



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 12 and 79:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters I and XIV) (continued)</i>	261
<i>Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Com- mittee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (continued) . . . . .</i>	

*Chairman:* Mr. Vahap AŞIROĞLU (Turkey).

AGENDA ITEMS 12 AND 79

Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued)  
(chapters I and XIV)

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (continued) (A/6522, A/C.5/1068, A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2)

1. Mr. S. K. SINGH (India) said that, at the last two sessions of the General Assembly, there had been a growing awareness of the shortcomings in co-ordination and co-operation between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The importance of that question had been recognized by the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, whose suggestions and recommendations (see A/6343), together with the observations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions were the basis for any action the General Assembly might take to improve co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.
2. The decision of the Advisory Committee to review the procedures followed in the preparation of its report deserved the support of the Fifth Committee, whose work would be facilitated as a result. Of course, if the Advisory Committee was to issue its report earlier, it would have to receive the information from the specialized agencies earlier.
3. The Advisory Committee's report (A/6522) showed the complexities of co-ordination, which could not be achieved by following the principles applied in the case of a national administration. The need for centralized co-ordination machinery was undeniable, and his delegation fully endorsed the Advisory Committee's views on the subject. Some delegations had expressed reservations about the action being taken

by the Economic and Social Council in that regard. He thought, on the contrary, that the action of the Council, co-ordinated with that of the Advisory Committee, was extremely useful and that judgement should not be passed on the Council's decisions at least until their results were known. Some delegations were opposed to the strengthening of the Administering Committee on Co-ordination, on the pretext that it was not an inter-governmental organ. The Indian delegation was more pragmatic, and thought that, quite apart from all legal considerations, ACC had an extremely useful role to play in practical co-ordination. He associated himself with the Advisory Committee's opinion on that subject.

4. Lastly, there was an obvious relationship between programming and budgetary questions and, if it was to discharge its duties fully, the Advisory Committee needed to be strengthened and encouraged. On the whole, his delegation endorsed the conclusions presented by the Advisory Committee in its report.

5. In connexion with draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2, of which his delegation was a sponsor, he would first reply to some comments made at the 1161st meeting. The principal criticism had been that the draft resolution was based mainly on the Advisory Committee's report, while it was said that the Committee had gone beyond its terms of reference by making a number of observations and suggestions on the differences between the scales of contributions of the United Nations and various specialized agencies. His delegation could not accept that criticism, which was the result of a misunderstanding, since the responsibility of the Advisory Committee in the matter of financial and budgetary arrangements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies was derived from Article 17, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Charter and had never been contested before. Some delegations had also criticized the sponsors of the draft resolution for giving directives to the specialized agencies. As the representative of Brazil had stated, the sponsors had taken into account the special conditions which influenced the establishment of the scale of contributions of each specialized agency. Agencies which applied for that purpose methods similar to those of the United Nations and which had no serious reasons for objecting to better co-ordination in that sphere should make an effort to achieve greater uniformity.

6. As to the objection that the sponsors of the draft resolution should not have said in their text that the General Assembly "agreed" with the comments and observations of the Advisory Committee on the variations in the scales of contributions, his delegation thought that the Fifth Committee's methods

of work were sufficiently well known to make it unnecessary to refute such criticism.

7. In a spirit of conciliation, however, his delegation proposed two changes in the draft resolution, which should dispel some of the doubts expressed. In the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "Agreeing with" would be replaced by the words "Taking note of" and, in operative paragraph 2, the words "Urges the specialized agencies . . . to take steps" would be replaced by the words "Recommends further that the specialized agencies . . . take steps". He had not been able to consult all the other sponsors, but he hoped they would have no objection to those proposals.

8. Mr. YUNUS (Pakistan) said that the main reason why his delegation had become one of the sponsors of the draft resolution was that it agreed with the views expressed in the Advisory Committee's report (A/6522), particularly paragraphs 39 to 43. The fact that some delegations had questioned whether the Advisory Committee's terms of reference allowed it to take such a stand placed Pakistan in a difficult position. If the Fifth Committee decided that the Advisory Committee had exceeded its terms of reference, the Pakistan delegation would be the first to withdraw its name from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution. The Fifth Committee must take a clear decision on whether or not the Advisory Committee had been empowered to express a view on the question of the scales of contributions used by the specialized agencies, because it would be illogical to support a draft resolution based on a text whose validity was contested on the ground that the author had not been entitled to write it.

9. A close examination of the actual content of paragraphs 39 to 43 of the report showed that the Advisory Committee simply drew attention to the differences between the rates of assessment applied by the United Nations and by its related organizations, and to General Assembly resolution 311 (IV) and that, after recognizing that several large agencies had brought their scale of contributions into line with the United Nations scale, the Committee expressed the view that "it would be in the interest of co-ordination and uniformity to reduce these variations to a minimum" and that "further attention" should be given to the question. The Advisory Committee had thus displayed complete objectivity and he could not but conclude that it was neither going beyond its terms of reference nor usurping the functions of the Committee on Contributions. He hoped the Fifth Committee shared that view.

10. Mr. ZIEHL (United States of America) said that his delegation fully shared the views expressed by the Advisory Committee on the role of ACC (A/6522, para. 17) and considered, in particular, that the officer in charge of inter-agency affairs should be responsible to the Secretary-General in his capacity as Chairman of ACC. It also considered, as the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had emphasized in its report (A/6343, para. 90 (i)), that adequate staff support should be provided to ACC by utilizing as far as possible the present staff of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies.

11. With respect to draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2, its purpose was to bring pressure to

bear on the specialized agencies to bring their scales of contributions into line with the United Nations scale. That was sufficient reason to question, as the USSR delegation had done (1161st meeting), whether the draft was warranted. In reality, the purpose of the resolution was solely to secure a change in the scale of contributions applied by the ILO for certain members. Co-ordination and uniformity of procedures did not appear to be the principal preoccupation of the sponsors. It should be recalled that the ILO had been considering the question for some time, that it had twice modified its scale of contributions, that it had examined the question in 1965 and again in 1966, and that it had scheduled it for review once more, in March 1967. The ILO scale of contributions was based on circumstances antedating the creation of the United Nations. The ILO, being a sovereign organization, was alone competent to modify it; moreover, advice from any United Nations body might well make more difficult the discussion of the problem in the ILO. If the real purpose was to induce the ILO to change its scale of contributions, the draft resolution was entirely out of order and should never have been discussed in the Fifth Committee. The changes proposed on behalf of the co-sponsors by the Indian representative did not satisfy the United States delegation; on the contrary, the second change, whereby the word "Urges" in operative paragraph 2 would be replaced by the words "Recommends further", made the draft resolution even more unacceptable. His delegation would accordingly vote against that text.

12. Mr. BANNIER (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that it was not for him to express an opinion on the substance of the question. Nevertheless, he wished to reply to the criticisms levelled at the Committee's report (A/6522) at the 1161st meeting.

13. Under its terms of reference, it was the Advisory Committee's duty to consider administrative and budgetary arrangements with the specialized agencies, and financial arrangements between the United Nations and the agencies. It had always been understood that in so doing the Advisory Committee acted on behalf of the General Assembly. When it considered the question of co-ordination in its report, the Advisory Committee was concerned only with greater efficiency. The General Assembly had never hesitated to address recommendations to the specialized agencies. For example, its resolution 2150 (XXI) implied, since the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts had recommended that specialized agencies having an annual budget cycle should adopt a biennial cycle, that those agencies should make certain changes in their procedures. Likewise, when the Advisory Committee stated that it would be in the interest of co-ordination and uniformity to reduce variations in the scales of contributions to a minimum, it was merely following a precedent and in no way going beyond its terms of reference.

14. Replying next to a question raised at the 1161st meeting by the representative of Israel, he said that the Advisory Committee intended to use experts for the study on the standardization of budget lay-out. The Advisory Committee shared the views expressed by the Canadian representative at the same meeting

on that subject: the purpose of the study was to facilitate comparison of budgets.

15. The Israel representative had suggested, furthermore, that the Advisory Committee's report might usefully include a table giving an inter-organizational comparison of grading in total figures and in percentages. The Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions was at present studying the very difficult question of grading standards, and had secured the services of a number of experts for that purpose. It was, moreover, probable that ACC would consider the question and that the Advisory Committee would take it up again when it had the necessary information.

16. Mr. QUIJANO (Argentina) recalled that some delegations had said that draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2 did not relate to agenda item 79. Yet it was common knowledge that the Advisory Committee every year considered the scales of contributions of the specialized agencies in its report on administrative and budgetary co-ordination. That was an integral part of co-ordination. In its past studies the Advisory Committee had always devoted a section to the question of scales of assessment. It was important for Governments to be able to compare the contributions they made to the various specialized agencies. That being so, there was no reason for continuing variations between the scales of the different organizations, when the basic criterion was capacity to pay. The establishment of uniform standards had also been studied by the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. Under Article 17, sub-paragraph 3, of the Charter, it was proper for the General Assembly to concern itself with the question. Moreover, while the Assembly—through its Fifth Committee, which was composed of specialists—could devote three months a year to budgetary matters, the same was not true of the corresponding organs of the specialized agencies. If the General Assembly of the United Nations did not study administrative and budgetary questions, no other body of any other organization would do so. Such study, then, certainly related to agenda item 79. Since that was also the view of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts, the problems it had brought to light should be studied very closely.

17. His delegation was not unaware that what was good for the United Nations was not necessarily good for the great Powers. It was nevertheless surprised to note that the delegations most hostile to the draft resolution were those of States that paid the highest percentage contributions. It was perhaps useful to consult the table in paragraph 55 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/6522) in order to see why. The table showed that standardization of scales of contributions would serve the interests mainly of the developing countries and those of many developed countries, but that it would work to the disadvantage, in certain cases, of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. However, he was happy to note that many delegations had viewed the question from a purely technical standpoint, and although adoption of the draft resolution might result in their Governments paying more, they had nevertheless said that they would support the text.

18. His delegation found the draft perfectly acceptable. It dealt with an important question and the solution proposed by the sponsors could not but be beneficial to the United Nations family as a whole. His delegation therefore believed it was expressing the opinion of all in asking that it be put to the vote.

19. Mr. CAHEN (Belgium) said that he would vote for the draft resolution, for he would support any move towards co-ordination in any field.

20. Mr. MERON (Israel) agreed with the Chairman of the Advisory Committee that the question of grading standards for staff was very difficult to solve. What his delegation had in mind was a manning table similar to that submitted by the Salary Review Committee<sup>1/</sup> established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 975 (X), indicating total staff and the proportion of staff in each class. He was glad to learn that the Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions was studying the question and he hoped that the Advisory Committee would in due course provide all necessary information in a comparative table.

21. Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) remarked that although his delegation had not had time to study the Advisory Committee's report thoroughly, it would vote for the draft resolution in the hope that it would lead to closer co-ordination of all the activities of the United Nations system.

22. Mr. KULEBLAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to explain certain aspects of his statement at the 1161st meeting. Contrary to certain delegations' assertions, his delegation's position was not dictated by selfish interests. Like the United States, the Soviet Union was a founder of the United Nations, and it was hence its duty to ensure that the provisions of the Charter and the resolutions and rules of procedure of the General Assembly were respected.

23. The question of harmonizing scales of contributions was limited in scope but had very far-reaching implications, and it was regrettable that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2 had approached it from only one angle and that their draft resolution was based solely on the Advisory Committee's report (A/6522). Neither the Advisory Committee nor the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken account of the specialized agencies' interests. That approach was inconsistent with resolution 311 (IV), in which the General Assembly had considered that there was room for a closer relationship between the assessments of member States in the contributions both of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies, but had not said that such a closer relationship was requisite. The only United Nations organ authorized by that resolution to deal with the problem was the Committee on Contributions, which could make recommendations only if so requested by a specialized agency. What, then, was the basis for the Advisory Committee's recommendations? That Committee was expressing its views in that respect even without first consulting the Committee on Contributions. Since the Advisory Committee was not empowered to consider the scale of assessments, its

<sup>1/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Annexes, agenda item 51, document A/3209 (separate fascicle).

recommendations were irrelevant. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee had cited General Assembly resolution 2150 (XXI) as an example of recommendations to the specialized agencies, but that resolution dealt with the problems clearly falling under the category of co-ordination and had been drawn up so carefully—taking into account the positions of Member States and the specialized agencies—that the Assembly could not but adopt it unanimously.

24. It seemed likely that draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2 would remain a dead letter. The best solution would be not to put it to the vote but to include a paragraph on the subject in the Committee's report. If that was not acceptable to all, his delegation would be ready to accept the Indian amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph (see para. 7 above). Despite the Indian amendment, it would be desirable to delete operative paragraph 2, which did not take account of the specialized agencies' views and had no prospect of being implemented. His delegation was ready to withdraw the proposal it had made at the 1161st meeting with regard to operative paragraph 3. It nevertheless hoped that the words "and to the Committee on Contributions" would be inserted after the words "specialized agencies concerned". His delegation hoped that if its first proposal was not acceptable to the sponsors, they would accept the amendments he had just proposed. Its vote would depend on their decision.

25. The CHAIRMAN observed that the other sponsors had accepted the changes in draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2 proposed by the Indian representative, but not the USSR representative's proposals to delete operative paragraph 2 and to mention the Committee on Contributions in paragraph 3. The sponsors wished the draft resolution to be put to the vote that very day.

26. Mr. KULEBIAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, as revised by the Indian representative.

27. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2, as revised.

*At the request of the Colombian representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda.

*Against:* United States of America, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Abstaining:* Chad, Japan, Morocco, Romania, Rwanda, South Africa.

*Operative paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 61 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.*

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

*Draft resolution A/C.5/L.885 and Add.1 and 2, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 63 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.*

29. Mr. KULEBIAKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed regret that he had been unable to persuade the Committee to accept his suggestions. The adoption of the draft resolution would, in his view, give rise to great difficulties in the matter of co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend the following draft resolution to the General Assembly:

"The General Assembly

"1. Takes note of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/6522) on the administrative budgets for 1967 of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency;

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to refer to the executive heads of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, through the consultative machinery of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, matters arising under chapter II of that report which call for their attention, together with the record of the related discussion in the Fifth Committee;

"3. Further requests the Secretary-General to refer to the executive heads of the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency the observations of the Advisory Committee contained in chapters III and IV of its report on their administrative budgets for 1967."

*It was so decided.*

31. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, if the Committee did not object, a full summary of the statement made by the representative of the Secretary-General at the 1160th meeting on chapters I and XIV of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/6303) should be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.*