



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Agenda item 47: General review of the programmes and activities in the economic, social, technical co-operation and related fields of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Children's Fund and all other institutions and agencies related to the United Nations system (continued) | 389 |

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

AGENDA ITEM 47

General review of the programmes and activities in the economic, social, technical co-operation and related fields of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Children's Fund and all other institutions and agencies related to the United Nations system (continued)* (A/7603/Add.1, chap. VII; A/7757, A/C.2/L.1088/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1090, A/C.2/L.1091, E/4744 (vol. I and II), E/4744/Add.1 and Corr.1, E/4748/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsors of the draft resolution on co-ordination of marine activities had submitted a revised text (A/C.2/L.1088/Rev.1), the implementation of which would not require additional funds: consequently it was no longer necessary to take into account the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.2/L.1091) concerning the administrative and financial implications arising from the original draft resolution. The revised draft would be considered at the next meeting.

2. He announced that the delegations of Canada, Chad, Colombia, Denmark, Mauritania, the Netherlands and Norway had asked to be included among the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1090) concerning the final report of the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/4748/Rev.1).

3. Mr. GUPTA (India), replying to comments made by the representatives of Yugoslavia, France and Tunisia, said that it had taken the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (ECPC) almost eight months to formulate recommendation A (*ibid.*, chap. III) after very intensive consultations and serious consideration of all the alternatives.

4. Some members had stressed the fact that it was for the Economic and Social Council to act upon ECPC's recommendation. The Council had considered that question in

late October¹ and had decided (see Council resolution 1467 (XLVII)), for lack of time, to refer the matter to the Second Committee. Some delegations now proposed to refer the recommendation back to the Council. It was time to stop passing the ball back and forth.

5. After holding detailed consultations with certain delegations which had had doubts about the advisability of operative paragraph 3, the sponsors had decided to include operative paragraphs 4 and 5. At all events the sponsors had done their utmost to give satisfaction to the delegations concerned.

6. Mr. GOBBA (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft, because it felt that the economic and social activities of United Nations bodies must be effectively co-ordinated. It did, however, recognize the supreme authority of the Economic and Social Council in co-ordination matters. In that connexion it drew attention to paragraph 29 of the ECPC report (E/4748/Rev.1), which it interpreted as meaning that the reconstituted Committee should play the part of adviser and assistant to the Council. It was therefore pleased to note the inclusion in the draft resolution of operative paragraph 5. His delegation took operative paragraph 4 to mean that the Council would undertake the examination which was referred to at its next summer session.

7. Mr. KABORE (Upper Volta) said that his delegation had not received the French versions of the documents to which operative paragraph 2 referred. That was a regrettable situation.

8. Since the draft resolution was mainly concerned with the problem of co-ordination, the sponsors would save certain delegations much inconvenience if they enabled the organs responsible in the matter to express their views as to the kind of system that should be established.

9. Finally, the draft under consideration was too long and gave the impression of concealing some kind of trap. The decisions advocated in it seemed to his delegation to be too technical and were liable to impede the work of the Council.

10. Despite the explanations given by the Indian representative, his delegation was not convinced of the usefulness of the draft and regretted that it would not be able to vote for it.

11. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) thanked the sponsors for taking into account the comments made by his delegation (see 1297th meeting, para. 4) particularly with regard to opera-

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Resumed Forty-seventh Session*, 1645th meeting.

* Resumed from the 1297th meeting.

tive paragraph 4. He also thanked the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for his detailed presentation, which, however, had only served to strengthen his delegation's convictions. His delegation still had the same misgivings and regretted that it would not be able to vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1090.

12. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation attached the greatest importance to co-ordination, on the understanding, however, that it must not be regarded as an end in itself: it was first and foremost a tool which could facilitate the work if properly used, but which could also prejudice it if used irrationally.

13. Where co-ordination was concerned, the very important role which the Economic and Social Council had to play in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations should never be forgotten. In its resolution 1459 (XLVII) the Council made some very practical comments on the co-ordination of the activities of United Nations organizations and of Governments. That was an extremely important resolution. The dominant role of the Council in co-ordination had also been recognized both by the General Assembly and by the report prepared by Commissioner Jackson entitled *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System*.²

14. In its final report (E/4748/Rev.1) the Enlarged Committee outlined the links which existed between the bodies responsible for co-ordination and offered some interesting conclusions, the most important being the recommendation regarding the structure of the future co-ordinating body. It went without saying that the General Assembly, which meant the Second Committee, could reconsider the recommendation in question, but that recommendation would none the less continue to be the basis of its action, because it offered the Council the most convenient means of carrying out its primary function. The Committee ought to solve the problem, particularly as the mandate of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC) would end very soon. It should, however, tackle it with full knowledge of the facts.

15. Numerous proposals had been submitted concerning the structure of the future co-ordination machinery. The first alternative would be to reconstitute the CPC, under the authority of the Council, in accordance with the procedure laid down in recommendation A of the Enlarged Committee's final report (*ibid.*, chap. III). The second would be not to set up a new body but to refer the whole problem of co-ordination to the Council's Co-ordination Committee, which would meet between Council sessions. The third would be to allow time for strong feelings to subside and extend the mandate of CPC. In his delegation's view all those solutions were attractive and the choice was a difficult one. Whichever it might be, the method selected must make it possible to establish a more effective co-ordination system than had existed hitherto. His delegation was fully prepared to accept any of the methods if it would lead to the achievement of the desired aim.

16. The draft resolution contained one of the above-mentioned alternatives and it was acceptable as a whole, provided that a few slight alterations were made.

17. In the preamble, certain references were made to previous General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions. However, there was no indication that it was the Council which played the leading role in co-ordination. The omission could be rectified by referring, for example, to Council resolution 1459 (XLVII). That same comment also applied to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution which could be taken to imply that the Council should continue to deal with matters discussed by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. A new operative paragraph 11 could also be added to the effect that the General Assembly welcomed the practice of organizing Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

18. Care should be shown in regard to paragraphs 3 and 4, which were the most important ones in the operative part. The question was whether the Council should be requested to reconstitute its Committee for Programme and Co-ordination or to consider the possibility of doing so. The reply was not as simple as it appeared, since a problem of a quasi-judicial nature and, simultaneously, a time element were involved.

19. The Soviet delegation was prepared to support the draft under consideration provided that the sponsors amended their text in the way indicated. At all events, he reserved the right to revert to the matter if necessary.

20. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he had little to add to the remarks of the USSR representative. However, he was surprised at the silence of the sponsors on the points raised by many delegations. It was not entirely accurate to claim that the current discussion could have taken place in the Economic and Social Council, because that would be to misunderstand the conditions in which the Council had met at its resumed forty-seventh session. It was true that the Council had referred consideration of the matter without comment to the General Assembly, but that did not mean that the Council had waited for the Assembly in order to form an opinion. It was in the interest of all that the results achieved should be acceptable to all. If a draft resolution submitting recommendations to organs such as UNCTAD and UNIDO as clear and—it could almost be said, as insulting—as those appearing in the draft under consideration was referred to the General Assembly, there would certainly be rather violent reactions. It was only normal for the General Assembly to allow the Council, its main subsidiary organ, all due latitude to take any appropriate decisions which were of primary concern to it.

21. His delegation had submitted (see 1297th meeting, para. 37) constructive suggestions regarding the draft resolution. In view of the many doubts, criticisms and suggestions which had emerged, he would limit himself to the suggestions already made by his delegation on operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 9. If there was no reaction from the sponsors of the draft, his delegation might convert its suggestions into formal amendments.

22. Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium) said that his delegation would like to have a bias in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1090, but the problem was an important one and the issue was difficult to settle. It was obvious that, in the

² United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10 (DP/5).

main, the Economic and Social Council was responsible for co-ordination under the Charter for which his delegation had a deep respect.

23. If his delegation voted for the draft resolution, it was on the understanding that it was for lack of any other solution and that the reconstitution of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination would be an experimental operation limited in time. Operative paragraph 3 was a little too peremptory and his delegation would be happy to join with other delegations wishing to tone down the wording.

24. In connexion with the ECPC report (E/4748/Rev.1), his delegation felt some concern in regard to paragraphs 23, 24 and 25, whose wording was vague to say the least, particularly with regard to the financial implications of reconstituting the CPC. Suggestions whose cost had not been quantified were included in a context where the cost was quantifiable. Lastly, all the relevant documentation was not available in all the working languages.

25. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft under consideration. Every delegation had clear ideas as to the nature of the problem and the solution which should be applied. His delegation was well aware of the Council's role in co-ordination, but that did not prevent it from supporting the draft under examination. There had been many proposals to amend it, particularly operative paragraphs 3 and 4. Those paragraphs could not be changed any further, as they had been very difficult to compose. He therefore proposed that the discussion should be closed and a vote taken on the amendments and then on the draft as a whole.

26. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Venezuela) said that the wording of operative paragraphs 3 and 4 had been subjected to much consultation and negotiation. It would be a step backwards to refer the decision to the Economic and Social Council and it would mean sacrificing the progress already achieved. Consequently, his delegation requested that a vote should be taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1090 and on the amendments submitted. It would endorse the position of the Chilean delegation.

27. Mr. FARHANG (Afghanistan) said that his delegation was grateful to the sponsors for their spirit of understanding. Nevertheless, despite their explanations, certain doubts persisted. In particular, operative paragraph 3 seemed to contradict the sixth preambular paragraph. Moreover, if the Enlarged Committee's mandate specified that it was a subsidiary organ of the Council, there was a risk that, if it operated in the manner described in paragraph 33 of the final report (E/4748/Rev.1), it would ultimately acquire much more power than a subsidiary organ should have. Thus, there would be the danger of creating a situation that was contrary to the intentions and provisions of the Charter. In addition, the implications of operative paragraph 11 were not very clear and there was also a risk of producing a system which would create bottlenecks and entail an irrational use of resources. Finally, his delegation had difficulty in seeing what the administrative and financial implications of operative paragraph 7 would be. Therefore, it could not support the draft resolution in its present form.

28. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) stated that, after studying the text thoroughly, his delegation was unable to

vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1090. The sponsors did not seem to have replied to all the questions raised and their haste seemed somewhat excessive. The Economic and Social Council would have a very heavy agenda at its next session. In view of the importance of the question, sufficient time would have to be allowed for it to undertake the thorough study which was indispensable and less strict directives should be given. The Governments, for their part, needed more time to consider the matter. Finally, his delegation was at a loss to understand why the sponsors were pressing for an immediate vote and urged them to reply to the questions that had been raised.

29. Mr. WILTSHIRE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that the Indian delegation had already answered some of the French delegation's questions. The Chilean delegation had replied to other questions asked by various delegations, including the Belgian delegation. Furthermore, everyone knew that the sponsors had held long and difficult consultations and had endeavoured to take account, as far as possible, of the views expressed. They had made every possible concession and could not now retreat from their present position. Time was short and a decision must be taken; otherwise the development of the countries of the third world would be hampered. After all, the draft resolution did no more than request the General Assembly to take action in accordance with a report which had been submitted to it. The Soviet Union delegation had spoken (see para. 13 above) of the essential role played by the Economic and Social Council in matters of co-ordination, and the Committee would in fact merely be a subsidiary organ of the Council. The sponsors could insert an additional paragraph on the preamble reiterating the main theme of General Assembly resolution 2188 (XXI), and they would therefore accept the Soviet Union proposal. Some delegations had expressed concern about the financial implications. If the CPC were reconstituted, it would clearly need the adequate secretarial assistance which it had not received in the past, but the provision of the services mentioned in operative paragraph 7 should not place too heavy a burden on the United Nations budget. Lastly, the sponsors considered that the arguments of delegations which did not share their views were not very convincing, and that the time had come to take a decision.

30. Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil), speaking on a point of order, recalled that there had been many consultations on the wording of operative paragraphs 3 and 4. Governments had had adequate time to study the Enlarged Committee's report (E/4748/Rev.1). As Chairman of the Enlarged Committee, he also had held several consultations with delegations wishing to put questions to him. The role of the Economic and Social Council was not in any sense being questioned: the draft resolution merely requested the General Assembly to take account of the report of a subsidiary organ of the Council. The proposal of the Soviet Union delegation seemed to be quite acceptable, but some of the other amendments to operative paragraphs 3 and 4 could not be accepted as they were tantamount to taking a step backwards. The Council would have to make a number of arrangements forthwith, and it was essential that its work was not held up. The Brazilian delegation endorsed the views of the Chilean and Venezuelan delegations, and hoped that the draft resolution would be unanimously adopted.

31. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) thanked the sponsors for their explanations but felt bound to say that they had not entirely dispelled his misgivings. Italy was not a member of the Economic and Social Council, but the Italian delegation had been present as an observer at the debates and noted with regret that they had not always come up to its expectations. Certain other delegations, moreover, had also indicated their disappointment. It seemed that the Enlarged Committee had not always enjoyed the Council's confidence, and it would therefore be preferable to allow the Council, as the responsible organ under the Charter, to take the necessary decisions and to set up the appropriate machinery itself. Lastly, the Italian delegation hoped that the sponsors would agree to hold further consultations with a view to producing a text which would receive unanimous approval.

32. Mr. VIAUD (France) read out the French delegation's amendments to operative paragraph 3. The phrase "to envisage the possibility of reconstituting" should be inserted after "in January 1970". The words "in accordance with" should be replaced by the words "taking into account". In operative paragraph 4, the words "thereafter" and "intergovernmental" should be deleted.

33. Mrs. AGGREY-ORLEANS (Ghana) formally proposed that a vote should be taken. She asked the Secretary of the Committee to read out the Soviet Union amendments, which the sponsors seemed to have accepted.

34. Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil) supported the Ghanaian representative's request.

35. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Soviet amendments were as follows: to insert the following paragraph as the third preambular paragraph:

"Reaffirming the central role assigned to the Economic and Social Council in the economic, social and human rights fields under Chapter X of the Charter of the United Nations,";

to insert a new operative paragraph 11 as follows (the present operative paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 being renumbered accordingly):

"Welcomes the practice of Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and urges that these meetings should be continued, bearing in mind that they have proved their value in facilitating understanding and co-operation among those dealing with interagency issues at the intergovernmental and executive levels, respectively,";

36. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia), supported by Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), suggested that operative paragraphs 1 and 11 might require some revision. Did the expression "members of the United Nations system" mean the same as the French expression *"membre des Nations Unies"*?

37. Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil) said that the sponsors could accept the second part of the French amendment to operative paragraph 4 (see para. 32 above). The word "intergovernmental" could be deleted, and its deletion would broaden the scope of the text. On the other hand, it did not seem possible to delete the word "thereafter". The

sponsors could not accept the amendment to operative paragraph 3, either.

38. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Committee), replying to a question by Mr. VIAUD (France), recalled that the financial implications of the recommendations of ECPC were stated in annex VII of its final report (E/4748/Rev.1). Whether or not the draft resolution was adopted, those financial implications would remain unchanged.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first French amendment (see para. 32 above) concerning operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1090.

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

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

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, France, Hungary, Italy, Madagascar, Poland, Romania, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Bulgaria.

Against: Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Singapore, Somalia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining: China, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Algeria, Austria, Belgium.

The amendment was rejected by 45 votes to 13, with 27 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second French amendment, relating to operative paragraph 4. Since the sponsors had agreed to delete the word "intergovernmental" (see para. 37 above), the vote would relate to the deletion of the word "thereafter".

41. Mr. CORREA (Chile), speaking on a point of order, said that the Spanish text contained no word corresponding to the word "thereafter".

The amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 12, with 25 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1090), as a whole, as orally revised.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 74 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.