

UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/AC.24/SR.76  
5 October 1951

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Dual distribution

Thirteenth Session

CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Tuesday, 7 August 1951, at 3 p.m.

CONTENTS:

pages

1. Inter-governmental organizations  
(item 49 of the Council agenda): 4
  - (a) Relations of inter-governmental  
organizations with the United Nations  
and the specialized agencies (resumed  
from the 73rd meeting)  
  
Adoption of the Committee's draft  
Report (E/AC.24/L.24)
2. Co-ordination among the United Nations and  
the specialized agencies (item 39 of the  
Council agenda): 5-26
  - (a) Report of the Administrative Committee  
on Co-ordination; and
  - (b) Report by the Secretary-General on  
particular co-ordination matters (E/1991  
and Add.1, E/1670 and Add.1, E/2049,  
E/2060, E/2053, E/AC.24/L.19)  
(resumed from the 75th meeting).

Present:Chairman:

Mr. KOTSCHNIG

Members:

Belgium	Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE
Canada	Mr. ROGERS
Chile	Mr. DONOSO
China	Mr. CHA
Czechoslovakia	Mr. KAISR
France	Mr. AMANRICH
India	Mr. DESAI
Iran	Mr. MEYKADEH
Mexico	Mr. CALDERÓN PUIG
Pakistan	Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN
Poland	Mr. BLUSZTAJN
Sweden	Mr. CARBONNIER
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. KOBUSCHKO
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. LEDWARD
United States of America	Mr. BLAISDELL Mr. CATES
Uruguay	Mr. QUADROS

Representatives of specialized agencies:

International Labour Organisation	Mr. JENKS Mr. COX
Food and Agriculture Organization	Mr. McDOUGALL
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Mr. LOPEZ-HERRARTE
International Monetary Fund	Mr. WILLIAMS
Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization	Mr. ROYER
International Civil Aviation Organization	Mr. MARLIN

Representatives of specialized agencies (continued):

Universal Postal Union	Mr. RADICE
World Meteorological Organization	Mr. SWOBODA
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Mr. BERKELEY
World Health Organization	Dr. FORREST Mr. LINDSAY Miss HOWELL
International Refugee Organization	Mr. CITROEN Miss BAVERSTOCK

Representatives of non-governmental organizations:

Category B and Register

Catholic International Union for Social Service	Miss de ROMER
Committee for Economic Development (United States of America)	Mr. PENCE
International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues	Miss de ROMER
Pax Romana	Mr. BUENSOD
World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations	Mr. PENCE

Secretariat:

Mr. Martin Hill	Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters
Mr. Sze	Secretary to the Committee

1. INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (item 49 of the Council agenda):
  - (a) RELATIONS OF INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (resumed from the 73rd meeting):

Adoption of the Committee's draft report (E/AC.24/L.24)

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Committee's draft report on relations of inter-governmental organizations with the United Nations and the specialized agencies (E/AC.24/L.24). He reminded the Committee of the interim nature of that report, which would not be submitted to the Council until appropriate insertions had been made with regard to the commodity organizations passed over by the Committee in its consideration of item 49 (a) of the agenda, and to which it would revert at a later date. He hoped that the Committee would approve the report without discussion as a faithful reflection of the agreements it had reached and the resolutions it had adopted.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) proposed that the passage in paragraph 4 referring to the Danube Commission and reading "a further report from the Secretary-General concerning its legal status" should be amended to read "a further report from the Secretary-General concerning its status", since the report called for concerned only the Commission's status, not its legality.

It was agreed that the word "legal" should be deleted.

The draft report was adopted by 12 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. KOBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft report because it contained provisions to which the Soviet Union delegation objected. He had given the views of his delegation at length in the course of earlier discussions, and would not repeat them.

2. CO-ORDINATION AMONG THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES (item 39 of the Council agenda):
  - (a) REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON CO-ORDINATION; and
  - (b) REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON PARTICULAR CO-ORDINATION MATTERS (E/1991 and Add.1, E/1670 and Add.1, E/2049, E/2060, E/2053, E/AC.24/L.19) (resumed from the 75th meeting)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to revert to its general discussion on items 39 (a) and (b) of the Council agenda.

Mr. DESAI (India) recalled the fact that at the previous meeting his delegation had suggested an appropriate line of action, namely, to work down from broad general objectives to specific details. The objectives of co-ordination had already been laid down in Article 55 of the Charter, and paraphrased in Council resolution 362 (XII). But with regard to the realization of those objectives, the Committee should take account of the limitations imposed on them by environmental conditions.

He referred to statements made in the Secretary-General's memorandum of 12 February 1951 (E/1900). First, in the case of the slow rate of progress in the economically least developed countries and the disparity in levels of income (paragraph 8), the Committee should take account of those factors in recommending the broad general directives which the Council might decide to issue to United Nations bodies or to the specialized agencies. Such a recommendation would allow those bodies to review their own programmes and select for priority treatment those projects which would speed up the rate of economic development in the underdeveloped countries and reduce the disparity between levels of income, which at present constituted a danger to peace. The Council could itself follow up that development with more positive action when it came to consider the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries.

It was the task of the Co-ordination Committee to assemble a factual picture of the progress made in that direction, and to that end it should receive once a year, or at each session of the Council, a review to be made either by ACC or by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, based on budgetary

provisions. It was, however, for the Committee and the Council to make recommendations regarding primary tasks and to call for reviews of progress.

Secondly, the Secretary-General's memorandum stressed the need for "a progressive increase in the relative importance in the total programme of technical assistance of the role of international co-operative action through the United Nations and specialized agencies" (paragraph 13). That was another matter on which the Committee and the Council could issue a broad recommendation. The vital question, as the representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) had pointed out in the Social Committee, was one of equipment. Most countries had technicians who could be trained and adapted to regional needs and programmes, but the crux of the whole matter was equipment. The Committee could emphasize the importance of that aspect as one requiring budgetary priority, and again review progress annually, or at each session of the Council, the relevant reports from United Nations bodies and the specialized agencies being scrutinised from that angle and on the basis of their budgets by ACC or the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

Thirdly, in connexion with point 7 of the Secretary-General's programme: more vigorous use of the specialized agencies (paragraphs 17-24), he understood that two main concepts were involved: the role of national administrations, and the conclusions reached by the United Nations bodies and specialized agencies as to which projects were of primary importance and significance, that was to say, which projects would, in accordance with the priorities recommended, yield the maximum amount of benefit in the shortest time at the lowest cost. He suggested that a recommendation from the Committee to the Council on the first of those concepts should follow the lines of the recommendations of the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as set out in paragraph 31 of document E/1991. The President had stressed the need for "sound programmes of investment properly bedded in the right kinds of economic and fiscal policy", and had expressed the view that in respect of both technical and financial assistance international agencies seemed "to offer potentially the most efficient avenue of approach". Emphasis should be placed on the need for national action, and recommendations made to Member Governments to set up agencies to co-ordinate development plans within

their own administrations. The frequently-expressed need for co-ordination at national level, which had again been stressed in paragraph 8 of ACC's report, could thus be met to a large extent. He referred to the technical assistance representatives, mentioned in paragraph 27 of ACC's report; the methods described there should be regarded as a temporary emergency measure; ultimately, governments should set up their own co-ordinated planning and development agencies. Such technical assistance representatives could not satisfy the long-term needs of national co-ordination in development matters, since of necessity they would lack a regional background. They should be withdrawn as soon as national administrations could arrange for effective co-operation between United Nations bodies and the specialized agencies and themselves.

The second concept involved in point 7 of the Secretary-General's programme was the imperative need for concentrating the limited resources available to the United Nations and the specialized agencies on tasks of primary importance and significance, where international action could achieve really substantial results, stimulate national efforts to promote economic and social betterment, maintain the dynamic quality of international action, develop international solidarity, and consolidate peaceful and friendly international relationships. The Committee could request the Council to make express recommendations on those lines to organs of the United Nations and to the specialized agencies in awarding priorities to the various projects within their budgetary limitations, and could obtain progress reports, again from a small expert body like ACC or the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which would be reviewing the budgets of United Nations organs and the specialized agencies, showing how far the objects of the recommendations had been furthered by the priorities allotted and what progress was being made in specified projects from year to year.

Only on the basis of a review of that nature - related to the broad recommendations and examined with reference to the extent to which the broad recommendations were implemented in the budgetary provisions of the various agencies and the United Nations organs - made by an expert body like the two he had mentioned, could the Co-ordination Committee judge during its brief sessions whether progress was being made, whether the forward movement had been halted, or



whether retrogression had set in. It could then enquire into the reasons for stagnation or for retrogression, and suggest necessary measures by way of co-ordination to remove the obstacles to progress. As the representative of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) had pointed out at the previous meeting, the annex to the report on relations with and co-ordination of specialized agencies (E/1991/Add.1) really contained examples of co-operation, and not of concentration on matters of primary importance. The fact of the matter was that neither the specialized agencies nor ACC could do more than what they had done in achieving such co-operation and removing overlapping or proliferation, but if there was to be further effective co-ordination related to the primary aims described, the Council itself would have to issue broad recommendations regarding priority of objectives which the specialized agencies and the various United Nations organs could follow up within their budgetary limitations in order to produce tangible results.

He put those points before the Committee, and suggested that appropriate formal recommendations could be introduced later, if his suggestions commanded support.

Mr. Atwar HUSSAIN (Pakistan) said that the attitude of his delegation to the general problem of co-ordination was similar to that of the Indian and United Kingdom delegations. He believed that the Economic and Social Council **should** lay down broad directives, and leave the regions and the specialized agencies to work out their own orders of priority, since the specialized agencies had the necessary technical information and a more representative membership.

He considered the report of ACC (E/1991) to be an admirable document, on the whole. He confirmed the statement in paragraph 9 that "the members of the ACC themselves can and do make suggestions for the co-ordination and concentration of the programmes in respect of their particular organizations", and observed that that claim was borne out by the annex to the report. He noted with approval the stress laid in the report (paragraph 35) on the need for co-ordination at regional level, and the fruitful co-ordination that had developed between the regional economic commissions and the specialized agencies as exemplified in the Annex



(E/1991/Add.1, paragraphs 4-6).

His delegation also warmly welcomed the suggestion contained in paragraph 37 of the report for increasing co-ordination with inter-governmental organizations lying outside the framework of the United Nations, and in particular with the universities.

The Pakistani delegation attached particular significance to the observation of ACC regarding the criteria for priorities laid down at the eleventh session of the Council, namely, that: "the application of such criteria is necessarily a continuing process and the value of the results achieved can only be judged after a certain period of time". In that respect, he referred to the resolution of the Fourth World Health Assembly contained in document E/2023. He considered that an attempt to make the criteria more specific would be a retrograde step.

His delegation also approved in principle the draft model rules of procedure for prior consultation (E/1991, Annex II). Rules D and E, which embodied recommendations under Council resolution 324 (XI) B, marked an improvement in procedure, although it might be thought that the six week's time-limit was too long.

With regard to the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects (E/2049), his Government urged that the system of issuing annual supplements should be replaced by the yearly publication of a single up-to-date volume.

Finally, while his delegation was in substantial agreement with the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (E/2053), it felt that the same criticism applied to the recommendation on priorities in Annex A to that report as to the question of priorities discussed earlier. In conclusion, therefore, he warned the Committee against a too ambitious approach, and observed that a rigid formulation of priorities in relation to specific projects and too much over-all planning, might in the long run turn out to be obstacles to real progress.

Mr. AMENRICH (France) wished to make some comments on the general concept of co-ordination. In the first place, co-ordination should not have the effect of freezing United Nations activities. The United Nations could not be expected

to have reached the ceiling of its activity after being in existence for only five years, and for that reason no financial ceilings should be imposed, it being the duty of each government to assimilate its own financial commitments to the various United Nations organs. The result would be a reasonable and flexible, yet stable relationship.

Nor should co-ordination result in subordination. When a complex problem was being dealt with, each organization concerned, instead of endeavouring to single out the aspect most closely related to its own sphere of competence, should, on the contrary, work to develop an organic solidarity, all the participants working towards a common end regardless of hierarchy. Efforts should be made to develop such organic solidarity to the greatest possible extent; indeed, many examples referred to in the documents submitted to the Committee showed that all the agencies wished to co-operate as closely as possible with one another.

In seeking co-ordination, however, there were certain extremes that should be avoided. For example, officials whose task it was to eliminate the overlapping of activities should not be more numerous than the cases of overlapping themselves. The creation of over-elaborate machinery and the tendency to set up committees and working parties for every problem that called for solution were also to be avoided. A certain excess was also apparent in the exchange of documentation and communications between the various organizations. Among the crazes to be avoided was the "craze for paper", since documents which were too bulky entailed unduly protracted study by governments. In that connexion, the French delegation would be interested to know what had happened to the decision, taken by the Committee at an earlier session, that a summary should be provided at the beginning of important and somewhat lengthy documents.

However, the foregoing were criticisms of detail, which should not be allowed to obscure the great advances already achieved in the field of co-ordination, thanks to the spirit prevailing among the various organizations and to the work of the department of the Secretariat responsible for liaison with the specialized agencies.

Arisin<sup>g</sup> out of those observations, the following question occurred to the French delegation: what was to be the task of the Council in the field of co-ordination,

looking beyond purely administrative and financial co-ordination?

The essential task of the Council was to strengthen the spirit of solidarity existing between the various bodies forming part of the United Nations by endeavouring to bring about co-ordination not only in respect of administration and finance, but also in respect of action to be undertaken. Such co-ordination must, however, respect the individuality of each agency and the terms of the agreements linking the various agencies to the United Nations. To achieve that end, the Council must draw up a plan of action constituting the common objective of the whole family of the United Nations, and it could perform valuable work in the field of co-ordination by singling out the main problems requiring consideration.

There were two possible courses of action, and his delegation reserved the right to submit formal proposals later, if it felt it to be necessary. The first method was for the specialized agencies to try in future to single out in their reports some of the big problems they had to deal with that entailed joint action with other agencies. Certain specialized agencies had already taken such action to some extent at their assembly sessions. The World Health Organization (WHO), for example, had laid stress on the problem of training health personnel; and the International Labour Organisation had concentrated on the problem of employment. The other method was for the Council itself to pick out the main problems and bring them to the attention of the specialized agencies, which would report back to it after studying them. That raised the question of priorities to which several representatives had referred. In that respect, the Council's task would be facilitated, if, in future, some specialized meetings were held, attended by high-ranking representatives.

The two methods he had just mentioned were not, by the way, irreconcilable, and, in time, could become complementary. The French delegation considered that the spirit of solidarity of the United Nations could be strengthened by applying them.

He concluded by saying that the documents submitted to the Committee showed a very marked improvement over those of previous years.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation appreciated the vast amount of work done by A/CN.24 during the past year. He particularly wanted to place

on the record the satisfaction of his delegation with the work done in the field of co-ordination by the Secretariat under the Director of Co-ordination and by the Specialized Agencies Section of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General during the preceding year. He noted particularly the inter-agency work on the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped and on migration. He welcomed the emphasis laid by ACC on the necessity for prior consultation, and supported in principle the draft model rules of procedure. He would again stress the need for national co-ordination; the United Kingdom Government always tried to ensure that its representatives all spoke with the same voice. It was also important that representatives should be certain how far they could commit their governments. He hoped that national co-ordination had improved universally.

He supported the Indian delegation's suggestions for closer co-ordination of the aid given by the various agencies in the promotion of national plans for economic and social development. He would revert later to the subject of technical assistance, which was another aspect of the same principle.

With regard to priorities, he had little to add to the remarks made by the representatives of India, Pakistan and France. He agreed with the principle stated by the United States delegation the preceding year, namely, that there were two degrees of priority only, inside or outside the budget. The best way to establish working priorities was, he felt, to fix a financial ceiling, and then decide which projects could most appropriately be carried out and which must be considered as beyond the means of any particular agency.

He agreed with the United States proposal that the Council, taking the over-all view, should draw attention to those tasks that needed to be tackled at any one time. Indeed, it had already done so with regard to full employment, the expanded programme of technical assistance, relief and rehabilitation and similar questions. Nothing had happened in the past that called for action cutting the independent status of the specialized agencies provided the Council knew what those agencies were doing, and so long as they applied the criteria it laid down. The Council was helped by the co-operation of the agencies in compiling documents which were to serve as a basis for discussion, and by the information they supplied in the course of debates.

But the United Kingdom delegation believed that more could be done to eliminate unnecessary work. Better use could be made of manpower, especially in the United Nations Secretariat, and in the specialized agencies and international civil service in general. Referring to the work of the Ad hoc Committee on the Organization and Operation of the Council and its Commissions, he submitted that many of the Council's subsidiary bodies could be scrapped without holding up international co-operation. Much highly intelligent manpower was being squandered in servicing meetings that could more profitably be devoted to worthier international ends. He would revert to that charge later, when the report of the Ad hoc Committee came up for consideration. Another relevant document was the report on the findings of the Committee on Expenditure of the United States Senate, which had been read by the United Kingdom Government with lively interest and some sympathy. The United Kingdom Treasury Committee agreed that there was room for very considerable economy. Although it was possible that increased activity over the past year had masked substantial economies, especially in the economic departments of the Secretariat, it remained true that much more remained to be done before the position could be considered satisfactory. The whole question would be dealt with by the Advisory Committee on Administration and Budgetary Questions and by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, but much could be done by the Council on the periphery of the co-ordination work of the United Nations, particularly in respect of such details as promptness in opening meetings; a committee such as the Co-ordination Committee could waste as much as a thousand man hours a year through tardy opening of meetings.

Turning to the inter-agency aspect of the problem, he commented on the slow progress being made in building up an international civil service. That was a matter which his delegation had very much at heart. The whole position was most unsatisfactory. There were few international civil servants with experience in more than one agency, and transfers from one agency to another rarely occurred. He would like to see a more conscious and more positive effort made to establish the nucleus of an international civil service on a proper professional basis, and cutting across the specializations.

In conclusion, he considered that the general work of co-ordination was



proceeding satisfactorily, and his delegation would strongly support the continuance of the efforts of ACC.

Mr. QUADROS (Uruguay) said that his delegation considered the report of ACC as generally satisfactory, and had no important comment to make on it.

The question of priority mentioned by the United States representative was of great interest to the Uruguayan delegation, which considered it to be the basic duty of all specialized agencies to assist in finding a really peaceful solution to the economic and social problems facing the world. After referring to certain specialized agencies which had made a valuable contribution in that field by calling attention to important problems, he said that the Uruguayan Parliament had authorized the Government to subscribe 100,000 dollars for technical assistance. He thought that the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development might play a useful part, for example, by expediting banking procedures.

The Uruguayan delegation had no definite proposal to make so far as co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies was concerned, and would support what it regarded as the best solution and the one which, while observing the principles of the Charter, would help to strengthen peace.

Mr. ROGERS (Canada) felt that two main problems were involved. First, it was important to see that effective emphasis was placed on matters of major importance. He considered that that was not strictly a matter of co-ordination. It depended on decisions of the Economic and Social Council or the appropriate specialized agency, including decisions to spend money on a given programme and a willingness to cut out projects of lesser importance. Secondly, co-ordination in the narrow sense was necessary to prevent overlapping and duplication.

At the previous meeting, the United States representative had proposed that the Economic and Social Council should review what the United Nations and the specialized agencies were doing in the economic and social fields, in order to make sure that what was being done was worth while. The Canadian delegation was in complete agreement with the aim of that proposal. It had always urged concentration of effort, both in the United Nations and in the specialized agencies.

It considered that the Council should from time to time appraise the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the light of the basic principles of the Charter. It doubted, however, whether the Council could do that in detail without going through the Catalogue of Economic and Social Projects and the annex thereto. There were practical objections to such an examination. In the first place, it would be a Herculean task. The Council might interfere seriously with the work of the agencies by addressing all sorts of enquiries to them. If moreover, the Council were to recommend that certain projects should be discontinued, the specialized agencies might justifiably object on the grounds that the Council lacked their own technical competence.

The Canadian delegation thought that the machinery of co-ordination in the narrow sense had now been developed to a fairly satisfactory standard. It would be well to consider the existing machinery. First, there was the process of screening as applied in ordinary democratic debate. At present, any country might submit a proposal to the United Nations, the specialized agencies or the regional economic commissions, and be assured of a thorough consideration of that proposal, perhaps in several different bodies. Secondly, the specialized agencies and the regional commissions applied the criteria laid down by the Economic and Social Council at its eleventh session. Thirdly, there was the consideration of the reports by the specialized agencies and the regional commissions. Fourthly, there was the examination of the budgets of the specialized agencies by their own executive organs and by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Fifthly, there was co-ordination and, as the representative of ICAO had suggested at the preceding meeting, co-operation between the various agencies themselves. Sixthly, there was the work of the Co-ordination Committee. Seventhly, there was consideration of the Economic and Social Council of the reports of the specialized agencies. Lastly, there was the action taken by governments themselves in scrutinizing the reports issued by the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

So much time and effort could be spent on co-ordination activities that it might well exceed that saved by co-ordination itself. The problem should therefore be handled judiciously.

The Canadian delegation was always prepared to consider proposals for improving



co-ordination, and intended to bring up certain points of detail in due course.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) supported the views expressed by the United States delegation as to the need for getting out of the rut and the advisability of concentrating the Committee's efforts on an examination of the problems that appeared to be most urgent. Among the suggestions put forward in the Committee, he would refer to the United Kingdom representative's proposal concerning the harmonization of the reports of the Council and the specialized agencies.

The Committee could feel gratified by the progress achieved in the field of co-ordination, which was mainly due to the work of ACC. However, disputes might arise in respect of those specialized agencies which were independent in status, although linked with the United Nations by a working agreement. In such an event, it would be of little use to draw up a programme of priorities, which might not be applied by all the specialized agencies because some of them had drawn up their own programme which differed from the Council's. That was a delicate question requiring careful study.

He would ask the Secretariat what body, if any, would be competent to deal with any dispute that arose. Certainly not ACC. If no such body yet existed, perhaps one should be created, and the Secretariat should investigate the difficulties that might be encountered in that field.

His delegation had been keenly interested in the statements by the representatives of FAO and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) at the previous meeting, to the effect that those organizations wished to be advised by the Council as to what questions should receive priority.

The Belgian delegation deplored the delay in bringing the International Trade Organization (ITO) into being, to which the Director of Co-ordination had alluded, since complex problems were arising in that field, particularly as regards supplies of raw materials.

Mr. NEBUSCHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union delegation would support any measures truly intended to eliminate duplication and to promote co-ordination within the framework of the Charter and the working agreements with the specialized agencies, but would oppose any decision contrary to the spirit of the Charter which might be taken. For example, resolution 377(V) adopted at the fifth session of the General Assembly, was in conflict with the Charter; the Security Council was the proper agency for frustrating aggression. That resolution was an attempt to draw the specialized agencies into a field for which they had not been intended. In no circumstances would the Soviet Union delegation support such proposals.

Mr. DONOSO (Chile) considered that, generally speaking, the report of ACC was satisfactory. Real co-ordination had been achieved; some circles even considered that it had, at times, been excessive. ACC should continue to hold its periodical meetings, attended by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the chief executive officers of the specialized agencies, with a view to the further development of the work of co-ordination.

Overlapping should be eliminated, and an effort made to concentrate activities which, at the moment, were too widely dispersed. The problems to be solved were of vital importance and, as the President of the Council had said, the time had come to act, as the world was looking to the United Nations for effective measures.

He agreed with the view expressed by the United States representative that it was necessary to get off the beaten track. Of the two courses suggested by the French delegation, he preferred the second, and was, moreover, of the opinion that the Committee should submit to the Council suggestions concerning problems of first priority.

The Chilean delegation was in agreement with the Indian delegation in considering that the economic development of under-developed countries was, at the moment, the most urgent problem; after that came the question of Indian reform which would appear to be less pressing.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Director of Co-ordination to reply to the query put by the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Martin HILL (Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and for Economic and Social Matters) said that there was no organ for reconciling conflicting views between the Economic and Social Council and the governing organs of the specialized agencies. The creation of such a body would, indeed, hardly be compatible with Article 63 of the Charter, which provided that the Economic and Social Council might discharge its co-ordinating functions through consultation with and recommendations to such agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Members of the United Nations.

Theoretically, the possibility of conflict did exist; but in practice there were two reasons why no conflict between the United Nations and the specialized agencies was likely to arise or, should it arise, to persist. First, there were the procedures followed by the Council and the specialized agencies before reaching decisions: much preliminary consultation among the interested organizations took place in commissions and committees and at Secretariat level, so that when the problem came before the Council or a competent body of an agency, it had already been thoroughly explored. Secondly, the membership of the United Nations and that of the specialized agencies was largely identical.

Baron de KERCHOVE d'EXAERDE (Belgium) was of the opinion that the first course mentioned by the Director of Co-ordination would only prove practicable when the initiative was taken either by the Secretariat of the United Nations or by that of a specialized agency. Where action was initiated by a member of the Council, however, there would be no prior understanding between the United Nations Secretariat and the Secretariats of the specialized agencies, and in that case only the second course would be possible, namely, the transmission of a recommendation to governments with all the moral effect inherent therein.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that in practice no conflicts would arise.

Mr. DESAI (India) wished to make it clear that the comments and suggestions he had made at the beginning of the meeting had been based throughout on the assumption that the Co-ordination Committee had done thorough and satisfactory work, and had gone as far as it could: for further progress, definite recommendations from the Council were required. Representatives of the specialized agencies had stated their willingness to do all in their power to achieve co-ordination, but if they were to satisfy requirements in that respect they would have to be provided with guidance by the Council, as the representative of the International Labour Organisation and others had pointed out.

Mr. CHU (China) stated that, in the view of his delegation, which attached great importance to the idea of co-ordination, such co-ordination should begin at home.

He pointed out that representatives of the same government often expressed divergent views in different organizations; proper co-ordination at national level would make things much easier.

With reference to General Assembly resolution 377 (V), "Uniting for Peace", several specialized agencies had already agreed to co-operate with the Security Council and the General Assembly. All the effort of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to promote social welfare and economic development would prove unavailing unless there were peace and security throughout the world.

His delegation would ponder the United States suggestions, with which it was generally in agreement.

With reference to the question of the economic development of under-developed countries, he pointed out that, as a result of the tension which at present existed in most parts of the world and of the vast defence programmes of the countries which were determined to resist aggression, the developed countries were unable to provide the under-developed ones with sufficient capital equipment. The Chinese delegation had therefore been the more gratified to note the effort made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to enable the under-developed countries to acquire capital equipment from the developed countries.

The International Bank was endeavouring to assist the under-developed countries to inaugurate industrial projects, and had made every effort to raise capital for development projects.

The Chinese delegation also greatly appreciated the co-ordinated effort of the specialized agencies in the under-developed countries, especially that of FAO and WHO which were engaged on a joint project to increase world food production and raise health standards.

He then referred to paragraph 62 of the report of ACC, dealing with regional offices. It was stated in that paragraph that an Information Office would be established at Karachi, in addition to the Information Centre at New Delhi, which had previously covered Pakistan as well as India. He felt that it was essential to have an office at Karachi, since information about the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be disseminated as widely as possible and the under-developed countries were entitled to know what those bodies could do.

Finally, the Chinese delegation was in favour of prior consultation. The draft model rules of procedure submitted to the Council by ACC in Annex II to its report (E/1991) deserved careful study, and he hoped that the present Committee would consider them as soon as possible.

Mr. CATES (United States of America) appreciated the opportunity of having a general discussion, and said that his delegation was prepared to draft for the Committee a working paper setting forth its tentative proposals as modified by the various points of view expressed in the Committee, for consideration at a later date, after the reports of the specialized agencies had been reviewed.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed that offer, which would facilitate the work of the Committee.

Mr. CALDERÓN-PUIG (Mexico) thanked the Director of Co-ordination for the detailed and satisfactory reply he had given to the question put by the Mexican delegation at the last meeting. He expressed the hope that the efforts of co-ordination described by the Director would bear fruit, and that the danger

of overlapping between organs set up to cope with special emergencies and the permanent specialized agencies would be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would close the general debate on item 39. The Committee would now consider the report of ACC on its ninth session (E/1991 and Add.1).

In the course of the preceding discussion, the word "suggestion" or "proposal" had often been used. He assumed that many of those suggestions would be submitted formally as and when they arose in connexion with the documents to be examined. He requested members to hand in such proposals as they might wish to make, in the form of draft resolutions or working papers, to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

In addition to specific proposals, other suggestions had been made which were perhaps beyond the scope of the documentation before the Committee, but still within its purview. He invited members to hand in such proposals, too, at the earliest opportunity. They could be discussed after the reports had been dealt with.

Mr. LEDWARD (United Kingdom), referring to the last proposal made by the Chairman, said that in the past it had been the practice of the Committee to incorporate all proposals and suggestions in a single report, which practice he hoped would not be abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN agreed, but added that a few draft resolutions might be taken separately.

Report by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on its ninth session (E/1991)  
Section I. Introduction (Paragraphs 1-10)

Mr. BLAISDELL (United States of America) recalled the fact that the introduction to the report referred to the importance of co-ordination at national level (paragraph 8). His delegation had noted with satisfaction that that point had at last been specifically referred to in the report, although it had been discussed on several previous occasions.



One way to achieve co-ordination would be to ensure that different representatives of the same government in the several specialized agencies expressed identical views, although it was admittedly difficult to achieve a considered, unified and co-ordinated statement of a national position.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the United States representative wished the Committee, in its report, to re-emphasize the importance of co-ordination at national, that was, governmental level.

Mr. BLAISDELL (United States of America) confirmed that that was so.

The Committee took note of paragraphs 1-10 of the report.

Section II. Emergency action to Assist in the Maintenance of International Peace and Security (Paragraphs 11 - 18)

Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that paragraphs 11 to 18 of the report arose out of resolution 377(V), "Uniting for Peace", adopted by the fifth session of the General Assembly despite the opposition of the Polish delegation, which had been given no opportunity of stating its views on that occasion.

That resolution ran counter to the basic principles of the Charter.

Subsequently, and arising from it, the Council had adopted resolution 303 (XII) at its twelfth session, and the specialized agencies had started to implement its provisions.

That was a preliminary statement; he reserved the right to revert to the matter later, when the United States proposals had been formally submitted to the Committee.

Mr. CHA (China) observed that in paragraphs 14 and 15 two alternative methods were mentioned. Judging from the resolutions adopted by the specialized agencies, he felt that the Committee should report to the Council in favour of the second alternative; that had been the one employed throughout, which suggested that the first method was superfluous.



Mr. BLAISDELL (United States of America) said that that suggestion was reflected in the draft resolution submitted by his delegation (E/C.24/L.25), which referred to paragraph 15.

That draft resolution, which was for transmission to the General Assembly, noted the action taken by various specialized agencies pursuant to Council resolution 363 (XII).

In submitting that resolution, however, he felt compelled to express the disappointment of his delegation and that of the United States Government at the lack of leadership shown by ACC in implementing resolution 363 (XII). It would be remembered that when that problem had been discussed at the twelfth session, the United States delegation had proposed that certain action should be recommended, namely: that the working agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be amended to take cognizance of the new situation brought about by General Assembly resolution 377 (V), "Uniting for Peace". The United States delegation had withdrawn that proposal when it had been pointed out that ACC was the logical body to discuss the question with a view to bringing about co-ordinated action. However, so far as his delegation could ascertain from the report, no attempt had been made at the last session of ACC to engineer such co-ordinated action. If ACC had so acted, the Committee would now have had before it a report on co-ordinated action on the part of the specialized agencies rather than a number of resolutions varying in form and content. The United States Government would have been perfectly willing to accept any considered decision for co-ordinated action by ACC, even if it had not been identical with that proposed by the United States delegation at the twelfth session.

On the substance of the matter, he would only reiterate briefly what members of United States delegations to the various specialized agencies had already said, namely, that the United States Government believed that the pledge to render assistance in the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security, as might be requested by the General Assembly, was too important a matter to be handled by simple resolutions. According to Article 63 of the Charter, the relationships between the United Nations and the specialized agencies were to be defined in agreements. The United States Government continued to believe that

the relations between the General Assembly of the United Nations and the specialized agencies on such an important matter as the preservation of peace should have been defined by way of formal agreement rather than by the adoption of a series of unilateral resolutions.

However, United States delegations had found themselves in a minority in the various specialized agencies. They had accepted then, and were willing to accept now, the will of the majority, and it was for that reason that he was introducing a draft resolution reporting to the General Assembly on the action taken by the agencies.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the texts of the resolutions adopted by the specialized agencies were to be found in document E/2060.

Mr. Martin HILL (Director of Co-ordination for Specialized Agencies and Economic and Social Matters) referred to the United States representative's expression of disappointment that ACC had not proposed co-ordinated action by all the specialized agencies. He reminded the Committee of the discussion which had taken place in the Committee on Negotiation during the twelfth session. Several representatives had felt that the action of the various specialized agencies must vary according to a number of individual considerations. At the end of the discussion, the Secretary-General's representative had given an explanation as to the procedure envisaged under Council resolution 362 (XII).

He then referred to the following statement which appeared in the Summary Record (E/C.1/SR.67, page 14):

"The Secretary-General would take the matter up with the ACC in accordance with the usual procedure....It was not for the Secretary-General to press for the adoption of any particular text or revision, or to include specific agreements. But, in the light of the debates held in the Committee, the Secretary-General and his colleagues in the specialized agencies would exchange views on these provisions which, in the case of each agency seem to them most likely to achieve their common aims. The results of the negotiations would be transmitted to the Council at its thirteenth session in the Administrative Committee's report. The Directors-General of the specialized agencies, after their

exchange of views, would submit proposals to their respective agencies' executive board, conference or assembly and the decisions taken by those organs would in due course be communicated to the Council through the Secretary-General of the United Nations".

The procedure envisaged had not been questioned by any member of that Committee, or by the Council itself, and it had been faithfully followed.

Mr. RADICE (Universal Postal Union) said that the third paragraph of the United States draft resolution did not tell the whole story, although, to date, a number of specialized agencies had declared their readiness to co-operate with the United Nations when called upon to do so by the Security Council or General Assembly; but there were two organizations, of which UPU was one, which had agreements with the United Nations. In the course of correspondence, it had become clear that UPU's agreement was in itself sufficient to cover any action which that organization might be called upon to take. He felt, however, that the wording of the United States resolution cast a certain reflection on his organization, as though it had taken no action despite the appeal, although no action had in fact been necessary. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution might be amended to deal with that point.

Mr. BLAISDELL (United States of America) said that he would endeavour to meet the objection raised by the representative of UPU.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the phrase in the last paragraph, referring to agencies "which do not already have adequate provisions in their agreements with the United Nations" was obviously intended to cover organizations such as UPU.

Mr. BLAISDELL (United States of America) stated that the position of the United States delegation to the twelfth session had been clear enough: co-ordinated action or, if preferred, separate but uniform action by the specialized agencies in relation to the United Nations, which would make clear what the specialized agencies would do in the event of a request for assistance by the General Assembly.

It was possibly true, as the Director of Co-ordination had said, that the discussion did not lead up to the conclusion that there would be identical texts for adoption by the annual conferences of the specialized agencies. However, there

had been no doubt as to the position of the United States delegation, which hoped that ACC, under the leadership of the Secretary-General, would ensure that a close line was followed in that matter by the specialized agencies.

Mr. AMINRICH (France) recalled that, at the time when ACC had suggested the two possible courses of action, first, the amendment of the agreements linking the specialized agencies with the United Nations, or secondly, the adoption of resolutions by the plenary conferences of those agencies, the French delegation had been strongly in favour of the second course. The resolutions adopted by some of those agencies, in that connexion, had appeared to it satisfactory.

Referring to the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation, he said he would reserve the right to speak on it when the French text had been circulated. The United States proposal seemed to be closely related to resolution 363 (XII) adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its twelfth session, which resolution had been supported by the French delegation.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Food and Agriculture Organization) wondered whether there could be any doubt that all the specialized agencies were willing to co-operate for the cause of peace.

Mr. LEDGERD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had maintained a similar view, and had gone on record to the effect that each agency could contribute best to the preservation of peace by doing what it had been set up to do. The United Kingdom delegation therefore felt that no further resolution was necessary. Nor could it see what more ACC could effectively have done; he hoped that the United States draft resolution would not suggest that it might have done more.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the resolution made no reference to ACC. He wondered if the United States delegation wished to do so.

Mr. BLAISDELL (United States of America) replied that he did not wish to re-open the question of a choice between the alternatives set forth in paragraphs 14 and 15, as a decision had already been taken on that subject. He only wished to ensure that information concerning the action taken would be passed on to the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 6. 5 p.m.