

to make it include all the Members. The majority of the delegations, on the other hand, including the Canadian, argued for a smaller committee whose tasks would be strictly technical and procedural. Under the compromise which was finally adopted, the composition of the General Committee was fixed at fourteen members, no two of whom would be nationals of the same state. These fourteen members would be the President, the seven Vice-Presidents of the General Assembly and the chairmen of the six main committees. The functions of the committee were carefully defined as purely advisory, the Assembly retaining full power in its own hands.

The experience of the first part of the First Session of the General Assembly proved the importance of this committee and the necessity of maintaining strictly the limitations on the powers granted to it. There appeared to be some confusion as to the nature of its reports. In several cases, the General Committee took upon itself the responsibility of recommending decisions on policy, rather than reporting back to the Assembly on the procedural aspects of the question. It was not intended, of course, that it should have this power.

The Netherlands proposal that the committee structure of the General Assembly should include a standing committee on peace and security was fully debated by the Preparatory Commission. This committee was intended to function when the General Assembly was not in session, thus reducing the need for special sessions of the Assembly to discuss urgent political problems. While welcoming a discussion of the proposal, the Canadian delegation doubted whether such a committee was needed. The Canadian delegate pointed out that the General Assembly would always have the power under the Charter of taking such action with regard to international peace and security as seemed necessary. If a standing committee proved necessary, the Assembly could appoint it at any time. At the suggestion of the Canadian delegate, the Netherlands proposal was withdrawn.

The proposal of the Executive Committee to set up a Nominations Committee was rejected by a large majority in the Preparatory Commission. The Canadian delegation supported the setting up of this committee on the general grounds that it could best ensure the selection of competent chairmen for the main committees, while at the same time maintaining the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The Canadian delegation emphasized the importance of selecting chairmen of committees who would be able to conduct meetings expeditiously and well; the real work of the Assembly would be done in committees, and the authority of the Assembly would, therefore, depend in a large measure upon the competence and impartiality of the chairmen of its committees. Those who opposed the appointment of a Nominations Committee did so on the grounds that the committee structure of the General Assembly should be kept as simple as possible and that the elections of chairmen should