longer-range financial problems confronting the Organization, and on the understanding that the Secretary-General would not allow it to go bankrupt without giving the Assembly ample opportunity to take appropriate action. The possibilities of some special financial arrangement, such as a bond issue, might be explored, or the feasibility of terminating or curtailing the operations in the Congo, or a combination of both, might be considered. It was clear that such action must be taken well before the middle of 1962.

20. His delegation agreed that ONUC must be given the resources to discharge its present mission under the Security Council resolution of 24 November 1961, but if the scale of the operations were not reduced in the near future, the continued financial burden might prove to be more than the Organization could bear. Once the parties could be brought together to settle their problems by negotiation, however, it should be possible for the United Nations to discharge its continuing responsibilities with a much smaller force.

21. He recalled that several delegations had indicated that they did not feel obliged to meet their assessed obligations in respect of ONUC, because they disap-

proved of the manner in which the operations had been conducted. Some delegations had advanced legal arguments to support their position, which in certain cases had been marshalled simply to reinforce a position taken on political grounds. The Soviet Union, for instance, argued that the General Assembly was not competent to apportion the cost of peace-keeping operations among Members. If the Soviet Union had confidence in its arguments, it would presumably have welcomed an opinion by the International Court of Justice, but it had objected to the proposal to refer the legal question to the Court and stated that it would not regard itself as bound by its opinion. Another argument put forward by the Soviet Union was that the Security Council alone was competent to decide matters relating to peace-keeping operations, the implication being that if such questions had been referred to the Council, the Soviet Union would have paid its share. But although the Soviet Union had voted in favour of the Security Council resolution of 24 November 1961, it had not asked the Acting Secretary-General to submit to the Security Council his proposals for implementing that resolution, a step which it was at liberty to take at any time. His delegation concluded that the Soviet Union was not really motivated by either of those arguments, but was using them to support a political decision: not to contribute to the cost of peace and security operations unless they were designed to serve what the Soviet Government deemed to be its national interest. He reiterated his delegation's view that it was not open to any Member State, whether a permanent member of the Security Council or not, to decide whether it would or would not contribute to the cost of any particular operation decided upon by a competent United Nations organ. If it were once conceded that such was the case, the United Nations could not hope to make a significant contribution to the cause of world peace.

22. He was speaking as the representative of a country whose national interests were not directly involved in the Congo. Australia had supported United Nations resolutions and actions taken to implement them simply as a responsible Member of the Organization, and by the same token had paid its assessed share of the cost of those operations. On the other hand, it had not initiated any proposals nor sought any special position in the direction of the operations. His delegation urged all Members to do their utmost to back the decision of the Security Council and the General Assembly to undertake those operations. If Members were not prepared to stand behind ONUC, the latter had no place in the Congo. It was therefore to be hoped that the two draft resolutions before the Committee (A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 and A/C.5/L.708/Rev.1) would be adopted without lengthy discussion, and that the General Assembly would take steps to solve the long-term financial problem before the United Nations went bankrupt, and preferably before the end of the present session.

23. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico), speaking for his delegation and those of seventeen other Latin American countries, proposed a series of amendments^{2/} to draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 to bring it into line with the terms of General Assembly resolution 1619 (XV). The first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 would be amended to include a reference to resolution 1619 (XV). The third, fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs

^{2/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.5/L.712.

and the last clause of operative paragraph 4 of the latter resolution would be introduced into the text of draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 and operative paragraph 8 of that proposal would be redrafted to bring it into line with operative paragraph 9 of resolution 1619 (XV).

24. If those amendments were not adopted, all the eighteen sponsors would vote against draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1.

25. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) expressed his delegation's surprise at the attitude displayed by the Latin American sponsors of the amendments. The purpose of the draft resolution was to ensure the necessary financial backing for the United Nations operations in the Congo, and his delegation could not but view with concern any amendments likely to diminish its chances of achieving that end. His Government believed that the cost of peace-keeping operations such as ONUC were "expenses of the Organization" within the meaning of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter and should be apportioned among Member States as such. The two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the subject at the fifteenth session (1583 (XV) and 1619 (XV)) reflected two different legal attitudes; the operative part of draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 as it stood was based on resolution 1583 (XV) rather than on 1619 (XV) and there was no reason to modify the text at the present stage, particularly as the Committee had decided (899th meeting), in draft resolution A/C.5/L.702 and Add.1 and 2, to refer the legal question to the International Court of Justice. The final test of any formulation must be whether or not it guaranteed contributions; the members of the Committee must, therefore, make it clear whether they would continue to pay their share of the costs if the proposed amendments were adopted. There was no advantage to be gained from changing the existing text if it made it difficult for States already contributing to continue their payments.

26. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom) said that the problem with which draft resolution A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 was designed to deal was quite difficult enough from the financial and budgetary standpoint without the issues being clouded by political controversy. Nevertheless, he felt bound to reply to certain allegations which the Soviet representative had made against his country at the 902nd meeting, when he had accused the United Kingdom of obstructing the United Nations operations in the Congo. Such attempts to place the blame for those protracted and costly operations on the United Kingdom and one or two other countries could not justify the Soviet Union's refusal to pay its assessment, now totalling about \$20 million, to the ad hoc account for the Congo. Nor was such massive defaulting to be excused by the argument that the Congo operations had been undertaken illegally, in contravention of the Charter, or on the ground that the Security Council had exclusive competence in matters of peace and security. It was to be wondered why, if the Soviet Union believed in that argument, it had never proposed in the Security Council that the conduct and financing of the Congo operations should be handled exclusively by the Council itself.

27. His Government had repeatedly made its position perfectly clear—consistent support for the United Nations policy in the Congo as laid down in the various resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. As the Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the United Kingdom had stated publicly in

New York on 22 September 1961, the United Kingdom Government had throughout supported the United Nations effort to establish a united Congolese State; but if that unity was to be lasting, it must be brought about by peaceful constitutional means and not by intimidation or violence. His Government had never supported the secession of Katanga, and wished to see the Congo operating as an effective and fully sovereign State embracing Katanga as well as all the other provinces. He reminded the Committee of the extent of the financial aid the United Kingdom Government had contributed to the United Nations operations in the Congo, and that at a time when it had been providing large-scale aid to less developed countries and doing its best to help territories for which it was responsible to emerge into a stable and prosperous independence. That was a record of which the United Kingdom refused to be ashamed.

28. Turning to the most recent events in the Congo, he reminded the Committee of past Security Council resolutions on that subject, which the Acting Secretary-General had said were reaffirmed by the Council's resolution of 24 November 1961,^{3/} and, in particular, of operative paragraph 4 of the Council's resolution of 9 August 1960^{4/} and operative paragraph 1 of the Council's resolution of 21 February 1961.^{5/} In the debate on the latter resolution, the United Kingdom representative had made clear its view that only in the last resort could the use of force by the United Nations be justified. It was against that background that his Government had felt real anxiety lest the United Nations might be drawn into beginning to use force to impose a political solution on the Congolese people, especially in the province of Katanga. Furthermore, there was a danger that the United Nations might become involved in extensive military operations for which it was not effectively equipped and to which there might be no satisfactory end. His Government had, above all, been concerned to encourage a peaceful reconciliation between the Central Congolese Government and the provincial government of Katanga, and to ensure that the United Nations did not go beyond its mandate as defined in the relevant Security Council resolutions; he categorically rejected the charge that the United Kingdom Government had been guilty of obstruction in so doing. His delegation, of course, recognized the right of the United Nations forces to act in self-defence; he must make it clear, however, that the continued full support by the United Kingdom of the Congo operations must depend upon the skill and wisdom and the conciliatory manner in which the United Nations carried out its mandate.

29. With regard to the draft resolution (A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1), his delegation believed that since under the Charter, the maintenance of international peace and security was a primary and integral function of the United Nations, the costs of all duly approved operations were expenses of the Organization within the meaning of Article 17, paragraph 2. The financing of peace-keeping operations was thus a collective responsibility and obligation of all Members. His delegation considered that contributions to such operations should be determined in accordance with the regular

^{3/} Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1961, document S/5002.

^{4/} Ibid., Fifteenth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1960, document S/4426.

^{5/} Ibid., Sixteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1961, document S/4741.

scale of assessments, which already reflected the relevant capacities of Member States to pay and made generous allowances for countries whose capacity to pay was low. He rejected the contention that some Member States bore a special financial responsibility for peace-keeping operations and, in particular, that there was any legal or moral case for calling upon the permanent members of the Security Council to pay more than their regular share of such expenses. He therefore opposed the introduction of any special scale of assessments and the granting of reductions to any Member State as a matter of right. He recognized, however, the need to mitigate the burden of large peace-keeping expenses on countries with low per caput incomes and urgent problems of economic development and therefore had no objection to the assessments of those countries being reduced by some equitable proportion to the extent that voluntary contributions were available to bridge the resulting financial gap.

30. His delegation was, accordingly, sympathetic to operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 8 of the draft resolution, although it would have welcomed the inclusion of a provision allowing Member States which qualified for reductions in their assessments to forgo them. With regard to operative paragraphs 2 and 3, his delegation was unclear about the nature and scope of the United Nations operations in the Congo during 1962, and while it understood the difficulties confronting the Acting Secretary-General and was prepared to agree that nothing more could be done at the present stage than to appropriate a total amount of \$80 million for the period from 1 November 1961 to 30 June 1962, he recalled that the Acting Secretary-General had stated on 24 November 1961 at the 982nd meeting of the Security Council that there would be a real possibility of making a gradual reduction in the size of the United Nations Force in the Congo beginning early in 1962. In the circumstances, his delegation was doubtful of the wisdom or propriety of authorizing expenditure throughout the whole of 1962 at so high an average monthly rate. He would be glad to know if the Acting Secretary-General now thought that the cost of ONUC was likely to average substantially less than \$10 million a month during the last six months of 1962 and, subject to the reply given on that point, his delegation would vote against operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, involving the principle of special financial responsibility with which his delegation did not agree, would abstain on operative paragraph 6, and would vote in favour of the other paragraphs and of the draft resolution as a whole.

31. His delegation was encouraged by the initiative which, according to press reports, the President of the United States of America had recently taken to bring about a meeting between Mr. Adoula and Mr. Tshombé. If such a meeting could lead to a fair, just and lasting understanding on the points at issue between the Central Government and Katanga, it would be something which, he hoped, all Member States could welcome.

32. Mr. TURNER (Controller) said that he had taken note of the question asked by the United Kingdom representative and would reply to it at the following meeting.

33. Mr. GIRITLI (Turkey) shared the late Secretary-General's view that the Members of the Organization must face the economic consequences of their own decisions and actions and feared that the extension of

the principle of unanimity among the five great Powers to matters of finance would irrevocably lead to the bankruptcy and paralysis of the Organization.

34. Despite its economic difficulties, Turkey had already paid its 1961 assessments for UNEF and ONUC in full. It was in principle prepared to support draft resolutions A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 and A/C.5/L.708/Rev.1, which, it felt, were constructive and realistic. It would reserve its position on the eighteen-Power amendments until they were available in written form.

35. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), replying to the United Kingdom representative, said that, despite that representative's assertions, it remained an undeniable fact that the United Kingdom Government had assisted Mr. Tshombé in his fight against the United Nations. In that regard, he recalled that Mr. Cruise O'Brien, United Nations Civilian Operations Officer in Elisabethville, and a national of a neutral State, had said at a press conference that, while the United Kingdom and France had voted in favour of the Security Council resolution of 21 February 1961, they had opposed its implementation, especially after 28 August, had subjected him to growing criticism and had brought pressure to bear for his removal. Mr. Cruise O'Brien's charges might have been regarded as motivated by personal rancour had they not been confirmed by General McKeown, Commander of the United Nations Force in the Congo. Those statements showed that the United Kingdom was pursuing a policy of protecting its colonial interests in the Congo.

36. Moreover, as he had already said, some of the permanent members of the Security Council, in flagrant violation of the decisions of the Council, were permitting Mr. Tshombé to travel and to manoeuvre against the United Nations at a time when the Organization was fighting him in Katanga. No matter how persuasively it was argued that the United Kingdom was co-operating to the utmost with the United Nations, the facts showed that that was not the case. For example, according to press reports, weapons were being sent from Northern Rhodesia into Katanga. If the United Kingdom was protecting its financial interests in Katanga, he failed to see why the Soviet Union should pay for operations designed to guarantee huge profits for United Kingdom enterprises. In that connexion, it would be interesting to know where Mr. Tshombé had obtained the sum of \$52 million which he was using to finance his activities against the United Nations.

37. The Soviet Union was now being asked to pay \$26 million towards the cost of such colonialist manoeuvres in the Congo. It was not, however, the Soviet Union which had brought the financial deficit upon the Organization, but those who were using the United Nations to pursue colonialist policies in the Congo. The United Kingdom representative had even suggested that the Members of the United Nations should welcome an agreement to be reached behind the Organization's back. The Soviet Union had, however, from the very beginning openly stated that it would refuse to pay any share of the expenses of operations which violated the Charter principle of unanimity among the five permanent members of the Security Council and had led to the assassination of Mr. Patrice Lumumba, Prime Minister of the Congo. Unlike the United Kingdom which had voted for the resolutions on the financing of the Congo, paid its

assessment and then opposed the purposes of the operations, the Soviet Union took the view that the operations were politically unsound and would never agree to contribute to their cost.

38. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, observed that the Soviet Union representative had replied in typical fashion by making all sorts of unfounded allegations and calling them facts.

39. The United Kingdom Government's criticism of Mr. Cruise O'Brien had related to a time when the United Kingdom had made clear its grave misgivings about the scope of the United Nations operations and about certain statements which the Press had attributed to Mr. Cruise O'Brien, but which he had later denied. The United Kingdom had supported the Security Council resolution of 21 February 1961 with serious reservations regarding the provision concerning the use of force. It had therefore been entirely consistent in welcoming an initiative aimed at securing a cease-fire in Katanga and would have thought that anyone with the real interests of the United Nations at heart would have felt the same.

40. With regard to his country's financial interests in Katanga, to which the Soviet Union representative had referred, the United Kingdom also had interests in other parts of the Congo. It was absurd to allege that the United Kingdom was moved by such interests to instigate Mr. Tshombé to fight the United Nations if only because it was obvious that business activities required conditions of peace.

41. The Soviet Union representative was resorting to tactics of smear and slander to divert attention from the entirely negative nature of his country's actions and its unwillingness to pay its fair share of the cost of the Congo operations.

42. Mr. TAZI (Morocco) noted that the Acting Secretary-General's responsibility for executing United Nations resolutions in regard to peace-keeping operations was being thwarted by budgetary difficulties and that the situation in the Congo revealed a dangerous disproportion between the size of the regular budget and the size of the budget of peace-keeping operations. His delegation attached great importance to the role of the United Nations in keeping the peace and felt that that role should be strengthened in situations where there was a threat to peace. With regard to the situation in the Congo, his delegation was gratified that the Acting-Secretary-General was taking vigorous action and that he had received moral and diplomatic support from certain sources. His delegation would support draft resolutions A/C.5/L.706 and Add.1 and A/C.5/L.708/Rev.1, which would give the Acting Secretary-General moral support and would provide him with the financial resources it needed.

AGENDA ITEM 53

Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1961 (concluded)[†]

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.711)

43. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela), Rapporteur, introduced the draft report of the Fifth Committee on the supplementary estimates for the financial year 1961 (A/C.5/L.711).

44. Mr. SOKIRKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that paragraph 6 of the draft report would more correctly reflect the factual situation if the words "and gave rise to strong objections" were inserted after the words "wholly unnecessary" in the fourth sentence.

45. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela), Rapporteur, agreed to amend paragraph 6 as suggested by the USSR representative.

The draft report (A/C.5/L.711), as amended, was approved.

AGENDA ITEM 54

Budget estimates for the financial year 1962 (A/4770, A/4813, A/4814, A/4910, A/4918, A/4919, A/4949, A/4965, A/4981, A/4995, A/5014, A/5025, A/C.5/869, A/C.5/870, A/C.5/874, A/C.5/876, A/C.5/877, A/C.5/878, A/C.5/881, A/C.5/882, A/C.5/887, A/C.5/889, A/C.5/894, A/C.5/898, A/C.5/903, A/C.5/906, A/C.5/907, A/C.5/908, A/C.5/L.674 and Add.1, A/C.5/L.679, A/C.5/L.693, A/C.5/L.694, A/C.5/L.704, A/C.5/L.710)
(continued)^{††}

United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas

DRAFT REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/C.5/L.710)

46. Mr. ARRAIZ (Venezuela), Rapporteur, introduced the draft report of the Fifth Committee on the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas (A/C.5/L.710) which it was proposed should be included as chapter III in the main report of the Fifth Committee on the 1962 budget estimates.

The draft report (A/C.5/L.710) was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

[†] Resumed from the 900th meeting.

^{††} Resumed from the 902nd meeting.