

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIFTH COMMITTEE, 912th  
MEETING

Thursday, 22 February 1962,  
at 3.40 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Financial implications of draft resolution I submitted by the Fourth Committee in document A/4929/Add.1 on agenda item 49 . . . . .</i>	369

**Chairman:** Mr. Hermod LANNUNG (Denmark).

*In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Arráiz (Venezuela), Rapporteur, took the Chair.*

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTION I SUBMITTED BY THE FOURTH COMMITTEE IN DOCUMENT A/4929/ADD.1 ON AGENDA ITEM 49\* (A/C.5/916, A/C.5/917/REV.1)**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 154 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee was required to inform the General Assembly of the effect upon the budget estimates of the draft resolution on the question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi, which the Fourth Committee had recommended for adoption by the General Assembly (A/4929/Add.1, para. 41, draft resolution I). The Secretary-General had submitted a note (A/C.5/917/Rev.1) on the financial implications of the draft resolution. The comments which he (the Chairman) had made at the 911th meeting on the original version of that note (A/C.5/917) applied also to the revised text.

2. Mr. McCRAW (Secretariat), introducing document A/C.5/917/Rev.1, said that the estimates were of necessity based on rather broad assumptions regarding the nature and scope of the activities of the proposed Commission for Ruanda-Urundi during the period up to the beginning of June 1962 when the Commission was to make a progress report to the General Assembly. Those assumptions were set forth in the Secretary-General's note.

3. The Committee would note that the estimates were limited to the activities enumerated in paragraph 5 of the note, under which provision would be made, in the first place, for the cost of travel and subsistence for the five members of the proposed Commission on the assumption that they would be in the field for a period of some three months. It had been assumed that the supporting staff would be in the field somewhat longer as they would have to arrive in Ruanda-Urundi before the Commission and because the majority would presumably have to stay in the field pending further decisions to be taken by the General Assembly at its resumed sixteenth session in June 1962. The twenty-two United Nations staff members would not only meet the immediate servicing

requirements of the Commission but would also assist the latter in planning the implementation of the measures referred to in operative paragraph 3 (a), (b) and (c) of the draft resolution. They would also advise and assist the Commission at the high-level conference called for under operative paragraph 4. A duration of three weeks had been assumed for that conference, the servicing of which would require some strengthening of the very limited language staff of the Economic Commission for Africa. It had been considered that the group of advisers mentioned in paragraph 5 (d) of the note would, with the co-operation of the United Nations supporting staff, assist the Commission, in particular, with the tasks indicated in operative paragraph 3 (d) and (e) of the draft resolution.

4. The estimate for the resumption of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly in June was not included in the total estimate of \$342,000 as it would come under budget sections other than section 18—Special missions. It was based on the assumption that a maximum of two meetings a day would have to be serviced. The weekly cost would be of the order of \$40,000 if more than one committee was to be convened or if meetings of two bodies were to be held simultaneously.

5. He wished to point out that the figure of \$150,000, mentioned in paragraph 8 of the note related to commitments only and not to actual expenditure. It would be appreciated that once the Commissioners and supporting staff had been dispatched to the field, the Secretary-General automatically incurred a commitment to return them to Headquarters. Thus, while the commitments were seen at a level of \$150,000, actual expenditures, pending submission of detailed estimates to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, during the latter's 1962 spring session, would be somewhat below that figure.

6. Mr. ULANCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was well known that his delegation favoured the granting of independence, at the earliest opportunity, to countries at present under colonial rule. However, the independence they achieved should be a genuine and not a fictitious one such as would result, in the case of Ruanda-Urundi, if military personnel of the former Administering Authority were to remain after independence had been proclaimed. Under pressure from the colonial Powers, amendments had been made to the draft resolution considered by the Fourth Committee, with the result that the text finally adopted by that body provided no guarantee of the withdrawal of Belgian troops from Ruanda-Urundi before independence or of the unification of the country. His delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution in plenary Assembly as in its amended form, it would not preclude a repetition of the events which had taken place in the Congo owing to the actions of the colonial Powers. It

\* Question of the future of Ruanda-Urundi: report of the United Nations Commission for Ruanda-Urundi.

would have to abstain in any vote on the financial implications (A/C.5/917/Rev.1). Moreover, the USSR would not consider itself bound by any of the financial implications of the draft resolution and his delegation reserved the right to refer again to the matter at a later stage. In its view, any further United Nations activities—particularly those of a military nature—which might be considered necessary in Ruanda-Urundi and which involved supplementary budgetary appropriations, would require the approval of the Security Council.

7. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that the statement by the USSR representative reflected the now traditional practice of the Soviet delegation of making statements in favour of the freedom and independence of peoples formerly under Trusteeship, statements which were followed by that delegation's denial of the financial support which would help those peoples secure their independence.

8. The United States delegation supported the Secretary-General's proposals and requests (A/C.5/917/Rev.1). It recognized the many delicate problems involved in the transition from trusteeship to independence and appreciated the sense of balance which had been shown by the members of the Fourth Committee. It realized that the estimated cost involved in implementing the draft resolution was considerable, bearing particularly in mind the present financial position of the United Nations, but it fully appreciated the need for the proposed Commission. It was sure the Secretary-General would strive to achieve every possible economy.

9. In view of the co-operative attitude which the Administering Authority had shown and its expressed desire to expedite Ruanda-Urundi's independence, his delegation believed that the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General represented the full extent of the extraordinary expenses which would arise. The amendments to the draft resolution which had been approved by the Fourth Committee were to be welcomed as indicating recognition of the fact that the authorities of newly independent States could either rely on their own resources or have recourse to other methods to ensure initial maintenance of law and order in their territory.

10. Mr. ULANCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the necessity for his delegation constantly to reiterate the same opinion arose from the constant repetition of the events which they were compelled to criticize. To enlist his delegation's support, independence had to be genuine and not fictitious. The draft resolution adopted by the Fourth Committee would lead to an independence of the latter type since it provided for the retention of Belgian troops in Ruanda-Urundi. Independence could not be said to have been granted under such circumstances. For that reason his delegation could not support the draft resolution or the financing of its implementation.

11. Mr. DANGEARD (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee and would therefore support the financial proposals contained in the Secretary-General's note. However, like other delegations, it was somewhat concerned at the magnitude of the estimates and hoped that the Secretary-General would keep expenditure to a minimum and avoid the involvement of the United Nations in activities whose cost would be prohibitive. He hoped that, when the proposed Commission arrived

in Ruanda-Urundi and the exact number of officials and experts needed to assist it became known, the estimated cost might be somewhat reduced. It was also his hope that the Administering Authority might be able to render further assistance and thus reduce the cost to the United Nations. His delegation was concerned, not so much with the present estimates, as with the possibility that an extension of United Nations involvement in Ruanda-Urundi would entail further substantial costs. It was necessary to bear in mind that the Organization also had responsibilities towards other newly-emerging States. While the object of the proposed expenditure was a worthy one, his delegation hoped that continuing costs of such magnitude would not be incurred.

12. Mr. TURINE (Belgium) pointed out that his Government had given a large measure of autonomy to the local authorities in Ruanda-Urundi. The Administering Authority no longer controlled transport and communication facilities in the country and its ability to render further assistance to the Commission was therefore considerably reduced. It would nevertheless do all it could to facilitate the implementation of the draft resolution.

13. Mr. TSURKAN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled that in the Fourth Committee his delegation had strongly advocated that Ruanda-Urundi should be granted independence as soon as possible and that its independence should be genuine and not subject to the manoeuvres or reservations of the colonial Powers. It had supported the sending of a commission to the Territory to ensure the withdrawal of Belgian troops, the granting of full powers to the indigenous Governments, and the democratization of the country and to help to find the best possible solution to the problems of the Territory.

14. His delegation would, however, be forced to abstain in the vote on the financial implications of the draft resolution because the final version of the draft had been radically amended and, instead of providing for the withdrawal of the Belgian troops, whose presence, in the opinion of many delegations, was incompatible with the Territory's independence, it stipulated that Belgian personnel—most of whom would undoubtedly be military personnel—would remain in the Territory in accordance with the terms of an agreement to be reached prior to independence between the Belgian Government and the Governments operating under its authority. His delegation was fundamentally opposed to Belgian troops remaining in the Territory after its independence and had therefore been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution or accept its financial implications.

15. Mr. BARTON (Canada) said that his country, which had supported the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee because it was the best obtainable formula whereby Ruanda-Urundi could develop into a viable State after its independence, would not evade its share of the responsibility for the implementation of the draft resolution, particularly so far as the maintenance of law and order was concerned. It was, however, concerned about the high cost of the measures proposed and hoped that the Secretariat would keep expenses down as much as possible.

16. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) recalled that he had voted for the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee and would accept its financial implications as estimated in document A/C.5/917/Rev.1. He agreed with the French representative that the Secretariat should

observe the strictest economy in implementing the draft resolution and felt, that in view of the economic problems of the United Nations, there was little likelihood that the Secretariat would be extravagant.

17. He found it difficult to understand the Soviet Union representative's position because, while that representative, like all other representatives, wanted Ruanda-Urundi to be genuinely independent, he refused to grant the necessary facilities. The United Nations was sending a commission to Ruanda-Urundi whose objectives would be to reconcile the various political factions in the Territory, to bring about the return and resettlement of the refugees, to guarantee human rights and fundamental freedoms, to maintain law and order and to make arrangements for the training of indigenous forces and the rapid withdrawal of Belgian military and para-military forces. He wondered what, in that programme, the Soviet Union representative found objectionable. While the Soviet Union representative maintained that all Belgian troops must be withdrawn before independence, he himself felt that the United Nations could hardly grant independence to the country and at the same time dictate to it what it must do. The Governments of Rwanda and Burundi quite understandably wished to retain irreplaceable personnel and, if the United Nations insisted on the withdrawal of Belgian troops, chaos would ensue because there was no one to replace them. Since conditions in the Territory were unsettled, there would be no force to maintain law and order after the Belgian withdrawal, and it would then fall upon the United Nations to send troops. He wondered whether the United Nations was prepared to do so in the light of its experience in the Congo.

18. Mr. McCaw (Secretariat) assured the French, United States, and Canadian representatives that the Secretary-General was acutely aware of the financial difficulties facing the United Nations and would make every effort to keep commitments and expenditure to a minimum. He knew that the Secretary-General and the Fifth Committee would welcome the advice of the Advisory Committee, which would carefully review the estimates of financial requirements at the end of March.

19. Mr. HODGES (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee and would support the necessary financial action in the Fifth Committee. His delegation welcomed the assurances given by the representative of the Secretary-General, and was confident that the members of the commission would avail themselves of the Secretary-General's advice and experience in keeping the number of advisers which they might request under the terms of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution within minimum limits.

20. While his delegation would have preferred to have a report from the Advisory Committee on the financial implications of the draft resolution, in accordance with normal procedure, it realized that the Advisory Committee had been unable to meet at such short notice and it would therefore support the procedure outlined in paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's note noting that the Advisory Committee would consider the detailed estimates in March. In the circumstances, therefore, his delegation would accept the financial effect of the draft resolution, as estimated in the Secretary-General's note, subject to the concurrence of the Advisory Committee, and would support the proposal that the Secretary-General should be author-

ized to enter into commitments immediately not to exceed \$150,000. He emphasized that that was a maximum figure and hoped that commitments and expenditures might be substantially less.

21. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) said that, as most speakers had stressed the need for the utmost economy in implementing the draft resolution and had hoped that the real costs would be less than the estimates, it was regrettable that, owing to changed circumstances, the Belgian Government would not be able to provide even minimum assistance, a fact which would tend to increase costs rather than to reduce them. He hoped, however, that Belgium, realizing its ultimate responsibility for the Trust Territory and heeding the appeals made in the draft resolution, would do its best to make the commission's task as easy and as economical as possible.

22. In the Fourth Committee his delegation had had reservations with regard to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, which had both financial and political implications. At its resumed session in June the General Assembly could only confirm the date of 1 July 1962 as the date for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement or postpone independence to some time in the future. His delegation, believing that the United Nations had a serious moral commitment to grant Ruanda-Urundi independence on 1 July 1962, thought that if a specific date had to be mentioned in the draft resolution then the issue could have been decided at the present session and the expense of a resumed session saved, especially since any postponement would have serious political repercussions in the Territory, as the Belgian representative had pointed out in the Fourth Committee, and since everyone in the Fourth Committee had been in agreement that independence should come as soon as possible. The sponsors of the draft resolution had, however, wished to ensure that all efforts were made to achieve the desirable conditions indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution prior to independence. Such conditions could be achieved only by the Governments of Rwanda and Burundi and the Administering Authority, which had the real responsibility for hastening independence, and the rule of the commission was to act merely as a catalyst. In his delegation's view operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution should have been worded so as to bring out that essential responsibility of the parties directly concerned.

23. Moreover, all delegations, including the Belgian delegation, had agreed in the Fourth Committee that the Belgian troops should leave the Territory before its independence, but, since Belgium had indicated that it would not be possible to evacuate all troops by that date, his delegation felt that the best solution would have been not to insist on the date of 1 July 1962 in operative paragraph 7 and therefore not to make obligatory the holding of the June session in such uncertain conditions. Nevertheless, realizing that the present text of the draft resolution was the best compromise possible, his delegation had voted for it in the Fourth Committee and would accordingly support its financial implications.

24. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan) said that, although his delegation had voted for the draft resolution in the Fourth Committee, he had as yet received no instructions from his Government with regard to the financial implications of the draft and since the sum involved was substantial, would therefore have to abstain in the vote at the present stage.

25. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) said that, while his delegation had no objection to the total expenditure estimated in the Secretary-General's note or to the procedure whereby the Secretary-General would be authorized to enter into commitments not to exceed \$150,000 pending the submission of detailed estimates to the Advisory Committee, it was concerned lest the potential future financial implications to which the Chairman of the Fourth Committee had referred in her letter to the President of the General Assembly (A/C.5/916, annex) might considerably exceed the present indications given by the Secretary-General. In his delegation's view, the financial and other responsibility for the achievement of the objectives mentioned in paragraph 3 and 4 of the draft resolution—including the maintenance of law and order and the guarantee of human rights and fundamental freedoms—rested at the present time with the Administering Authority and would after independence rest with the independent Government or Governments. His delegation would be greatly concerned if those tasks became the financial responsibility of the United Nations and therefore urged the commission to make the greatest possible use of the advisers, technicians and other personnel now available in the Territory, which would help to limit expenditure.

26. The CHAIRMAN, noting that no proposals had been made, suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly first, that the adoption of the draft resolution submitted by the Fourth Committee would give rise to additional expenditure, prior to the contemplated resumed session in June, estimated at \$342,000; secondly, that, in the event that a

larger number of military and civilian experts than had been anticipated in the latter estimate proved necessary, additional provision would need to be made on the basis of an average salary and subsistence cost per expert per month of \$1,500, to which must be added \$2,000 per expert for travel and related expenses; and, thirdly that, in addition, the costs of the resumed session in June were estimated at a minimum of \$25,000 per week. The Fifth Committee should also recommend to the General Assembly that, as a matter of budgetary procedure, the proposals contained in paragraph 8 of the Secretary-General's note (A/C.5/917/Rev.1) be approved, including the authorization to the Secretary-General to incur commitments for the purposes indicated not to exceed \$150,000, pending the Advisory Committee's examination of and concurrence with the total expenditure envisaged.

*The proposal was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.*

27. The CHAIRMAN noted that the observations made by the members of the Committee would be recorded in the summary records of the meeting. He proposed that the Fifth Committee's report on the question should be submitted directly to the plenary Assembly, on the understanding that the report would be a procedural one transmitting to the Assembly the decision just adopted.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.