

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FIFTH COMMITTEE 331st
MEETING

JOINT SECOND AND
THIRD COMMITTEE 64th
MEETING

Monday, 21 January 1952, at 8.30 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter VIII, section I) (A/1884) (concluded)	279
Co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies : (a) Administrative budgets of the specialized agencies and development of common services : report of the Secretary-General; (b) Concentration of effort and resources : report of the Economic and Social Council. (A/1812 and Add.1, A/1956, A/1971, A/C.2&3/L.45/Rev.1-A/C.5/L.136/Rev.1, A/C.2&3/L.46/Rev.1-A/C.5/L.137/Rev.1, A/C.2&3/L.47-A/C.5/L.138, A/C.2&3/L.48-A/C.5/L.139, A/C.2&3/L.49-A/C.5/L.140, and A/C.2&3/L.51-A/C.5/L.142) (concluded)	279

Chairman : Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter VIII, section I) (A/1884) ¹ (concluded)

[Item 11]*

Co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies : (a) Administrative budgets of the specialized agencies and development of common services : report of the Secretary-General; (b) Concentration of effort and resources : report of the Economic and Social Council (A/1812 and Add.1, ² A/1956, A/1971, A/C.2&3/L.45/Rev.1-A/C.5/L.136/Rev.1, A/C.2&3/L.46/Rev.1-A/C.5/L.137/Rev.1, A/C.2&3/L.47-A/C.5/L.138, A/C.2&3/L.48-A/C.5/L.139, A/C.2&3/L.49-A/C.5/L.140 and A/C.2&3/L.51-A/C.5/L.142) (concluded)

[Item 28]*

REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BRAZIL (A/C.2&3/L.45/Rev.1—A/C.5/L.136/Rev.1)

1. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) recalled that the Fifth Committee had adopted a resolution on the operational programmes under the responsibility of the United Nations (A/C.5/L.120).³ The Brazilian draft resolution before the Committees meeting jointly referred to co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies in respect of the administrative part of the operational programmes financed by voluntary contri-

butions and executed by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. With a view to facilitating co-operation between delegations he was prepared to withdraw the last paragraph of the recital.

2. Miss STRAUSS (United States of America) said that she supported the substance of the Brazilian draft resolution, but felt that, since paragraph 2 of the operative part was expressed in general terms, it might be preferable to include it in the Rapporteur's report than to adopt it as part of a resolution.

3. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) referred to the adoption by the Fifth Committee of a resolution designed to establish a measure of control over the administrative part of that section of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance which was under the control of the United Nations. He thought that the specialized agencies should establish similar machinery. He suggested that a paragraph be inserted in the Brazilian draft resolution requesting those specialized agencies which had not already done so to set up machinery for controlling the administrative parts of the portions of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance which were subject to their control.

4. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) remarked that, if the Committees had no objection, he was agreeable to having both operative paragraphs incorporated in the Rapporteur's report as the view of the Committee.

5. Mr. ABBASI (Pakistan) pointed out that there was no constitutional sanction for the Brazilian draft resolution. He would, however, support it if the reference to Article 17 of the Charter was deleted, and the second operative paragraph retained.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 3*.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

² *Ibid.*, *Supplements No. 5 and 5A*.

³ *Ibid.*, *Fifth Committee*, 323rd meeting.

6. Mr. ADARKAR (India) agreed with the Pakistani representative that an important constitutional issue was involved. The text under discussion was quite separate from the resolution adopted by the Fifth Committee, and the United States amendment (A/C.2&3/L.51—A/C.5/L.142) was not applicable to the former proposal which referred to programmes executed by the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The Indian delegation had not fully considered that important matter and was therefore not prepared to state its final position.

7. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) felt that his proposal was sufficiently flexible since it requested the Economic and Social Council to propose methods of co-ordination to the General Assembly. The Council, in co-operation with the Secretariat, was the most suitable body to deal with the matter. He was therefore opposed to postponing the matter and considered that his text should be put to the vote.

8. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) supported the suggestion that the operative part of the draft resolution should be included in the Rapporteur's report. As stressed by the French representative at the previous joint meeting, it was undesirable to increase the number of resolutions unnecessarily.

9. Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) agreed with the Indian and Belgian representatives that the operative paragraphs should be incorporated in the Rapporteur's report.

10. Miss STRAUSS (United States of America) felt that the second operative paragraph should end with the words "such co-ordination" instead of "such voluntary programmes".

11. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) thought that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions rather than the Economic and Social Council was the body most suited to consider appropriate methods for effecting the co-ordination of the administrative parts of operational programmes financed out of voluntary funds.

12. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) pointed out that it was in order to ask the Council, which was the main co-ordinating body, to deal with the matter. Nothing prevented the Council from endorsing the view of the United Kingdom representative.

It was agreed to include the substance of the operative part of the Brazilian revised draft resolution in the Rapporteur's report.

13. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) recalled that the Fifth Committee had adopted a resolution to establish a measure of control over the administrative part of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance which was subject to the authority of the United Nations. He suggested that a paragraph might be inserted in the Rapporteur's report requesting those specialized agencies which had not done so to set up machinery for controlling the administrative parts of the portions of the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance which were under their control.

14. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) remarked that the Australian representative had brought up an important issue. It could be assumed that the specialized agencies had already scrutinized their programmes and the budgetary implications of the latter. The Rapporteur's report should take into account action already taken, for example the fact that the Second Committee had already adopted certain resolutions, relating to technical assistance, which requested the specialized agencies

to devote special attention to controlling and scrutinizing their programmes. The specialized agencies should be asked to co-operate as far as possible and to bear in mind the distinction between operational and administrative funds.

15. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark) agreed with the Canadian representative whose point illustrated the disadvantages of dealing with a question both in the Fifth Committee and at meetings of the Second and Third Committee's meeting jointly with the Fifth.

16. Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) agreed with the substance of the Australian and Canadian representative's observations.

17. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) accepted the view of the Canadian representative. It would be sufficient if the Rapporteur's report drew the attention of the specialized agencies in their implementation of General Assembly resolution 411(V) to the action taken by the Fifth Committee to scrutinize the administrative part of its technical assistance expenses.

It was agreed to include in the Rapporteur's report a reference to General Assembly resolution 411 (V) and to the action taken on the matter by the Fifth Committee.

REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY BRAZIL (A/C.2&3/L.46/Rev.1-A/C.5/L.137/Rev.1)

18. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) said that he had no objection to also including the substance of that text in the Rapporteur's report.

19. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) pointed out that the third paragraph of the recital of the Brazilian proposal stated that it was the Advisory Committee which was required to report on the administrative budgets of the specialized agencies, whereas Article 17 of the Charter did not refer specifically to that Committee. The Advisory Committee could assume such functions only if so authorized by the General Assembly.

20. Mr. ABBASI (Pakistan) said that he would support the draft resolution if no reference was made to Article 17 of the Charter.

21. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada) recalled that Mr. Aghnides had explained to the Fifth Committee how the Advisory Committee could be of assistance in examining the various programmes. Mr. Aghnides might be requested to indicate what type of information would normally result from the Advisory Committee's examination of the administrative and financial questions, so that a brief reference to the matter might be included in the Rapporteur's report.

22. Mr. AGHNIDES, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, referred the Committees to paragraphs 22, 23 and 24 of document A/1956. He agreed that a useful purpose would be served if the proposal were included in the Rapporteur's report.

It was agreed to include the substance of the operative part of the Brazilian revised draft resolution in the Rapporteur's report.

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY NORWAY (A/C.2&3/L.48-A/C.5/L.139)

23. Mr. DONS (Norway) remarked that the findings of the Secretariat, after studying the question of a con-

solidated budget for the United Nations and the specialized agencies, had not been encouraging; a number of obstacles appeared to render the idea impracticable.

24. At meeting⁴ the Australian representative had asked how the Norwegian delegation proposed to solve the difficulties in the way of adopting a consolidated budget. Mr. Dons had no ready-made solution to offer and had therefore proposed, in his draft resolution, that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to study further and to report on the constitutional and practical problems involved.

25. He wished to refer the Australian representative in particular to a report on the relations of the United States with international organizations prepared by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments submitted to the United States Senate in February 1951. The report dealt *inter alia* with the question of a consolidated budget for the United Nations and the specialized agencies which had been studied by a Sub-Committee on Relations with International Organizations. After listing the advantages to be gained from a consolidated budget, the report made the following reference to the objections submitted to changes in the *status quo*:

“(1) the Constitutions of the specialized agencies would have to be amended so as to provide for a transfer of budget-making powers from the constituent assemblies of the agencies to the General Assembly of the United Nations; (2) changes would have to be made in the character of the General Assembly delegations; (3) the General Assembly would have to provide for lengthening its sessions, so as to afford it sufficient time to perform, at one time and place, the budget task now performed by the financial committees, governing bodies and conferences of the various individual agencies; and (4) a means would have to be found of overcoming the divergence of membership between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, since none of the agencies have as members all of the governments represented in the United Nations, and some of the agencies have as members, governments which do not belong to the United Nations and [which] are therefore not represented in the General Assembly.

“The Sub-Committee is of the opinion that these objections are without merit. Since the majority of the Member Governments of the United Nations are also members of the specialized agencies, no sound reason appears to exist for their failure to amend the constitutions of these agencies...

“With respect to the other objections, necessary changes can be made in the character of the General Assembly delegations and provision can easily be made for lengthening the session of the Assembly. As for the problems presented by divergent membership in the United Nations and the specialized agencies, procedures can be worked out whereby the section of the budget relating to each specialized agency would be initially voted in the General Assembly only by those member governments which are members of that agency. Arrangements can also be worked out whereby members of specialized agencies which are not Members of the United Nations would be able to debate and vote on the budgets of those specialized agencies to which they belong. Arrangements of this type between the International Labour Organi-

sation and the League of Nations proved to be entirely satisfactory. Finally, following such initial action on the budget of each agency, the consolidated budget of the United Nations and the agencies included therein could be approved by the General Assembly in plenary session.”

26. The point of his quotation was to show that there were experts outside the United Nations who believed that a consolidated budget was an indispensable reform and that the difficulties could be overcome. He was willing to agree that the time was perhaps not ripe for such an important reform, but the chief object of his draft resolution was to remind delegations of the problem. He would withdraw it if it received no support in the Committee.

27. Although it might be impracticable to establish a consolidated budget at the present time, fuller use could be made of the powers of the General Assembly in respect of the budgets of the specialized agencies. He therefore wished to suggest that in his consultations with the executive heads of the specialized agencies, the Secretary-General should press for conformity in the presentation of budgets and for other similar reforms and that an account of the progress made should be included in the report of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions should approach the budgets of the specialized agencies with boldness and suggest that the General Assembly should recommend specific changes in the budgets of those agencies. The General Assembly had full power to adopt such action. If the Committees agreed, the Rapporteur could include the substance of his draft resolution in his report and the General Assembly could revert to the matter at its next session.

28. Mr. ABBASI (Pakistan) said that he would support the Norwegian draft resolution if the words “the Secretary-General to study and report through the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions” were amended to read “the Economic and Social Council to study and report”.

29. Mr. ADARKAR (India) pointed out that the task of dealing with the budgets of the United Nations and the increasingly numerous specialized agencies would be beyond the capacity of any single committee. A committee could not deal with the various budgets unless it was fully informed about the multiple aspects of the individual programmes involved, for which purpose the expert resources of entire governments would be required. Moreover, the various governments had established different types of organizations to deal with United Nations affairs and with the technical programmes of the specialized agencies.

30. He therefore hoped that the Norwegian representative would withdraw his draft resolution. His Government was opposed to it now and in the future.

31. Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) felt that, although the draft resolution had some commendable aspects, it was untimely. The action proposed could not be implemented until all States Members of the United Nations were represented on all the specialized agencies. Otherwise it would be extremely complicated to study the budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. The suggestion of the Norwegian representative would to some extent be met if the United Nations were to make a comparative study of the practices followed by the specialized agencies in adopting their decisions, particularly in the field of finance.

32. The French Government had noted the diversity of methods adopted by the various agencies in dealing with matters of a similar nature. It would therefore be useful for the United Nations to study those methods and to request the various agencies to introduce what appeared to be the most effective and efficient procedure.

33. Since it was rather late in the session to take up the matter in detail, it would be preferable to postpone the subject to another session or to refer it to another central organ of the United Nations.

34. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) was in favour of the proposal contained in the Norwegian draft resolution, to give the matter of budgetary consolidation further study, and at the same time wished to point out that there was one type of official, namely the Treasury official, who to a very considerable extent replaced all others in deciding budgetary questions.

35. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that any measures for budgetary consolidation beyond those currently being taken would only have the effect of complicating the financial economy of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. He would remind the Brazilian representative that the membership of the United Nations and of the agencies did not coincide and that that fact constituted a very serious technical difficulty in the way of any attempts at further consolidation. His delegation would be unable to support the Norwegian draft resolution.

36. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) considered that the Norwegian draft resolution was premature.

37. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark), observing that some years had elapsed since the previous study on the subject had been made, believed that the draft resolution contained much that was commendable. Since, however, the Advisory Committee was engaged in that matter and was a body in his opinion better suited to deal with it than the Economic and Social Council, the Chairman of the Advisory Committee might offer some helpful observations.

38. Mr. AGHNIDES, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, remarking that the idea contained in the Norwegian draft resolution was attractive, and that the agreements between the United Nations and a number of the specialized agencies, such as ILO and UNESCO, did in fact contemplate the possibility of arrangements for budgetary consolidation, nevertheless feared that the constitutional problems which had baffled the Advisory Committee's previous attempt remained largely unchanged, and would thus render any further attempt of doubtful value. The only obvious solution would be for the specialized agencies to make over their budgetary authority to the United Nations, and that was clearly something that they could not do. However, the Advisory Committee would be prepared to make another attempt on the lines indicated. In his view, the best approach would be through the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. An indication to that effect might perhaps be included in the Rapporteur's report.

39. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) considered that the terms of the Norwegian draft resolution involved not co-ordination but actual amalgamation, as regards which no commitments could at present be undertaken. He was in complete agreement with the Indian representative who had pointed out the practical difficulties,

with the Pakistan representative who had referred to the constitutional issue, and with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee who had shown that any far-reaching change would involve a complete surrender of budgetary authority by the specialized agencies. Furthermore, the non-uniformity of membership as between the United Nations and the specialized agencies would result in a situation where taxation would be levied without representation. On all those grounds the Philippine delegation proposed indefinite deferment of the matter and was opposed even to mention of it in the Rapporteur's report.

40. Mr. ADARKAR (India), while agreeing with the Brazilian representative that treasury officials were, in fact, capable of doing a large portion of the work involved in budget making, still felt that the discussion of consolidated budget estimates would need the participation of so many officials representing so many branches of science and technology as to be impracticable at the present time, and perhaps until world government supervened.

41. Mr. POLLOCK (Canada), remarking that any tendency to unify and simplify budgetary procedure was always welcome and desirable, felt that the fact must be faced that the difficulties obstructing genuine budgetary consolidation at the present time were insuperable. In those circumstances he wondered whether the Norwegian representative would be satisfied if his proposals were to be mentioned in the report, accompanied by a statement that the Committee had recommended that the matter should be studied on a long-term basis, thus leaving the door open for the matter to be formally raised again at a future date.

42. Mr. DONS (Norway), concurring in the above proposal, considered that a recommendation might be added that the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee should continue along the lines already authorized and that the Advisory Committee, in particular, might adopt a somewhat bolder approach in its study of the budgets of the specialized agencies. If that were acceptable, he would, as he had indicated earlier, be prepared to withdraw his draft resolution.

43. Mr. VOUGT (Sweden) said that he was in favour of the procedure proposed by the Canadian representative and which the Norwegian representative had accepted.

44. Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) also signified her acceptance.

45. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) thought that the addition proposed by the Norwegian representative to the Canadian representative's formula had substantive significance. As a result of the addition the report would appear to give a definitive verdict in favour of budgetary consolidation.

46. Mr. DONS (Norway) did not believe that there was any disagreement between himself and the Canadian representative. The addition which he had proposed, and which appeared to have been responsible for the Polish representative's concern, amounted merely to an encouragement to the Secretary-General and the Advisory Committee to continue the policy which had already been laid down for them. He had further added as his own personal opinion that the Committee should be bolder in its attitude towards the specialized agencies' budgets. The matter could perhaps best be settled by submitting a text agreed between himself and the Canadian representative.

47. After further discussion, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Canadian and Norwegian representatives had jointly submitted a text for inclusion in the Rapporteur's report.

It was agreed that the text submitted by the Canadian and Norwegian representatives should be included in the Rapporteur's report.

48. The CHAIRMAN opened discussion on the United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.2&3/L.49-A/C.5/L.140).

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED KINGDOM
(A/C.2&3/L.49-A/C.5/L.140)

49. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom), recalling that he had already introduced the draft resolution on a previous occasion, only wished to recapitulate the main motives inducing his delegation to submit it. Broadly speaking, the purpose of the draft resolution was to enable the Council's economic and social programmes and their financial implications to be viewed as a whole. For that purpose more information should be placed at the Fifth Committee's disposal concerning economic and social activities, and at one time. Under the present system the Council was not provided with estimates of the total costs of its economic and social activities and was obliged to consider priorities often without relation to absolute figures. The last two recommendations of the draft resolution dealt with the transmission of the information to the General Assembly and had the object of ensuring that the supplementary estimates were submitted in a more orderly fashion.

50. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) pointed out that the terms of the third paragraph of the operative part ought to be amended because, since the draft resolution had been submitted, it had been decided to hold only one session of the Council in 1952.

51. Mr. YATES (Secretary of the Joint Second and Third and Fifth Committees) proposed that the beginning of that paragraph should be amended to read:

"Requests the Secretary-General, as soon as possible after the regular annual session of the Economic and Social Council immediately preceding the regular session of the General Assembly, to submit to that session of the General Assembly such supplementary information..."

52. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) accepted the amendment.

53. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the United Kingdom representative would agree to the withdrawal of the draft resolution as such and to the insertion of its provisions in the Rapporteur's report, which should, in his view, be sufficient to secure the Secretariat's co-operation.

54. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that, particularly since the draft resolution was also addressed to the Economic and Social Council, he would prefer to maintain it.

55. Mr. PLEIC (Yugoslavia) asked for information on the consequences of the procedure outlined in the last paragraph of the draft resolution. In his opinion there was a danger that some items would be postponed each year until the following session of the General Assembly.

56. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) replied that the object of the last paragraph, and of the draft resolution as a whole, was to enable the situation to be

seen in its entirety. Instead of studying the Economic and Social Council's programme and its financial implications piecemeal, the Assembly would wait until the material had been prepared in full and then deal with it as a single item. That might involve a delay of two or three weeks, but would not lead to the postponement of any part of the work to the following session.

57. Mr. MACHADO (Brazil) supported the United Kingdom draft resolution.

58. Mr. ADARKAR (India) regretted he could not support the United Kingdom draft resolution. He recalled that the French representative had urged ⁵ that the General Assembly ought not to burden the Economic and Social Council or the Secretary-General with too many resolutions on co-ordination, especially when they were not absolutely necessary. The draft resolution (A/C.2&3/L.53-A/C.5/L.153) which had been sponsored by the Australian and United States delegations and approved at the previous meeting of the Committees meeting jointly had given the Economic and Social Council and its functional and regional commissions detailed directives for the establishment of priorities, and there was therefore no reason to suppose that the difficulties which had arisen during the past year, and had been accentuated by the Council's having held two sessions, would be repeated in future. The Council's future reports would, for example, contain the supplementary information referred to in paragraph 3 of the United Kingdom draft resolution. There would be fewer supplementary estimates, although it should be recognized that supplementaries were sometimes unavoidable, however well the Council's work was planned. It was also going too far to suggest that no action should be taken by the Fifth Committee on any requests for funds for economic and social purposes until priorities had been established for the whole programme in those fields. Such a suggestion seemed to spring from a tendency he had noted to under-estimate the importance of the United Nation's economic and social work by comparison with its often futile political discussions.

59. If the system which would be brought into being as a result of the decisions taken at the present sessions still proved unsatisfactory, the United Kingdom representative would be at liberty to re-introduce his draft resolution at the next session of the General Assembly. For the present he appealed to him to withdraw it, and drew his attention in conclusion to the fact that it had already been decided to draw the Economic and Social Council's attention to the discussions on co-ordination which had taken place at the present session of the General Assembly.

60. U KYIN (Burma) agreed with the Indian representative, who had voiced the same fears that he himself had expressed at the previous joint meeting, namely that action on economic and social projects might be delayed if the United Kingdom draft resolution were adopted. He would have to vote against the draft resolution if put to the vote.

61. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that if his draft resolution were adopted, consideration by the Fifth Committee of the budgetary proposals relating to economic and social projects might be delayed for two or three weeks but not from one year to the next. The date on which work upon the projects was begun would not therefore be affected.

⁵ See A/C.2&3/SR.59 and A/C.5/SR.312.

62. Mrs. LABEYRIE (France) and Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) expressed their gratification at the way representatives had responded to the appeal not to adopt too many resolutions on co-ordination. Did not the United Kingdom representative agree that it would be sufficient for the Economic and Social Council as well as for the Secretariat to have the substance of his draft resolution endorsed in the Rapporteur's report?

63. Mr. CORLEY SMITH (United Kingdom) said that he was in entire agreement that too many resolutions were undesirable, but repeated that he was convinced, from his experience in the Council and in the Joint Second and Third Committee, that the proper form for the proposal under consideration was that of a resolution.

64. Mr. GARCIA (Philippines) thought that the crux of the United Kingdom draft resolution lay in paragraph 4. The supplementary information referred to therein had, however, already been submitted to the Fifth Committee and reported upon by the Advisory Committee, and it was always open to the Fifth Committee at any session to defer consideration of those sections of the budget relating to other economic and social activities until that information was submitted and reported upon.

65. Mr. BRACCO (Uruguay) thought that the United Kingdom draft resolution would greatly assist the Fifth Committee and the Economic and Social Council and said that he would vote in favour of it.

66. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) requested that a separate vote be taken on paragraph 4.

67. The CHAIRMAN put paragraph 4 of the United Kingdom draft resolution (A/C.2&3/L.49-A/C.5/L.140) to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 18 votes to 4 with 10 abstentions.

68. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) requested that the vote on the United Kingdom draft resolution as a whole be taken by roll-call.

A vote was taken by roll-call as follows:

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

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour: France, Israel, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark.

Against: India, Pakistan, Philippines, Burma.

Abstaining: Dominican Republic, Egypt, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Czechoslovakia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 19 votes to 4, with 9 abstentions.

69. Mr. DE MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) said that in his opinion the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the resolution which had just been adopted were of considerable value. Paragraph 4, however, had very serious possible implications, and in the absence of definite instructions from his Government regarding it, he had had to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

70. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in accordance with past practice, the Rapporteur should be instructed to include in the report a recommendation to the General

Assembly to take note of those parts of the Economic and Social Council's report which had been referred to the joint meetings. On the basis of that recommendation and similar recommendations from the other Committees, the General Assembly would adopt a single resolution taking note of the Council's report as a whole.

71. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested the Chairman to put his proposal to the vote so that he could abstain on the grounds that the People's Republic of China had not been represented in the Economic and Social Council during the period to which the report related.

72. Mr. YU (China) said he wished to place on record his view that the Soviet Union representative's remarks were out of order.

The Chairman's proposal was adopted by 25 votes to 1 with 6 abstentions.

73. The CHAIRMAN further proposed that no further joint meetings be held to approve the Rapporteur's draft report, but that the Rapporteur should be instructed to circulate it to representatives who had attended the joint meetings and to discuss with them any difficulties or comments they had with a view to revising it and submitting it to the General Assembly.

It was so agreed.

74. Mr. FRIIS (Denmark), on a point of order, said that it was the constant desire of his country and the other Scandinavian countries to expedite and simplify the General Assembly's work. In the light of experience gained his delegation had serious doubts as to whether the holding of joint meetings of the Joint Second and Third Committee with the Fifth Committee was really useful. Such meetings complicated the heavy meeting schedule of the Assembly. Many of the points that had been made at joint meetings, many of the decisions that had been taken could have been made or taken equally well at meetings of the Fifth Committee; others could have been taken at meetings of the Joint Second and Third Committee, or of the Second Committee or the Third Committee. The General Committee might consider, at the beginning of the next session, whether the joint meetings ought to be continued or not.

75. Even if it decided that they should, it would be wise to alter their methods of work, which at present encouraged general statements and consequently lengthy debates. If joint meetings were to be held in future, they should be limited strictly to the discussion of specific proposals submitted preferably in advance and relating to points in the annual reports of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. The Assembly had, in the past, by its resolutions given a valuable impetus to co-ordination activities. At present, the Economic and Social Council and the ACC had found the right approach to the question of co-ordination, and it was now quite unnecessary to have a full-scale inquiry annually into the progress made towards what must necessarily be a long-term goal.

76. Mr. HILL (Secretariat) said that if the meeting endorsed the Danish representative's suggestion, the Secretary-General would of course take it into account in submitting his proposals to the General Committee at the next session of the General Assembly.

77. Mr. BRENNAN (Australia) said that his delegation considered that the joint meetings had resulted in a number of valuable decisions which could not have been

reached in any other way than by a joint meeting of those interested in the substantive and in the budgetary aspects. He hoped the Secretary-General would take that expression of view into account also.

78. Mr. ADARKAR (India) proposed, and Mr. ABBASI (Pakistan) seconded, a vote of thanks to the Chairman for his efficient and courteous conduct of the debates.

79. The CHAIRMAN expressed his gratitude to all representatives who had attended the joint meetings for their co-operation, and to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Secretariat for the assistance they had given, and declared the present series of meetings closed.

The meeting rose at 11.40 p.m.