

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIFTH COMMITTEE, 809th
MEETING**

Monday, 5 December 1960,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 49:</i>	
<i>Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1960 (continued):</i>	
<i>United Nations activities in the Congo (ONUC) for the period 14 July to 31 December 1960 (continued)</i>	275
<i>Agenda item 54:</i>	
<i>Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and with the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. . .</i>	277
<i>Agenda item 50:</i>	
<i>Budget estimates for the financial year 1961 (continued):</i>	
<i>Administrative arrangements under the draft Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. . . .</i>	280

Chairman: Mr. Mario MAJOLI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 49

Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1960 (A/4492, A/4507, A/4508, A/4580, A/C.5/816, A/C.5/836) (continued)

United Nations activities in the Congo (ONUC) for the period 14 July to 31 December 1960 (A/4580, A/C.5/836) (continued)

1. Mr. MOLEROV (Bulgaria) said that the supplementary estimates submitted by the Secretary-General in document A/C.5/836 required careful consideration by the Committee, not only because of the amount involved—which, on an annual basis, represented twice the regular budget of the United Nations—but also because of the purposes for which the funds were being used. His delegation agreed with those who had argued that it was inappropriate to discuss the cost of the United Nations action in the Congo under agenda item 49; it believed that the proper course would have been either to deal with the matter under agenda item 85—the situation in the Republic of the Congo—or to create a separate item for the purpose. That procedure would have had the advantage of maintaining a clear distinction between the various United Nations funds involved and would have prevented increasing instability and confusion in the Organization's finances.

2. United Nations intervention in the Congo had been necessitated by the fact that the Belgian colonizers had grossly violated the Agreement of 29 June 1960 granting independence to the Republic of the Congo, almost immediately after signing that instrument. It was obvious that they had never seriously intended to grant true freedom and independence to the Congolese

people, as they had done everything possible, both before and after independence had been granted, to overthrow the Central Government of the Congo and to transfer power to a government which would permit them to continue their exploitation of the country's natural resources.

3. In response to the appeal of the lawful government of Mr. Lumumba, the Security Council had adopted a series of resolutions—subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly—calling on the Belgian Government to withdraw its troops from Congolese territory and authorizing the Secretary-General to take the necessary steps, in consultation with the Government of the Republic of the Congo, to provide that Government with such military assistance as might be necessary. However, although the task to be carried out was perfectly clear, the implementation of the Security Council's resolutions had been hampered by certain Powers. It had been decided that only troops from neutral countries would be sent to the Congo, but 250 of the 359 senior staff appointed to ONUC were nationals of the United States of America and its allies. The United Nations Command had flirted with the Belgian agent Tshombé and had immobilized the only legitimate government of the Congo by occupying the Leopoldville airport and radio station and disarming the armed forces of the Central Government. The Security Council's call for the withdrawal of Belgian troops had never been implemented and the United Nations agencies had not only failed to give the Central Government the assistance it needed, but had actually contributed in large measure to its overthrow, thus allowing the agents of the colonizers to establish a puppet government. The action taken had therefore frustrated the hopes of the Congolese people and was the exact opposite of the action called for by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

4. The representatives of certain Western Powers had attempted to convince the Committee that the United Nations activities in the Congo constituted a collective operation, the cost of which should be borne by all Members of the Organization. There was, however, no justification for that view, as both international law and the municipal law of all civilized countries held aggressors responsible for the damage they caused and for the costs arising from their actions. In the present case the aggressor, or rather the aggressors, were well known and it was significant that the United States Government was offering to pay half the cost of the operation. If the other and original aggressor agreed to pay the other half, the Committee would not be faced with any financial problem.

5. Belgian mining interests and monopolistic United States corporations had exploited the resources and the people of the Congo for years and it was to preserve their interests and not those of the Congolese people that the United Nations action in the Congo had been directed in the manner he had described. It was

only reasonable that the Governments behind those monopolies should pay the cost of the Congo operation.

6. If the United Nations action had been carried out impartially and in conformity with the Security Council's resolutions, United Nations troops could long since have been withdrawn from the Congo and the cost of the action would have been much reduced. The losses, suffering and privation which both the Force and the Congolese people had had to endure could also have been avoided.

7. As the action taken in the Congo had run directly counter to the decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, his delegation could not agree to pay any of the costs involved. At the same time, however, it wished to express its gratitude to the soldiers from African and Asian countries who had been sent to help their brothers in the Congo and who bore no responsibility for the tragic developments in that country.

8. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) said he wished to register a strong protest against the Bulgarian representative's references to his country. Such statements should not be permitted and were categorically repudiated by his delegation.

9. Mr. FENAUX (Belgium) protested against the tendentious and slanderous statements made during the debate, in particular by the Bulgarian representative, and reserved his delegation's right to reply to them.

10. The CHAIRMAN inquired whether the Bulgarian representative had any further comments to make on the substance of the item before the Committee. It was his practice to allow delegations freely to express the views of their Governments, but he hoped that they would not bring political controversy into the Committee, which was primarily concerned with administrative and budgetary matters. The points raised by the Bulgarian representative had already been extensively debated in the Security Council and in the General Assembly.

11. Mr. MOLEROV (Bulgaria) said that the fact that the Committee was an administrative and budgetary organ did not preclude it from considering the political aspects of the items before it. In his statement, he had clearly indicated the manner in which he considered the Congo operation should be financed. Under international law those responsible for aggression should bear the cost. He had not named the aggressors, but their identity was obvious. As the decisions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly had not been implemented, his Government could not contribute to the cost of the operation.

12. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed astonishment at the unprecedented action taken by the Chairman in suggesting that the Bulgarian representative's remarks had not been germane to the business of the Committee and in inquiring whether he had completed his statement. It was entirely proper for representatives to express their countries' views in accordance with the instructions of their Governments, and political considerations could not be excluded from their statements. A financial problem could not be solved in isolation from the underlying political factors. For that reason, his own delegation had contended that the question before the Committee should be considered under agenda

item 85. Other delegations had introduced political considerations into their remarks and it was not incumbent upon the Chairman to evaluate the statements made by representatives in the Committee.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that he held no dictatorial powers and always allowed representatives the greatest freedom of expression. He had not taken it upon himself to evaluate the Bulgarian representative's statement, but had merely expressed the hope that delegations might leave their political differences outside the Committee. He had been under the mistaken impression that the Bulgarian representative had not completed his statement. The second statement made by that representative had made the Bulgarian delegation's position clearer to him.

14. Mr. MOLEROV (Bulgaria) said that although the United States representative had repudiated his comments, the facts were well known. The United States took 100 per cent of the uranium ore mined in the Congo and such ore had been used to make the first atomic bombs which had been dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

15. Mr. CAMARA Maurice (Guinea) agreed with the USSR representative that it was inappropriate to exclude political considerations from the debate and to expect delegations to refer solely to the administrative and budgetary aspects of the matters before them. Delegations acted under the specific instructions of their Governments and not as stateless budgetary experts. His own delegation had instructions to express opposition to colonialism and, for that reason, it considered that it was justified in issuing a warning to potential victims of colonialist aggression during the discussion of the present agenda item.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, while it was true that all the questions referred to the Committee had political aspects and that the Committee could not deal with them from an exclusively financial standpoint, it was his hope that, in view of the limited time available and the existence of other forums in the General Assembly where the same political matters were at present under discussion, as little time as possible would be devoted to political questions in the Fifth Committee.

17. Mr. BURNS (Canada) protested against the criticism of the United Nations Secretariat which had been expressed by the Bulgarian representative and others, particularly when there was no opportunity for the Secretary-General to rebut the allegations made. The Secretariat had acted in accordance with the instructions given to it, instructions which had been confirmed by the unanimous decision taken at the fourth emergency special session of the General Assembly.

18. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Bulgarian representative had every right to criticize the action taken by the Secretariat, since the Secretary-General's representatives were always present at Committee meetings to reply to such criticism and the Secretary-General himself had already replied to similar criticism which his own delegation had expressed in the Committee and elsewhere.

19. Mr. NOLAN (Ireland) said that the Bulgarian representative, in his concluding remarks, had appeared to make a distinction between the contingents sent to the Congo by African and Asian countries and those sent by other countries. He would be glad if that point could be clarified.

20. Mr. MOLEROV (Bulgaria) said that he had not intended to make any such distinction.

21. Mr. MORRIS (Liberia), referring to the same remarks by the Bulgarian representative, objected to the inference that Governments which had contributed contingents to the United Nations Force bore some responsibility for the tragic developments in the Congo.

AGENDA ITEM 54

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and with the International Atomic Energy Agency: report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/4415, chapter VII, section I; A/4599, A/C.5/820, A/C.5/841, A/C.5/847)

22. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/4599) and to a note by the Secretary-General containing budgetary information on the specialized agencies and IAEA (A/C.5/820). The Committee might also examine under the current item chapter VII, section I, of the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4415)^{1/} concerning programme appraisals in the economic, social and human rights fields, which had been referred to it under item 12 of the agenda. The Chairmen of the Second and Third Committees, in documents A/C.5/847 and A/C.5/841 respectively, drew attention to the views expressed in those Committees on programme appraisals, to which reference was also made in paragraphs 5-12 of the Advisory Committee's report.

23. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the primary responsibility for the co-ordination of programmes—one of the two aspects of co-ordination among the organizations in the United Nations family—was borne by the Economic and Social Council; the General Assembly, as the repository of legislative authority in administrative and budgetary matters, reserved to itself responsibility for that aspect of co-ordination. The two aspects, however, had of necessity to be examined together, and he had drawn attention at the fourteenth session (744th meeting) to the Committee's responsibility in that regard.

24. It was gratifying to note from chapter VII of the Economic and Social Council's report that the Council had increased its already considerable efforts with respect to co-ordination during the past year. The Advisory Committee took a particular interest in the forward appraisal of economic and social programmes of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and IAEA. The Council's Committee on Programme Appraisals, in paragraph 371 (i) of its very useful consolidated report on the Five-Year Perspective, 1960-1964,^{2/} observed that any arbitrary stabilization of budgets at present levels was not desirable, and that additional funds were undoubtedly needed for programmes, without greatly increasing administrative overhead. There was no question of the growing need for international co-operation in countries' economic

and social development; the resultant expansion of programmes must, however, be carried out in an orderly fashion and must be based on a forward appraisal of needs and priorities on the one hand and of opportunities and capabilities on the other.

25. The Advisory Committee shared the interest evinced by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in the plans of the various organizations for assisting newly independent and emerging States, the financial particulars of which were summarized in paragraphs 19-21 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/4599). Provision for such assistance was also being made on an increasing scale under special and extra-budgetary programmes, such as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the malaria eradication programme of WHO.

26. The Advisory Committee gave details in paragraphs 17 and 18 of its report of the participation of specialized agencies and IAEA in the United Nations operation in the Congo.

27. The Advisory Committee's preliminary comments under General Assembly resolution 1437 (XIV), section I, paragraph 5, concerning co-ordination in the field, appeared in paragraphs 28-35 of its report. The Advisory Committee had already suggested that attempts by organizations to conduct their increasingly decentralized operations through separate field organizations would be wasteful and confusing. In that connexion the increasing reliance placed on TAB resident representatives was a useful development; further measures could be taken to combine responsibilities and functions in a single office or under a single representative in a given location, especially in the case of programmes for which the United Nations bore sole responsibility. The executive heads of the organizations had an important role to play in developing administrative co-ordination, but the responsibility of Governments was even greater. Those represented in the policy-making organs of, for example, the Expanded Programme, the Special Fund and UNICEF could make a significant contribution to co-ordination within the United Nations itself. Meanwhile the Advisory Committee would take every opportunity to promote continuing co-ordination among the organizations.

28. The Advisory Committee commented in paragraphs 46-109 of its report on specific points arising out of the review of the agency budgets for 1961; it had reported separately on the 1961 budget estimates of the TAB secretariat and field offices^{3/} and the administrative budget estimates of the Special Fund.^{4/} The fact that all those budgets were subject to review by the same body was in itself an important factor in the process of co-ordination, and the Advisory Committee's reports showed that the individual budgets were considered, not in isolation, but as an integrated whole.

29. Mr. GABITES (New Zealand) congratulated the Advisory Committee on its excellent report (A/4599), which carried forward the work done by that Committee on the subject in previous years, culminating in the valuable report submitted at the fourteenth session on administrative and budgetary co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies, with

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Supplement No. 3.

^{2/} United Nations publication, Sales No.: 60.IV.14.

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 30, document A/4564.

^{4/} *Ibid.*, agenda item 28, document A/4565.

particular reference to the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance.^{5/}

30. The Advisory Committee drew attention to the expansion in the operational activities of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies to meet the needs of the large number of countries, which had recently achieved, or soon would achieve, independence, and also in activities for the benefit of the under-developed countries in general, financed by the Special Fund. The Committee gave, in addition, a clear and concise picture of the activities being carried out by the specialized agencies in the Congo at the request of the Security Council. Those developments illustrated the need for and, more significantly, the feasibility and the value of, close co-ordination between the United Nations and its related organizations. The Congo operation, in particular, demonstrated what could be achieved in terms of human welfare by international organizations when they worked as a team, pursuing the same goals and co-operating closely at all levels.

31. Recent events had made it abundantly clear that the achievement of independence by most countries of the world had increased rather than diminished the need for international action in the economic and social, as well as in the political field. There were still great and urgent needs to be met in the under-developed countries in general and in the newly independent States in particular. The expansion of activities and the accompanying rise in expenditure made it increasingly important to ensure that the resources available to international organizations were used in such a way as to produce the greatest possible benefit. That required that the activities of the organizations concerned should be coherently and dynamically related to one another; not only must duplication and waste be avoided, but co-operation and integration must be achieved at every level.

32. There was no doubt that the division of responsibility for international action in the economic and social fields between the United Nations and the specialized agencies increased the difficulty of that task. A single consolidated budget for all those organizations would obviously greatly facilitate the application of a rational scale of priorities to all their programmes and the development of a concerted approach to the needs and problems with which they were faced. Such a procedure was not, however, practicable at present, and, in any case, the question had implications going far beyond the administrative and budgetary sphere. Given the present division of responsibility, means must be found to co-ordinate the work of the various organizations without necessarily interfering with their respective constitutional positions.

33. The Charter vested responsibility for co-ordinating the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies primarily in the Economic and Social Council; but, at the same time, it gave the General Assembly the function of examining the administrative budgets of the specialized agencies. That apparent inconsistency was a recognition of the fact that "co-ordination by consent" could not be achieved by any single means. Co-ordination of programmes, which was the concern of the Economic and Social Council, was complementary to administrative and budgetary co-ordina-

tion, which was the responsibility of the Fifth Committee. It was useful, however, for the two approaches to be considered together from time to time by a body as nearly as possible representative of the full membership of the United Nations family, since the success of either approach depended mainly on the co-ordination of policies within the Governments of the individual States members of the various organizations. He therefore welcomed the opportunity which had been given to the Fifth Committee to consider together the annual report of the Advisory Committee on the administrative budgets of the agencies for 1961 and the section of the Economic and Social Council's report dealing with programme co-ordination, in particular with the five-year appraisals exercise.

34. The appraisal clearly illustrated the close relationship between the two approaches he had mentioned and the advantages of co-operation between those responsible for them. The idea had originally been put forward by the Advisory Committee, but it had been expanded and to some extent modified by the Economic and Social Council in the process of implementation. The Advisory Committee recognized, however, in paragraph 8 of its report (A/4599) that the appraisal report reflected a substantial achievement of its basic objective in constituting a comprehensive review of the economic and social work of a large part of the United Nations family, showing the extent to which the activities of the organizations concerned had met a number of needs for international action and permitting the various programmes to be seen as part of a whole.

35. The consolidated report of the Committee on Programme Appraisals was a very interesting and valuable document. It brought together for the first time information about the programmes of the United Nations and those of the larger specialized agencies and considered them in the broadest perspective, in relation to the needs and opportunities for international action in the economic, social and human rights fields. The Committee on Programme Appraisals concluded, in paragraph 371 (i) of its report, that any arbitrary stabilization of budgets at present levels was not desirable and that additional funds were undoubtedly needed for the programmes and activities as described. At the same time, it recognized, in paragraphs 352-355 of its report, the need for the orderly regulation of growing programmes so as to ensure their maximum effectiveness and suggested that streamlining, or the application of priorities, should be made an annual exercise in the specialized agencies as well as in the United Nations. His delegation considered those conclusions and suggestions sound and relevant, and fully supported them.

36. Another important matter dealt with in the consolidated report was the problem of maintaining the proper and essential role of Governments in the field of co-ordination. It pointed out that the Economic and Social Council had for some time experienced difficulties in carrying out its responsibility in that field because of the multiplicity of organizations, policies and programmes to be considered and their complicated interrelationships. In particular, the volume of documentation reaching the Council had grown beyond the ability of many delegations to read and to master, and Governments had found it difficult to brief their representatives adequately. The Council had recognized the gravity of the situation and had established an *ad hoc* working group to study the documents submitted to the Council in 1961 and to prepare a concise

^{5/} *Ibid.*, Fourteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 49, document A/4172.

statement of the issues and problems in the field of co-ordination which arose from them. The Advisory Committee's reports on administrative and budgetary co-ordination would be of great value to the new body in its work, and he hoped that the working group's report would in turn be of some assistance to the Advisory Committee.

37. The Economic and Social Council recognized that, in the first instance, the responsibility for co-ordination rested on the secretariats of the organizations concerned, which, by continuous close co-operation, could obviate or overcome many of the problems arising from the division of authority within the United Nations family. In Economic and Social Council resolution 799 A (XXX), which his delegation regarded as most valuable, the Council had requested the Secretary-General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies and of the IAEA to take measures necessary to facilitate the discharge by the ACC of its increasing responsibilities, and had gone on to suggest specific ways in which that Committee could assist the Council in its work. His delegation fully supported the action taken by the Secretary-General under that resolution in requesting provision for the expansion of the ACC secretariat. He hoped that the Secretary-General would be able to carry out that expansion within the budgetary limits laid down by the General Assembly and would be grateful for confirmation on that point.

38. The Council had taken a number of useful steps towards strengthening the machinery of programme co-ordination. It was necessary, however, to ensure full co-ordination not only in the formulation but in the execution of programmes. The consolidated report drew particular attention to the need for co-ordination of programmes of activity at the country level, as well as on a global and regional basis. It pointed out that in newly independent countries, where the resources available were often very limited and the needs were always very great, it was particularly important to avoid competition and overlapping to adopt a concerted and fully integrated approach to development. Economic and Social Council resolution 795 (XXX) recognized that it was the responsibility of Governments to relate the assistance which they received to their development needs and programmes and pointed out that resident representatives had an important role to play in that respect, especially in newly independent countries. It called upon the Secretary-General and the executive heads of the related agencies to continue to make full use of those officers and to accord them adequate authority in co-ordinating the development and execution of programmes of assistance, whether financed from voluntary funds or from the regular budgets of their organizations. The Advisory Committee also had taken a considerable interest in the subject of co-ordination in the field. In paragraph 44 of its report to the fourteenth session^{5/} it had pointed out that independent attempts by each of the organizations to provide regional facilities through the setting up of networks of field offices might prove both uneconomical and confusing; and it described the co-ordination and efficient use of staff and facilities in the field as one of the major administrative and budgetary problems of concern to the General Assembly in the next several years. His delegation fully agreed with the Advisory Committee's view, and was glad to learn from para-

graphs 28 to 35 of the report before the Committee (A/4599) that it had kept and would continue to keep the question under review.

39. Some progress had already been made with co-ordination in the field. The Advisory Committee had noted in paragraph 39 of its report to the fourteenth session that the TAB resident representative system was now better understood and that the facilities offered by that system were being utilized to an increasing extent. It was particularly encouraging that the Special Fund was making full use of resident representatives rather than setting up a field organization of its own and that, in a number of cases, resident representatives acted for one or more of the specialized agencies and/or the United Nations Office of Public Information. Although there had been progress, much still remained to be done to achieve full co-ordination in the field. Most of the specialized agencies did not make as much use as they might of resident representatives, with the result that their field organizations were larger than they should be. Some organizations within the framework of the United Nations itself, such as UNICEF, while making some use of the resident representatives, maintained field organizations of their own alongside that of TAB. It might also be useful if the Advisory Committee could devote particular attention in its next report on co-ordination in the field to the positions of the specialized agencies and of UNICEF, and to the relations with each other, as well as with TAB and with the United Nations itself. He would welcome the comments of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on that question.

40. The Advisory Committee had a very important role to play in the co-ordination of extra-budgetary programmes in general, the need for which had recently become more widely recognized with the rapid growth of the Special Fund. In its resolution 786 (XXX), the Economic and Social Council had introduced a system of project programming under the Expanded Programme and had eliminated the system of agency planning shares and agency sub-totals in country projects. That resolution, when fully implemented, should do much to increase the flexibility of the Expanded Programme and to make it a more effective instrument for United Nations action in the economic and social field. But in spite of such recent progress, much still remained to be done to integrate the various activities financed from extra-budgetary funds—notably those of the Special Fund and UNICEF, as well as of the Expanded Programme—with those financed from the regular budgets of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies. That was preeminently an area for co-operation between programme bodies and those concerned with administrative and budgetary matters. The Advisory Committee had already given valuable assistance to the Economic and Social Council in connexion with the allocation of administrative and operational services costs under the Expanded Programme, and his delegation was glad to note that it would consider the matter in greater detail during 1961 and would submit appropriate recommendations for further action in time for the Economic and Social Council to consider them at its thirty-second session (A/4599, para. 24). He hoped that the Advisory Committee would also be able to give assistance in connexion with UNICEF and the Special Fund with a view to ensuring that their programmes were coherently related to one another and to the work of the United Nations family as a whole.

^{5/} Ibid.

41. In the immediate future, the Advisory Committee could assist in the task of assessing and dealing with the effects of the current expansion in the activities of the Expanded Programme and of the Special Fund. The Committee on Programme Appraisals pointed out in paragraph 371 (iv) of its consolidated report that the role played by voluntary funds in the operation of the programmes and activities of the United Nations and the related agencies was markedly increasing and that the development was giving rise to certain administrative difficulties for those organizations. The Advisory Committee had made a similar observation with regard to the Special Fund in paragraph 35 of its report to the General Assembly on the budget estimates for 1961²⁷ and, in paragraphs 25 to 27 of the report before the Committee (A/4599), it had devoted further attention to the arrangements made for the participation of the specialized agencies in the Special Fund's work. The substantial increase in contributions to the Expanded Fund and to the Special Fund, announced at the recent Pledging Conference, indicated that the problem was likely to grow rather than to diminish in the next few years and to require a good deal of attention at all levels. The Economic and Social Council had already requested ACC to prepare a study of the problem which would be considered by the Council at its thirty-second session. That study was of considerable importance for the smooth and rapid development of the work of the United Nations and, therefore, justified unusual efforts. The Advisory Committee was in a position to make a valuable contribution to the study, particularly on account of the knowledge it had acquired in the course of its own examination of the technical assistance activities of the specialized agencies. He was sure that the Council would welcome its advice and he hoped that the Committee would feel free to comment on ACC's report when it was submitted in the summer of 1961.

42. In conclusion, he emphasized that co-ordination was not merely a matter of administrative tidiness, or even of economy; it was a matter of increasing the effectiveness of international action in the economic and social fields, so as to ensure that the great and urgent needs for such action were met to the greatest possible extent. The object of co-ordination should be, not only to avoid duplication, but to achieve a constructive unity of effort in a common cause. Co-ordination required sustained thought and effort, not only on the part of the two United Nations organs which had direct responsibility for co-ordination—the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly—but also on the part of other bodies, including the functional and regional commissions and the governing authorities of special programmes such as the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, UNICEF and the Special Fund; on the part of the secretariats of the various organizations included in the United Nations family; and finally, and most importantly, on the part of the individual Governments of the States Members of the United Nations and its related agencies. The co-operative efforts of all were required if those organizations were to be welded into a strong and effective instrument for the achievement of the purposes laid down in their constitutions.

43. Mr. TURNER (Controller) confirmed that the necessary strengthening of the ACC secretariat would be carried out, within the budgetary limits laid down, as early as possible in 1961.

²⁷ Ibid., Fifteenth Session, Supplement No. 7.

AGENDA ITEM 50

Budget estimates for the financial year 1961 (A/4370, A/4408, A/4603) (continued)*

Administrative arrangements under the draft Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (A/4603)

44. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the Advisory Committee's report (A/4603), submitted in response to a suggestion made in the Fifth Committee at the General Assembly's fourteenth session (733rd meeting).

45. Mr. BENDER (United States of America) observed that the clear historical review given by the Advisory Committee in its report illustrated how easy it was for basic administrative principles to be forgotten and for United Nations units to proliferate. In order to ensure that the Advisory Committee's instructive study and recommendations for corrective action were not wasted, the Fifth Committee should recommend the General Assembly to endorse the Advisory Committee's report and to transmit it for serious consideration to the Plenipotentiary Conference which was to be convened in New York in January 1961 for the purpose of concluding the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. The most appropriate form for the Committee's recommendation might be a resolution, which could be drafted by the Rapporteur.

46. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the amendments to article 24 of the draft Single Convention recommended by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 16 of its report had been approved by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

47. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) replied that it was not yet known whether the Commission would consider the Advisory Committee's views before the Plenipotentiary Conference was convened.

48. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Committee should ask the General Assembly not to endorse the Advisory Committee's report but merely to bring it to the attention of the Plenipotentiary Conference for due consideration.

49. Mr. AGHNIDES (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) pointed out that the main administrative problem to be resolved in adopting the Single Convention was whether or not the secretarial services now provided by separate bodies should be unified. If the Fifth Committee favoured unification it would, in his opinion, be well advised to ask the General Assembly to commend the Advisory Committee's views to the Plenipotentiary Conference.

50. After a brief procedural discussion in which Mr. BENDER (United States of America), Mr. CUTTS (Australia), Rapporteur, and the CHAIRMAN took part, Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the Fifth Committee should not depart so far from its normal practice as to endorse the Advisory Committee's report; that would entail examining and adopting the twenty-two paragraphs in the document seriatim. Action on the lines he had already suggested would be more in accordance with precedent.

* Resumed from the 806th meeting.

51. Mr. BANNIER (Netherlands) expressed his delegation's full support for the United States proposal. The Fifth Committee was responsible for ensuring that the activities of the United Nations were conducted in an orderly fashion, and it should not, in the case of narcotic drugs, abandon that responsibility to the Plenipotentiary Conference. The unification of the secretariats concerned with narcotic drugs involved no innovation as to substance but would be a great improvement from the administrative standpoint.

52. Mr. SERBANESCU (Romania) felt that the Committee should defer any decision on the merits of the Advisory Committee's recommendations until the Rapporteur had suggested a form of words.

53. Mr. GABITES (New Zealand) pointed out that the Plenipotentiary Conference would be primarily concerned with substantive rather than administrative

matters, and that the Fifth Committee in any case had more experience of the latter. He therefore felt that it would be quite appropriate for the Fifth Committee to give a clear indication of its views and he supported the suggestion made by the United States delegation.

54. Mr. KITTANI (Iraq) fully endorsed the Advisory Committee's recommendations. It was high time to remove the anomaly created by the existence of separate secretariats performing similar functions with respect to narcotic drugs, and the 1961 Plenipotentiary Conference provided the best opportunity of doing so.

55. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should ask the Rapporteur to submit a draft for its consideration.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.