

MAY 23 1961

Tuesday, 6 December 1960,  
at 11.5 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council</i> <i>(chapter VII, section II, paragraph 645 only)</i> <i>(continued)</i> . . . . .	157
<i>Statement by the Legal Counsel</i> . . . . .	157

Chairman: Mr. Gonzalo ORTIZ MARTIN (Costa Rica).

## AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter VII, section II, paragraph 645 only) (A/4415; A/C.6/L.469 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.475, 476, 479) (continued)

1. Mr. SHARP (New Zealand) observed that the members of the Committee were agreed on the objectives set forth in the Secretariat's note (A/C.6/L.476), differing only as to the methods to be employed to achieve them. All recognized the advantages of consultation between bodies dealing with the same problems. It was obviously desirable, therefore, that the General Assembly should incorporate in its rules of procedure a rule designed to prevent the misunderstandings with the specialized agencies which were liable to occur if the Assembly decided on new courses of action without first consulting the specialized agencies concerned.

2. It had been with a similar end in view that the Economic and Social Council, its subsidiary bodies and the specialized agencies had adopted rules of procedure providing for consultation before the adoption of any decision on questions of common interest. That arrangement worked well and it was for that reason that the New Zealand delegation had joined with the delegations of Denmark, the Netherlands and the United States of America in submitting a draft resolution (A/C.6/L.479). He noted that the word "is", included by error in the first line of the English text of paragraph 1 of the proposed rule 11a, should be deleted, and that the reference to the specialized agencies in that rule ought naturally to be understood to mean also the International Atomic Energy Agency. He explained that the sponsors had proposed an amendment to the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and not a resolution because the question was a procedural one.

3. The draft resolution met most of the objections raised to the text proposed in paragraph 645 of the Economic and Social Council's report (A/4415). First, it was in keeping with paragraphs 1 and 2 of rule 80 of the Council's rules of procedure. Secondly, it did not make an inflexible rule like that in paragraph 3 of that rule, which stipulated that the specialized agencies must have been consulted before any decision was taken; it spoke simply of "such consultation as may be

possible" with the representatives of the specialized agencies, and would thus not tie the hands of the General Assembly. Lastly, it preserved the freedom of action of the General Assembly while respecting the autonomy of the specialized agencies; it should, moreover, be noted that, if consultations did not take place, the specialized agency concerned might use the degree of autonomy which it possessed in a way which was not in keeping with the appropriate resolution of the General Assembly.

4. Mr. GLASER (Romania) felt that the members of the Committee should be given time to consider that very involved question and to find out the reactions of other bodies on the subject.

5. Mr. HAJARNAVIS (India) agreed with the representative of Romania; it was important to study the draft resolution carefully, since it differed considerably from the draft submitted by the Economic and Social Council in its report.

6. In reply to a question from Mr. NISOT (Belgium), Mr. ROSENBAUM (United States of America) stated that paragraph 2, of rule 11 a, proposed in the draft resolution applied only to the technical implications of the General Assembly's proposals and not to their political implications.

7. Mr. MOLINA LANDAETA (Venezuela) observed that rule 11 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly was headed "Notification to other bodies" whereas the proposed rule 11 a was headed "Consultation with other bodies". He wondered whether the sponsors intended to include the proposed provisions in rule 11 or, in view of the difference in subject matter, to make them a separate rule.

8. Mr. TAMMES (Netherlands) said that the sponsors would like to see the rule incorporated in the rules of procedure after rule 11, since that seemed the most appropriate place, but as an entirely separate rule.

9. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Spanish text of paragraph 1 of the proposed rule 11 a should read "informar a la Asamblea general" and not "informar al Consejo".

## Statement by the Legal Counsel

10. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Legal Counsel) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the delegations of Bolivia, Costa Rica and the United Kingdom had asked for the inclusion in the agenda of the fifteenth session of the General Assembly of a new item entitled "Review of the methods and procedures of the General Assembly" (A/4616). The General Committee would consider the matter, and there was a strong likelihood that it would allocate the item to the Sixth Committee.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.