

The principal reason for the continuing impasse over this question in the Security Council is that a number of the Soviet-sponsored candidates are not generally considered to be in a position to comply with the conditions of membership stipulated in Article 4 of the Charter. For its part, the Soviet Union appears to be unwilling to give favourable consideration to the applications of the remaining candidates, except in the context of a general move by the Security Council to approve the admission of all the states whose applications for membership are still outstanding. On the basis of Paragraph 2 of Article 4 of the Charter and the advisory opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice on March 3, 1950, the admission of those states cannot be effected by the General Assembly on its own initiative unless there has been a specific and prior recommendation for admission by the Security Council.

In the light of these circumstances the General Assembly could do no more than approve, on December 4, a resolution sponsored jointly by Brazil, Canada, Philippines, Sweden and Syria, which requested the Security Council to keep the outstanding applications under consideration in accordance with the terms of the resolutions passed by the General Assembly at its Fourth Session. The joint draft resolution was adopted by a vote of 46 in favour, 5 against, with 2 abstentions. The General Assembly also had before it two further proposals relating to the admission of new members: a draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union recommending that the Security Council review the applications of all candidates for admission to membership with the exception of the Republic of Korea; and a draft resolution introduced by El Salvador which would have conferred observer status upon all the applicants sponsored by the Western Powers pending their eventual admission to full membership. Neither of these proposals commanded the required support in the General Assembly. The Canadian delegation voted against the Soviet proposal on the ground that it excluded the Republic of Korea from the list of outstanding applicants. It was also unable to support the proposal put forward by El Salvador which implied substantial modifications in the structure of the United Nations and could not be regarded as entirely compatible with the provisions of the Charter.

Administrative

Place of Meeting of the Sixth Regular Session of the General Assembly

On December 14 the General Assembly adopted, by a vote of 31 in favour, 16 against, with 11 abstentions, a proposal sponsored jointly by Bolivia, Colombia and Peru, to convene the Sixth Regular Session of the Assembly in Europe. The proposal instructed the President of the Assembly and the Secretary-General to select the city most suitable for the purpose and to make the necessary arrangements with the host government.

The Canadian delegation voted against the joint proposal on the ground that adequate facilities existed at Headquarters in New York, while the convening of the next session in Europe would involve not only serious difficulties of a technical nature, but an estimated additional expenditure of \$1,750,000 if the session were held in Paris, and \$1,600,000 if it were held in Geneva. These, moreover, represented minimum estimates based on the assumption that the host government would provide the greater part of the conference facilities required by the General Assembly.

On the other hand, it was contended that there were substantial political advantages in a reasonable decentralization of the work of the principal organs of the United Nations. It would acquaint the Organization with the problems and needs of diverse regions of the world and, conversely, allow local public opinion to gain a fuller understanding of the purposes and goals of the United Nations. More specifically, the decision to convene the 1951 session of the General Assembly in Europe would be interpreted by Europeans as a testimony of solidarity and a message of